By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 16504. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that any social security benefit increases provided for by Public Law 92-336 be disregarded in determining eligibility for pension or compensation under such title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 16505. A bill to require States to pass along to public assistance recipients who are entitled to social security benefits the 1972 increase in such benefits, either by disregarding it in determining their need for assistance or otherwise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN (for himself and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 16506. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish national parks or national recreation areas in those States which presently do not have a national park or national recreation area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHERLE (for himself, Mr. POAGE, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. THONE, and Mr. MAYNE):

H.R. 16507. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise certain requirements for approval of new animal drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 16508. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide additional assistance to small employers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 16509. A bill to require States to pass along to public assistance recipients who are entitled to social security benefits at least half of the 1972 increase in such benefits, either by disregarding it in determining their need for assistance or otherwise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 16510. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.J. Res. 1293. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Res. 1105. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to reruns of television programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 16511. A bill to allow International Risks, Inc., to use within the District of Columbia the name "Special Risk Covers of the District of Columbia, Inc."; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 16512. A bill for the relief of Lealla Laura Melvin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 16513. A bill for the relief of the Cuban Truck & Equipment Co., its heirs, and assigns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 16514. A bill to permit the Capitol Yacht Club of the District of Columbia to borrow money without regard to the usury laws of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 16515. A bill to permit the Capitol Yacht Club of the District of Columbia to borrow money without regard to the usury laws of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE IMPORT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1972 TO THE EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT AND THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, in April 1972 we were successful in having the Secretary of Commerce determine that Passaic County, Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey, statistically qualifies, based on the continuing high unemployment rate in our county confirmed by the U.S. Department of Labor, for designation as a title I area eligible for long term economic development grants and loans for the construction of public works and development facilities including added Federal supplementary grants under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, Public Law 89-136.

This action was most important to my congressional district, one of the most highly industrialized and major labor market areas in the northeast metropolitan region of our country, where we have suffered among the highest unemployment ratios in the United States. Eligibility under title I of this act authorizing grants for public works and development facilities, as it is presently constituted, provided us with the opportunity to apply for 50 percent direct matching Federal assistance funds for:

First, acquisition or development of land and improvements for public works, public service, or development facility usage; and second, acquisition, construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion or improvement of such facilities including related machinery and equipment, as well as supplementary grants for a total maximum Federal share up to 80 percent to take maximum advantage of:

First, designated Federal grant-in-aid programs defined in the act; second, the forementioned direct grants enumerated under first—above—and third, Federal grant-in-aid programs authorized by the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act and the 11 watersheds authorized by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944—including the Passaic River Basin—for which these areas are eligible but, because of their economic situation, they cannot supply the required matching share.

All essential factors in generating permanent jobs for long-term employment in our economically depressed areas and contributing substantially to the establishment of stable and diversified local economies.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that the amendments to the Public Works and Economic Development Act scheduled for consideration on today's congressional calendar will provide my Passaic County District with the following benefits which are essential to help meet the desperate need for economic development programing and capital economic expansion in our county, State and Nation—and particularly in our urban centers where the highest level of unemployment prevails throughout our country.

The amendments would strike the requirement that supplementary grants for public works and development facilities can be used only to increase the Federal contribution above the authorized maximum, thereby permitting use of supplementary grants to raise the Federal contribution from the amount of the basic grant to the authorized maximum. The bill would also decrease the required local share for grant-in-aid projects from 20 to 10 percent.

The amendments authorize operating grants at a rate not to exceed 75 percent of operating costs for vocational training facilities constructed with direct grants under title I of the act. These transition grants would be available for any two years during the 5 years following enactment to help communities make permanent arrangements to fund such operating costs.

The eligibility criteria provisions of the amendments under the public works impact program are most significant in providing immediate short term employment for pockets of high unemployment without sacrificing the limited funding available to other areas under the Public Works and Economic Development Assistance Act. The public works impact program would receive $500 million in each of the next 2 fiscal years. The amendment redefines special impact areas as areas, urban and rural and without regard to other boundaries, which have a large concentration of low-income persons, substantial unemployment, or actual or threatened unemployment due to closing or curtailment of a major source of employment and provides 100 percent Federal matching funds for these areas of high unemployment, concentrated low income, or substantial outmigration.

Mr. Speaker, by citing only benefits as they apply to title I of the Public Works and Economic Development Act, I trust no one will misconstrue the value of any of the other amendments contained in today's legislation as being less important. I firmly believe that the bill, as presented, has incorporated many of the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

desperately needed improvements in existing law that have been brought to the attention of our Public Works Committee and our committee staff members, and particularly our legal counsel, have done an excellent job in encompassing the evaluations made of the existing programs as well as recommendations received during our public hearings in the substantive 1972 amendments to the Public Works and Economic Development Act. The extension of these economic programs for an additional fiscal year to June 30, 1974 is, as the committee has reported, essential to assist economically depressed areas so that they may be brought into the mainstream of our Nation's economic growth.

REPORT TO THE HOUSE ON THE THIRD PARLIAMENTARY AND SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE AT LAUSANNE, SWITZERLAND

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the pace of scientific information and application has increased at an exponential rate since the 18th century, especially since World War II and the advent of sophisticated information systems. Science and technology have in the last 200 years changed beyond comprehension the potential for improvement in man's quality of life. Science and technology are inextricably bound to the social and economic fabric of modern society, and the effects which their development has on society are so great that they can no longer be permitted to evolve at random or to suit the needs of isolated interests. Decisions regarding the social impact and desirability of new scientific and technological innovations have increasingly been thrust upon political bodies because their effects are, as the Director of Oak Ridge National Laboratory has stated, trans-scientific—that is, their impact and behavior go beyond the predictive capabilities of science. Yet politicians have, with uncomfortable regularity, been asked to make decisions on technological proposals without having an adequate evaluation of the possible impacts of the technology on society. Recognizing the crucial need for more knowledge and careful assessment of those impacts before we vote our decisions, the House of Representatives voted in February to establish an Office of Technology Assessment—to provide us with adequate information for managing science and formulating a rational science policy for our Nation.

Although many countries in Europe have established such an office, either serving their parliaments directly or stemming from their ministries of trade, the Members of the Council of Europe determined that there was sensed a need to discuss science policy as it affects the member states collectively rather than individually. Therefore, the Consultative Assembly of the Council convened the Third Parliamentary and Scientific Conference of the Council of Europe. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a report to the House on this excellent conference.

The conference, which was held in Lausanne, Switzerland in April, was organized by the council's committee on science and technology to consider three topics pertinent to science in Europe today:

First, parliamentary democracies in the scientific-technological age.

Second, European science policy.

Third, management of technology and parliamentary control.

Some 150 members of parliament, scientists and science managers, and industrialists met to discuss the issues and to make recommendations as to how the European community might best organize meaningful scientific and technological policies for its citizens. To enlarge the scope of debate representatives of foreign countries were invited to participate in the conference. It was my privilege to attend by special invitation directed to our House Committee on Science and Astronautics. Among other non-European representatives were the Honorable Ian Watson, member of the Canadian House of Commons, who attended as a representative of the Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association. Also attending from the Canadian Parliament was Senator Allister Grosart, Chairman of the Steering Committee of the Special Committee of the Senate on National Science Policy. Mr. Takao Fujimoto, director of the special committee of the house of representatives for the promotion of science and technology, represented Japan.

The conference lasted for 5 days and consisted of working sessions at which the attendees considered each of the three conference themes. Thought-provoking papers were presented at each session and were followed by a general discussion and debate of the issue at hand. All conference attendees were encouraged to submit recommendations which they thought should be incorporated in the conclusions of the conference.

Regarding the role of parliamentary democracy in the scientific and technological age, the conference concluded that the power shift in modern states between administration and parliament, to the detriment of the latter, has resulted from specialization of the machinery of administration due to the demands of the complexities of modern life. In recent years the rapid development of technology has tended to speed this tendency. "Since parliamentary democracy is still the system of government best suited to safeguarding individual freedoms and human rights in a technical age," the conclusions state, "the decline in the authority of parliaments must be countered by providing them with the means to function independent of the executive power." Parliaments must provide themselves with operating methods and structures and up-to-date information systems so that the members are fully aware of the import of the decisions they must make.

Recognizing the need to develop trans-European institutions capable of synthesizing scientific and technological data, making recommendations to parliaments, and implementing a program of action, the conference concluded that European governments should encourage organizations like CERN where the cost of equipment for fundamental research can be shared by the participating governments, thus enabling European governments to tackle together research which they could not afford individually. The conference further recommended that European governments:

First, encourage intergovernmental and international scientific and technical organizations;

Second, facilitate the movement of scientists and scientific instruments for participation in programs developed by governments or international institutions;

Third, refrain from undertaking large joint technological projects when there may be parallel efforts on a national level;

Fourth, make necessary arrangements at the outset of a joint project for joint industrial exploitation and marketing of the results—thus emphasizing the importance of technology transfer;

Fifth, establish, in cooperation with the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, a data bank "designed to identify the described current research in Member States of the OECD and the Council of Europe."

I also made a recommendation which was incorporated into the conclusions of the conference on European science policy: "that European governments, in pursuance of the objectives set out in the preceding paragraphs bearing on fundamental research, give consideration to the establishment of a European Science Foundation under the direction of a Board of Governors drawn from both the physical and social science communities."

Further conclusions reached by the conference were that economic growth in Europe will, in the future, be based less on manpower reserves and more on the management of technological innovations; that European nations acting separately will be increasingly limited in the field of advanced technology; and that "so far European cooperation has above all been hampered by an insufficient integration of policies and action programs and too vague an appreciation of the dynamic nature of the new political power relationships between industry and the public authorities, whereby the latter intervene on at least three different levels: research, structures, and contracts." Considering these conclusions, the conference made the following recommendations, which I quote in full because they are so relevant to our own development of a rational science management policy:

A. At the national level

(i) that European governments should identify the public and private research and development centres and organisations capable of contributing to product and process

innovation in order to establish in ocncert a group of priority objectives to which public funds may be allocated;

(ii) that European governments should assess the contribution of state enterprises to process and product innovation and their role in the state's general economic policy;

(iii) that European governments should analyse the role of the multinational corporations which regulate a significant proportion of technological innovation in Europe in the interest of a world-wide business policy in order to determine whether or not the strategy of the multinational corporations is in accordance with the co-ordination of innovation activities which the State seeks to attain;

(iv) that European governments should carry out an analysis covering the above areas in order to make possible the comparisons of different programmes against social and political objectives;

(v) that European governments, in order to provide a basis for evaluation of programmes, should increase their support to research in the social and political sciences concerning the interrelation between technological, economic, social and political development, as well as studies of decision-making processes and of structural arrangements for improved control and regulation of the development and uses of new technologies;

(vi) that European governments should take the necessary steps to encourage universities in Europe to undertake individually and jointly interdisciplinary research and examination in order that universities may contribute effectively and constructively towards the solving of the problems threatening the future well-being of mankind.

B. At the European Level

(i) that the European governments concerned institute co-operation in international institutions in the field of economic and technological long-range forecasting and planning, in order that those responsible for selecting research and development objectives at European, national, regional, company or laboratory level, and in particular parliamentarians, may be supplied with a full and coherent range of detailed studies of the situation;

(ii) that European governments grant European institutions and the European Communities in particular the necessary powers and means to formulate advanced technology policies, especially on those three levels where action is most urgently needed: research and development, the re-adjustment of industrial structures, the concerting of public contracts; and that European States should be given the opportunity of collaborating in these activities;

(iii) that European governments encourage concerted action by public authorities and organisations (international, national or regional) in order to ensure that their initiatives in advanced technology are complementary;

(iv) that European governments ensure that the purchasing policies of such authorities and organisations contribute to the elimination of administrative obstacles to the establishment of a unified market for the products of advanced technology, even in fields not covered by a common research and development programme.

Summing up the conclusions of the conference, it can be said that in the modern industrial state there is a grave necessity to reorder priorities and to direct scientific and technological efforts toward social objectives. Science policies must begin to mesh with and further those objectives, and parliaments must initiate the process and contribute to the formulation of objectives and review implementation of policy. With such conclusions the Council of Europe is trying to avoid the pitfalls of modern states noted by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Kurt Waldheim, in March:

Failure to assert the primacy of policy over technology is an alarming and increasingly dangerous phenomenon of the modern world. All too often, those responsible for the future development of technology are insufficiently aware of the far-reaching political, economic and social implications of their choices.

The European community as represented by the Council of Europe is on its way toward making itself aware of its problems and responsibilities in the areas of science and technology management. At a time when our own national priorities need serious reevaluation—when we face a breakdown of our social order because the major application of our technology has been directed at the military rather than toward solving our great domestic problems like transportation, housing, health care, trash disposal, and the energy crisis—it would be good for us as Members of Congress to study the recommendations of this Third Parliamentary and Scientific Conference of the Counil of Europe as food for thought in approaching our own science and technology policy and management problems.

Moreover, our peacetime technology effort that is our public investment in basic and applied research, having taken a back seat—even a rumble seat—to military needs, may find itself at a competitive disadvantage with a resurgent continental technology of a united Europe. While we applaud their initiative we had better look to our own.

NOTE.—The Council of Europe was formed in 1949 to forge a greater unity among its members. Its aims of facilitating economic and social progress and safeguarding common ideals and principles are pursued by the Council through "discussion of questions of common concern and by agreements and common action in economic, social, cultural, scientific, legal and administrative matters and in the maintenance and further realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms." (Article 1 of the Statute of the Council of Europe). Membership in the Council is dependent upon observance of parliamentary democracy; there are at present seventeen member states: Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOVIET INVASION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, August 21, 1972, will mark the fourth anniversary of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. By this act of foreign interference, Czechoslovakia's right of sovereignty over its own affairs was clearly, and unjustifiably, violated.

It is without question appropriate that we once again express our outrage over this action but, at the same time, we must be cautious not to act in a manner inconsistent with the overriding goal of American foreign policy. That goal, which now more than ever must be our constant guide, is to establish an atmosphere of peace in a world in which the people of Czechoslovakia can resume the great strides they were making toward obtaining increased liberties prior to the abrupt act of Russian intervention which we decry today.

Rather than to continue deploring this act in tired political rhetoric—although expressions of moral support are not without value—it is now time for us to encourage the Czech people to set out, once again, along the road to freedom. It is for us to determine, and then, to act, in whatever ways we can most-significantly aid them in this critical project. Very possibly, the most constructive activities the American people can undertake are those which will, by expanding our influence through diplomatic channels, liberalize the Czechoslovakian nation as well as those other nations engaged in similar struggles. This implies increased cultural exchange, more flexible trade agreements, and serious consideration of the future role of NATO and the possibilities for mutual and strategically-equitable troop reductions in Europe.

This approach will not only aid the people of Czechoslovakia in their efforts to regain their freedom from Soviet control, but it could have wider benefits as well, in the contribution it will make to the overall betterment of international relations and the making of a more-peaceful and understanding world.

NAACP SHOWS CONCERN FOR AFRICAN AFFAIRS

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, recent actions taken by a number of black organizations indicate that there is an ever larger concern for African affairs among all segments of the black community. National organizations in every area of endeavor, be they political, cultural, social, or economic, are taking firm and unequivocal stand on the right of African peoples to determine their own fate.

I am pleased to note that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People—NAACP—has taken such a stand. I am certain that we will be hearing more from the NAACP as they move to implement the foreign affairs resolutions adopted at their most recent national convention in Detroit, Mich.

Mr. Speaker, I insert these resolutions into the RECORD:

VII. FOREIGN AFFAIRS

AFRICA

The NAACP since its inception, has expressed a continuing interest in the Mid-East and Africa, opposed Colonialism, supported Pan-Africanism, the struggles of Africans for independence and self-determination. As expressive of our interest and concern with the problems of these areas, we commend our Executive Director, Roy Wilkins, for his recent trips to South Africa and Israel.

After independence, we have urged our nation, through grants and aid and technical assistance, to help the emerging new nations to develop their economic potential, increase their trade relations with the United States and other countries.

We have long recognized that South African apartheid, is one of the world's most iniquitous and debilitating practices separating black and non-white Africans from the white minority and discriminating against them in education, housing, employment as well as denying civil and political rights to this non-white majority.

Noting that the practice of apartheid support by foreign governments, including the United States, through investment policies, presence of foreign corporate enterprises, which follow the practice of a racially discriminating nation, and desiring to bring about an end to such practices in South Africa and other African nations, which likewise are guilty of denying equal rights and opportunities to natives, we call for the following:

1. Expansion of Economic aid to Africa;

2. An end to United States complicity with apartheid and the minority-ruled minority of Africa;

(a) Support of South African students in their courageous stand against segregation and discriminatory educational policies. Especially do we deplore and condemn the repressive action of the South African Government which closed the tribal colleges and universities because of student protests against expulsion of an African University student leader who attacked the Bantu Education System.

We also applaud and support the protest of white students against apartheid and we condemn the action of the South African governments in banning protest meetings from the campuses.

(b) A fresh review by American corporations of their employment policies and practices in South Africa and the pressing of corrective steps to insure equal opportunities for employment, training, upgrading and advancement of blacks in all categories of employment.

(c) A fresh review as of 1972–73 by U.S. organizations and individuals of their investment portfolios with firms doing business in South Africa with attendance at stockholders' meetings to insist that such firms use their corporate powers to help bring about remedial, non-discriminatory policy changes in management, employment, training, upgrading in South Africa, or withdraw their financial investments and franchise arrangements if such policies remain unchanged. We call on our members to withhold economic support from such companies doing business with the Union of South Africa where those companies do not accede to our request that they use their good offices to bring about a favorable change in the apartheid policies in South Africa.

We urge the appropriate NAACP officials to make available a list of American companies doing business in South Africa for the guidance of our members.

(d) Effective implementation of measures against illegal South African administration of Namibia.

(e) Closing of NASA Tracking Station in Johannesburg.

(f) Strict adherence to UN Arms Embargo against South Africa and Portugal.

(g) Termination of sugar quotas to South Africa and its redistribution to black Africa.

3. Termination of Azores agreement and of all military aid to Portugal.

4. We are dismayed and angry by the peremptory action of the United States Senate in disregarding the sanctions against Rhodesia in the matter of Rhodesian chrome, especially since it is acknowledged that the stockpile of the United States is more than enough to meet our needs for the next decade.

We reaffirm our long standing position regarding support of equal rights to Black Rhodesians and urge full support of UN sanctions against Rhodesia and an end to importation of Rhodesian chrome into the U.S.

5. Support of UN efforts to aid in the realization of self-determination and majority rule in Africa.

6. End to nuclear cooperation with countries, such as South Africa, which have not signed non-proliferation treaty.

7. Increased economic cooperation and assistance to the emerging African nations by the United States.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA—4 YEARS LATER

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago this month the Soviet Union sent its army into Czechoslovakia to eliminate the effort by the people of that country to achieve self-determination and freedom.

What has been referred to so often as the Prague Spring of 1968 was indeed short lived. For a short time, the people of Czechoslovakia, who have suffered so much as a result of both the Nazi and Communist occupations of their country, felt in control of their own destiny. For a short time, people could express their thoughts openly, could read the press and literature of the Western world of which they feel culturally so much a part, and could travel outside of the Soviet orbit.

Despite the fact that many in the West believe that the Soviet Union has, in some sense, altered its traditional policies and goals, the evidence seems quite to the contrary. Not only has the Soviet Union reimposed its iron grip upon the people of Czechoslovakia, but at this very moment, as if in celebration of the Soviet invasion of 4 years ago, a new purge of dissenters is taking place.

Since July 17, seven trials have been known to have occurred. The most recent is that of former Czech Communist Party College Rector Milan Hubl, and two other men who were accused of distributing "provocative printed matter" in order to weaken "the socialist system in the state." What they did was to pass out pamphlets during Czechoslovakia's elections last fall, informing voters of their constitutional rights to cross out names of the government-sponsored slate or not vote at all. Hubl, who was also accused of making contact with Italian Communists, was given a 6½-year sentence. One codefendant received 20 months.

The fact is that freedom has been obliterated in Czechoslovakia, and tyranny is regaining its iron grip on that country. That this is being done at the very moment when many in the West hail the new approach which is said to be emerging from the Communist world makes the suffering of the Czech people doubly ironic.

Commenting upon the recent series of trials, the Washington Post declared that—

Once again, the world is paying heed to Czechoslovakia and observing the barren quality of its public life. It is less a handful of doughty individuals than the government itself which is on trial. Prague's hopes of pacifying the people with economic improvements and of quietly nursing the country back into international respectability have had to yield to the domestic imperatives dictated, or so one must presume, by the Soviet Union.

The Post notes that—

Ironically, the invaders of Czechoslovakia currently enjoy a higher world standing, including a closer relationship with the United States, than does the victim.

Following is the editorial, "Czechoslovakia: A county On Trial," which appeared in the Washington Post of August 3, 1972:

CZECHOSLOVAKIA: A COUNTRY ON TRIAL

Such is the political ambiguity that still hovers over Prague four years after the Soviet invasion that it is hard to tell whether the current trials of "subversives" mark the darkening of a long night of the knives—as one defendant, Milan Hubl, reportedly warned Gustav Husak, the leader of Czechoslovakia—or whether, as the government contends, the trials are simply meant to erase the last public traces of resistance to the post-invasion status quo. That Mr. Husak chose the period of the trials to go on vacation, in the Soviet Union, would seem to illustrate the point.

The Czech government notes that it is not the liberal leaders of 1968, long since purged (but not tried) who are in the dock, but others who are charged with "crimes" committed—after repeated official warnings—in the 1970s. The political overtones are nonetheless apparent. The several dozen defendants did in fact support Alexander Dubcek in 1968; they support what he stood for still. But their acts—like distributing leaflets urging citizens to ignore government voting instructions in the 1971 elections—are not those which either a democratic country or a confident socialist country would regard as criminal. Indeed, some defendants, admitting the charges against them, claim that what they did was for the *good* of Czech socialism. But of course the trials are not about the perfecting of socialism; they are about the consolidating of an uneasy regime's power.

If the internal effects of the trial are as yet uncertain, the external effects are not. Once again the world is paying heed to Czechoslovakia and observing the barren quality of its public life. It is less a handful of doughty individuals than the government itself which is on trial. Prague's hopes of pacifying the people with economic improvements and of quietly nursing the country back into international respectability have had to yield to the domestic imperatives dictated, or so one must presume, by the Soviet Union.

Ironically, the invaders of Czechoslovakia currently enjoy a higher world standing, including a closer relationship with the United States, than does the victim. The reason is simple: the Soviet Union has the power. Yet

as the fourth anniversary of the invasion nears, the plight of the Czechs remains infinitely sad.

There has been an outcry throughout the world against the new series of repressive trials. Italian, British, and Swedish Communist newspapers have criticized the trials, and so has the acting head of the French Communist Party, Georges Marchais. An underground organization calling itself the Citizens' Freedom Movement has invited Angela Davis, the black militant leader, to come to Prague to attend the trial. The purpose of the visit would be, as the open letter to Miss Davis puts it, to help the defendants, who are being "persecuted for having questioned the wisdom of their rulers," but who, unlike Miss Davis herself during her recent trial, were unlikely to be accorded "the elementary right to defense in court proceedings."

The British magazine, the Economist, in its issue of July 22, 1972, reports about the invitation to Angela Davis, and notes that—

> There can be little doubt that the publicity surrounding the appeal to Miss Davis and another recent protest by a large group of prominent left-wing western intellectuals, including the philosopher Jean Paul Sartre and the novelist Graham Greene—have embarrassed both the Husak regime in Prague and the Soviet leaders. The open persecution in Czechoslovakia of right and left alike makes a bad impression on left-wing opinion in western Europe just at a time when some left-wing, non-Communist groups appear to be increasingly ready for close political cooperation with the communists in France, Italy, and elsewhere in the non-Communist world.

It is certainly time for the world to understand the true nature of communism. We have been given many examples, and if we fail to come to this realization it means that the brave people of Eastern Europe—particularly those of Czechoslovakia who face a new repression at this very moment—have suffered in vain. As we commemorate the fourth anniversary of the Soviet invasion, and as we observe the new persecution which is now taking place, we must make it clear to the world that wherever freedom and dignity are under attack, the sympathies of the American people are with the oppressed, not with the oppressor. We must keep faith with the brave people of Czechoslovakia, and must look forward to a time when their freedom and independence will once again be restored.

A RAY OF HOPE STILL EXISTS

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the streets of Prague, Czechoslovakia, will be quiet Monday. Quiet, not because the people of the Czech nation are content but because the tanks and soldiers of the Soviet Army extinguished all hope of freedom and liberty 4 years ago. Few will forget the tragic day on August 21, 1968 when the Soviet Union brutally and tyrannically overran the nation of Czechoslovakia. For over 20 years of Soviet domination, the independent minded Czechs sought some form of freedom amidst the dictatorship of communism. Alexander Dubcek, who ruled Czechoslovakia for only a 15-month "brief spring of freedom," was ousted and many of his supporters, Mr. Speaker, are now being tried in Prague for "subversive activity." These gallant freedom-fighters of Czechoslovakia are daily being sent to prison or death by the Soviet authorities. Participants in the August 1968 uprising are being rounded up and some are even being sent to insane asylums.

The Western world cries out for liberty and freedom for the persecuted Czechs. The Czech people have shown their outrage time and time again through work stoppages and other means of defiance. The puppet regime in Prague will continue to bend to every Soviet whim, realizing its only hope for political survival is the never-ending threat of a return of Soviet troops.

Mr. Speaker, the Czech-Americans should be commended for their continued vigilance in reminding us of the repression that exists in Czechoslovakia. With groups as the Czechoslovak National Council of America leading the fight to inform America and the world of what really is happening to their countrymen. Perhaps a ray of hope still exists. America condemns the Czech invasion of 1968 as much as the Nazi onslaught on Czechoslovakia in 1939. The spirit of freedom and the light of liberty in Czechoslovakia will never be crushed.

THE RISING COST OF MEAT

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, for 20 years the American consumer has witnessed a steady and relentless increase in the cost of food, particularly the cost of meat. In the past several months, the rate of increase appears to have accelerated. Today, I would like to address myself to two topics, first, the forces underlying this 20-year trend and, second, the reasons for the sudden spurt in prices since February, particularly in the Washington metropolitan area.

To explain the 20-year trend of rising prices, it is necessary to examine the cost structure of the three major components of the food marketing chain, the farmer, the wholesaler, and the retailer.

For raw agricultural products, there have been substantial increases in prices. However, the farmer has seen his production costs rise an average of 50 percent. Despite these increases in operating costs, farm prices have risen only 6 percent in the past 20 years. Farmers have been able to survive only by virtue of their increased productivity—223 percent over the last 20 years.

While farm prices have risen 6 percent, wholesale prices have jumped 20 percent. Most of the difference can be attributed to increased costs at the wholesale level. Labor costs have risen 300 percent; freight costs 140 percent; services—rent, insurance, telephone, and so forth—240 percent; containers 160 percent; fuel, power, and light costs have jumped 135 percent; while the costs of new plants and machinery have increased 192 percent. Throughout this period of rising costs, the profit margin for wholesalers has hovered around 1 percent.

For the third component of the food marketing chain, the retailer, prices have spurted 43 percent in the last 20 years. Again, most of this increase can be attributed to rising operating costs, particularly for labor which accounts for 50 percent of expenses. Most analysts would probably agree that for the retail food industry, after-tax profits as a percentage of sales should ideally average around 1.5 percent. Actual profits have traditionally been lower, peaking at 1.41 percent in 1965. In 1971, the food chain industry's profits on the dollar, after taxes, was down to 0.86 percent.

Underlying the rising costs within the food marketing chain is the steadily increasing consumer demand for beef. Consumer consumption of beef has more than doubled over the last 20 years, increasing from 56.1 pounds per capita to 114.3 pounds per capita. Over the last 7 years the increase was 30 percent. This steadily rising demand for meat has sustained high prices. Indeed, it has been a significant force in pulling these prices up.

To help alleviate this continuing problem of supply relative to demand there are two initiatives to which we must give serious consideration. The first is the permanent lifting of import quotas. The President has, for the balance of 1972, already suspended import quotas for meat. This means that the amount of foreign meat that can be imported is no longer limited to 6.7 percent of U.S. production.

However, only limited relief in the supply situation can be expected from the President's action. I say this because there exists a worldwide shortage of beef, and foreign suppliers are not likely to jump to the American market, possibly losing other markets to competitors, when there is no assurance that import quotas will not be reinstituted at the end of this year. Further, the American market offers no substantial financial incentives as U.S. beef prices are only three-fourths of 1 cent above the world level.

To overcome some of this anticipated hesitancy on the part of foreign suppliers, I have suggested to the President that in formulating the administration program for next year he give serious consideration to legislation repealing the section of the Meat Import Act of 1964 which establishes the import quota system.

The permanent lifting of import restrictions could result in some change in world market patterns, bringing a larger supply of beef to the United States. It is, however, unlikely that a permanent lifting of the import quotas would increase the supply of beef to the extent that it would depress prices. Rather, the effect

would be to prevent consumer demand from further outstripping supply, thus decelerating the rate of price increase, not depressing existing prices.

The second initiative to supplement the supply of beef which must be given careful attention is increasing the available grazing land to support a larger national herd.

Under the terms of existing legislation, 50 to 58 million acres of cropland are held out of production each year. If pasturing of this land were permitted, it has been estimated that the United States could produce up to 2 percent more beef. If this pasturing were allowed, it is doubtful that more than 20 million additional acres would be grazed during the pasture season. However, these acres would provide substantial additional feed for the existing 116 million head of cattle on U.S. farms and ranches, eventually permitting an increase of a few million head in the U.S. herd.

Grazing set-aside cropland would not lead to an immediate increase in beef cattle marketings. Some cattle would gain more weight because of improved pastures, but additional female breeding animals would be retained on the farms and ranches to utilize the additional grazing, thus slightly reducing the number of cattle marketed for the first year or two. It would not add sufficient pasturage, however, to cause a noticeable reduction in current marketings.

I have written to the Secretary of Agriculture and requested that the Department study the issues surrounding this suggestion so that it can provide the Congress with a full study when the legislation implementing the set-aside program comes up for review next year.

With an ever-growing population and rising standard of living, it is unlikely that the American consumer's demand for beef will relent. The actions I have suggested regarding meat imports and grazing land will assist cattlemen in their efforts to meet this constantly increasing appetite for meat.

To this point, I have been discussing long-term national trends and long-term potential solutions. However, to explain market behavior since February, particularly in the Washington area, it is necessary to examine a narrower time spectrum. The fluctuations in food prices, particularly for meats, can be understood in terms of, first, the market forces of supply and demand, and second, expanded retail margins.

The high demand that has characterized the food market over the past 20 years has not relented in past months. If anything, demand relative to supply has increased because the supply of beef coming to the market has decreased somewhat. The decrease is generally attributed to the corn leaf blight of 1970. In that year, much of the corn crop fell victim to the blight. With a reduced supply of corn, the price of feed corn went up. The increase in production costs, without a corresponding increase in the return to the farmer, resulted in many cattle being withheld from the market. Had this particular series of events not occurred it is still unlikely that supply would have kept pace with demand.

However, not all of the price increase that occurred in February can be attributed to the forces of supply and demand. A significant portion of the explanation is to be found in expanded retail margins of profit.

Under the Price Commission's volatile pricing rule, firms operating in a market characterized by volatile prices, such as the food industry, may immediately pass along increased costs in order to maintain their customary profit margins.

In the food industry, retailers are wary of the effect constant price changes may have on the consumer. Therefore, retail pricing policies exhibit a lag phenomenon. That is, when wholesale prices begin rising, retailers hold the line until wholesale prices reach a trigger point. At that point retailers raise their prices. During this lag time retailers experience shrinking profits. The loss is recovered when wholesale prices begin to decline because the higher retail prices are maintained until wholesale prices drop below another trigger level. When that level is reached, retailers drop their prices. This downside lag compensates retailers for the upturn lag.

Combined with the volatile pricing rule, this lag pricing characteristic of the retail food industry set the stage for excessive retail price increases in the early months of this year. When wholesale prices reached the trigger level in February retailers increased their prices above the customary levels. Further, retailers appeared prepared to lengthen the time lag on the downside. This situation led the Cost of Living Council to meet with retail executives in a jawboning session in late March. That meeting saw an immediate reduction in retail prices.

Recently released figures indicate that food shoppers in the Washington area are experiencing another sharp, and possibly unjustifiable, price increase. The most recent monthly data on food costs shows that prices in the Washington metropolitan area rose 2.1 percent—not seasonally or annually adjusted—while the national average was 0.6 percent—not seasonally or annually adjusted. During that 1-month period, retailers throughout the Nation experienced the same increase in costs as retailers in the Washington area. Yet, prices in this area increased at a much faster rate. These figures suggest that retailers may be trying to accomplish in the local area, what was attempted nationally in February—increase profits beyond the average generally accepted by economic analysts.

A characteristic of the Washington retail food market which could give impetus to excessive price increases not found generally in other areas of the Nation is the absence of independent competition to the prices charged by the leading Washington chains. In the Washington metropolitan area, the major food chains completely dominate the market, accounting for 87 percent of total sales. Contrasted to the lack of competition in this area is the situation in other metropolitan cities. In New York, the leading food chains accounted for 51.7 percent of total sales. In Philadelphia the figure is 68.5 percent, and in Boston only 53.3 percent. The lack of independent competition in Washington may significantly reduce the pressures for price constraint on the part of large retail food chains.

As a result the Washington area consumer is more readily exposed to inordinate increases in food prices. The big food chains have minimal constraints of the competitive market place which is in the tradition of the American economic system.

I have today formally requested the Price Commission to investigate retail food pricing policies in the Washington metropolitan area to determine if prices have indeed been raised to excessive levels, as they were last February. If this proves to be the case, the Price Commission must immediately order prices rolled back to appropriate levels.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed by the possibility that the benefits and burdens of the President's economic stabilization program may be shared unequally. Therefore, I am urging that the Price Commission also assume a continuing active role in monitoring food prices to ensure that the consumer does not bear the heaviest burden of wage-price controls.

WHO IS DESTROYING OUR ARMED FORCES? (III)

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, a UPI dispatch of January 23, 1971, said:

> The U.S. Army had built a wall around its installation at Cam Ranh Bay to keep out drug pushers and prostitutes. Now, however, the official policy is permitting ladies of the evening to be signed onto its bases officially in central Vietnam to meet American troops in their barracks. The key for admission to such bases is a Vietnamese identity card, a document that any undercover Viet Cong agent can obtain without difficulty. The Army admits that the girls are smuggling dope into the formerly walled installations, as well as posing serious security risks; but says the Army: the risks are worthwhile in the interests of keeping the peace within an increasingly disgruntled and demoralized Army.

That is an example of how Armed Forces policy, which should be building up the morale of our men in uniform has been contributing to their demoralization in Vietnam. The origins of that policy can be traced to very high levels.

Until June 1970, for instance, two Navy lieutenants were giving morning intelligence briefings to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Their names were Gordon Kerr and James Pahura, and both were members of the Concerned Officers Movement, an organization which has shown itself to be not concerned about victory over communism, but preferring Communist victory in Southeast Asia.

Going down one step in the chain of command, we come to Adm. Elmo R.

Zumwalt, author of the famous Z-Grams. It was these Z-Grams that promulgated more sideburns, more liquor in the quarters, and similar changes in policy leading to what one source in San Diego would call "a dangerous undermining of Navy discipline and morale." It was in San Diego that 180 active and retired admirals voiced their vehement objections to the trend reflected in a New York Times report that San Diego "and other Navy towns were filled with off-duty sailors in unpressed dungarees often spotted with grease stains and paint and sometimes ripped." No wonder a Navy man would comment in the Navy Times for November 1970:

It is patently obvious Admiral Zumwalt intends to haul the U.S. Navy (willingly or not) into consonance with liberal America as it girds for the 21st century.

As this goes to press, Admiral Zumwalt has hauled the Navy still further in that direction by announcing his capitulation to the women's liberation movement in the form of plans for young ladies to man battle stations aboard ship and perhaps even fly combat missions in Navy aircraft.

These trends were put in clearer perspective upon discovering that on June 2, 1965, Elmo R. Zumwalt became the youngest rear admiral in the Navy while serving as executive assistant and naval aid to Paul H. Nitze, then Secretary of the Navy, now negotiating for President Nixon's Disarmament Agency in Geneva. It was Paul Nitze who headed a five-man committee for the National Council of Churches in 1958 that called for—among other things—opposition to the development of U.S. military strength, except under United Nations control; opposed retaliation by the United States even if attacked; advocated turning over the Strategic Air Command to the United Nations; and urged that Quemoy and Matsu Islands be handed over to the Chinese Communists. Congressman WAGGONER of Louisiana described this document as "a running theme of appeasement, coexistence, and surrender, the like of which probably cannot be found in any other document this side of the Iron Curtain."

At Fort Carson, Colo., once known as one of the toughest training areas in the United States, the Rocky Mountain News reported November 17, 1971:

Bikini-clad go-go girls dance nightly in the enlisted men's service clubs. The post has two coffee houses, operated with government funds, where the GI's gather to rap with their commanders, practice arts and crafts and many to vent their anti-Army, anti-Vietnam war views.

This undermining of our military by "pressure from above and pressure from below" follows the classic pattern outlined in Jan Kozak's book "And Not a Shot Is Fired." In a future series I will explore the part that tax-exempt foundations have played and are playing in these developments. Every American would do well to think very deeply on these words of the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur in his annual report as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army in 1933:

The unfailing formula for production of morale is patriotism, self-respect, discipline, and self confidence within a military unit, joined with fair treatment and merited appreciation from without. It cannot be produced by pampering or coddling an army, and it is not necessarily destroyed by hardship, danger or even calamity. It will quickly wither and die if soldiers come to believe themselves the victims of indifference or injustice on the part of their government, or of ignorance, personal ambition, or ineptitude on the part of their leaders.

POWERS OF THE HOUSE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a news article appeared in today's New York Times which reports the attempts of the chairman of the House Administration Committee to include within his authority the power to remove from the payrolls House employees with whose work he disagrees.

One quotation from Chairman HAYS, in particular, deserves the attention of concerned Members of the House. In reference to a Foreign Affairs Committee staff member whose salary he withheld, he is quoted as having said:

We're going to have a showdown when the guy gets back here from a European junket. After that, I'll decide if he'll keep on getting paid.

Nowhere in the rules of the House am I able to find any provision which delegates to the chairman of the House Administration Committee the authority to make such a decision concerning employees outside his committee's jurisdiction.

I include the entire article from the New York Times in the RECORD at this point:

REPRESENTATIVE WAYNE HAYS BECOMES A NAME TO RECKON WITH IN THE HOUSE

(By Marjorie Hunter)

WASHINGTON, August 16.—Around the halls of Congress, in these waning days of summer, the lawmakers have begun asking themselves: Who actually controls the House? The mild-mannered Speaker, Carl Bert Albert of Oklahoma? Or a brusque Ohio Democrat, Representative Wayne L. Hays?

To most Americans, Wayne Hays is little known, if at all. But to colleagues in the House and to the thousands of House employes on Capitol Hill, his name has become the Household word.

For in the year or so since becoming chairman of the House Administration Committee, Mr. Hays has assumed more and more power over the internal workings of the House, even challenging several recent appointments by the Speaker.

The latest disputes, involving efforts by Mr. Hays to dismiss some House employes, arose on the floor yesterday, threatening at one point to halt all House business for the day.

A challenge came from Representative Donald M. Fraser of Minnesota, former chairman of the Liberal Democratic Study Group, as he protested attempts by Mr. Hays to dismiss a staff member on the Fraser subcommittee.

QUORUM CALLS HALT HOUSE

By demanding a series of time-consuming quorum calls, Mr. Fraser effectively halted House business for nearly an hour and a half.

It was only during the third such quorum call that the matter was resolved during an off-the-floor conference attended by the Speaker, Mr. Hays and Mr. Fraser.

Minutes later, Mr. Hays returned to the floor and announced that he had agreed to sign the pay voucher of the Fraser subcommittee staffer, Robert Boettcher, for July.

But Mr. Hays disclosed later that "we're going to have a showdown when the guy gets back here from a European junket." He added, "After that, I'll decide if he'll keep on getting paid."

Still unresolved, however, is whether Mr. Hays will continue trying to dismiss two press gallery staff members recently appointed by Speaker Albert.

With the retirement in July of Clarence T. Day as superintendent of the House periodical press gallery, the gallery's executive committee, headed by David Searles of Business Week, recommended promotion of Mrs. Jeanne C. Hundley, the assisistant superintendent, to the top job. The executive committee also recommended appointment of David Holmes as assistant superintendent.

Speaker Albert, in early July, confirmed the two appointments. At the same time, he named Ruth Tate to a vacancy on the staff of the House radio and television press gallery.

Mr. Hays subsequently informed Mr. Holmes and Miss Tate that he would sign their paychecks only through mid-August and after that, they would have to look for new jobs. He said he felt the two gallery staffs should be cut.

Payroll vouchers for a number of other House employes, including doormen and pages, also went unsigned, at least for a while, at one point this summer. Some were forced to borrow money for subsistence.

Mr. Hays said yesterday that the delay in signing these pay vouchers was only for a few days when he was out of town.

"No one on my staff has authority to sign my name," he said. "I want no rubber stamping around my office."

CREATES SUBCOMMITTEE

In addition, Mr. Hays has created a House Administration subcommittee on nonessential employes, headed by Representative Frank Annunzio, Democrat of Illinois.

Mr. Annunzio informed the House yesterday that his subcommittee had asked representatives of the Civil Service Commission to prepare a brochure" on every House employe to determine whether the jobs were essential and not just "make-work patronage" jobs.

The survey, however, will not include staffs of House members. These are named directly by the members and not by officers of the House.

In challenging the attempt to dismiss his own subcommittee staff member, Mr. Fraser proposed that the House amend its rules to bar any further attempts at dismissal or withholding of pay until the House Rules Committee approves any proposed set of hiring procedures devised by the House Administration Committee.

No action has been taken on the Fraser proposal.

Mr. Hays contends that Mr. Boettcher, staff director for the last year of the Fraser subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, had meddled in scheduling business of still another Foreign Affairs subcommittee, headed by Mr. Hays.

Mr. Fraser, in turn, contends that Mr. Boettcher merely sought to line up a witness to testify in behalf of a Fraser bill pending before the Hays subcommittee.

The pay disputes are but the latest in a series of clashes touched off by efforts of Mr.

Hays to obtain a tighter grip over House administration.

Since taking over the committee, he has raised the price of haircuts in House barbershops from 75 cents to $2, removed jump seats from Capitol elevators and ordered operators—many of them students working their way through college—not to read on the job.

He has trimmed House restaurant deficits by sharply raising prices, removing linen tablecloths, dismissing employes he said had been stealing food, collecting thousands of dollars in overdue meal bills from fellow Congressmen, and converting one restaurant into a carry-out facility.

He also tried to eliminate breakfast table service in the House members' dining room, but gave up after one angry member reportedly threw a self-service tray against a pantry wall.

MOVES INTO CLERK'S SPHERE

He has succeeded in wresting authority to operate the House computer service and electronic voting system from the Clerk of the House, W. Pat Jennings, and has taken over other functions once performed by the Clerk.

And he has taken over the authority, with approval of the House, to determine the members' fringe benefits, such as paid trips home, stationery allowances, telephone services and office expenses.

With these and other moves, he has converted the once relatively obscure House Administration Committee into a powerful force in the daily lives of his House colleagues and Capitol employes.

House employes who fail to perform to his satisfaction are summoned to his newly decorated office and given tongue lashings. He frequently reminds the employes that it is he who signs their paychecks.

What many consider his heavy-handed approach has put him in conflict with various House officials, including Mr. Jennings, the Clerk; William M. (Fishbait) Miller, the Doorkeeper, and the Capitol Architect, George White.

He brushes aside such criticism, insisting that he is merely trying to put the House on an efficient operating basis.

"Congress does a lot of talking about economy," he said recently, "but economy must start at home."

His moves have gone largely unchallenged by Speaker Albert despite grumbling by some members that Mr. Hays has become what they call "the real czar of the House."

One member recently complained: "Wayne's a big bully, and he's walking all over the Speaker. And there's nothing we can do about it."

SALUTE TO THE U.S. OLYMPIC TEAM

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday August 17, 1972

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, today we have received the U.S. Olympic team in this Chamber. I must confess it excites me to know these men and women will be carrying the Stars and Stripes to Munich.

These athletes, the best amateur athletes in this Nation, take their strengths and skills to the Olympic games. But they also carry with them something far more important—they carry the dreams and aspirations of every person in this country who has ever competed in athletics, who has ever been caught up in this infectious competitive spirit of a baseball game, a basketball game, a race.

These young men and women carry the spirit of America to the Olympic games. And when any one of them wins and stands on the highest step to receive his or her medal, some of us will feel goose bumps.

It is exciting to realize that many of these men and women come in effect from down the street, or, perhaps, next door. They are Americans from neighborhoods across this land. Yet they are not ordinary Americans. They are Americans who deserve our admiration and get it.

I should like to recognize and salute all of our Olympians, but especially those from my State, Oregon. A sportswriter for the Portland Oregonian, Leo Davis, has identified 22 athletes with ties to Oregon. He says:

Undoubtedly Oregon can lay claim, however tenuous, to more Olympians per capita than any State in the Union.

We in Oregon are proud to be so well represented in the Olympic Games. We are proud that Eugene, Oreg., was chosen as the site for the Olympic track and field trials this year. We are proud that University of Oregon track coach Bill Bowerman has been named head track coach for the United States. We are proud that the United States will be so well represented in Munich.

I. W. ABEL TESTIMONIAL

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend thousands of steelworkers in the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania honored the man who has led their national organization for the past 7 years, Mr. I. W. Abel, president of the United Steelworkers of America.

Mr. Abel has collected numerous honors throughout his illustrious career as a union leader but I am certain he holds those given him by his fellow steelworkers above all else. I have no doubt he will long remember the tribute paid him by the members and pensioners of Steel City Local Union 1272, USWA, on Friday, August 11.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my personal commendations to the officers and rank and file members of No. 1272, who put together an outstanding program honoring one of the greatest labor leaders our nation has known: Francis E. McNairy; James P. Comer, local president; Louis N. Pierro, general committman; Chester "Obie" Obiedzinski, treasurer; Donald E. Hammerle, vice president, and Samuel Davich, president of J & L Veteran Employees Association.

SUPPORT FOR THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, although I regret that my absence yesterday forced me to miss the vote, I strongly supported the Public Works and Economic Development Act amendments which passed by a vote of 285 to 92.

The major focus of the bill is its extension of the economic development programs through fiscal year 1974. These programs, created in 1965, call for financial assistance to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in economically distressed areas. I have consistently urged congressional action to stem this problem, through my introduction of the recent Emergency Employment Act extensions and other legislative efforts. Unfortunately, economically distressed areas still exist, and unemployment in many areas remains high. The Lawrence-Haverhill area, in my district, is a sad example, with over 9-percent unemployment. Other areas in the Sixth District, Massachusetts, and across the Nation are similarly suffering under this economic malaise.

In this public works bill, we have made fundamental and vital progress toward addressing this problem through the public works impact program. By providing grants for public works projects to specified areas of high unemployment or a large concentration of low-income persons, this program has already benefited many areas with needed employment for the jobless and the construction of community service facilities for all. This program has received the extension it deserves.

But although these kinds of financial assistance programs are crucial to stabilize the economy and ease the plight of many of our jobless, we must not overlook the importance of the "environmental effects" section of the bill. For the past few years, as you know, a growing interest in environmental quality has brought forth from the Congress a broad range of pollution abatement laws. In the process of mandating certain air and water quality levels, the Congress has largely ignored the plight of those who must comply with these pollution requirements.

A recent study by the Council on Environmental Quality indicated that some small businesses would be adversely affected by these laws. These smaller operations often contain older equipment, have more limited resources, and in general, are unable to cope with the demands of the new laws. The study found that some of these "marginal plants" would be forced to close down, unable to meet the costs required for acceptable pollution control.

In light of present economic conditions, such plant closings might have

disastrous effects on many areas with already high unemployment and business difficulties. It was never our intent to solve the pollution problem at the cost of forcing workers out of their jobs and small companies out of business. Recognizing this need, I introduced on August 8 the Small Business Pollution Abatement Loan Assistance and Worker's Readjustment Assistance Act, which would provide assistance to small businesses for the purpose of meeting pollution control standards mandated by all Federal, State, or local laws and regulations. It also provides readjustment allowances, relocation benefits, job training and relocation services for workers whose plants are forced to close down because of pollution laws. I was pleased to see this concept embodied in the public works bill which passed yesterday.

Although I welcome this early step to aid compliance efforts, I remind you that some aspects of the problems are not fully met by the bill. Now that we have recognized the problem, we must continue to insure that environmental progress is not made at the expense of the Nation's workingmen and small businesses.

TEAMSTERS PENSION FUND AND ORGANIZED CRIME

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the August issue of the magazine Overdrive, carried the third in a series of three articles on the Teamsters' pension fund and organized crime. I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the first part of the article entitled, "How The Central States Pension Fund Finances The Nevada Schemes of Organized Crime." Since it is a rather long article, the second part will be included later.

The article follows:

HOW THE CENTRAL STATES PENSION FUND FINANCES THE NEVADA SCHEMES OF ORGANIZED CRIME

ORGANIZED CRIME, INC.

Some may say that it will become boring, hearing about the same kinds of corruption month after month. There is that danger, no doubt, but readers should keep in mind that what we are describing is not happening in some dream world. It's happening to you in the trucking industry, and it also seriously affects all phases of democracy in this country. The criminal conspiracy of organized crime can only exist by using fear and corruption to gain immunity from the law.

The activities of the Mafia that are publicized attract attention to their particular crimes. But organized crime is much more than that, more subtle, more sinister, and its leadership would frankly prefer that all attention be devoted to the Mafia, leaving them free to pursue their unpublicized schemes.

Think of the Mafia as a division of a company called Organized Crime, Inc. You should, because that's the way it is. The real manipulators of this criminal conspiracy always attempt to remain in the background. Names like Lansky, Mulligan, Groves, Chesler and Shenker are not in the news often, but their influence on the fabric of American life is more persuasive and damaging than any 10 Mafia leaders. In months to come, we will show more and more of the "quiet" crimes like influence-peddling and political corruption, the basic ingredients to the success of the Mafia and other elements of organized crime, and how the Fund actively promotes them.

MOE DALITZ AND THE FUND

Oddly enough, the first Pension Fund loan in Nevada was made to a hospital. As innocent as that may seem on the surface, a careful examination of the backgrounds and activities of those behind it show a continuing web of organized crime stretching beyond the borders of the United States to Switzerland and the Bahamas.

The Sunrise Hospital on Maryland Parkway in Las Vegas first received a Fund loan in August of 1959. Those connected with the Sunrise at that time were Morris (Moe) Dalitz, Allard Roen, Irwin Molasky and Merve Adelson.

Dalitz' intriguing background shows that he was involved in bootlegging during the 30's. Shortly thereafter, he was the leader of what was known as the Cleveland Syndicate, a huge bookmaking operation in that area. His first known contact with the Teamsters came in 1949, when he arranged a payoff to Hoffa from a group of employers in order to settle a contract dispute.

THE DESERT INN

Two years before, Dalitz had made his entry into Nevada gambling. He and others from the Cleveland gambling fraternity arranged for the money to complete construction of Wilbur Clark's Desert Inn—for 74% of the take.

Perhaps the most fascinating of Dalitz' associates is Meyer Lansky, considered the financial wizard of organized crime, and a "director" of the syndicate which oversees it. Currently, Lansky is in Israel to avoid prosecution in this country, and he has been indicted for skimming millions of dollars out of the Vegas Flamingo Hotel and arranging for its disposal in other countries. Dalitz is a close friend of Lansky, and both have been involved in various "businesses" over the years.

* * * * *

Both Roen and Dalitz were among the original developers of La Costa, the 3,000 acre spread near San Diego which has become a retreat for the top men in organized crime. La Costa, it should be mentioned, has been financed exclusively with Pension Fund money. Roen's activities with underworld figures go back many years, including stock transfers to gangster Bugsy Siegel and Lansky. In 1962, Roen pleaded guilty to stock fraud in a case involving a $100,000 bribe being paid to a United States Senator.

Since 1959, the Dalitz group has managed to direct $11,350,000 into the Sunrise Hospital. The latest loan occurred in 1971. At that time, a $5,500,000 loan to the hospital was made by the City National Bank in Beverly Hills. Under the terms of the agreement obtained by OVERDRIVE the Pension Fund will buy that loan from the Bank in January 1973, making Sunrise indebted still further to the Fund.

The Dalitz group has arranged a number of other Fund loans which have filtered through a bushel basket of corporations in a bewildering tangle of financial wizardry.

THE STARDUST AND FREMONT

Between 1961 and 1964, the Fund dumped $8,200,000 into the Dalitz-controlled Stardust Hotel. The amount still owed on those loans is $5,700,000.

In 1962, the Fremont Hotel received a total of $4,600,000 of which $2,500,000 is still owed the Fund. The year before that, a company called Three-O-One Corporation picked up an $850,000 loan for a downtown Las Vegas building. Over $500,000 is still due on that one. Both of these were controlled by Dalitz & Company.

Two other corporations which had members of the Dalitz group or their associates involved were United Resort Hotels, Inc. and the Lodestar Corporation. These two pulled out $10,850,000 in Fund loans, including one for a hotel on Lake Mead than ran into financial difficulties. Slightly under $8,000,000 remains unpaid on these 6-year old loans.

Although Dalitz sold his gambling interests in Las Vegas to Howard Hughes recently, there is little reason to doubt that he still has influence there. Nowadays, Dalitz operates his various enterprises out of La Costa.

"OWNERSHIP NOT OFFICIALLY RECORDED"

In 1965, the government began prosecution of a Dalitz associate on income tax charges. Three years later, however, the case was dismissed under curious circumstances, which arose when it was discovered that the FBI had bugged the casinos of at least five hotels, including the Stardust and Desert Inn, both of which were controlled by Dalitz. Lawsuits were filed against the government for this bugging, and in an apparent attempt to stop them, the government dropped its tax prosecution in return for the other side dismissing its lawsuits. What was learned from those bugs has never been released, but one FBI agent frankly stated that they contained what "I would refer to as ownership which is not officially recorded with the state of Nevada."

A Las Vegas-based real estate company which is run by those from the Dalitz group is Realty Holdings, Inc. Pension Fund records show that they have borrowed close to $15,000,000 within the past two years. Other records and agreements obtained, however, lend strength to the belief that considerably more money is involved. Many of these documents do not contain what amount of money is involved from the Fund, referring only to "value received" and "for a valuable consideration." But whatever amounts they are, they indicate that Dalitz and his men are far from being without power in Nevada.

MORRIS SHENKER AND THE DUNES

When it comes to manipulating Pension Fund money without having to answer to anyone, St. Louis attorney Morris Shenker is at least equal, if not superior, to convicted swindler Allen Dorfman. Shenker, a shadowy, behind-the-scenes operator who shuns publicity, has arranged hundreds of millions of dollars in Pension Fund loans. And in the process, he has received millions of dollars in fees for his "services." Although Shenker's activities are too numerous to detail here (they will be enumerated in an upcoming article), some general comments can be made. He is an acknowledged financial genius when it comes to setting up complex money deals (and hiding their ownership), and even IRS experts admit that he has been able to stump them. Further, he has been cited as the number one lawyer for organized crime in this country. Although he has dazzled and confused the IRS on many occasions, OVERDRIVE has learned that federal agencies are beginning a massive investigation into his affairs. Shenker's main activity with Fund loans in Nevada has involved the Dunes Hotel in Las Vegas.

When the Dunes opened in 1955, the owner was listed as Joseph Sullivan. Later, it was discovered that the hidden owner was Raymond Patriarca, chief of all Mafia operations in the New England states, and headquartered in Providence, Rhode Island. Just recently, however, Patriarca was sent to prison as the culmination of a major offensive against him by the Justice Department.

Later, Sullivan sold out to James (Jake) Gottlieb, who died this past April; he owned, among other things, Western Transportation in Chicago and Missouri-Oklahoma Express in St. Louis. Gottlieb reportedly then gave $100,000 to Major Riddle (Major is his name, not a military title) to buy control of the Dunes' casino operation. An outfit called

M & R Operating Company was then formed, composed of a group of gamblers, with Riddle in charge. M & R then leased the casino operation from Gottleib.

FRIENDS OF HOFFA

In 1962, the first loan from the Pension Fund was made to the Dunes. Since both Gottleib and Riddle were friends of Hoffa, it can be assumed that this friendship had something to do with the loan approval. In early 1963, Shenker's involvement with the Dunes surfaced publicly for the first time.

A partnership called Leonard J. Campbell Enterprises was formed in order to buy the Dunes from Gottleib. The main stockholders of Campbell Enterprises were William Vogler and Rollins Furbush, both executives of American National Insurance, Galveston, Texas; the shareholders of M & R (now called M & R Investment Company); and E. Perry Thomas, Chairman of the Bank of Las Vegas, and who has also been connected with Fund loans. In a complex series of transactions involving the funneling of money through various corporations, M & R ended up with the Dunes again, and Campbell Enterprises was dissolved. Leonard Campbell, though, still remained, ending up in charge of the slot machines in the casino.

In 1967, Shenker, Furbish and Vogler, together with 22 others, bought a controlling interest in Continental Connector Corporation, which bought M & R (and therefore the Dunes) in 1968.

ANOTHER FUND BORROWER IN THE DUNES

Since 1970, a company called Rapid-American Corporation in New York was attempting to gain control over the Dunes through the purchase of its stock. Apparently a takeover couldn't be finalized, so Rapid-American rescinded its agreement to buy 500,000 shares of Continental stock at around $18.50 per share. It has been learned that the shares will be sold to Shenker, E. Perry Thomas (who is now chairman of Continental) and Irvin J. Kahn. In months to come, the story of Kahn will be told—the man who has borrowed hundreds of millions from the Fund is a business partner of Shenker's, and is another phantom operating in the twilight zone of organized crime).

Throughout these past ten years of tangled corporate schemes, the Fund has been dumping millions of dollars into the Dunes. Today, documents indicate that the Dunes has borrowed a total of $15 million from the Fund. The last transaction recorded shows that the Fund picked up a Dunes loan in January, 1969, which had been made by the First Security Bank of Utah for $3 million. Interestingly enough, the Dunes still manages to owe the Fund a total of $12 million.

INDICTMENTS FOR SKIMMING

But in December, 1971, the owners of M & R ran into a problem. A federal grand jury handed down indictments charging six men with skimming cash from the casino receipts prior to their being counted for tax purposes and income tax evasion.

The officers of M & R who were indicted are Sydney Wyman, Robert Rice and George Duckworth, all former big-time gamblers from St. Louis, and Howard Engel. Also charged in the same case is Leonard J. Campbell and Charles Speck, former Dunes credit manager.

PRISON REFORM

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a comprehensive plan to reform the Nation's prison system. The purpose of the Prison Reform Act of 1972 is to make the prisons institutions for rehabilitating and training criminals so they can become useful, productive members of society when they are released.

In most cases our prisons are nothing more than warehouses where men and women are stored until they are released to commit another crime. The current estimates are that four out of every five felonies are committed by persons who have already served a prison term.

There is a great deal of information about life in prisons, but too much of it comes from "experts" who have only second hand knowledge.

Only recently have the men and women who have served time in prisons been looked to as the best source of information about our jails and what can be done to improve them.

Many of these former prisoners are intelligent and articulate and they are making important contributions to the movement to help prisoners and improve prison conditions.

One of these men is James Burgess, a former inmate of Holmesburg Prison, which is in my northeast Philadelphia district. Mr. Burgess is now back at Holmesburg as a community-prison worker for the Episcopal Community Service of Philadelphia.

Mr. Burgess is an expert on prison conditions and their effect on the prisoners. At this time I enter his statement on the need to improve our Nation's prisons into the RECORD:

PRISON REFORM

When will we ever learn from our past mistakes? For a hundred years we have been putting people behind walls as punishment for their crimes, and then further punishing them by abusing them, robotizing them, stripping them of whatever dignity they have left, and housing them in cells the SPCA would not tolerate for animals. After their sentence is served, they come back to society unable to cope because instead of being taught to compete, they have been taught to conform, and instead of being taught self confidence, they have been taught that they are worthless. When they come from behind the walls, they are bitter, afraid, and feel there is no future for them. In addition to being crippled emotionally, they have been crippled socially. Their family ties have deteriorated over the years of incarceration. They have no funds. They have no job, and know that most employers will treat them as lepers when they find out they have a criminal record. Even if they could find a job, it may take two weeks before they get their first paycheck: leaving them with the pressures of survival for that time.

When you put a bitter, confused, frightened man, with no money and no family in a society he can't cope with, what do you think the result will be? I am not surprised that the guesstimates of the recidivism rate go as high as 75%. It is a wonder to me that they are not 100%!! Our present philosophy of put the criminals behind walls where we don't have to think about them is failing miserably. Will we never learn?

If we are ever to clamp shut the revolving doors in our prisons we are going to have to take one of two avenues. Either we are going to have to throw the key away, or we are going to have to spend the time, effort and money to work with the people behind the walls and find out what is causing their antisocial behaviour and take steps to correct it.

It sounds easier to throw away the key, but it isn't. With no turnover our present prisons would soon fill to overflowing. You would have to build hundreds of new warehouses to store people. New prisons are expensive, and so are the staff and logistics it takes to run them. There is also a moral problem. Can we turn our backs on people who need help, and be at peace with ourselves? If we were walking along the river front, and saw someone drowning, we would attempt to save them. At the very least we would send for help. We would have difficulty living with ourselves if we just passed them by. Yet there are thousands of men, women and children in our prisons, drowning, and crying for help. Can we continue to ignore their cries?

If we have to put people behind walls to protect society, let us at least work with them behind the walls and try to solve the problems that are keeping them from leading normal happy lives.

My own prison experience has been in the country prisons. At that level, the overwhelming majority of people are incarcerated for drug related crimes. My experience has been that addicts, once detoxified, and released from the pressures of supporting their habit and their every day needs, undergo a complete personality change. While in prison they almost always express a desire to rid themselves of their psycological habit. It is tragic that they have to wait for their release from prison to enter a drug program, when the prison itself is the most logical place to run a large scale therapy program. There is no question in my mind that effective drug programs are the number one need in the prisons today.

We also need to give inmates the opportunity to get an education while incarcerated. I have known many men in prison who could not read or write. Is it any wonder they could not survive in our highly competitive society? Very few college graduates steal pocketbooks from little old ladies.

In line with this reasoning, we also need to provide vocational training, so ex-offenders will have the skills needed to secure decent, self gratifying employment.

I do not feel that the schools and training programs should necessarily have to be within the confines of the prison. I feel that letting inmates commute to established schools in the community would not only increase their enthusiasm but would also give them a healthier mental attitude.

Those incarcerated for minor offenses, and who can secure employment should be allowed to work during the day and return to the prison at night. This will allow them to maintain the dignity of being self sufficient, and will also make them tax paying citizens rather than tax receiving.

If we are ever to bring about prison reform, we are going to have to change public attitude. There are too many people who feel that implementing prison programs will eventually turn the prisons into country clubs. They do not realize that no matter how good conditions in the prison become the inmates will be suffering a very severe punishment—that of loss of their freedom and separation from their loved ones. That punishment is so severe, that there is no need to add on the punishment of bad living conditions and hostile attitudes of correctional staff. All the bad conditions of the prisons accomplish is to make the inmate bitter, and render him unreceptive to positive change.

We have tried the philosophy of punishment, and it has not worked. It is time to try a new tack—that of trying to give offenders a feeling of self esteem.

Most inmates whom I have interviewed have become antisocial, or started using drugs because they have had a very low opinion of themselves. Many actually hate themselves. They feel completely inadequate, worthless, and not capable of being loved by anyone. How can a person who does not respect himself, respect others? No wonder there are so many violent crimes in America today. All our prisons are doing today, is reinforcing this feeling of worthlessness.

In the interest of being brief I have listed

only the most important needs in our prisons. As you well know there are reams and reams of printed material by learned authors; all pointing out the inadequacies of the prison system and calling for specific changes. But they only amount to so much waste paper and trash, as does this report, if no one is moved to act upon them. So I pray that you not consider this report as just more information about prison reform (God knows we have more than enough of that already); but as a plea to act on all the information we have gathered. Every day, every hour, that we delay putting intelligent reforms into effect more lives are being wasted, more people who need and deserve our help are drowning.

TELEPHONE PRIVACY—XXXV

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 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 politakers. 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 33d 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—some of the names have been omitted:

MT. PROSPECT, ILL.,
August 7, 1972.

DEAR SIR: We, and everyone we know, are very much in favor of H.R. 14884 to outlaw telephone soliciting if the subscriber so requests. We would be really grateful for prompt action.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

WOODBRIDGE, VA.,
August 11, 1972.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ASPIN: I am writing in support of your bill concerning telephone solicitation.

In our area calls average perhaps 3 per week usually from Land Developers. These calls are, needless to say, very annoying.

I hope your bill passes, and I would like to add my support.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

TYLER, TEX.,
July 28, 1972.

Representative RAY ROBERTS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I, along with many of my friends and neighbors, are continuously being bothered with telephone solicitation. I don't have time for these calls and I regard them as an invasion of privacy. The things people try and sell over the telephone are a waste of time and money and I don't enjoy being bothered with such calls. I get several a month.

I understand that Rep. Les Aspin of Wisconsin is trying to get something done about this with his Telephone Privacy Act. I urge you to support this act. The idea of putting an asterisk by the names of people, in the phone book, who do not want solicitation is a good idea.

Would you please see what you can do about this situation?

Sincerely,

——— ———.

BAYLOR COLLEGE OF MEDICINE,
Houston, Tex., August 3, 1972.

Hon. LES ASPIN,
The House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ASPIN: This letter is to indicate my strongest support for your bill which would allow the American public to put a "no solicitors" designation on their telephone numbers.

Rest assured that many Americans from all walks of life share our dislike of being interrupted at the most annoying moments by telephone solicitors. This bill has my sincere, whole-hearted support.

With best wishes for your success in passing this bill, I remain

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

PALATINE, ILL., *August 2, 1972.*

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

SIR: Please add my name to those in support of your proposed bill, H.R. 14884, to keep nuisance calls off the phone.

What a bore they are. I resent them intensely.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

AUGUST 7, 1972.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ASPIN: Enclosed are the names of four voters who support bill HR–14884. We feel it is about time some one st (excuse me the phone is ringing) opped this infernal bothering by the telephone. Please keep us informed of the bill's progress and if there is anything else we can do let any of us know.

Thank you.

DAVID MICHAEL DEMALA,
CHARLES FRANK DEMALA,
VIOLET ANN DEMALA,
JUDITH ANN MARX.

FIGHTING INFLATION AFTER PHASE II

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, the June 1972 issue of Fortune magazine carried an article entitled "Fighting Inflation After Phase II," which spurred a letter to the editor of 1,825 newspapers by C. C. Moseley, president of Grand Central Industrial Centre, Glendale, Calif.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I insert here some excerpts from Fortune, and the letter from Mr. Moseley:

[From Fortune magazine, June 1972]

FIGHTING INFLATION AFTER PHASE II

Fiscal policy will be a particularly difficult problem because the federal budget is in a quite literal sense out of control. The aggregate cost of individually meritorious programs tends, of course, to exceed any viable total; let the congressional budegtary process focuses only on the programs and includes no explicit consideration of the total budget. The result is federal commitments, by direct outlays and through credit guarantees, that are growing at a more rapid rate than the economy can accommodate.

The figures concerning this matter are dramatic. In his latest budget message the President noted some serious shrinkage in our future "budget margin." Only last year the fiscal 1976 margin was put at $30 billion—i.e., federal expenditures implied by programs to which we were already committed would be $30 billion below the revenues that the tax system would produce in 1976 if the economy were operating at reasonably full employment. In the budget message for this year, the unspent margin for fiscal 1976 was down to $5 billion. The governmental process must again be made subject to fiscal discipline, or the price-cost battle, and even the free economy itself, will be in serious jeopardy.

GRAND CENTRAL INDUSTRIAL CENTRE,
Glendale, Calif., July 17, 1972.

DEAR EDITOR: Has the majority in Congress gone completely nuts? Don't sneer at this remark—you be the judge.

In the June Fortune magazine, in an article by President Nixon's former chief economist Paul W. McCracken, it was stated that ". . . federal commitments by direct outlays and through credit guarantees, are growing at a more rapid rate than the economy can accommodate," and that federal expenditures to which we are already committed would be $30 billion (yes, $30,000 million) short of the revenues that the tax system would produce in 1976. Unbelievable, but true!

Imagine the size of the deficit (money to be borrowed) by the time Congress gets through with additional projects! The writing is on the wall—greater inflation and higher taxes. The "Spenders" in Congress are bankrupting the country. Let's throw the "Spenders" out before we all go broke!

Sincerely,

C. C. MOSELEY, *President.*

FAIR AND IMPARTIAL ELECTIONS

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the left and right in the country can come together on the issue of fair and impartial elections. At this time, I would like to submit these nationally syndicated articles, by James A. Wechsler and William F. Buckley, Jr., which speak for themselves.

[From the New York Post, July 20, 1972]

DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

When the South Vietnamese had their election in 1967, Lyndon Johnson invited a

bunch of liberal professors to go over there and satisfy themselves that the election was clean. This they did, and one professor from the Boston area reported to the President his conclusion that the election in South Vietnam was as clean as the typical election in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

This comment was the source of enormous underground mirth among the cognoscenti, who understood exactly what the good professor was trying to communicate. That democracy in South Vietnam, while passably fair, is a pretty relaxed thing, along Massachusetts lines. I think it was in Boston, or maybe it was in Chicago, a little while back that an election district reported 183 votes, all of them for the Democratic candidate, and guess what? By sheer coincidence, the 183 citizens had filed in and voted alphabetically! That is democracy plus law and order.

I have always thought that if you're going to have democracy, you may just as well do it right. After the decision is reached as to what voter qualifications are, let them vote, and go ahead and count their votes. The evidence is overwhelming that the political machine in Brooklyn was recently concerned to return the incumbent to office, rather than to ascertain whom the majority wanted.

It would have been absorbed as routine Democratic graft except that the challenger is none other than Allard Lowenstein, the president of Americans For Democratic Action. Mr. Lowenstein has a particular stake in the contest, unrelated to the question of whether he will be sent to Congress.

He is the young man who has already made the history books in virtue of having persuaded Eugene McCarthy to make the race against Lyndon Johnson in 1968, thereby proving that The System was alive and well. He is as influential among the young as anyone in America, and if he gives out the word that you cannot have a reliable democratic contest in the heart of metropolitan New York, his constituency will experience a disillusionment that wil redound to the benefit of the crazies in American politics.

In his primary contest, every kind of fraud and harassment was exercised. New voters found their registration cards missing. Others were given runarounds. Some spent as much as four hours trying to locate the right polling place, and filing their votes. Others found machines rigged.

One lady wrote: "I was told that I had been redistricted. That I should vote at 75 Cadman Plaza. I left; (but there is) no 75 Cadman Plaza. On my walk back I noticed that that some people were voting at 140 Cadman Plaza. I stopped in there and was told I would have to go to 75 Henry St. When I got to 75 Henry St. I was told that it would be another two hours' wait. I gave up."

There were only 30,000 votes cast, and yet the Lowenstein forces are talking about as many as 14,000 irregularities, and hard-core fraud in 4000 to 5000 cases. At that, the incumbent beat Lowenstein by only a few hundred votes. The evidence suggests that Lowenstein would have won by something like a landslide.

* * * * *

So now it goes to the courts. It being widely suspected that local state judges are not going to upset the political machine that put them where they are, Lowenstein will probably end up in federal court. There he will be given an opportunity to document his grievances, in behalf of the electorate. And the message may go out to the bosses: Cut it out.

It happens that Mr. Lowenstein backs enthusiastically almost every mistaken political idea that ever issued out of the social imaginations of man. But that isn't the point, any more so than when us good guys sat around in 1964 worrying about how many votes would be stolen from Barry Goldwater by the Democratic poll tenders.

Fair elections, like precautions against accidental wars, are in everybody's interest. It is lucky for our international reputation that we didn't invite any South Vietnamese professors over to monitor the Lowenstein election.

[From the New York Post, July 7, 1972]

FIGHTING BACK

(By James A. Wechsler)

For many long, wearying hours of the past two weeks, a dedicated battalion of Allard Lowenstein's volunteer supporters has been quietly assembling evidence to document the charge that he was defrauded of victory in his Congressional battle with John Rooney and the Esposito machine. Their findings will form the bulwark of the case his attorneys will present in his legal fight to force a rerun.

Lowenstein's move grew out of a meeting with his campaign workers on the morning after primary day when Rooney had been reported winning by 1005 votes. (The final official margin, according to the Lowenstein camp, was actually closer to 800). Lowenstein's initial impulse was to go on a holiday with his family and then take up other endeavors. His campaign was deeply in debt; despite his own conviction, based on first-hand inquiry and reports he had received throughout the night, that he had been robbed of a hard-earned triumph, he knew how much hard, tedious labor would be involved in preparing a challenge. He was reluctant to ask his tired troops to begin another mission.

In a sense they made the decision for him that morning. One after another of the veteran community figures and activists who had carried his banner rose to describe primary-day chicanery and plead for a counterattack.

"After listening to them, I really felt ashamed that I'd even contemplated giving in," Lowenstein remarked yesterday. "So many of them kept saying that I was the one who had urged them to work within the electoral process—and now we had to show that we wouldn't let the machine steal an election from us. So I told them I had had my half-hour vacation and now we'd go back to work."

There are two major thrusts in the documentation now being prepared under the able, spirited direction of Terry Lenzner, former chief of legal services in the OEO.

One is the contention that more than 2000 prospective Lowenstein voters were disfranchised in varied ways; many found their registration cards were mysteriously missing when they went to the polls. The principal victims, it is alleged, were blacks and Puerto Ricans, many of whom were bruskly turned aside when they went to the Board of Elections seeking help. (Additional frustrations, such as the breakdown or shortage of voting machines, were widely reported in the city that day, but the Lowenstein forces assert they can show the chaos was significantly conspicuous in areas favorable to him).

The parallel charge is that the Rooney total was flagrantly padded by use of names of the dead or departed, repeat voters and other hallowed practices of the old-line machines. A court order opening the Board of Elections files has already produced much confirmatory material.

The intensity of feeling among those participating in the challenge can be quickly discerned in interviews with a group of them. Thus Bertha Thomas, a warm articulate community worker in the predominantly black Fort Greene area declared:

"For the first time many minority citizens became aware of their right to vote in a primary. Now we're out to see that justice is done—not just for Al but for all the community people who were turned away. It was worse than in the deepest South."

Wilfredo Vargas, a 26-year-old Vietnam veteran who helped to rally Puerto Rican voters for Lowenstein in Williamsburg, said:

"This was the first time we could get a big Puerto Rican turnout—maybe 40 per cent instead of 15 per cent of those registered. But I know there were two or three hundred right in my own area who were told there were no cards for them—in some cases even when a husband and wife registered together, only one card was there. The people are watching to see what happens now. If the system is not going to be fair, why be part of it? I'm grateful to Al for fighting back—at least the machine will know it didn't get away with this."

John Mulhern, a former priest in a Puerto Rican neighborhood, said "I've never seen an election like this—everything was done to confuse and frustrate people by shifting polling places out of their areas and even refusing to give them directions."

A rerun would admittedly pose formidable problems for the Lowenstein forces, whose ardor is unmatched by any hidden fiscal resources. They would be counting heavily, however, on the anger stirred by what so many regard as a fraudulent exercise. The savagery of the Rooney campaign may also produce a backlash; by now, for example, many of the Hassidic Jews whom the Rooney machine recruited must have learned of the crudely anti-Semitic whispering campaign staged by Rooney adherents in such areas as Greenpoint.

Meanwhile echoes of the fight will be heard shortly in Miami Beach, where some young Lowenstein campaigners like Steve Morgan and Dennis Concilla plan to air their story before the youth and black caucuses at the Democratic Convention, the battle of Brooklyn's 14th CD may have just begun.

HEROIN MAINTENANCE

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. PEYSER, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Don Miller, Chief Counsel of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs has prepared the following memorandum regarding heroin maintenance for the congressional ad hoc Committee Against Heroin Maintenance. I thought it might be of interest to my colleagues:

MEMORANDUM ON THE USE OF HEROIN UNDER THE COMPREHENSIVE DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION AND CONTROL ACT OF 1970

The question has been raised as to the interpretation of the law regarding the use of heroin in treatment or research under the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 (CSA of 1970).[1] The question is posed incident to certain proposals to establish pilot programs to determine the feasibility of maintaining addicts on heroin as a treatment modality.

As early as 1918, heroin had become known as a drug particularly liable to abuse and to produce ill affects, and that such liability is not offset by substantial therapeutic advantages not possessed by such drugs as morphine. On March 16, 1918, the New York Psychiatrical Society and the New York Academy of Medicine made the following recommendation: "We recommend that the Federal Government take such measures as are feasible to abolish the manufacture of heroin altogether."[2]

Next, in 1920, the American Medical Associ-

Footnotes at end of article.

ation made the following recommendation: "We therefore recommend: . . . 2. That heroin be eliminated from all medical preparations, and that it should not be administered, prescribed or dispensed; and that the importation, manufacture and sale of heroin should be prohibited in the United States."[3]

The Congress fully subscribed to this medical consensus, and in the Act of June 7, 1927, amended the law relating to the importation of opium and declared that ". . . no crude opium may be imported or brought in for the purpose of manufacturing heroin."[4]

This action was immediately followed by physicians becoming widely aware of the dangers of heroin, and it was abandoned as a drug having an acceptable medical use. It has been deleted from the United States Pharmacopeia and the National Formulary; the United States Dispensory (26th Ed.) states that heroin has "so great an addiction liability it is available only for research purposes;" and Merck Index (8th Ed.) states that "Because of its addiction liability, the importation or manufacture of [heroin] . . . is forbidden in the United States by Federal statute."

In 1956, the Congress acted again against heroin and declared that all heroin legally possessed had to be surrendered with a specified time.[5] By this action, Congress virtually outlawed the use of heroin for treatment, providing only that the surrendered heroin could be used for scientific research purposes.

By 1970, all heroin in legal channels had been surrendered. Knowing that there was no need to retain the features of the 1956 Act, the Congress repealed the heroin surrender provision when it enacted the CSA of 1970. However, also knowing that there was no currently accepted use in treatment in the United States, the Congress placed heroin in Schedule I of the CSA of 1970. Also, the Congress retained the opium importation provision by providing in Section 1002 of the Act that "No crude opium may be so imported for the purpose of manufacturing heroin . . ."

From the history, it is prefectly clear that both the medical community and the Congress have concluded that heroin is not to be used in treatment. Even if research does find a therapeutic usefulness, the Congress has blocked its manufacture. The only way heroin could be brought into the United States would be for the Attorney General to declare an emergency under Section 1002(a)(2)(A) of the Act which specifies that he may allow the importation of any drug "during an emergency in which domestic supplies of such substance or drug are found by the Attorney General to be inadequate." It is not probable in view of other medications available that the Attorney General would be justified in declaring such an emergency regarding heroin.

As for research with heroin, the CSA of 1970 contemplates that researchers may conduct scientific investigations with heroin. Just how the researchers may acquire the heroin is not spelled out in the Act. Considering that Section 1002 does not allow opium to be brought in to manufacture heroin and that the Attorney General probably would not be authorized to declare an "emergency" to bring in the heroin, only one source for the heroin is left; that is, the use of seized heroin.

Under Section 511 of the CSA of 1970, the Congress provided that "Whenever property is forfeited under [the Act] the Attorney General *may* . . . forward it to the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs for disposition (including delivery for medical or scientific use to any Federal or State agency under regulations of the Attorney General)." Emphasis has been added to show that the word "may" places the decision entirely in the hands of the Attorney General. He may, or he may not do so; it is purely an act of grace on his part to make seized heroin available for research. Certainly, there is no requirement that the Attorney General must make heroin available to conduct heroin maintenance programs even under the aegis of research. Moreover, confiscated heroin is totally unsuitable for intravenous injection in humans; the heroin is neither pure nor sterile. Therefore, all confiscated heroin would have to be purified—a procedure that BNDD could not undertake. It is doubtful that the Congress intended for BNDD to perform commercial manufacturing services to researchers.

There is also a legal consideration that requires further consideration by the Federal Food and Drug Administration. Section 303 (f) of the Controlled Substances Act of 1970 provides that "Registration applications by practitioners wishing to conduct research with controlled substances in Schedule I shall be referred to the Secretary [of HEW], who shall determine qualifications and competency of each practitioner requesting registration, as well as the merits of the research protocol." It is believed that FDA must consider heroin as a "new drug," and, therefore, probably require researchers to go through the regular new drug procedures, including research on animals prior to its investigational use in human beings. BNDD has no jurisdiction in this regard; it is pointed out only as a matter that warrants further consideration before a heroin maintenance program is approved.

My conclusion is that it is not permissible to bring heroin into the United States; it has no currently accepted medical use in treatment; the Attorney General has complete discretion as to whether seized heroin may be available for research; and it is highly doubtful that Congress ever intended that BNDD should become a manufacturer and distributor of heroin for use in such a long range program.

FOOTNOTES

[1] P.L. 91–513; 84 Stat. 1236.

[2] New York Academy of Medicine, Med. Records, March 16, 1918, Vol. 93—p. 468.

[3] JAMA, May 8, 1920, Vol. 74, No. 19, pp. 1324–1328.

[4] P.L. 68–274.

[5] Narcotic Control Act of 1956; P.L. 84–728; 70 Stat. 567; 18 U.S.C. 1402 (repealed).

MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR RABBI URI MILLER

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the members of Beth Jacob Congregation, Baltimore, and the American people have suffered a grave loss in the death of my friend, Rabbi Uri Miller. On July 9, a memorial service was held to pay tribute to Rabbi Miller. Rabbi Nahum M. Ben-Natan, who succeeded Rabbi Miller as spiritual leader of Beth Jacob Congregation, did a superb job of organizing and conducting this service, and I want to pay tribute to him for his efforts.

I should like to share with my colleagues my eulogy and the names of those who participated in the service.

EULOGY FOR RABBI URI MILLER

The death of Rabbi Uri Miller has saddened the nation. That Rabbi Miller was a brilliant spiritual leader is, of course, well known, but he was also a man of action. In government he served as co-chairman of the President's Commission on Civil Rights nearly a decade ago. In religion he served as chief executive of many distinguished national organizations. His compassion was deep—for the young, for the old, and for the people of the Jewish faith who have been trapped in the Soviet Union.

The Jewish people with their thousands of years of cultural, economic, and intellectual leadership can be described as the great success story of the human race. Rabbi Uri Miller can be described as one of the great success stories of the Jewish people.

I valued him as a friend, I respected him as a leader, and I shall miss him as you will miss him. I am deeply proud to have been his Representative in the Congress of the United States.

Rabbi Nahum M. Ben-Natan, Beth Jacob Congregation, 5713 Park Heights Ave, Baltimore, Maryland.

Rabbi Samson R. Weiss, 13 Even Haazel, Jerusalem, Israel.

Father Thomas Peterman, Perry Point VA Hospital, Perry Point, Md.

Rabbi Louis J. Lehrfield, Hebrew Theological College, 7135 N. Carpenter Rd., Skokie, Illinois.

Rabbi William Herskowitz, Rabbinical Council of America, 220 Park Ave. South, New York, N.Y.

Rabbi Jacob Weinberg, Ner Israel Rabbinical College, Mt. Wilson Lane, Baltimore, Md.

Rabbi Leon Adler, Synagogue Council of America, 432 Park Ave., New York, N.Y.

Mr. Fred Neal, Mayor's Office, City Hall, Baltimore, Md.

Hon. Theodore R. McKeldin, 10 Light St., Baltimore, Md.

Rabbi Benjamin Bak, 3407 Menlo Drive, Baltimore, Md.

Rabbi David S. Goldstein, Baltimore Hebrew Congregation, 7401 Park Heights Ave., Balto., Md.

Rabbi Albert Pattashnick, Talmudical Academy, 4445 Old Court Rd., Balto., Md.

Hon. George L. Russell, Jr., Tower Building, Balto., Md.

Rabbi Israel Goldman, Chizuk Amuno Congregation, 8101 Stevenson Road, Balto., Md.

Judge Solomon Liss, 3207 Fallstaff Road, Balto., Md.

REPUBLICANS CONSISTENTLY SUPPORT THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a telling testimony was presented at the recent platform hearings of the Republican National Convention in Miami. Delivered by the chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, Dr. Leo E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, it stresses the consistent record of the Republican Party in incorporating planks in its convention platforms since 1952. The committee was represented by Mr. Joseph Lesawyer, an executive member and also executive vice-president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, at the Democratic Party convention in July. Because of its purely factual elements I commend this testimony to the reading of my colleagues.

Incidentally, in reviewing news reports from Miami, it is unfortunately true that publicity seeking critics, such as Representatives McCLOSKEY and RIEGLE, are receiving far more attention from the

media than a responsible man like Dr. Dobriansky.

The news release follows:

REPUBLICANS CONSISTENTLY SUPPORT THE CAPTIVE NATIONS 1952–1972

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members, it is a veritable privilege for me to testify again at a Republican Convention Platform hearing on a fundamental issue thaat has confronted us Americans for some time and will starkly face our people in the foreseeable future. Since 1948, in Philadelphia, it has been in the nature of a moral obligation for me and others to appear quadrennially in testimony for the incorporation of a strong plank on all of the captive nations in Central Europe, within the Soviet Union, in Asia and Cuba. And it is a striking and glorious fact, deserving of prime emphasis at the outset, that from 1952 thru '68, Republicans at each national convention have consistently and unequivocally supported the freedom cause of the captive nations as a basic, integral factor in our national security interest. This enviable record of expressed principle, moral conscience and political perception must be extended in the forthcoming '72 Platform.

A detailed review of this superb and unsurpassed record makes for exciting and constructive reading. By more recent examples, it is sufficient here to just quote in part from the '64 and '68 Platforms. The '64 plank began, "Republicans reaffirm their long-standing commitment to a course leading to eventual liberation of the Communist-dominated nations of Eastern Europe, Asia and Latin America . . .;" the '68 plank declared in part, "The peoples of the captive nations of Eastern Europe will one day regain their freedom and independence. We will strive to speed this day by encouraging the greater political freedom actively sought by several of these nations".

What is equally important is the fact that in the spirit and terms of this long-standing Party commitment, our President has in his Administration issued four successive Captive Nations Week Proclamations, the most recent of which, last month, emphasized that "in much of the world, the struggle for freedom and independence continues." Nowhere does this observation apply more powerfully, more strategically, and more meaningfully for world peace and freedom than to the areas of the captive nations. From the total viewpoint of our American body politic, it is in a real sense regrettable that, in contrast to Senator Humphrey and others, the Democratic Presidential candidate has consistently shown no concern whatsoever for the plight and strategic importance of the captive nations, as so prominently indicated by his absence of participation in last month's 14th Observance of Captive Nations Week which the President appropriately proclaimed. It appears that many have stiff to learn the Lincoln proverb: "Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves."

Now for a few essential facts and truths justifying a concise, meaningful and perpetuated captive nations plank in the '72 Platform. First, in addition to reflecting the above tradition, such a plank would also reflect the principles for which millions of Americans during the Captive Nations Week observances. Following Publication 86–90, which President Eisenhower signed in 1959, the 14th Observance last month was featured by extensive Congressional addresses, over two dozen Governor and Mayor proclamations from New Hampshire to Texas and Alaska to Georgia, rallies and events in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Chicago, Los Angeles, New Orleans and other major cities, and even in 17 allied countries.

Second, despite both transient and power balance changes in the past two decades, the massive reality of the captive nations in toto has remained unchanged. Here is the list with the years of communist takeover:

Armenia, 1920; Azerbaijan, 1920; Byelorussia, 1920; Cossackia, 1920; Georgia, 1920; Idel-Ural, 1920; North Caucasia, 1920; Ukraine, 1920; Far Eastern Republic, 1922; and Turkestan, 1922.

Mongolian People's Republic, 1924; Estonia, 1940; Latvia, 1940; Lithuania, 1940; Albania, 1946; Bulgaria, 1946; Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, etc. in Yugoslavia, 1946; Poland, 1947; Romania, 1947; and Czecho-Slovakia, 1948.

North Korea, 1948; Hungary, 1949; East Germany, 1949; Mainland China, 1949; Tibet, 1951; North Vietnam, 1954; and Cuba, 1960.

With regard to South Vietnam, Free China and others, the question of "Who's Next" on this list is a most valid one if you consider the policies advocated by those who oppose the President.

Third, as the President indicated in his '72 Captive Nations Week Proclamation, a year doesn't pass without new eruptions for freedom and independence among the captive nations. To mention just a recent few, the self-immolations in Lithuania, the mass arrests of dissidents in Ukraine, religious resistance in Czecho-Slovakia, the upsurge of Croat nationalism in Yugoslavia, the swim of hundreds of youth from Red China are indicators of the persistent struggle for freedom in the captive nations. Fourth, it is vitally important to distinguish between detente, involving negotiations with Red regimes, and any politico-moral acquiescence to the permanent captivity of these nations. There is nothing that Moscow, Peking, and others politically crave for more than the latter from us, but the very fact of the President's issuance of these proclamations demonstrates that such immoral acquiescence is unattainable. And fifth, the far-seeing diplomatic offensive of the President toward both Moscow and Peking underwrites the growing importance of those numerous captive nations in the USSR and Red China, opening up new frontiers of contacts and knowledge that in due time will dissipate typical American myths that these two imperial complexes are made up of only Russians and Chinese respectively.

In the light of these and my other observations, the following captive nations plank is proposed for your acceptance:

"The Republican Party has consistently and unswervingly upheld the goals of freedom and independence for all the captive nations in Eurasia and in Cuba. 'Yet,' as President Nixon's latest proclamation of Captive Nations Week stresses, 'in much of the world, the struggle for freedom and independence continues'. In fixed principle and by flexible deeds we support this struggle, and sharply distinguish between detente for peaceful negotiation and any immoral acquiescence to the permanent captivity of nations in the communist empire. Our firm faith in and dedication to the eventual freedom of all the captive nations from imperialist communist rule countervail in the spirit of 'peaceful coexistence' the communist ideology of subverting free world institutions."

FINANCING EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM IS SERIOUS PROBLEM

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege today to present to Chairman MILLS and his colleagues of the Ways and Means Committee Msgr. Francis B. Schulte, superintendent of schools of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia. The monsignor testified on the Public and Private Education Assistance Act of 1972 (H.R. 16141, H.R. 16215), which it is my pleasure to cosponsor with the gentleman from New York, Hon. HUGH CAREY.

I have long felt that the Congress must come to grips with the ever more serious problem confronting the nation in the financing of its educational system—public and private. I am certain the Monsignor Schulte's cogent comments on this matter will be of great interest to the membership of the House. Therefore, I insert his testimony in the RECORD at this point:

TESTIMONY OF MSGR. FRANCIS B. SCHULTE
AUGUST 17, 1972.

I am Francis B. Schulte, Superintendent of Schools for the Archdiocese of Philadelphia. Under the general supervision of this office are 279 parish elementary schools, plus 4 special schools, and 31 diocesan high schools, educating altogether 223,000 students. (These figures are exclusive of the private Catholic schools and Catholic colleges and universities in the Archiocese.) The territory of the Archdiocese includes the City of Philadelphia and the four surrounding counties—Bucks, Chester, Montgomery, and Delaware. Almost 60% of these students are in Catholic schools in the City of Philadelphia. About 15% of the city students are from minority groups, and more than 20% of these are non-Catholics.

DECREASING ENROLLMENT AND INCREASING COSTS

The Catholic schools of Philadelphia are facing an increasingly serious financial crisis. A brief look at enrollment figures over recent years will provide us with some understanding of the situation. In 1964–65 our schools in the five counties served some 271,379 pupils in contrast with last year's enrollment of 223,000, a decline of some 48,000 students.

These enrollment figures are related undoubtedly to steadily rising costs in education. A tradition of little or no tuition in the schools of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia had produced a uniquely democratic clientele over the years. As recently as 1965–66 high school "tuition" was $20; today the charge to each student is $300 a year, in addition to $150 per student from the parishes. Only in this last school year was tuition officially introduced into the elementary schools, so that, until very recently, there was no financial deterrent to the exercise of parental rights in education, and rich and poor alike were accepted into our schools as a result of the outstanding sacrifice of our Catholic people and friends.

Today, however, with the steadily rising tuition, we are faced with the distasteful specter of becoming less democratic, less "Catholic"—forced more and more to a position of being open only to those who can afford to come to our schools.

CITY AND SUBURBAN SCHOOLS AFFECTED

The Report of the Gurash Committee, recently completed and made available to this Committee, indicates that operational costs of Catholic schools in the city and suburbs will rise astronomically by 1976. The picture of many Catholic schools in the City of Philadelphia is one of deteriorating buildings, empty classrooms, rising tuition, and enormous debt. These conditions have already begun to limit freedom of parental choice in education.

The financial crisis of the Catholic schools affects the public schools' financial problems. Unfortunately, many Catholic schools serving families least able to absorb any added costs are located in the center of a large pub-

lic school system which is itself struggling under the threat of bankruptcy. One out of every three children in the City of Philadelphia attends Catholic school. Unless immediate, substantial aid comes to these schools, both public and nonpublic schools will find their mutual problems gravely intensified.

In suburban areas of the Archdiocese the two-pronged debt factor of newer school buildings and families laboring under the costs of resettlement likewise limits parental freedom of choice in education. Those parents who continue to struggle to keep their children in our schools experience the added burden of increased school taxes to enable the public schools to absorb the transfer of their neighbors' children.

State and federal legislation over the past few years has provided various kinds of supplementary assistance to our schools. Valuable as these materials and services are, they do not touch upon the basic burdens of salaries and other operational costs. More and more, our schools must depend on tuition charges which cannot do otherwise than increase drastically.

SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

The Gurash Report, to which I referred briefly, is the work of a group of outstanding leaders in our community—Catholic and non-Catholic, business and professional people. Their independent study of our schools encompasses the social contribution of our schools as well as their present financial need. The Report stresses the important role played by Catholic schools in the total educational effort of the Philadelphia community and lists the following considerations:

1. Education encompasses the entire spectrum of social political, and spiritual values that are part of the fabric of life in a free society.

2. Catholic and other parochial schools are committed to an educational philosophy involving morals, conduct, and spiritual as well as intellectual excellence.

3. The American tradition of educational diversity has been a great strength to our educational system and should be preserved.

4. The individual citizen's right to choose the kind of education which he wishes his children to have is an important right and should be preserved.

5. Catholic schools are a stabilizing factor in the life of our urban communities.

6. The example set by the Catholic schools of efficient and economically constructed and operated facilities is also important.

7. In addition to the foregoing, the resources committed to supplying Catholic education in the Philadelphia area provide this community with:

A quality education for one out of three children in the City of Philadelphia and comparable numbers in the four surounding counties.

An important source of a skilled labor force and an educated citizenry.

A source of community and business leaders.

A full range of student activities which provide educational, social and recreational services to the community at large and develop in the students themselves a sense of social responsibility.

Substantial facilities and personnel to undertake the education of minority groups and the poor. This aspect of social contribution of Catholic resources was prominently noted by President Nixon in his Message on Educational Reform, March 3, 1970, in which he comments:

"They offer a wider range of possibilities for education experimentation and special opportunities for minorities, especially Spanish-speaking Americans and black Americans."

These resources exist today and present potentially a powerful instrument for social awareness and change. The resources so committed should be conserved along with our other national resources.

The community stake—both economic and social—is high. Independent of full acceptance of the benefits claimed or value judgments implied, the Catholic and other nonpublic schools of the Philadelphia community are a substantial factor to be reckoned with and assessed.

8. There exists between the public and Catholic schools of Philadelphia a large measure of interdependence, cooperation and interaction.

FINANCIAL IMPACT OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

The major findings of this Committee in the financial area may be summarized in these words:

1. By 1975 the deficit in the schools of the Archdiocese will reach $55.4 million.

2. Costs will continue to spiral due to:

a) Rising teacher salaries;

b) Decline in availability of Religious teachers; and

c) Improving (declining) student/teacher ratios.

3. Despite all these pressures, costs in the Catholic schools will remain substantially below the public school system when measured on the basis of cost per student.

4. The Catholic schools of the five counties represent a saving of more than 800 million dollars a year in operating costs alone, not to mention the housing of the children.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE IN EDUCATION

Finally, I would like to reaffirm our belief in the primary rights of parents in the education of their children. As was stated in the Wall Street Journal of December 8, 1970, in a letter to the editor, written by E. Earle Ellis, of New Brunswick Theological Seminary:

"Is it not understandable that the religio-philosophical framework of current public education is for many Christians and Jews confessionally offensive? The state's use of the taxes of such people exclusively for public school represents a two-fold infringement on their religious liberties. First, it is a discriminatory distribution of tax aid to one kind of educational structure, one that is confessionally objectionable to them. More seriously, it forces such persons of moderate income to send their children to these schools whatever their confessional preferences may be. It needs to be stated again, loud and clear, that whatever proper educational requirements the state may make, the primary rights in educating a child belong to the parents—not to the state."

CONCLUSION

Based on my observations and experience as Superintendent of Catholic Schools in a large metropolitan area, I urge prompt action on legislation to provide some relief in the form of tax credits for parents of children attending nonpublic schools.

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY

Catholic schools make an important social and educational contribution to the total educational effort of the Philadelphia area. These schools also have a most significant financial impact on educational costs in the area. The contributions of Catholic schools have been widely recognized, most recently by the Gurash Report.

In recent years, Catholic schools, along with most American schools, have faced rapidly increasing costs. More and more of these costs have been met by rising tuition. This increase in tuition is limiting the availability of this form of nonpublic education and placing greater and greater burdens upon poor and middle class parents.

Relief for these parents in the form of tax credit legislation is urgently needed. Such legislation would be wise public policy for our nation.

BATTLE IN BROOKLYN

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, fair and open and honest elections are at the very heart of this democracy. When there are serious doubts about the validity of an election, when there is substantial evidence of fraud and deceit, it is vital that those doubts be resolved, the evidence heard. People must be able to trust the democratic process. If they cannot trust the process, they cannot trust the government that it supports.

Vote fraud and dishonest elections are not unknown in this country. Almost every election, there are charges that one candidate or another has been "cheated" out of the election. All too often, the charges lack substance, based more on sour grapes than sound evidence. Because of that, it is often easy to ignore all charges of vote fraud—even the serious ones, the ones with substance. It would be a tragic mistake to ignore the charges and the evidence now being raised in New York's 14th Congressional District. The charges are not frivolous. The evidence has substance.

The newspaper article which follows explains what happened on primary election day in New York and what is being done about it. If the charges are proved, if the election was not honest, the only way to restore the trust and confidence of people in democracy is to hold a new election. Because of the principles involved, because of the importance, I think it is something all of my colleagues will want to follow. The article is attached:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Post, July 1, 1972]

BATTLE IN BROOKLYN

(By Jose Torres)

It seems as if the battle over who won and who lost in the 14th C.D. in Brooklyn is not yet over. I mean, as far as many Puerto Ricans are concerned, Al Lowenstein didn't lose to incumbent Rep. John Rooney. And these countrymen of mine are willing to go all the way to prove to the world that Lowenstein was cheated.

Until now figures say that Rooney received 14,292 votes to Lowenstein's 13,403. The arithmetic says that Lowstein was the loser by 889 votes. But a lot of Puerto Ricans disagree. And, 14,500 Puerto Rican registered voters make a big 22 percent of the C.D.'s total.

I was having lunch yesterday in Otero's Restaurant on Smith St. and Pedro Sanchez, a young man I know, came to me and said: "Al was cheated." Frankly, I didn't know what this man was talking about.

"I've been voting for years," he continued, "and as usual, I went to vote to I.S. 293." He asked for a beer, asked me if I wanted one, and as he pulled a dollar bill from his pocket he almost yelled: "It's a shame. Here we are in a democratic country. I was always proud of it. But now I don't know what to think. Some people here believe we Puerto Ricans are dumb people."

The young man took a sip from the can of beer and kept talking. "You know, Chegui," he almost yelled my nickname, "I didn't vote. Not because I didn't want it, but because 'the machine' didn't allow it. I was told that they couldn't find my card. So, for three hours I argued and I screamed, but

'they' didn't let loose. Man, 'they' prevented me from exercising my right to vote." "The machine" he meant was the Democratic machine in Brooklyn.

"What are you talking about?" I finally was able to sneak a word in.

"The Lowenstein-Rooney fight," he said with a broad smile. "Al Lowenstein, the Kennedy man, was cheated. And he was cheated in the most obscene way." Pedro was sincerely angry. He was not putting me on. "If Mr. Lowenstein don't put these bunch of crooks in jail, I'll do it."

Elba Rodriguez, 21, was more frustrated than mad. "I think I should blame myself," said Elba, entering the conversation. "I was given the chance to vote and blew it." Then she went on to explain that it was the first time she had been in a voting booth and she didn't know what to do.

"I was told to pull this way (she motioned her right hand to the right direction) and then this way (she moved her right hand to the left) and that's exactly what I did." So, automatically her votes were cancelled out.

When a third man, Raul Bones, joined the conversation I decided that this was no joke. There was a serious problem involved here. And I didn't laugh anymore when I heard Sanchez complaining: "It was a fraud."

The important thing here is that Sanchez, Rodriguez and Bones were not political activists. In fact they had said that they were going to vote for Lowenstein and that was about all they said about politics. "But that was enough," claimed Sanchez. "We had trouble for saying that we were for Lowenstein and not for Rooney."

I personally don't feel that Rooney himself would involve himself with this kind of maneuver. Rooney had shown me in the past that he's a decent man. In fact, he had been one of the few politicians in New York who has always wished me luck before my fights and sent me congratulatory telegrams after my boxing victories.

Of our personal relationship I have no complaints. But I began to dislike his political views about three years ago, after a few of my close friends died in a war that Rooney thought was proper.

But also Rooney is part of a machine, and although he is a Democrat, he's one of President Nixon's favorite Democrats. In fact, of all of New York's Congressmen in Washington, Rooney has been one of the most consistent backers of Nixon.

He's also been for jets to Taiwan, no jets for Israel; help for the South African government; help for fascist governments like Spain and Greece; more money for defense. But backing Nixon on the Vietnam war is what really turned me off from Rooney.

And if what all these countrymen of mine are saying about the primary vote foul-up is true, I see no reason why they should stop pressing the authorities to cancel the results.

Said Wilson Bones, son of Raul: "The complaints have been many. And there are many people who will testify to the fact that they didn't vote because they were somehow stopped from voting."

If Wilson is right, there is only one thing for me to say: Help!

ANNUNZIO DEMANDS STRICT ENFORCEMENT OF THE LAW

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, there has been a 30-percent increase in the reported crime rate in the last 3 years. The latest FBI figures show that during the first 9 months of 1971, there were increases of 10 percent for violent crimes and 6 percent for property crimes compared with the same period in 1970. Compare these figures with the total number of arrests, which increases about 5 percent a year.

An attorney and investor in Palm Beach, Fla., who understated his capital gains, thus avoiding taxes and penalties of over $1 million, was given 2 years' probation and fined $5,000. A numbers operator in Detroit was fined $5,000 for false wagering on his excise tax returns. The taxes on his income amounted to well over $1½ million.

How can average citizens maintain their respect for the law when "big-time operators" are dealt with so leniently?

It is obvious that in spite of all the talk about a war on crime being fought by the Justice Depatment's Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the crime rate has gone up, millions of dollars have been wasted and the program has been badly administered. Large lump-sum money grants to the States have helped to create new and unmanagable bureaucracies caught up in politics.

This Federal program has supplied the Birmingham, Ala., Police Department with three Army tanks to the tune of $67,000. Just how a tank will help to apprehend the burglar and the mugger is a question nobody seems to be able to answer. I am not even sure that a tank would be particularly effective under riot conditions.

In 1967, the President's Crime Commission urged that the courts adopt modern administrative and business management methods that would avoid repeated appearances and continuances. This recommendation has been ignored, even though by adopting it, both the courts and the police would be helped. Prosecuting witnesses, including policemen, are often required to come to court on five or more separate occasions for a single case. These delays reward defendants. Last year, 94,000 felony arrests in New York City resulted in only 550 trials. The other cases were dismissed or reduced to misdemeanors in return for guilty pleas.

Drug addiction, a major reason for the increase in crime, is spreading among young people. This problem, and innovative ways to deal with it, has received too little attention. In a 2-year period, when Federal appropriations for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration program increased from $270 million to $700 million, funds for the Federal juvenile-delinquency programs were cut from $15 to $10 million. Tragically, young people are involved in the vast majority of crimes.

Flashy gadgetry and unplanned, unthinking spending is not the answer to the problem of rising crime rates. We must support the overhaul of our court system and insist that justice be administered promptly and fairly without reference to the defendant's financial status. When our young people see the millionnaire tax cheater get off with a slap on the wrist—and the financial tycoon rewarded for dishonesty in the marketplace—it becomes easy to accept lawlessness as a way of life.

It was in this spirit that I introduced a resolution in the House urging that economic and military assistance to Thailand be suspended for its failure to take adequate steps to control the illegal traffic of opium through its borders.

I believe that if we take vigorous action to enforce the law at all levels of criminal activity and see that prompt court action is taken against all offenders, we will have gone a long way toward the solution of our crime problem.

CENTRAL NEW YORK IS RICHER HAVING KNOWN CALVIN THOMPSON

HON. JOHN H. TERRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, in our time there have been giants in history whose names will continue to be used as comparison with leaders of the future. This morning, the central New York area learned of the death of a man whose contribution to our spiritual and temporal well-being will constantly be used as an example of true concern for service to one's community.

Dr. Calvin M. Thompson, Jr., pastor of the Delaware Street Baptist Church for 37 years, established a position in the Syracuse community as both a religious and civic leader. In addition to his duties as pastor of his church, he broadcast a weekly radio program on WSYR titled "Sunday Morning at the Crossroads."

Dr. Thompson's willingness to help in difficult times was represented by his membership nearly 4 decades ago on the Syracuse Housing Authority when public housing was extremely new and certainly not something that a clergyman would dare lend his name to.

We have in our Nation a tradition of separation of church and state which has served us well during our 200 years of existence. Dr. Thompson represents that unusual man who could combine his religious duties with civic participation and never create a conflict because of the two responsibilities he held.

The death of Dr. Thompson brings sorrow to the hearts of all who knew him and sought his counsel in times of need. The entire central New York area is richer for having known him. His contribution to the Greater Syracuse area was recognized this morning in an editorial in the Syracuse Post Standard, as follows:

CALVIN M. THOMPSON, JR.

Through extension of his personality far beyond his pulpit by way of radio, the press and civic leadership, the Rev. Dr. Calvin M. Thompson, Jr., who died yesterday, was in a very real sense a minister to the entire Central New York community.

Pastor of Delaware Street Baptist Church for 37 years until his retirement in 1970, Dr. Thompson exerted a tremendous influence with his own congregation but he served also thousands of shut-ins and persons of all faiths through his "Sunday Morning at the

Crossroads" radio program on WSYR since 1934, and in retirement had continued as religious adviser of that station.

Ever alert for any chance to carry his message to a wider audience, Dr. Thompson had "exchanged pulpits" 20 years ago with the late Richard H. Amberg, then general manager of this newspaper, with Mr. Amberg preaching at Delaware Church and Dr. Thompson writing the lead editorial in the Sunday Post-Standard.

Dr. Thompson was particularly proud of the fact that he had never missed a Sunday morning broadcast, even on the tragic Sunday in 1958 when his beloved church was in flames and he made his way to WSYR.

But it was as a doer of deeds as much as a preacher of sermons that Dr. Thompson made his greatest impact on the community and on every organization with which he was associated.

He was a member of the Syracuse Housing Authority nearly 40 years ago, when public housing was a highly controversial issue, and he served faithfully both as a member and for several years as chairman while the SHA withstood a storm of opposition and while Pioneer Homes was being established as Syracuse's first low-cost housing project.

He was a past president of the Syracuse Council of Churches, past moderator of the Onondaga Baptist Association, former chaplain of the State American Legion, former grand chaplain of the New York State Masons, and a leader of the New York State Baptist Convention, among numerous other secular and religious responsibilities.

He never refused an opportunity to serve when he thought his help was needed.

He was a friend of the poor and the rich, a counselor of the old and the young, a benefactor of all races, and a true practitioner of the "oldtime religion" which moves men's souls to follow the basic teachings of Christianity.

Many will miss his inspirational messages but will recall his firm loyalty to his principles. Syracuse is richer for having known Calvin Thompson.

STILL NO JUSTICE FOR KENT STATE

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I have come before this House in several occasions to plead the case of those who feel that justice has been dealt a low blow by the Nixon administration in connection with the killing of four college students at Kent State University, May 4, 1970.

The circumstances surrounding those killings and the wounding of several more students, many of them innocents who were merely traveling between classes, have never been made public.

Twenty of us in this body formally asked the administration to convene a Federal grand jury to investigate the questionable behavior of certain Ohio National Guardsmen during the shooting. Our request was denied.

An independent researcher suggested there was a conspiracy to kill those students. I put his account into the RECORD for the information of my colleagues on July 22, 1971.

Today I will introduce another item for your perusal. I have edited the report slightly to conform with our RECORD extension rules, but the message remains powerful.

It is the account of bureaucratic runaround and blatant lying carried on by the administration with respect to the request by more than 10,000 Kent State students for a Federal grand jury investigation of what happened at their school on that fateful day.

After you read this account, ask yourself why the young people of this Nation have so little faith in their elected leaders. From this report the answer to that question is clear. The report follows:

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY'S PETITION TO THE WHITE HOUSE: TEN MONTHS OF DECEIT

Attorney General John Mitchell said today there are "apparent violations of federal law" in the Kent State shooting case. He said the federal government will move to prosecute the violators "if Ohio authorities do not." Mitchell did not specify the nature of the violations but said they involved both students and Ohio National Guardsmen.—*Akron Beacon Journal*, July 29, 1970, "Mitchell Eyes Prosecution By U.S. In Kent State Case"

"Watch what we do instead of what we say."—John Mitchell, Attorney General of the United States, July 1969.

BACKGROUND TO THE PETITION FOR A FEDERAL GRAND JURY INVESTIGATION OF THE KENT STATE UNIVERSITY TRAGEDY

Although several investigations were held following the Kent State University killings, none could determine why Ohio National Guardsmen fired into a crowd of K.S.U. students on May 4, 1970. The evidence indicated that the shootings were totally unjustified, but the President's Commission on Campus Unrest and the Justice Department could do no better than to speculate why the shootings occurred.

In the summer of 1970 Justice Department officials analyzed the 8,000 page FBI investigative report on the May 1–4 K.S.U. disorders to determine whether Federal prosecution was warranted. On July 29 of that year former Attorney General John Mitchell said there were "apparent violations of Federal law" involving both students and Guardsmen. The Justice Department reportedly was gathering evidence for presentation to a Federal Grand Jury in Cleveland if Ohio authorities did not prosecute.

In early August former Ohio Governor James Rhodes directed his attorney general to convene a special state grand jury. Twenty-five persons, mostly students, were indicted on October 16 for various offenses which allegedly occurred during the four days of disorder at the University. Despite advice from the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division that six Guardsmen could be criminally prosecuted under Ohio law, no indictments were returned against any Guardsmen.

The conclusions of the special Ohio grand jury have long been discredited. Its report, which contradicted both the Commission on Campus Unrest and the Justice Department's summary of the FBI report in concluding the Guardsmen fired in self-defense, was physically destroyed by Federal Court order in November 1971. In December 1971 state prosecutors dropped charges against 20 of the 25 defendants for lack of sufficient evidence.

Almost immediately after the special Ohio grand jury's report was released, K.S.U. student and faculty legislative bodies issued a joint statement calling for a Federal Grand Jury investigation of the May 1–4 disorders. Such an investigation was under consideration at the Justice Department, which resumed and intensified its evaluation of the matter in October, 1970. In November Jerris Leonard, the former chief of the Department's Civil Rights Division who had earlier promised federal action if the state proceedings were not capably handled, said a decision whether to convene a Federal Grand Jury would be reached before the end of the year.

For the next eight months, however, the Justice Department refused to say what it intended to do about the case while the parents of the four slain K.S.U. students, five members of the Commission on Campus Unrest, many Congressmen, organizations and individuals appealed for a Federal Grand Jury investigation of the shootings. In response to these numerous pleas, Department spokesmen publicly and privately promised that a decision would be announced at "the appropriate time."

On August 13, 1971, over fifteen months after the shootings, Mitchell finally announced the Justice Department's decision. He said that his personal review of the case prompted him to agree with the Commission on Campus Unrest's conclusion that the rifle fire was "unnecessary, unwarranted, and inexcusable." But in the next breath he said, "there is no credible evidence of a conspiracy between National Guardsmen" and that he believed further federal action in the case was unwarranted. Mitchell did not comment on the fact that four lives had been taken without due process of law, which attorneys for the parents of the four slain students had asserted was a violation of Section 242 of the U.S. Code, Title 18. "The appropriate time" for the announcement, the *Christian Science Monitor* commented, "was late on Friday (4:00) to minimize news coverage and safely after Congress had left town for summer recess."

Two weeks after Mitchell's announcement Senator Edward Kennedy, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, indicated his subcommittee would investigate the Justice Department's refusal to convene a Federal Grand Jury. During the subsequent eleven months Kennedy's numerous requests that the Justice Department provide his subcommittee with its investigative file were refused.

THE PETITION FOR A FEDERAL GRAND JURY INVESTIGATION OF THE KENT STATE UNIVERSITY TRAGEDY

In his August 13 announcement, Mitchell said that he was satisfied that justice had been served. Over 10,380 K. S. U. students and faculty, however, did not agree with him. That number signed a petition circulated after classes resumed for the Fall quarter urging President Nixon to reverse the decision.

The unique circumstance of Dr. Glenn A. Olds, the University's new president, being a friend and former adviser to President Nixon, provided the inspiration for dormitory counselors Paul Keane and Greg Rambo to coauthor the petition. Olds himself refused to sign the petition, saying he was not familiar enough with the facts of the case, but promised to convey the results of the petition to President Nixon if a clear mandate of the student body was obtained. On October 20 Olds brought Keane and Rambo to Washington in a University airplane and presented the signatures to Presidential Counselor Leonard Garment in the White House during an hour long meeting. Olds spoke forcefully on the students' behalf and told Garment he could not get on with the "creative or innovative work of the University" until the issue had been resolved. Rambo requested an answer to the petition by December 1, and, should President Nixon decide to uphold Mitchell's decision, they at least be provided with a detailed explanation of why it was reached.

Although the petition was addressed to the President and urged him to reverse Mitchell's

decision, Garment referred the petitions to the Justice Department. On November 14 he said "the matter is now under consideration here (at the White House) and at the Justice Department." Garment said he hoped a response would be forthcoming "within the next couple of weeks." On December 9 Keane and Rambo returned to Washington with K. S. U. Student Body President Bill Slocum to present Garment with 23,000 more signatures obtained when the petition was circulated on other campuses. (The nationwide petition drive ultimately resulted in a total of 50,000 signatures.) Garment said then that the dropping of charges against 20 of the 25 persons indicted by the special Ohio grand jury could possibly speed up the Justice Department's decision. The students were prepared to distribute packets to every member of Congress along with a request that they sign the petition. After the meeting was over and the students left, Garment came out of his office and walked double-time halfway down the White House hallway to ask them not to distribute the packets. Still reading the information in the packets, Garment cautioned "this might cause people to make statements which wouldn't be helpful and which you have no reason to understand." The students agreed not to distribute the packets.

Justice Department officials had previously said that new evidence would help the call for a Federal Grand Jury. In October and November Garment received two detailed briefs from Keane and Rambo. The thrust of the briefs was that sufficient evidence already exists warranting the convening of a Federal Grand Jury.

There were a few indications that the Administration intended to respond to the petition before Mitchell resigned as attorney general and officially resumed his role as campaign manager for President Nixon's reelection effort. On February 17, a Justice Department spokesman said there would be a response soon, but added he was unable to specify when it would come in terms of days. On February 23, after Attorney General-designate Richard Kleindienst testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee that he would not reverse Mitchell's decision if confirmed as his successor, Garment reaffirmed that there would be "a review and a response in a formal fashion by the administration" within a few weeks. Garment indicated the response was being held up until President Nixon returned from his trip to China.

The Justice Department, however, became involved in a controversy in early March after columnist Jack Anderson printed a memo linking the Department's out-of-court settlement of three antitrust cases against International Telephone and Telegraph with ITT's pledge of an estimated $400,000 contribution to the Republican National Convention. On March 1 Mitchell resigned as attorney general without a response to the petition and Kleindienst's confirmation as his successor was held up while the Senate Judiciary Committee probed the circumstances of the ITT settlement. On March 10 a Justice Department spokesman said there was "no time fix" for a response to the petition.

The same day Keane placed a surprise call to David Norman, chief of the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division and the official Garment said he had been working with. It was this telephone call which convinced the petitioners that they had been deceived by the Nixon Administration.

Asked whether he received the two detailed briefs from Garment, Norman said, "I *think* they are in the packet Len (Garment) gave me." (emphasis not added) Norman told Keane that "we're getting a new attorney general in here and he might want to consider the petitions after he is confirmed."

Not only had Kleindienst testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee two weeks earlier that he would not reopen the Kent State case if confirmed as attorney general, but he had been saying essentially the same thing in response to questions after several speeches he had given since the petition was received in the White House. Norman's statement was another example of the curious lack of communication between Justice Department officials (and some White House aides) which also surfaced during the Senate Judiciary Committee's hearings on the ITT case. Kleindienst told the Senate Judiciary Committee on February 23 that he was "not aware the case is being reconsidered." His testimony contradicted Mitchell's December 20 letter to Ohio Congressman William Stanton in which Mitchell assured him the petitions were "receiving careful consideration."

In the telephone conversation, Norman was asked about one of the important points involving Federal law cited in the two detailed briefs: the assertion which appears in the Justice Department's very own summary of the FBI report that some Guardsmen may have jointly fabricated claims of having had to fire their weapons in self-defense. Norman, as if he had never heard of Kent State, said only he thought he had seen that point mentioned "in a memo prepared during the course of the (Justice Department and FBI) investigation." Significantly, when one of Garment's aides was asked the same question on July 13, 1972, he seemed equally unsure of the authority of that assertion.

The Nixon Administration continued to ignore requests for a response to the petition throughout the spring quarter. In April Garment told Olds that "we're still waiting for advice from the Justice Department." It was never explained why Kleindienst could not give his advice as Acting Attorney General. The issue of a Federal Grand Jury investigation, which dominated the campus news during most of the first two quarters of the academic year, seemed to fade and was replaced with protests over fresher issues: University budget cuts and President Nixon's Indochina war policies.

When the academic year ended without a response to the petition, Olds lamented that the "long delay has crippled my effort to persuade students the system will work." On July 10, nine months after Garment received the 10,380 signatures, Keane and Rambo finally were informed that a Federal Grand Jury would not be convened. The promised "review and a response in a formal fashion by the administration" came in the form of photocopies of a letter Garment sent to the parents of the four slain students on July 6. Since neither the White House nor the Justice Department made a public announcement nor issued a formal press release, and since the letter was received the first day of the Democratic National Convention, there was almost no press coverage of the letter.

Garment's five paragraph letter stated that Kleindienst "was asked about this matter in a public question and answer session and has answered for himself and for the Administration that he has not seen presented to him sufficient new evidence of information which would compel him to reverse the decision of former Attorney General Mitchell concerning the submittal of this matter to a Federal Grand Jury."

None of the points involving Federal law which were raised in the two detailed briefs were addressed in Garment's letter. Garment did respond briefly to the conspiracy charges suggested by Michener and Davies. Garment wrote, "Willfulness or specific criminal intent or planned or purposeful conspiracy must be proved in order support a federal indictment; there is still no evidence available to prove such a violation of the Federal criminal statutes. . . . There is still no evidence known to the Attorney General of a *federally* punishable conspiracy." (Garment's emphasis).

On July 12 Justice Department spokesman John Wilson was asked whether the Department had contacted Michener concerning his statement that the conspiracy theory was 'irrefutable'. Wilson said he did not know and added it would probably be up to Michener to contact the Department with any new information rather than the other way around.

The next day Brad Patterson, Garment's aide, was asked whether Garment's July 6 letter to the parents was considered to be the response to the petition by the Nixon Administration. Insisting that he was not an official White House spokesman, Patterson said the Administration's response to the petition was actually Kleindienst's response to a question asked at his first press conference after being confirmed as attorney general on July 13. Patterson said that confirmation that Kleindienst's remarks was the Administration's official response to the petition would have to come from Garment himself. It was subsequently learned that all calls to Garment's office concerning the matter were being referred to the Justice Department.

The text of Kleindienst's remarks, as provided by the Justice Department:

QUESTION. Has the matter of whether or not to have a Federal grand jury investigation regarding the shootings at Kent State ever been resolved?

Mr. KLEINDIENST. Since March 1 when Mr. Mitchell left, I have appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee in which I testified about this. I have been on several campuses throughout the country in which I have had students ask me what am I going to do about Kent State. I've said publicly and I've said before the Senate Judiciary Committee that there has not been presented to me, since I have been the Acting Attorney General, sufficient new evidence or information or material that would compel me to reverse the decision of Mr. Mitchell concerning the submittal of this matter to a Federal grand jury.

QUESTION. I don't think they (the petitioners) have ever been told, have they?

Mr. KLEINDIENST. Well, they might not have gotten a personal letter from me. I don't want to appear insensitive or callous. I think you all know about my family and the affinity I have toward young people, but I don't know to what extent the Attorney General of the United States, in the proper execution of his responsibilities, is called upon to respond to matters of this kind that don't come about in the ordinary operation of our Department. Certainly in no attitude that I have attempted to conceal, as much as I grieve for those families, as much as I grieve for America, that this unfortunate situation occurred. But my position tonight is that I just don't think that the circumstances would alter Mr. Mitchell's basic decision, prior to the time that he left.

Several months before, Olds had asked Pepsi-Cola President Don Kendall and TV entertainer Art Linkletter to speak to President Nixon about the petition. Olds told Keane and Rambo that Kendall had told him Nixon had put the petition as "top priority" on the White House agenda.

When Olds also received a photocopy of Garment's July 6 letter to the parents and was unhappy with the White House treatment of the petition, he asked Billy Graham to intercede for a personal response from President Nixon and a reply to the briefs. Olds made a similar plea to Garment, who told him that he wanted to respond in more detail in his letter to the parents but could not.

Garment did write a short note on July 27 to Keane and Rambo to apologize "for my failure to write to the two of you when I

wrote the parents. There is not much I could have added, certainly nothing of substance, but it was the least I could have done in view of our meetings and dealings and the sincerity of purpose and good faith with which you conducted yourselves throughout."

On July 25 Keane, Rambo and the new K. S. U. Student Body President, Bob Gage, wrote to Kleindienst requesting a meeting, a detailed explanation of why the Justice Department will not convene a Federal Grand Jury on the grounds cited in the briefs, and a thorough explanation of what Kleindienst meant by asserting there was no evidence known to him of a *federally* punishable conspiracy. On July 25 the students also wrote to Garment asking for a meeting with him and President Nixon to discuss the Nixon Administration's handling of the petition. As of the writing of this report (August 8), neither letter has been acknowledged. Nor are they expected to be, considering the numerous letters sent to the Justice Department and the Nixon Administration concerning the Kent State case which have never been acknowledged.

POLITICS, 1972

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as the United States approaches its 200th anniversary the American people face the twin tasks of improving the conduct of our nation's foreign relations and building a better country for our own 210 million citizens. Because of these important needs, the elections that will be held this November will be among the most significant in our Nation's history.

The American electorate must, therefore, choose wisely from the many candidates who seek to govern our communities, our States and our Nation. We cannot allow ambitious candidates to ride into office on the crest of inflammatory rhetoric. We cannot allow demagogues to divide us by appealing to our emotions rather than our reason. Arousing the public and appealing to the people on the basis of their fears rather than their hopes is an inadequate substitute for bringing an issue to light on the basis of its merits. Too often in the past, we have permitted emotional issues to serve as a smokescreen obscuring debate on pertinent matters.

It is vital that in this year's election, the American people should scrutinize the record of candidates using past voting rather than glittering promises as a criterion in selecting the best men for various offices.

Recently, the Communications Workers of America, which represents more than 550,000 people, passed a resolution at its annual convention calling for a close examination of the voting records of all candidates for political office.

Because of its timeliness and importance, under unanimous consent, I insert this resolution entitled "Politics 1972" in the RECORD. I agree with the CWA not on every single issue, but with by far the great majority of issues discussed in the resolution.

The resolution follows:

POLITICS, 1972

Less than half a year from now, hundreds of thousands of Communications Workers of America members, their families, and millions of other Americans will file into voting places all over the country. Young and old, rich and destitute, radical and reactionary, Democrat and Republican—all will make their marks, and flip their levers, in the ritual which determines how well or how poorly our communities, our states and our nation are run.

This Resolution will not tell you whom to vote for.

But it will say that you and those associated with you should choose wisely, because if you and they choose wisely, our communities and states and the nation will be governed well.

Choosing wisely is not always easy.

In the hot atmosphere of American political campaigning, charges are replaced by counter-charges, claims are superseded by counter-claims, today's promises smother yesterday's and tomorrow's smears lie in ambush, awaiting their call into the political action.

Despite this, we must choose well.

And we can, if we disregard the charges and the counter-charges, the claims, the promises, and the smears.

Wherever possible, whenever there is a record, we must look at the record.

Fortunately in many elections there is a record.

All of the national candidates seeking the nominations of the major parties have records. All of the incumbent Congressional candidates for the House and Senate, and many of those seeking state and community offices have records.

But they must be looked at carefully.

Some politicians have so small a sense of truth, and so vast an imagination, that they can convert votes against us into votes for us, when they are campaigning.

It is not unusual for an anti-labor legislator—on the state or national level—to tell us that he has just voted to protect the rights of working people, when he has actually just voted for "compulsory open shop"—a vote directly opposite the interests of working people.

And it is not unusual for an anti-labor legislator to tell us that he has always been in favor of tax reform, but neglect to tell us that to him tax reform means taking taxes off corporations, and the very wealthy, and putting them on middle and low income workers.

So the record requires scrutiny.

Every Local President and Local legislative chairman in our Union has been sent a voting record analysis of each incumbent member of Congress. Many state central bodies prepare a voting record analysis of members of the state legislature.

These should be reviewed, so that our votes are given or withheld on a basis of the facts and the record, and not on emotions or erroneous information.

We must oppose those legislators who would take away our right to strike, and who would end collective bargaining by installing a compulsory arbitration system, with arbitrators chosen by the government.

We must oppose those legislators who try to pass off a sales tax in disguise, such as the value added tax, as tax reform, when value added tax is actually the opposite of tax reform.

We must support the true tax reform legislators—those who would correct the errors in the system which now place an unfair share of the tax burden on low and middle income earners, while the wealthy and the corporations too often can avoid any tax payment at all.

We must support those who would eliminate the percentage depletion allowances for minerals and the intangible drilling costs loophole, who would disallow special treatment for stock options and other favoritisms, including accelerated depreciation, investment credit, long-term capital gains, and who would tax profits held overseas by multinational corporations.

We must support those legislators who will work for passage of the Kennedy-Griffiths version of National Health Insurance, which would give Americans a true health delivery system. We must support those legislators who will work for the Hart-Magnuson No-Fault auto insurance bill, which will give Americans real insurance protection in auto accidents.

We need comprehensive child care, an education policy which provides every American with all of the education he or she can utilize without regard to ability to pay, and we need a full range of consumer protections in the market place.

We need an environment that is healthful, we need enforcement of laws which protect workers, and we need welfare reform without destroying job rights of welfare workers.

We need livable cities for all Americans, jobs for everyone who can work, and we need a climate of considerateness toward each other, not a climate of confrontation.

That is not a long list—that is only a beginning.

Where a candidate has a record, it should be checked, and where a candidate does not have a record, positions should be established before support is offered.

Those seeking our support for the highest national office, the Presidency of the United States, also have held or hold office, and they have records.

Therefore, when we make our decision on the Presidency, we should check their record.

If a candidate tries to sound as though he invented tax reform, we have a right to ask where he stood on it before the campaign started, and where he stood on it when he had the authority to do something about it?

As we might expect, we will find our longtime friends through the years have consistently voted to remove the inequities in the tax burden, and take some of it off workers. And we will find that some who claim to be our friends are capable of delivering an emotional spiel about taxes, but did not deliver the votes to do anything about it when they could have helped us.

If a candidate takes an obviously emotional issue—any emotional issue—and attempts to ride it into office by inflaming the voters, we have a right to ask—what is the candidate's record? What has the candidate accomplished on the issue? How many of his promises has he actually delivered on, and how many are just hollow, crowd-inflaming promises?

The facts and the answers will be in the record, for every issue that concerns us.

Therefore, Be It Resolved: That the Communications Workers of America will give maximum consideration and exposure to the record of each candidate for office who seeks our support and our votes, and

Be It Further Resolved: That we will disseminate the facts from the record showing which candidates are true friends of workers, and which candidates want to woo our votes from us with emotion instead of substance, and

Be It Finally Resolved: That the members of the Communications Workers of America will strive throughout the months between now and election day, November 7,

to give our fellow workers, and others we know and talk with, the true facts from the record about candidates running for office.

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE EYE CARE PROGRAM

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the Navajo Times, of Window Rock, Ariz., on April 6, 1972, contained an editorial in praise of the recently passed Interior appropriations bill, H.R. 9417.

I would like to take this opportunity to place this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial follows:

NAVAJO TIMES EDITORIAL

We have been informed that the House Appropriations Committee and the Subcommittee on Interior have approved an additional $400,000 for an expanded eye care program in the Indian Health Service.

Also, the Appropriations Committee has approved an additional $1 million for the Contract Health Care Program for procuring those health services the Indian Health Service cannot provide because of lack of staff, distances and other factors.

It is gratifying that Important Committees of the U.S. Congress have recognized that serious vision and health problems exist among Indians and that they have taken steps to solve these problems.

Statistics abound on the problems the Indians have faced in the overall health field. In the field of vision, even the most casual observer who has spent some time among Indians will conclude that their eye problems are much more serious than that of the general population.

The American Optometric Association, composed of eye specialists, has as members, over 18,300 optometrists who provide over 70 percent of this country's eye care.

Yet, there are reportedly only twelve of these eye specialists serving in the Indian Health Service!

The eight Indian Health Service Areas representing the greatest concentration of Indian population have an estimated Indian population of 477,546 Indians. Of these, 179,174 are children in the school age bracket. Yet, a total of about 40,000 of these children receive vision examinations each year which is only 22 percent of the total Indian students in these areas.

Students in the general population not only get frequent vision and health examinations through various school systems, but they do not have the problems which have plagued most Indian children from birth.

For Indian non-students the situation is even worse. It is estimated by the American Optometric Association that less than 10,000 of these Indians in the Areas cited have received an annual examination. This is less than 4 percent of this population of Indians.

For the school age five years and for non-students in the Indian population this means that many or most would never get an examination!

While perhaps it could be argued that even more is needed, the House Appropriation Committee and the Subcommittee on Interior are to be highly commended for their far-sighted and concerned action.

We hope that the Senate Appropriations Committee and the other bodies who will be involved will join in this humanitarian effort to give the First Americans assistance so that they can eventually have equal health treatment with the rest of society.—CHET MACRORIE, Editor.

WENDELL G. SCOTT, M.D.

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most gallant and talented men of medicine ever to challenge the grim specter of cancer both personally and professionally was my friend and distinguished constituent, Dr. Wendell G. Scott of St. Louis, Mo. The great new cancer attack bill bears the imprint of his patient devotion to that cause, and I think it can fairly be said that while he may have lost his own battle, he has done more than his share to help us win ours. He will be greatly missed.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to place the remarks of his own friend and colleague, Dr. Ronald G. Evens, director of the Mallinckrodt Institute of Radiology:

WENDELL G. SCOTT, M.D., 1905–72

(By Ronald G. Evens, M.D.)

Wendell G. Scott, M.D., died of cancer on May 4, 1972 at the age of 66.

Born and raised in Colorado, he attended the University of Colorado as an undergraduate student. He came to Missouri in 1928 to attend Washington University Medical School; and fortunately for this Medical Center, decided to stay. After graduating with the Class of 1932, he interned at Barnes Hospital and accepted a residency in radiology at the Mallinckrodt Institute of Radiology. Throughout his professional career he was associated with the Mallinckrodt Institute and Washington University Medical School, holding the position of professor of clinical radiology.

Dr. Scott exemplified excellence to all who knew him. His competence as a radiologist and concern for his patients was evident at all times; his desire to further the specialty of radiology and the care of patients was the driving force behind his many scientific and organizational activities. His accomplishments as a scientist and radiologist include more than 70 publications and active participation in the development of radiographic kymography and rapid film changers for diagnostic radiographic use. The latter project was an important step in the development of angiographic evaluation of the heart, brain, lungs, and the organs of the abdomen.

He was called to active duty in the United States Navy in 1941, and served with typical devotion to duty to all causes that he believed important. He received several commendations for activities in radiology and general medicine, and continued to be active in the United States Naval Reserves and as a consultant to the Surgeon General's office, attaining the rank of rear admiral.

Dr. Scott was a great diplomat, understanding the art of compromise with an uncanny ability to lead individuals or societies towards accomplishment of goals. He served as president of the Barnes Hospital Medical Society and the Washington University Medical Alumni Association, president of the St. Louis Radiological Society, vice president of the Radiological Society of North America and the American Radium Society, president of the American Roentgen Ray Society, and was national president of the American Cancer Society in 1964. He was an important contributor to numerous organizations including the American Medical Association, Veterans Administration, American College of Radiology, and the James Picker Foundation. He also served as editor-in-chief of the American College of Radiology publication, *Your Radiologist*, editor of the *Planning Guide for Radiological Installations*, and editor of the journal of *Cancer*. He recently was commissioned by President Nixon to the National Cancer Advisory Board.

Dr. Scott's recognitions include the Gold Medal of the St. Louis Medical Society, the President's Medal of the American Roentgen Ray Society, the Gold Medal of the American College of Radiology, the National Award of the American Cancer Society, and the distinguished alumni awards of the University of Colorado and Washington University. He received an honorary degree of Doctor of Science from the University of Colorado and was to receive an honorary degree from Washington University in May of 1972.

Scottie had a mix of qualities, rarely found, that makes a great man. He was demanding and persevering, yet warm and loyal. He could involve himself in several important projects, yet give each his seemingly undivided attention. He could be active in university and national medical affairs, yet find time to remain a loving husband, father, and grandfather as well as a busy radiologist.

Many of Scottie's loves and accomplishments cannot be found on certificates or awards. His close family relationships are signified by his grandchildren who called him "O.K." His farm, near St. Louis, provided a place for pleasant interludes in a busy schedule.

His family, his profession, and his University will miss him greatly. Friends and colleagues have established a living memorial to his loyalty and excellence in the Wendell G. Scott Annual Lecture at the Mallinckrodt Institute of Radiology.

IS KINDERGARTEN TOO LATE?

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Richard L. Willey, Dean of the College of Education at Idaho State University, was one of the featured speakers at the recent Early Childhood Conference I sponsored in Idaho to focus on the needs of young children. Dr. Willey is well known in Idaho as a researcher, and I include his remarks on "Is Kindergarten Too Late" in the RECORD and commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

IS KINDERGARTEN TOO LATE?

(By Dr. Richard L. Willey)

The subject of my talk, duly assigned, was to cover what "Research Finds About Early Childhood Education." This topic, if you have been listening, has been more or less covered this morning and afternoon. My title is not original. It actually was taken more or less unconsciously at the time, but in my "research" I find it is the title of an article in Saturday Review of some three years ago. An article that I read and quietly filed in the kindergarten section of my mind.

Before I launch into my researched talk I want to pose a puzzlement to this assembled

group. It is an interesting puzzle even if it adds nothing to the discussion at hand.

Certain leader and/or legislators feel that to justify early childhood education, kindergartens, etc. one should be able to point to research that points to casual relationships between kindergarten preparation and scientific designed test results. To the thinking and rational person this makes sense. Remembering, of course, that in Idaho we do not have general public kindergarten programs and the expectation is that if we have the research pointing to the need, QED Kindergartens. Let us examine this type of premise from another view point or perspective.

How much research do you know about that has been done on the specific value of a college education? Does it matter what curriculum one takes over another? Is there the real value (instead of just the stated value) of a liberal education? Has this been scientifically demonstrated? Most institutions of higher education require a general education spread that covers social science, science, humanities, art, literature and language. Does research show the value of a particular course or sequence? How about high school; is there scientific evidence that shows that high school students correctly prosper by the traditional courses that they have been taking for generations? Against what do we measure the evidence? The early appraisers of goals, objectives, and/or functions of secondary education said that there were seven objectives (these were formulated in one form or another since the turn of the 20th Century): Health, Command of Fundamental Processes, Worthy Use of Leisure; Citizenship, Ethical and Moral Behavior; Vocation. As an aside Health was the number one priority. Does our evaluation system and research of the secondary school point out that we have been extremely successful in this goal? What does research show us on this? Do we succeed in making good citizens? What about vocational education? What does research show about it? Really! Does it point out that a person is better off to start his preparation in high school; after high school? Is it best to make youngsters decide about 11 or 12 as to avocation or vocational future? Does the pursuit of a graduate degree and the course work that students take really make for success?

With rare exception the schools that I have mentioned were started without any information on the research. Noble experiments but what does the research still show? But I need not limit the discussion to other agencies that we have in our country and the efficacy of a research base. What does research have to say about the advantage of the family system that we have? What does research show on school district reorganization?

My simple and over-extended and oversimplified answer is that when research has something to say, more often than not the findings are blocked by counter-vailing beliefs or old wives tales. We have our beliefs about government, about economies, about college preparation, about secondary education, about elementary education, and we have very seldom let our research stand in the way of our beliefs.

Yet, in the case of kindergartens we have asked for the scientific proof once and for all to point out that if they are not the entire answer to all our problems then there can be no justification.

The point, and I believe there is one, is that those un-believers don't really give a whit about what research shows or doesn't show with early childhood education. It is simply a ruse; a delaying tactic. That when the research is replicated and replicated and studied and reported on, there will be a request by the power to make one more study and to report just one more time.

Perhaps we all should review most briefly the history of the kindergarten movement. Friedrich Froebel (1782–1852), a German educator, philosopher, is known as the "Father of the Kindergarten." He organized the first kindergarten (Kinder-children, Garten-garden). He was strongly influenced by the thinking of such men as Rousseau, Pestalozzi, and Comenius. Froebel was convinced that education should serve to develop the whole child—physically, morally, and intellectually. Credit must also be given to such Americans as Susan Blow (1843–1916), G. Stanley Hall (1846–1924), and John Dewey (1859–1952), for their influence. Some years before Froebel's death, kindergartens were banned in Germany. Shortly after his death, however, there was a great surge in the kindergarten movement. Froebel even predicted that the kindergarten movement would find its most fertile field in the U.S. It was in 1873 that the first public kindergarten was established in St. Louis. By 1880 there were 400 kindergartens scattered through 30 states. By 1914 there were 7,554. By 1962 there were public kindergartens in 42 states and the District of Columbia. Eight states did not provide public kindergartens—Alabama, Arkansas, Idaho, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Carolina, South Carolina and West Virginia (all but Idaho could be classified Southern, at least in geographical terminology).

But you are not really too interested in the per-cents of youngsters in kindergartens; the number of private kindergartens in Idaho; the percent that are qualified as teachers, etc.

You want to know what research does show about kindergartens. To this end I reviewed many sources of kindergarten research. I reviewed the old sources, and I reviewed the new. I read the generalizations and I read the specific reports. I even made such a report on findings in the Spring of 1966. This was widely circulated in Idaho—to legislators, IEA members and other interested citizens. It was part of a report to "Designing Schools for the Future in Idaho."

But with many crusades, or ideas, there seems to be a time when their time has come—examine pollution. You knew about it and so did I but there suddenly seemed to be a bursting of the idea and we knew that changes had to take place. We knew it with the population problem. Maybe we knew it about bussing and we seem to know it with Viet Nam.

The time of the kindergarten seem to come within the last ten years for even as late as the early 1960's early childhood education was considered by most people to be a desirable luxury for those who could afford it, but it by no stretch of the imagination was considered an essential part of every child's education. But within the last 5 to 7 years early childhood education has come to occupy the focus of attention in public education. It would be fair to say that the surge most likely can be traced to the Federal Government and its many programs in early childhood (perhaps this can be traced to the Federal Government at least reading the research reports on what researchers found about early childhood education). Project Head Start was the most monumental project so conceived. First conceived only eight years ago as an eight week summer crash program for 100,000 preschool children. So phenomenal was the response from local communities that the original plan was extended to accommodate more than 500,000 during the summer of 1965. By 1966 it was a year round program with more than 1,000,000 children between the ages of 3–5 enrolled. What they found with these youngsters is not all contained in research reports. Youngsters in Head Start programs were given complete medical and dental examinations. In Tampa, Florida (to make sure the stigma doesn't stamp it as Idaho) of 1,150 examinations, 230 revealed children who needed psychiatric help; 100 had visual problems; 24 were so serious that the children might never have learned to read without treatment; 12 had tuberculosis; 10 had serious hearing defects; 4 had brain damage; half of all the children suffered nutritional deficiencies. A superintendent from Idaho told me about one of his experiences with Head Start. He went by the lunch room to observe one day at the recommendation of his supervisor. He told me how he observed some of the children eating. One little fellow put his left arm encircling his plate and about two or three inches off the table. With the other arm and his hand cupped like a shovel, he proceeded to scoop the food from the table to mouth. Using, of course, his left arm to fend off others who might take his food. And the Superintendent exclaimed, "That wasn't an Indian child, it wasn't a black child, that was a white child."

One of the great tragedies in our country is the continual waste of human life. I'm not talking about auto accidents and murders but primarily the destruction of children. When children are born they are clean, ready and expectant to begin a viable and productive life. When they begin to malfunction, along about the time they are eight or later, we hire special teachers, policemen, youth workers, and build special classrooms, penal and mental institutions, and special hospital beds to get these children under some type of control, artificial as it may be. We say we cannot afford at the beginning to feed and nourish their bodies, and their spirit, but the children that survive in the environs I describe, as one person put it, "In my neighborhood an adult is a dead child." In the end the justification for the drop-out, the misfit, the welfare family, is that this is the way things are done in the free enterprise system, but in view of the fact that all the money is wasted, as well as the children, and surely young children are as valuable as our other natural resources, we wasted money and wasting money is not part of our capitalistic system.

Finally, what has recent research shown about children under six? About fifteen years ago, a growing number of educators began to conduct experiments with young children to determine the factors that influence intelligence and personality. They investigated environmental factors (environment was interpreted to be physical, psychological, and social climate as well). The results of these studies, they say, have been conclusive: The environment of the early years has lasting effects upon the individual's intelligence, personality, and physical and mental health.

One investigator of the relationship between early environment and intelligence is Bloom, of the University of Chicago. As a result of experiments conducted over several years at the Center for the Advanced Study of the Behavioral Sciences, Dr. Bloom had concluded: "Whatever may have been the genetic potential for learning, there is little doubt that the environment will determine what is learned and even the extent to which learning does take place. We would expect the variations in the environments to have relatively little effect on the IQ after age eight, but we would expect such variations to have marked effect on the IQ before that age, with the greatest effect likely to take place between the ages of about one to five."

In the preface to the publication I sent out in 1966, I had this quote from Bloom, "A child has gone 50 percent of the way in organizing the thinking patterns that we call intelligence by the time he has reached the age of four, and the next 30 percent by the time he is eight. The patterns of aggressiveness in a boy are normally 50 percent established by the time he is three.

Half a child's capacity for learning in school is established by the age of nine."

Studies by Lee also point out the importance of the environment in the early years and the diminishing effects of the environment as children grow older. Hunt, in his research regarding intelligence and experiences, suggests that the early years are crucial in the development of the ability to think and generalize; Jersild and Wann emphasize the importance of early experiences in development of children; Piaget's research over the past thirty years indicates that the thought processes comprising intelligence are continually changing as a consequence of a person's encounters with his environment. Kirk has demonstrated that preschool experiences which promote understanding and wide use of language result in greater success in the later years in school.

In a comprehensive review of the research evidence of over twenty years concerning the relationship of the early environment to personality development, Saul and Wenar state, "The emotional pattern is basically shaped during the first six years of childhood." Whether the child grows up to be dependent or self-sufficient, passive or aggressive, tense or composed, inhibited or communicative is, in large measure, determined by his experiences during early childhood.

The relationship between early childhood and environment and physical development also has been substantiated by numerous medical studies. Vision, hearing, speech, muscular strength and control—all develop rapidly before the age of six.

In view of these reports, it is apparent that an educational program for children under six no longer can be viewed as a luxury for the privileged or as compensation for the underprivileged. It must and should be recognized as an essential part of the education of *every* child.

But what does a good kindergarten do for a child? Headley states that it has been convincingly shown that kindergarten helps in the following manner:

To help the child to become a more friendly, likeable, helpful person; to grow in power to cope with individual and group problems; to respect the rights and ideas of others; to respond to intellectual challenges; to achieve good muscular and eye-hand coordination; to understand concepts essential to his continuing success pursuits of learning; to be responsive to beauty in all its many manifestations; to realize his unique, creative potential.

Things up to this point have been general in nature. The following are merely illustrative and are not meant to be definitive:

1. Almy, Milles C., "Children's Experiences Prior to First Grade and Success in Beginning Reading," *Contributions to Education*, No. 955, New York; Teachers College, Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1949.

"A significant positive relationship exists between children's beginning success in reading and their earlier response to all sorts of reading stimuli. Almy makes no case for any formal reading program, but stresses the importance of exposure to the awareness of the function of printed words in everyday life."

2. Dickerson, Ann E., *The Value of Preschool Education From a Review of Experimental Literature*, an unpublished research survey conducted at the Institute of Child Development, University of Minnesota, 1958.

"After summarizing 157 separate pieces of research bearing on early childhood education, Dickerson concludes that early childhood education has a positive influence on later academic achievements; that it provides a wide variety of opportunities for building skills necessary to intelligent behavior, helps to safeguard health, and develops good social attitudes."

3. East, J. K., "Kindergarten Is a Good Investment," *School Executive*, May 1953, 52–53.

"In comparing the achievement of kindergarten and non-kindergarten children in the first grade on the Metropolitan Achievement Test, East found that the average achievement for the kindergarten group was a grade equivalent of 2.1; for the non-kindergarten group, 1.65. He concluded that it is better and cheaper to give children the right start, i.e., kindergarten, than to have them cope with failure in the earlier years of their formal education."

4. Goetch, Edward W., "The Kindergarten as a Factor in Elementary School Achievement, *"University of Iowa Studies in Child Welfare*, III, 4 (1962)

"Goetch found the grade means of reading scores higher for those children who had attended kindergarten than for those who had not."

5. Lee, J., et al., "Measuring Reading Readiness, *"Elementary School Journal*, (May 1934), 656–66.

"Lee found that the scores made on the Lee-Clark Readiness Tests by children with kindergarten experience better predicted their ability to learn to read than did the scores made by children who had not had kindergarten experience. He concludes that a background of common experience is an asset in a formal reading situation."

6. Meyers, V. C., "It is Worthwhile to Send Your Child to Kindergarten," *Educational Method* (April 1936), 388–89.

"In comparing the achievement of kindergarten and non-kindergarten children in first grade, Meyers concludes that the kindergarten children did "decidely better" than the non-kindergarten children, both in their ability to adjust to school and in content subjects."

7. Morrison J. Cayce, "The Influence of Kindergarten on the Age-Grade Progress of Pupils in New York's Elementary Schools, *"Portfolio on Kindergarten Extension*, Washington, D.C.: Association for Childhood Education, 1941, 1945.

"Morrison concludes that the provision of kindergarten instruction reduced first grade failure by 14 per cent and that normal or accelerated promotion through the grades was made by 80 per cent of the group with kindergarten experience, by only 59 per cent of the group without kindergarten experience."

8. Teegarden, Lorene, "The Kindergarten and Reading Reversals, *"Childhood Education* (November 1932), 82–83.

"Teegarden points out differences in the reading achievement in children from different socio-economic backgrounds. At the end of first grade, 70 per cent of the children in the middle socio-economic group who had had kindergarten experience, and 56 per cent of those who had not, were reading satisfactorily. In the lower socio-economic group, 40 per cent of the children who had had kindergarten experience, and 34 per cent of those who had not, were reading satisfactorily. In the lower socio-economic group it was a fact that children with kindergarten experience showed less tendency to confuse and reverse letters and figures than did those children who had not had kindergarten experience."

In May of 1970, Mary Wallace Smith of Boise completed her M.S. Ed. thesis on *A Comparative Study of the Effectiveness of a Volunteer-Run Kindergarten Program for Low-Income Children in Boise, Idaho.* In comparing two matched groups of low income children, one group with no kindergarten, the other group in attendance at the YWCA volunteer kindergartens, she found the following results. At the end of the school year, 71% of the non-kindergarten group showed below average readiness for school while only 33% of the kindergarten group fell into this category, even though the test scores were equal at the beginning of the year. Comparison of tests at the beginning and end of the school year showed the kindergarten group had made a 67% greater gain in school readiness. The results of these readiness tests are significant as they have been found to have a high correlation with the child's academic success during the first grade.

Far from running into problems when they enter school, as so many parents fear, children who learn to read early maintain their lead in reading achievement over the years, according to a longitudinal study by Professor Dolores Durkin of the University of Illinois College of Education. She carefully compared thirty early readers (children who learned to read before the age of six) with thirty children who learned later. The two groups had the same average IQ and the same first grade teacher. By the end of the third grade, the early readers were still an average of one year ahead. Both this study, which was made in New York City over a three year period, and an earlier study made by Dr. Durkin in California over a six year period support the premise that an early start in reading has most value for a slow learner.

Conclusions

Some conclusions may be drawn from a survey of current educational research concerning the value of kindergarten attendance as measured by school success in later years. The first would be that most educators and child development experts agree that kindergarten experience does positively influence the later school success of that child. The second conclusion would be that while disadvantaged youngsters make dramatic and necessary gains in achievement and IQ after attending kindergarten, even middle-class youngsters make significant and lasting gains. Study after study emphasized the fact that the disadvantaged child enters school as much as a year or more behind his middle-class counterparts in intellectual development, and he seldom catches up with them. Without a doubt, the disadvantaged child or the slow learner stands to gain more from a kindergarten than a middle-class child with an average IQ or above from a rich environment.

A third conclusion would be that a kindergarten program would essentially reduce costly and often ineffective remedial programs later in the school years. The kindergartens would be able to diagnose and work with physical, social and mental problems at their early stages. The fourth conclusion, and perhaps the most significant one is that a reappraisal of the kindergarten program necessarily means a reappraisal of the entire educational program. An enriched kindergarten program geared to the individual child would require that similar type program be then offered in the first grade and throughout the school years. If any of the advantages of a kindergarten program are to be carried beyond kindergarten, this is both desirable and necessary. The Carnegie Corporation said in its 1969 annual report on Early Education: "It seems clear that the schools must be changed in order to accommodate the abilities of the children who enter them—which sounds like a truism, except that much current thinking seems to hold that the purpose of early childhood education is simply to prepare children to do well in the schools as they are now organized and managed."

I have in my hand a volume simply entitled, "Current Research in Early Childhood Education: A Compilation and Analysis for Program Planners" by Annie L. Butler.

Its contents dwarf any attempt that I have made to give information relative to Research Finding on Early Childhood Education. It serves out the conflict between the

environmentalists and the geneticists; the hurry, hurry and the go-slow philosophy. The reading versus the socialization. But the overwhelming conclusion that can hardly be argued is that things, positive things, can occur in Early Childhood programs of this type.

HOW MUCH POWER IS ENOUGH?

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, now that the so-called energy crisis is a topic of national discussion, we hear a lot about projected future energy requirements. National planners have evidently done too thorough a job in predicting the country's future energy needs, since the immense figures included in their projections seem to be intimidating and even debilitating those public institutions charged with finding the energy resources to meet these future needs. Perhaps talk of billions of tons of coal and barrels of oil, and hundreds of trillions of cubic feet of gas, has simply overwhelmed our traditional "can do" attitude. How else do we explain the Congressional unwillingness to stir itself on this question and to do the hard work necessary for legislative action.

If mega-volumes of coal and oil are in fact "psyching us out," we might best take another tack in our approach to the energy question, one that does not bury us in the weight of gigantic future needs but, instead, offers more immediate and more obvious solutions. Close consideration of energy conservation might offer one such possibility. It is not a new idea—and I am proud to say that Joseph Swidler, chairman of the Public Service Commission in my own State of New York, has been a long-time advocate of it—yet it is a concept that has been given too little attention.

Finding ways to conserve energy is a most pragmatic beginning for building a new energy policy, and it is an area of endeavor which may offer some surprising perspectives on our present careless use of energy. I am told, for instance, that some air conditioners are more than one-third more efficient than others in the use of electricity, and that the ordinary light bulb converts no more that 10 percent of the electricity it uses to light, the rest being given off as heat.

It is, then, encouraging to find the recent Christian Science Monitor editorial titled, "How Much Power Is Enough?", and, in reading through it, to see that Chairman Joseph Swidler will soon conduct a noteworthy investigation of electricity use in the New York City area. I commend this brief editorial to my colleagues, and suggest that during future discussions of energy needs we also ask: How much is enough?

HOW MUCH POWER IS ENOUGH?

The chief response to the 1965 electric power failure in the Northeast United States was to improve the power grid and make it more reliable in times of heavy demand. This was a sensible thing to do. It was also sensible to work out emergency plans for cutting back power to select large users, and this was done.

But one thing not done was to question whether so much electrical power need be used at all, or indeed whether limits should be put on the use of air conditioners and other electricity devouring inventions on a broad enough scale to keep electrical use down.

This week, with New York suffering a prolonged heat wave, that state has announced that an electricity-use investigation will be launched by its Public Service Commission this September.

Such an investigation makes sense.

Hitherto, it has been accepted as if it were some natural law that electrical power consumption would double each decade—as it has since the war. One factor affecting the ever greater use of electricity, of course, is simply the economy of scale—the more electricity is used the cheaper it becomes, and in turn the more it is used. Another factor is that electrical heating units are cheaper to install than other forms of heating, adding to the growing emphasis on its use.

But the main factor has been that unbridled power use has been simply accepted as the way things are done.

There is no reason Americans cannot moderate their demands for electrical or other forms of power. They are being compelled to moderate the power and design of their automobiles, an industry which only a decade ago were given heavily preferential treatment—until it was apparent that the auto was creating as many problems in pollution and urban congestion as it was solving in giving mobility to people. The use of land is likewise being moderated in ways once land-rich Americans never would have imagined.

So perhaps Americans should consider new building codes that keep structures more temperature constant, should take an honest look at how many electrical appliances may be needed—in other words, economize on electrical use as much as strive to produce ever-larger supplies.

We hope the New York investigation into ways of moderating electricity use is a step in this direction, and not largely a bridge over public outcries during the heat wave power shortage at hand.

IT IS TIME TO BALANCE BOOKS

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest new Members of the U.S. House of Representatives is the distinguished Congressman from my neighboring district to the north, the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable DAWSON MATHIS.

Congressman MATHIS posed a question which needs answering. The Florida Times-Union of Jacksonville, Fla., on Monday, August 14, carried an editorial on this subject which I believe deserves repeating here.

I also feel that the time has long past when the American people were due an answer.

The editorial is as follows:

IT IS TIME TO BALANCE THE BOOKS

Brash newcomers often have a way of asking questions which stump the experts.

But Georgia's Rep. Dawson Mathis of Albany, now completing his first term in Congress, deserves an answer to a simple question he has asked, without success.

So far as he has been able to determine, Mathis says, nobody in Washington seems to know precisely how much money foreign governments owe the United States, or how much of such obligations are in default.

In an effort to force an answer, Mathis and several of his House colleagues have joining in offering a resolution calling on the Treasury department to provide the information within 90 days, along with a statement of what measures it proposes to take to collect debts already in default, some extending back as far as World War I.

"We as a people," Mathis said, "have been most fortunate through our history, to have been able to help other nations less fortunate than we, but the time has come for some of these nations to recognize that they have an obligation to pay back the money owed to the United States. These funds were loans, not gifts."

Among the chief beneficiaries of U.S. assistance in the past are countries now taking their place among the world's leaders in economic and industrial development, and which are not only challenging the United States in international trade, but are moving in to compete with U.S. production in domestic markets.

The entire world economic picture has undergone radical change since many of these foreign loans were made, when the U.S. dollar and U.S. industrial might dominated the world scene. Today, with its far-flung international commitments, the United States is sustaining heavy unfavorable balances of payments, and the dollar is periodically under attack by international traders.

However, much the generosity of the United States in earlier years in extending financial help to others was justified, both morally and in America's own enlightened self-interest, it is ridiculous for foreign beneficiaries of U.S. assistance in the past, who are now enjoying robust economic health, to be allowed to forget or ignore their valid debts.

It is, as Rep. Mathis said, 'inconceivable" that no one in Washington "knows how much money is owed to the United States." Beyond question, the information is there. What is needed is for those in possession of it to be required to put it on the record.

THE THREE "R'S" PLUS "H"

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, heroin pours into America from France and through the good offices of our Southeast Asian allies. Our State Department looks the other way, hoping this horror will just go away. Never has self-delusion been more futile or dangerous. Hard drugs are permeating many schools in our largest communities, especially New York City.

If Brooklyn schools have heroin today, then suburbs of Chicago, Los Angeles, New Orleans and St. Louis will receive its blessings by Christmas. By this time next year, Pocatello, Louisville, Tallahassee, Sheboygan, and Waco will be awash in this poison.

The House Select Committee on Crime recently conducted hearings on drug

abuse in schools of New York City. Let me share some observations and evidence emerging from them. They are ominous, chilling and fraught with peril for all our children.

Estimates of drug use in schools varied. However, all witnesses agreed that a drug epidemic is engulfing our public school system.

All concurred that this horror cuts across every racial and economic line, striking middle-class and ghetto schools alike. Testimony was graphic and corroborated by stunning films depicting sale and use of heroin in schools, grammar and junior highs included.

Even worse, this traffic is not hidden in closets or dark recesses of school buildings. Rather, both traffic and use are open, in broad daylight and close proximity to school personnel at all levels. Here is what we can expect. Children arriving at school with lunch money in their shoes to evade shakedowns and extortion by student addicts or gangs. Students chronically absent because they are too badly addicted to function in any school environment. Unaddicted students being drawn into heroin networks by student addicts attending the same school and sitting beside them.

Overwhelming evidence was presented showing that the New York Board of Education knows all this and has not acted on behalf of New York's children.

Highly respected educators, aware of the spread of heroin in the schools, described attempts to have the board act with courage and vigor. Such pressures were matched by concerned, apprehensive parents all over the city. Yet as late as 1969, the New York Board of Education did not devote a single meeting to discussing this menace, literally growing before its eyes.

The board was not the sole entity abdicating responsibilities. Subordinates throughout the school system took a cue from those at the top. Everywhere, principals denied police reports of heroin use in their schools. Principals even hindered undercover police work. Teachers were helpless. If school and city authorities let it pass, how could they stop it?

Today, the Board of Education of New York continues this criminally negligent attitude toward heroin. The chairman of the State Commission of Investigation testified that despite a year-old report vigorously criticizing the board's head-in-the-sand attitude, nothing had changed.

The board and its apologists place this peril in the same category with failure to do homework or truancy. The people of New York should place them on notice that they will, in the very near future, be held personally responsible.

Worst of all, the board has yet to publicly admit there is a heroin problem. How can the public be mobilized when there is no alert on dimensions of the problem from those charged with sounding alarms? What do these moral cowards require—addicts shooting up outside their meeting chamber?

Who is a greater criminal—the mugger or a responsible public official looking the other way when he must do his duty? Citizens are just as dead from bureaucratic inaction as from a robber's pistol. A no-holds-barred investigation must be mounted into the heroin situation in our schools and inaction by the board.

One point should be made constantly until the public realizes what is going on. The whole heroin horror is perpetrated with complete knowledge of officialdom. Heroin permeates American society. Those looking the other way are fools or worse. We have little time to lose. Half a million addicts, at a minimum, are on our streets. To those who inevitably rise to pooh-pooh hysterical outcries, I recommend a guided tour of some neighborhoods and schools, and will gladly take them on such a tour.

Our Government knows where heroin comes from, how it travels, who deals in it and how it enters the U.S. France is mainly to blame. France is where it is refined. They are up to their necks in this nefarious traffic. Agencies of their government are involved. The "French Connection" is far more real than the movie. Turkish opium is processed in Marseilles and shipped here. John Cusack was packed up and shipped home because he made an honest effort to halt traffic the French Government wants continued. Seizing a few refining labs only points up how much they know and can do. We are being thrown a few bones to silence us. In a few weeks the heroin supply could be seriously curtailed, if those with power and knowledge acted.

In every American city, local authorities know where it comes from, who wholesales and distributes and pushes it. Society and history will pronounce a merciless, damning verdict on those who now sit quiescently and allow this.

New York's Board of Education is a good place to start. Yet Americans should know that not an ounce of heroin can move from Turkey to France to New York to Toledo and into our children's veins without the knowledge of foreign, national and local authorities.

Dick Gregory has a devastating line:

> If a 10-year old child can find the heroin man, how come the people in charge can't?

Now let's hear some anguished denials from those dedicated officials. Anybody for geometry?

BILL TO REQUIRE COURT IMPACT STATEMENT

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today that would require the Congress to consider the needs of the courts at the same time that it considers the needs of the country for new legislation. This concurrent resolution would, in essence, require a court impact statement in each report of legislation from a committee of either House of Congress to that House.

Each report accompanying a bill or joint resolution of a public character would have to contain an estimate, made by such committee, of the number of cases in Federal courts which might result from the adoption of such bill or joint resolution, and of the number of additional court personnel required to handle the increased caseload.

The quality of justice in our Federal courts has decreased as a result of the explosive increase in the caseload without a commensurate increase in Federal judges and court personnel. Cases filed in the U.S. district courts have increased from 92,000 10 years ago to 145,000 this year. The U.S. Court of Appeals will have 14,500 cases this year as opposed to 4,200 10 years ago; the Supreme Court had 2,400 cases docketed 10 years ago and this year had 4,500.

Chief Justice Burger in his "state of the judiciary" message on August 15 stated that the two major reasons for the present case overload on the Federal court system were population increase and litigation stemming from new legislation. He went on to conclude that awareness of the impact of new legislation would help the Congress and the courts "plan rationally for the future with regard to the courts' burden."

The legislation I introduce today would accomplish that result. I invite the cosponsorship of my colleagues in the House.

NEWS BULLETIN OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD the August 14 edition of the news bulletin of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. I take this action to help my colleagues be informed of events and developments taking place across the Nation in preparation for the country's 200th anniversary in 1976. The bulletin is compiled and written by the Communications Committee staff of the ARBC.

The bulletin follows:

[August 14, 1972]

BICENTENNIAL BULLETIN

Acting ARBC Director Hugh Hall will appear before the Platform Committee of the Republican National Committee on Tuesday, August 15, at the Eden Roc Hotel in Miami Beach to present the ARBC's program and urge that it be incorporated in the Party's '72 Platform.

Copies of the complete Hearings on the Bicentennial before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays and Celebrations will be available soon and can be procured from the Government Printing Office or through the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Northbrook, Illinois' Bicentennial Olympic Park Committee sponsored a "Super Skytacular" utilizing the famous Goodyear Blimp, America, to help raise funds for the Park, which the Committee hopes can be built

by 1976. Part of the August 11–13 program included raffled rides aboard the blimp. Special guests on board included Northbrook's "Golden Girls," Dianne Holum and Anne Henning, both 1972 Winter Olympic's Speedskating Gold Medalists.

Bob O'Brien, a member of the ARBC's Communications Committee represented the Commission as keynote speaker at the Oklahoma Bicentennial Workshop on August 4th. Representatives of ARBC Communications will also be participating in the National Newspaper Association Managers convention in Disneyworld, August 14–17. Communications member Ted Serrill has informed the ARBC that several thousand newspapers will be represented that are interested in developing support programs for the Bicentennial.

Robert Tarlecki, who originated the famed Dogwood Trail, one of Chester County's (Pa.) Bicentennial projects, reports that he has received the support of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Nurserymen Association. The group, which has 170 members, promises to donate one tree from each nursery to the Dogwood Trail.

Representatives from the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming presented a Bicentennial proposal for an Indian arts and crafts center and museum at a recent meeting of the Wyoming Bicentennial Commission. Mrs. Peggy Curry of Casper, Commission Chairman, said the group is seeking more projects from various groups and individuals in Wyoming.

Governor Dale Bumpers of Arkansas stated in a recent news release that the $45,000 grant from ARBC to the Arkansas Bicentennial Celebration Committee would be used "to develop local and statewide observance projects, to provide liaison among participating groups and individuals and to coordinate Arkansas's Bicentennial program with the national effort."

Frederick Seaton, Commission Member, who represented the ARBC at the Fourth of July ceremonies at Mt. Rushmore, said that the spirit with which Rapid City area people are rebuilding from the devastating floods on June 9 "is not only typical of the spirit of '76, but also of the spirit of cooperation and refusal to accept defeat that has made America grow, and grow great. In the face of disaster and tragedy, South Dakotans are rebuilding, renewing and rededicating themselves."

The Florida Commission has recently released an exceptionally fine film on Bicentennial plans for the state. Designed to create additional interest in the Commission's activities, the film was produced by Tel-Air Interests, Inc., of Miami and highlights statewide programs in Heritage '76, Festival USA and Horizons '76.

"From These Roots" A Mosaic of Stories, Legends and Facts from and about our 50 states, makes worthwhile reading. The author, Carolyn Gitman, is a one-woman campaigner for Americans to see America. The book is entirely edited, researched and compiled by Mrs. Gitman, the wife of Dr. Joseph Gitman, Professor at King's Point Academy. The book is published by Vantage Press Inc., and Mrs. Gitman is listed as distributor, Post Office Box 804, Great Neck, New York 11022. Cost: $7.95 plus 65¢ for postage and handling with a 10% discount to libraries, historical societies and State Bicentennial Commissions.

Author of the forthcoming Bicentennial *Songs of '76*, Oscar Brand, noted recently, "My curiosity drove me to books about the Revolution, and to further collections of songs. I perceived strange stories in these antique accounts and marvelously interesting sidelights that seemed more vital than the standard accounts of historical chronology. Having noted them down, I shared them with my audiences on television, radio or in concert. That's how I came to write this book. That's why it's a 'singer's history.' *Songs of '76* is a volume of sidelights on history from the vantage point of the folk balladeer; with 65 songs, with words and guitar accompaniment, it is all fresh and mostly unfamiliar. It is an eyewitness report of events that have paraded before the balladeer's imagination—events that you may never have read about in your history book but which were important to the balladeers of '76 and are still important to the music lover today."

Contact: Duke Zeller, Editor, (202) 254–8007.

LEGISLATIVE REPORT TO LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS, POLICEMEN, FIREMEN, AND AMBULANCE TEAMS

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday August 17, 1972

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point in the RECORD a legislative report which I have prepared for law enforcement and other public safety personnel:

TO ALL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS, POLICEMEN, FIREMEN, AND AMBULANCE TEAMS

Having always been among those who are seriously concerned with the welfare and effectiveness of our law enforcement personnel, firefighters and ambulance teams, I am listing for your information and guidance, summaries of legislative measures that have been proposed by me during the 92nd Congress. It is my hope that you will carefully review this material so that I may have the benefit of your views on these proposals, as well as any other suggestions and ideas you may have that you think should be considered.

H.R. 8933. Law Enforcement Officers' Bill of Rights: To amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide a system for the redress of law enforcement officers' grievances and to establish a Law Enforcement Officers' Bill of Rights in each of the several States. This bill would guarantee the civil rights of our police officers and give national recognition to their fight to maintain their highly honorable and trustworthy stature during these most critical times. A firm and strict approach is necessary to stop the attack on our public safety officers and what they stand for in order to hold secure their dignity and honor and to provide them with the rights enjoyed by other citizens throughout the country.

H.R. 10500. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the first $5,000 of compensation paid to law enforcement officers shall not be subject to the income tax.

H.R. 10287. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to permit an exemption of the first $5,000 of retirement income received by a taxpayer under a public retirement system or any other system if the taxpayer is at least 65 years of age.

H.R. 9091. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide that pensions paid to retired policemen or firemen or their dependents, or to the widows or other survivors of deceased policemen or firemen, shall not be subject to the income tax.

INSURANCE BENEFITS

H.R. 16397. Law Enforcement Officers' Group Life Insurance Act. Authorizes the Attorney General to provide group life insurance and group accidental death and dismemberment insurance for state and local law enforcement officers. This program would closely parallel the Servicemen's and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance programs.

H.R. 12629. Public Safety and Criminal Justice and Correctional Personnel Benefits Act. Authorizes a type of insurance program providing death benefits to survivors of certain public safety and law enforcement personnel and public officials concerned with the administration of criminal justice. Over 500 State and Local policemen have been killed in the line of duty in the past five years. Except for rather limited workmen's compensation laws, 15 states provide no specific benefits to the survivors of officers killed in the line of duty, Federal survivor benefits are available to the family of a local law enforcement officer killed in the line of duty if he is dealing with a federal law. This legislation would provide for the payment of a gratuity of $50,000 in survivor benefits when a law enforcement officer is killed in the line of duty leaving a spouse or one or more eligible dependents as defined by the bill.

H.R. 12740. Police & Fire Officers' Benefits Act. Provides benefits to survivors of police officers, firemen and corrections officers killed in the line of duty and to police officers, firemen, and corrections officers who are disabled in the line of duty.

H.R. 6145. Extends maximum benefits of $50,000 to law enforcement officers and firemen (and their survivors) not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty. Such benefits would include: medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies; compensation for disability; and compensation for death based on the number of survivors. However, in the event of such death, the total monthly compensation shall not exceed 75% of the decedent's monthly pay. Extends such benefits to professional state and local policemen and firemen, volunteer firemen, and to members of a legally organized State or local law enforcement agency who are serving without compensation.

H.R. 4232. Provides compensation for totally disabled local firemen or survivors of local firemen killed or disabled while performing their duties in an area of civil disorder.

H.R. 16313. Federal Injury & Death Benefits for Volunteer Firemen, Ambulance Teams and Rescue Squads. Such benefits would be extended to members (and their survivors) of a legally organized volunteer fire department, ambulance team or rescue squad who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty.

You will be pleased to know that the House Judiciary Committee has held hearings on most of these death and disability measures. Hopefully, progress will be made during further committee consideration and the bills will be ready for action in the House this fall.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

H.R. 13052. Nationwide Emergency Telephone No. "911". Amends the Safe Streets Act to provide funds to assist state and local governments for the purpose of developing and improving communications procedures and facilities with respect to prompt and efficient dispatch of police, fire, rescue and other emergency services.

H. Con. Res. 630. Prevention of Hijacking. Makes it the sense of Congress that the President should immediately cut off all aid to countries failing to take sufficient anti-hijacking measures or harboring hijackers.

H.R. 15498. National Crime Victims Compensation Act—Public Safety Officers' Group Life Insurance Act. Provides for the compensation of innocent victims of violent crime in need; makes grants to states for the payment of such compensation; authorizes group insurance program similar to that proposed by H.R. 16397.

H.R. 3821. Permits the disposal of surplus Federal property to State and local governments and volunteer firefighting and rescue organizations at 50 percent of the estimated fair market value.

H.R. 3127. Seeks to improve law enforcement in urban areas by making available federal funds to improve the effectiveness of police forces.

H.R. 12628. Emergency Crime Control Act. Extends special federal funds to high crime urban areas.

As you know, last year the Congress enacted the Organized Crime Control Act and passed the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act Amendments providing further federal aid to local law enforcement agencies. And, considerable legislation on overall police and law enforcement matters is pending in Congress. In addition, the Revenue Sharing proposal passed by the House, with my active support, provides $30 billion over a five year period to states and localities for high-priority areas such as law enforcement and fire protection. At present, the Senate is considering this measure.

PRISON REFORM

Perhaps the greatest aid which public officials can extend to law enforcement officers is to end the role of our prisons as breeders of even more hardened and skilled criminals. In the area of prison reform, I have filed the following measures:

H.R. 11062. Assists in combatting crime by reducing the incidence of recidivism, providing improved federal, state and local correctional facilities, strengthening the administration of federal correctional agencies, and tightening control over probationers, parolees and persons found not guilty by reason of insanity.

H.R. 11063. Provides minimum standards in connection with certain federal financial assistance with respect to correctional institutions and facilities.

H.R. 11178. Provides financial asistance for state and local community based correctional facilities; for the creation of innovative programs of vocational training, job placement and on-the-job counseling; for improved educational programs and probation services.

CONCLUSION

Measures such as these which have been proposed by me, I believe, would enable public safety officers to carry out their proper duties in seeking to achieve optimum public safety and protection while assuring equitable treatment and benefits for the services rendered in the line of duty.

In closing, I welcome your comments on any of the measures I have discussed and your views on possible new legislative approaches I might take. And, if you wish to obtain a copy of any of the bills listed here, please feel free to contact me.

LEGISLATION TO CORRECT THE ADVERSE EFFECTS OF THE 20-PERCENT INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to correct a number of unforeseen adverse effects of the recently enacted 20 percent increase in social security benefits. This legislation is necessitated by the fact that the increase in retirement and disabilities benefits, under the present Social Security Act, is going to make a great number of people ineligible for other forms of Federal-State public assistance.

Title I of my bill amends five sections of the Social Security Act that determine eligibility of individuals for such programs as: State old-age medical assistance; State plans for aid and services to needy families with children; State plans for aid to the blind; State plans for aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

Under the present law, eligibility for assistance, such as Medicaid and food stamps, is determined by need, and is limited to individuals with an income of less than $2,100. In New York City alone, there will be approximately 38,000 people, now receiving between $1,750 and $2,100 annually who, on October 3, will suddenly be ineligible for Medicaid and other services because of the 20-percent increase in social security. Thus the social security increase will in effect be negated almost entirely by the loss of other benefits.

Title II will amend two sections of title 38 of the United States Code, veterans' benefits, to insure that increases in the retirement and disabilities benefits will not be included in determining the eligibility of an individual for pensions or compensation under this title. If the amendments contained in this title of my bill are not enacted by January 1, 1973, veterans, dependents of veterans, widows on VA pensions, and dependent parents on dependency and indemnity compensation will face a loss of, or a reduction in, their pensions.

It is my hope that this legislation will insure that the 20-percent increase and future increases will not result in reductions in other forms of assistance.

WE MUST TIGHTEN THE PURSE STRINGS OF GOVERNMENT

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has delivered a simple message to the Congress of the United States. We must move quickly and decisively to control government spending or be faced with "higher taxes, higher prices and a cut in purchasing power for everyone in the Nation."

Over the years lipservice has been given to "balanced budgets" and "fiscal responsibility," but the fact is, the liberal majority of the U.S. House of Representatives, as managers of the Public Treasury, has done an appallingly bad job. So bad has been the majority's performance that were the Congress to exchange places with the board of directors of General Motors or any other corporation, they would bankrupt the business in short order by their profligate spending policies. Fortunately or unfortunately, the U.S. Treasury has a greater capacity to absorb debt than any private enterprise. And the liberals in Congress have not lost any time in piling up that debt upon debt by adding millions upon millions of dollars to almost every program that comes before the Members for a vote. From fiscal year 1963 to fiscal year 1971, outlays—expenditures plus net lending—have increased from approximately $111 billion to about $211 billion. During the same period, receipts increased from $106 billion to $188 billion. Only once during that whole period, in fiscal year 1969, did receipts exceed outlays—$188 billion as opposed to $185 billion—for a budget surplus of about $3 billion. And even then the budget was only in balance when the collections of the trust funds were incorporated into the total for government revenues. In every other year since 1963, outlays were greater than receipts, resulting in budget deficits which ranged from somewhat less than $2 billion in fiscal year 1965 to an alarming high of $23 billion in fiscal year 1971. The almost continual annual deficits of course have led to substantial increases in the gross Federal debt. The debt increased from $311 billion in fiscal year 1963 to $408 billion in fiscal year 1971, the highest in American history.

Estimates for fiscal years 1972 and 1973 are very disturbing. The most current data available for fiscal year 1972 indicate an outlay level of $233 billion versus anticipated receipts of $207 billion, for an expected budget deficit of $26 billion. Initial forecasts estimated an even greater deficit of almost $39 billion. The expected reduction in the deficit is fortuitous rather than planned. A deliberate policy of expanding Federal outlays was adopted; only the inability to spend money fast enough—the incapacity to translate plans into on-going programs—prevented outlays from reaching the intended level. With lower outlays, and higher receipts than originally estimated, the fiscal year 1971 budget deficit is now projected at $26 billion—less than expected but still the highest since the peak deficit years of World War II. Furthermore, the deficit for fiscal year 1973 is expected to be even higher: $27 billion, with outlays programed at $250 billion and receipts anticipated to be $223 billion. Several nongovernment economists, however, predict that the eventual fiscal year 1973 deficit will be significantly higher than the official $27 billion. Because of the continuing deficits, the growth in the public debt will persist; the debt will be about $436 billion for fiscal year 1972 and is expected to reach $477 billion at the end of fiscal year 1973. Interest on this debt is presently costing the taxpayers billions of dollars per year.

Some economic theorists have advanced the proposition that fiscal policy—the management of outlays and receipts to create desired budget surpluses or deficits—is a useful tool to counter the ups and downs of the business cycle. Implementation of such a countercyclical policy would in theory result in the creation of surpluses during periods with high levels of business activity and low rates of unemployment, and in the creation of deficits during times of depressed

business activity and high unemployment. Budget surpluses tend to inhibit the economy whereas deficits serve to stimulate economic activity. Pursuit of this policy would, in addition, operate to increase the public debt during depressed periods but to decrease the debt during prosperous times. The history of the past few years indicates that there has been no consistent attempt to follow such a countercyclical policy and there is good reason to question the basic premises of the theory. Deficits have been produced both in depressed and prosperous years. Failure to control the increase in expenditures, combined with failure to increase taxes in prosperous years, have, as I have already noted, added to inflationary pressures on the economy.

Overall Federal expenditures continue to increase even though costs for the Vietnam War have been declining. Vietnam War costs reached their peak in fiscal year 1969 when the incremental costs of the war—costs over and above what would have been spent for defense in peacetime—reached $19.8 billion. War costs since then have declined to an estimated $6.8 billion in fiscal year 1972 and an expected $3.5 billion in fiscal year 1973. These latter estimates do not take into consideration the current expansion of the bombing program. But this decline in Vietnam costs has been accompanied by increases in income maintenance and Great Society programs. A recent study by the Brookings Institution indicates that from fiscal year 1963 to fiscal year 1973, defense and defense-related expenditures dropped from 53 to 34 percent of the total budget, while civilian outlays grew from 47 to 66 percent. Furthermore, the study concluded that many of the numerous social programs, costing billions of dollars, had failed, indicating that money and good intentions alone cannot provide solutions to social problems. Nevertheless, the Brookings experts predicted that Federal expenditures for existing programs will increase in the future and that there will be demands for new services from the Government. With the tax reductions effected during recent years, the Federal Government will be hard-pressed to find the resources needed to finance these increased demands.

The continued increases in expenditures, in budget deficits and in the national debt have fortunately led to renewed interest in proposals to reduce or control Federal expenditures, to balance the budget, and to limit the growth of the public debt.

We must recognize that, despite the control over the Federal purse strings given to Congress by the Constitution, in practice, the Executive exercises extraordinary control over spending. However, the President frequently cannot take the most desirable action in the public interest when Congress enacts appropriation bills in excess of budget requests. His only recourse may be to veto the entire appropriation bill, which in many cases will be impractical. It has therefore been suggested that the Chief Executive be given the item veto power, whereby he could prevent specific increases which he considers without merit or of low priority.

Several critics believe that there is presently too little coordination between expenditure and revenue decisions by Congress. Congress now views the budget largely as a series of separate and unrelated acts, with decisions on taxes and expenditures made independently by separate committees in each House. I believe that some way must be found to insure that Congress considers the budget as a whole and relates revenues to expenditures. One attempt to accomplish these purposes was the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which established the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget. The committee was to meet early in each session of Congress, consider the President's budget proposal in relationship to economic conditions and efficiency, set an annual ceiling on appropriations, and coordinate taxes with expenditures. This committee did not live up to expectations. It was probably too large to be effective, and the overall expenditure limit was difficult to implement. At any rate, the committee died after it was unable to agree on a ceiling in 1947 and after its 1948 ceiling was not enforced.

The Committee for Economic Development has recommended creation of a "joint budget policy conference", to include congressional leaders, majority and minority representatives from the revenue and appropriations committees of both houses, and members of the Joint Economic Committee. This conference would study the budget as a whole, and would provide communication among the revenue and appropriations committees of the two houses and the Joint Economic Committee.

There appears to be much room for improvement in the coordination of appropriations decisions. At present, appropriations are determined in some thirteen separate appropriations bills, with little consideration given by the subcommittee responsible for each bill of its effect on total new obligational authority, total obligations to be incurred, or the likely level of expenditures. The costs of the programs considered in each of the individual bills are not considered in relationship to the costs associated with the other bills. Thus, Congress does not look at appropriations and other expenditures as a whole and compare alternative programs. The omnibus appropriation bill, associated with the fiscal 1951 budget, was an attempt to introduce the necessary coordination, but this proposal met the same fate as the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget.

It is apparent that the Government has not heeded the advice of Thomas Jefferson when he said:

> To preserve our independence, we must not let our leaders load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude.

Over the years, many Members of Congress have proposed various methods to bring to the attention of responsible Federal officials the need to restrict expenditures to available receipts and thus to assure a balanced budget. Unfortunately, as the record testifies, these efforts have not been successful. Expenditures keep climbing, deficits continue to occur, the national debt continues to increase. The time for positive and drastic action has long since arrived. I believe that the only way to insure fiscal responsibility is by means of the constitutional amendment. I am therefore introducing a constitutional amendment which would contain the following provisions:

Total appropriations as well as total expenditures for any fiscal year cannot exceed total expected revenues for that year. There is to be no permanent increase in the national debt.

The existing debt is to be redeemed.

The above provisions may be suspended only in times of war or national emergency.

When Federal officials are forced to observe the mandates of this constitutional amendment, the financial integrity of the country will be insured. Less drastic steps have clearly failed. It is high time to adopt this amendment as rapidly as possible.

WORK IN ENGINEERING SCARCE

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, however much it is said that our national economy is improving, the plight of millions of people out of work or underemployed has remained dismayingly the same.

Foremost among that group are the scientists and engineers of our Nation, out of work, without pension rights or new employment opportunities, allowed to let those faculties that have made our Nation, the greatest industrial nation, grow idle.

In Connecticut this problem is particularly acute, as chronicled in many stories over the past few years, and remains so as shown in the following article from the August 13 edition of the Hartford Courant. While some help from the U.S. Labor Department and voluntary groups of scientists and engineers has cushioned the blow, the unemployment of these men and women remains a national disgrace and an economic tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this article to the Members of this body, and particularly to those who are charged with maintaining a vital defense budget and promoting our aerospace industry. Stimulating those industries is the greatest step we can take for the national economy, and bringing scientists and engineers back to their proper work is the best stimulus to those industries.

The article follows:

UNEMPLOYED HARDPRESSED: WORK IN ENGINEERING SCARCE

(By Barry Schiffman)

A 62-year-old engineer with a PhD degree had three children in college, a $60,000 house in the suburbs and membership in an expensive country club before he lost his job.

Now, after more than two years of unemployment, he and his wife are living in two furnished rooms in Hartford. His three children were unable to stay in school, and one is also unemployed.

"He wore the best of clothes when he first came in here, but now he's dressed shabbily," says Martin Meany, coordinator for the Connecticut Volunteer Engineers, Scientists and Technicians (CONN-VEST) a self-help group for unemployed engineers.

The engineer, whose name was withheld, had sent about 350 resumes of his work history to firms, but received only two responses, Meany says.

Meany, an employe of the State Employment Service which provides office space at 90 Washington St. for CONN-VEST, says "he's licked because of his age."

The 62-year-old engineer is just one of an estimated 5,000 aerospace engineers and technicians looking for work in Connecticut.

As defense expenditures were cut back in the past two years, the engineers started turning up on the unemployment lines.

CONN-VEST was established in Connecticut last November, shortly after a layoff of some 500 engineers at the Pratt and Whitney Aircraft Division, United Aircraft Corp. Similar organizations had been formed in other states to help engineers find employment.

CONN-VEST holds workshops for the engineers to help them know where to look for jobs and how to do well on interviews. And the group canvasses industry in the state trying to get the first word on job openings that may be filled by the engineers. It also provides a referral service.

Manpower for these activities is provided by the out-of-work engineers who must give at least four hours a week. Some financial support comes from the U.S. Labor Department, and office space and the coordinator's salary are given by the state Labor Department.

Some of the engineers who have found jobs contribute money to CONN-VEST to help the most successful groups of its kind and has compiled a 53 per cent placement rate in its first half year. John J. Nolan, CONN-VEST director, says the average placement rate is about 20 or 30 per cent.

The engineers encounter particular problems in finding work, and when they do get a job offer it often is not in their specialty and usually pays less than they were getting in their previous jobs.

A former chemical engineer is now working as an undertaker's assistant; a broadcast engineer is manager of a fast food franchise and an electrical engineer is manager of a shoe store.

Their new jobs often pay several thousand dollars a year less than what a top-level engineer can earn. Top engineering positions in the aircraft field pay between $18,000 and $20,000 a year, Nolan says.

The fact that many of the unemployed engineers have aerospace experience blocks them from some positions. The Connecticut Bank and Trust Co. donates computer time and prepares a weekly print-out of the registered job seekers and their specific skills.

"It's not true, but it's believed. Aerospace contracts are on a cost-plus basis, and aerospace engineers have a reputation of thinking money is no object," Nolan says.

"Age, however, is the biggest problem. They might have laws against discrimination, but it's difficult to prove anything," he says.

"We hear we're overqualified. They tell us we'll leave as soon as we find a better job up to our qualifications," he says.

"But, when a company wants to hire someone, they'll get an engineer to fill a technician's spot at a technician's salary and have him do the work of three men," Nolan says.

There is resentment among the engineers who a decade ago had felt a great demand for their skills and now face tremendous competition for less desirable jobs.

When engineers talk about their problems, unions are usually mentioned. One engineer at the CONN-VEST office in Hartford suggested that organization like a construction union—which controls hiring and firing and apprenticeship programs—would have been a good idea. This engineer was once a vice president of a large aircraft firm.

"Engineers had an outlook that each individual could do the job better than anyone else and felt secure that he would survive." Nolan said "They didn't trust any idea like basing job security on seniority."

PERSONAL PROBLEMS

Besides the economic difficulties the loss of a job creates, the men are faced with tremendous personal problems.

"It's difficult for a man who has worked all his life and has only a few years left. He had kids in college and he's running out of unemployment benefits. What do I do? How do I tell him to pay his bills? It's hard to send him to welfare," Nolan says.

"If he goes on welfare and still owns his home, it'll be attached. But most of our people are 40 or 50 or older. A man of that age has little chance of getting a job," he says.

Among the CONN-VEST members there has been one suicide, a heart attack believed to have been brought on by anxiety, and four or five divorces attributed to unemployment and drop in standard of living. There may be more problems, but the CONN-VEST staff does not seek personal information about the registrants.

Security becomes a great concern of the job seekers, but jobs are so scarce that most will return to the aerospace companies if given the opportunity, Nolan says. "There's nothing around at all. You have to take it," he says.

But further cuts are expected in the areospace field and some engineers at the CONN-VEST office said 20 percent of those now employed will lose their jobs before the field stabilizes.

One former engineer is studying to become a male nurse. Monthly Labor Department reports have continually shown a demand for nurses since the beginning of the recession.

HOPES TO EXPAND

CONN-VEST hopes to expand activities and develop more services for the unemployed engineers. Although only 10 percent of the estimated unemployed are registered, the group feels it has been successful.

"Many engineers live too far from Hartford to be attracted to the organization and many do not realize what we can do," Nolan says.

"We're efficient. Once we had a call for a German-speaking engineer and we sent someone for an interview in a half hour. The next day we found two more," he says.

The directors of the group have been among the most successful in finding jobs. Since last November five directors have found jobs, and Nolan is waiting for security clearance before he becomes a sixth former director.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, SENATOR FROM LOUISIANA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the death of the late Honorable Allen J. Ellender, the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana and President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate, is a great loss to the people of this Nation and the State of Louisiana.

Formerly chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee and at the time of his death its ranking member as well as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Allen J. Ellender was a great American and a particularly favorite son of the people of his native Louisiana.

Allen J. Ellender's public life was a model for all Americans. Sincere, honest, and dedicated, his life in public service spanned virtually a half century without a breath of scandal or conflict of interest. His death leaves a void that the people of Louisiana and this Nation will find difficult to fill.

Allen Ellender loved his people and they returned his affection. He will be missed. The Nation has lost a great legislator. Louisiana has lost a favorite son, a man from the bayou country who rose to heights of power never before attained by its people, yet a man who never lost touch with the folks at home—his people, the people who were the source of his strength and determination.

THE SLOW PARLIAMENTARY DEATH OF THE PRODUCT SAFETY ACT

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, in recent years we have come to realize that a wide variety of commonly utilized consumer products are hazardous to the point of causing death and injury to millions of people annually.

Toys, lawnmowers, clothing, drugs, pesticides, glass doors, unvented gas heaters, household chemicals, children's car seats, floor furnaces, cars, baby furniture, and a host of other items take a devastating toll annually. Many very young lives are lost as a result of this state of affairs. Nor is industry interested in making any effort or spending money to make such products safe.

A variety of laws have been passed to remedy specific ills in respect to certain categories of products. One such was the Toy Safety Act, designed to remove thousands of different kinds of dangerous toys from the market. Another was the Poison Prevention Packaging Act, which aimed at insuring that all hazardous products came equipped with childproof safety closures. Yet another was the Flammable Fabrics Act, which sought to require availability of flameproofed nightwear for children.

Various Government agencies were specifically charged with responsibility for enforcement of these measures. The first two were placed in the jurisdiction of the Food and Drug Administration. The last was placed under the Department of Commerce.

In each case, the agency charged with protecting the public through enforce-

ment of the law has totally abdicated its responsibility at the expense of an unsuspecting public. None of these laws are now being effectively enforced. Years have elapsed since Flammable Fabrics was placed on the books. The textile lobby has been able to influence the Department of Commerce, and today no across-the-board Federal protection is available. Thousands of young children die horrible deaths annually because of this Federal inaction.

President Nixon signed the poison prevention packaging law in December of 1970. We are still waiting to see aspirin packages equipped with childproof closures this month. Hurray for FDA, the consumer protection agency which only protects industries it is supposed to regulate.

This is why a new Product Safety Act was just passed by the Senate. It would establish a new Government agency to replace FDA to act as a consumer protection watchdog to guarantee that consumer products in the American marketplace are safe.

The House Commerce Committee has overwhelmingly approved a similar measure. Most observers are agreed that if presented to the full House, the bill would receive approval.

Yet since June 22, this House bill has reposed on the shelf in the Rules Committee of this House. Is it not one of the major functions of that same committee to see to it that important bills are given priority for floor consideration? It was my understanding that this was indeed the case.

Yet the Rules Committee of this House has given priority to much less important legislation in the interim.

The National Commission on Product Safety reported that annually 20 million injuries and 30,000 deaths are associated with consumer products. Reams of testimony have informed Congress that much of this could be prevented by removing unreasonably hazardous items from the marketplace. The bill now awaiting a rule would effectively accomplish such an objective.

In spite of a promise from the Rules Committee that it would consider the bill, it is not on their agenda. There are five bills on that agenda. Here they are:

Air passenger fees; a middecade sample census survey; wheat research; amendments to the public works law; interim SALT agreements.

If the product safety bill is not allowed out to the floor for full House consideration, it will be effectively killed, depriving the entire Nation of a vitally necessary and long overdue defense against what is revealed to be an appalling state of affairs.

Who wants to kill this essential measure? Let us drag a few resident Washington inhabitants out from under their accustomed rocks and examine them. First there is the drug lobby, which wants the bill dead as soon and completely as possible. FDA would be abolished under the Senate version, which the drug industry fears might be accepted in conference, as was the stronger version of the Poison Prevention Packaging Act of 1970. They do not want to take a chance on such an unhappy event. FDA enforces laws, by and large, of, by and for our drug and food industry, and the consumer can go hang. No mere page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD can do justice to the list of FDA failures when the public interest is at stake. The recent DES fiasco is a proper example. In the face of overwhelming evidence that this additive has some connection with cancer, the agency has stubbornly refused to act in the public interest. Yet the chemical is banned in a score of foreign countries.

So the crux of this lobbying effort is to preserve intact for as long as possible the entity we know as FDA. Should the agency be abolished, and a new consumer protection entity created, some very neatly stacked houses of cards would be destroyed.

The Senate bill would establish a new product safety agency and give to it FDA's present functions of regulating food and drug manufacturers. It would also give that new agency responsibility for ensuring safe consumer products.

Recently, the General Accounting Office did some food plant inspecting of its own, and submitted a report flaying FDA for lax inspection of facilities processing foods we commonly consume. Is there any wonder, then, that the food industry wants this bill on the House side to die a quiet death in the Rules Committee? It is their last chance to kill it.

How fascinating to observe the edifying spectacle of industries, lobbying to preserve an agency charged with policing them. Industries, we might add, which the agency has been charged often with favoring in the past at public expense. Coincidence, no doubt. Certainly, it must be just that and no more.

The Senate passed this measure overwhelmingly, by a vote of 79 to 10. The House is ready to debate and vote on this bill in our own version. The need for such a measure is proven. The Rules Committee of this House has a duty to the public, our leadership, and the House membership as a whole to perform its function and grant a rule.

EARLY INTERVENTION

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Bettye M. Caldwell, director of the Center for Early Development and Education in Little Rock, is one of the Nation's leading authorities on the subject of young children. At the recent early childhood conference I sponsored in Idaho, Dr. Caldwell discussed the impact of early childhood programs and the rationale for early intervention.

I am including excerpts from Dr. Caldwell's very timely remarks in the RECORD:

THE RATIONALE FOR EARLY INTERVENTION

(By Dr. Bettye M. Caldwell)

The second reason for our becoming so focused on the importance of early childhood is what I have called the emperical rationale. I have suggested in my paper on early intervention that our present literature basically consists of an old wave of data and is terribly old—that is pre-1960—and then a new wave of data that to a great extent is post-1965; Head Start is but seven years old.

There were actually a number of studies conducted prior to 1960 that pointed to the importance of early experience but as I said in my opening remarks it is an idea whose time has come, and the idea of time had perhaps not come during that period and I think many of us were less willing to listen to the facts at that time.

A classic example is a very famous study by Harold Fields that was done in 1939. This is a study in which a number of children who had been diagnosed as mentally deficient—that was the word that was used at that time—and who were residing in an over-crowded orphanage in Iowa, but who had to be taken out of the orphanage because they were retarded or deficient, were transferred to an institution for older retarded girls. It sounds like hardly an infant enrichment experience, if you will, and yet it proved to be exactly that.

I have re-read this article several times in recent years and I have found it full of all kinds of wisdom that was overlooked. The adult-child ratio was 50:1; there were 50 adolescent girls on a ward who had been institutionalized for the most part for many years and into those wards came one baby. Can you think of anything that would have meant more to those girls and can you think of anything perhaps much more wonderful than for those babies who had been neglected and who simply had not had enough attention over in the orphanage? The results of this study were most encouraging. The children were left in that environment for awhile, then almost all of them were later found to be adoptable and they were taken out of the orphanage, out of the institution altogether and were placed in foster homes and eventually adopted.

In the early 1960's, Harold Fields followed the sample. It is a very interesting thing because we protect the identity of adopted children in order to help them and their new families, and he had to carry out a fantastic sleuthing enterprise to track them all down, but he found them and the results of the follow-up were as encouraging, if not more so, than the analysis that he made at the time they were at the institution.

The contrast group, which lost close to 30 points in IQ; the other group gained close to 30 points. The contrast had remained over this 30-year period. All 13 children in this experimental group were found to be self-supporting and none was a ward of any institution, public or private. In the contrast group of 12 children, one had died in adolescence following continued residence in a state institution and four were still wards of institutions. The cost to the state for the contrast group for whom intervention was essentially custodial care was at least five times that of the cost of the experimental group.

Of course, it is very difficult to get into what it means in terms of this intangible thing that we call the quality of life, but it would seem without question that the ones who were able to go out into the society at large had a much more meaningful life experience.

That study has been quoted and re-quoted for one particular reason, not because he proves that the environment was so important, but this was the first study that got into the literature that could be really called an infant enrichment study. These infants were transferred not at age four or five, but when they were between one and two, or thereabouts. It was really the first study that demonstrated that apparent retardation that could be measured at that point

in time, could actually be corrected by placing the children in an environment that was more conducive to their growth.

Now, what about the new wave of studies? Dr. Zigler has mentioned the studies of Susan Gray and her colleagues in Nashville, Tennessee. They have now followed their children through the second grade. In contrast with some of the accusations that have been made in the Westinghouse study, not all the differences that were shown in the groups were "washed out by grade two". Studies completed throughout the nation including my own work at Syracuse are now reasonably established as offering some evidence that you can indeed improve the cognitive functioning of children as a consequence of enriching them during their early years.

Of the studies that I have mentioned only the Syracuse study, and that is the one I was involved with, had children in an enrichment project during infancy. When I pooled children from all the years that I directed that project—1964 to 1969—I can come up with the generalization that you can increase the quotient on the developmental quotient (I resist calling them IQ's at this early developmental period) something like 12 to 15 points the first year, and 3 to 5 points for the second year. If children participate in a program of this sort over any length of time, obviously this can result in substantial gain. Not all of the children gained and in our program, gain was inversely correlated with what you might call the general adequacy of the home. That is, the children who were from the most depriving environments tended to show the greatest gain.

The one thing that we did not find at Syracuse that I had expected to find was that when we divided our groups at age three, because that is the ordinary cutting point for acceptance to a nursery school program, we did not find that the children who were admitted prior to age three gained any more than the children who were admitted after age three.

If you will look at the gradual divergent, at the fact that children tested cross sectionally—as 1, 2, 3, 4—you will tend to see a slight decline in children from disadvantaged circumstances. This means that if you have a young group that is going to enter an enrichment program, that is tested at one, where is he in relation to these other groups. He starts out higher, which means that it is more difficult for gain to be greater. If you come here at age three, there has already been a certain decline that has been associated with the environment and therefore it is easier for the gains to be greater. I think that this is probably a valid interpretation and I hope that within the next few years we will be able to get more information about these very precious first three years in order to tell whether that is a rationalization or whether it is a rational answer.

In my remaining time I want to try to comment briefly on some things that I feel now are obligations of all of us if we are to move forward with the kind of program that Congressman Hansen is interested in, and the kind of program that Dr. Zigler in his key position can help generate throughout America. There are a few obligations that I feel we have—those of us who represent the bread and butter of the field. That is, we are really there working with children and are trying to carry out these programs and have the responsibility for seeing to it that quality does indeed exist.

The first one of these needs that I see now is that we need to develop comprehensive early childhood programs, embodying a full range of services. I like very much what Dr. Zigler said about Head Start entering an orthodox phase long before it had a chance to really be experimental. We do not need orthodoxy at this time; we need a great deal of flexibility. We need a willingness to look at different models and to search for different models. We need a willingness to think that we don't know all of the answers right now. We also need to have our heads battered against the wall when we find ourselves thinking in extremes—that is, it's full day care or nothing; does a child have to be in Head Start five half days a week? It may be that for many children the kind of enrichment or intervention that is needed might be one hour a week, and if so we need to develop the kind of model that is sensitive to that particular child and his family.

This, to me, is an extremely important thing for us to do, for us to be willing to think of new models and to develop a full range of services. I could not agree more with Dr. Zigler's remarks about the importance of day care and if you want to really know what hurts my feelings, it is to have day care indicted as something that is breaking up families in American life. Day care is perhaps doing more to help family life than many of the other social institutions that we have. Anything that provides a service that is develop mentally oriented and that the children need is helping families. Day care has been created and there is a need for more day care because of family problems. Family problems do not increase because we have more day care and it is extremely important for us to keep this distinction in mind as we develop programs for young children.

A second point that I wish to make here, and this is so very important, is that researchers who are conducting studies dealing with the effects of early intervention are obligated to follow their children in subsequent developmental periods. We are constantly hit with the thing that Head Start does good, but then they go back. I don't believe this is true. I even offer a different analysis of the Westinghouse report. There were still some gains that could be found and gains that were associated with a very brief period of time in the span of life of those individual children. It is mandatory and I am willing to mandate that people who accept grants to do studies of this sort must be obligated to build in some kind of machinery for long-term follow up. You should not be permitted to kiss and run; you should be required to do this work and say "I will see to it that a machinery is set in motion" so that we will indeed be able to say what happens in subsequent developmental periods.

My next point is that there must be continuity, not only of research but of programs between early childhood and the elementary years. We cannot continue to have this chasm at age six or age five as it is in some states. It is utterly ridiculous, it is what is called the naive environmentalism that says, "you step in here now and then you are through." That is all you have to do. That is an absolute denial of the very basic premise that says that the environment is important in the first place. If it is important initially, it is important later on and we simply must develop programs that provide for continuity from very, very early childhood up to the attainment of biological maturity.

I am extremely grateful for the opportunity that I have had to be involved in a program of this sort. We are operating the Center for Early Development and Education and it is a school that is a community-based school with home intervention, with all kinds of activities. We actually have classes for children ranging from infancy up through the end of sixth grade, in the same old elementary school—the oldest school built in Little Rock, built in 1895—but the kids are splendiferous and I think that the program is also splendiferous or at least has the potential of becoming so, because this kind of continuity is what we must have in these programs.

The next to the last point that I want to make is that if we are going to move beyond this point, we must obtain more careful program description. Here again, we continue to advertise our models and say, that is better than yours, or yours is better than his, and so on. We really don't know that they are that different. I can't help but smile when I read everything that comes out now about the open school. This is the new thing. The open school is everything. Well, the open school to me is absolutely nothing other than what we call the traditional early childhood education classroom. I want to mention a model which I call the ecological model, because I like to say that you have to design an environment and not create a curriculum. But we are probably much more alike than different. Until we get more careful program description, we have no justification for going around and screaming mine is better than yours, or yours is no good. We really need to know what is transpiring.

My last point that I would like to urge is that I hope in the future we will have an exercise, wisdom and good will, in the designation of priorities of money and time. Now wisdom and good will are always nice attributes to have around, but at times of peak excitement about certain ideas, it is easy to campaign for one approach as opposed to another, early childhood versus something else. To seek to divert funds from one endeavor to a different one. As a passionately-committed early childhood educator, I can see no justification at this time for a strategy that would involve massive diversion of funds from education of older children into early education. That may sound like heresy, but I believe that. Rather we need to work for an increase in allocations for programs for all ages. In our enthusiasm for early education it is very easy to promise too much. When too much is promised, a little disappointment seems like a lot. Or to use an expression that I have used on other occasions, the inevitable sequel to oversell is overkill.

We have been through our period of optimism, followed by skepticism, followed by denunciation, followed by a kind of reassessment or an attempt to rise from the ashes, and I think that now we are in a period of consolidation.

It is my greatest hope that in our current enthusiasm for early intervention, we do not try to oversell ourselves to the point where we cannot deliver and thus be forced into another early demise. We do not need another Renaissance of interest in early childhood development. We need only to make certain that the current interest fulfills its obligation. At this time, I think we are more comfortably theory-based and we are substantially data-based. I feel that it will indeed be a possible task. Thank you.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE GLENN M. ANDERSON AT MARITIME TRADES DEPARTMENT LUNCHEON

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, August 16, 1972, my colleague and Member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee delivered a very important address at the AFL-CIO Maritime Trades Department luncheon. The gentleman from California, Congressman ANDERSON, addressed himself to safeguarding the U.S. coastal sealanes. Never in the maritime history of this great Nation has it been more

urgent that we continue the sanctity of the Jones Act and strengthen it. The gentleman from California (Mr. ANDERSON) has done this necessary goal a great service by his timely and important address. I take this opportunity to include Congressman ANDERSON's remarks in the RECORD for the information of the Members of Congress:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN GLENN M. ANDERSON, DEMOCRAT OF CALIFORNIA, AT AFL-CIO MARITIME TRADES DEPARTMENT LUNCHEON, E. L. BARTLETT MEMORIAL AUDITORIUM, TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

In 1920, Senator Wesley L. Jones of the State of Washington, introduced an amendment to the Merchant Marine Act restricting domestic sea trade to ships of the U.S.-flag. With the passage of the Jones Act, this means that no foreign-flag ships could—or can—conduct trade between U.S. ports.

At the time of passage, Senator Jones said, and I quote:

We are entering no brotherly love Sunday School in seeking our part of the world carrying trade. Fair means and foul will be used to defeat us. Fierce assaults will be made upon us from every angle. No meek turning of the cheek will win. We must fight back and fight hard to maintain ourselves, and every honorable means must be used to advance. Other nations will make concessions to attain certain advantages. We have it in our power to secure concessions that we should have. Unquote.

These are different times, of course. But are we really so far removed from that fiercely competitive maritime world Senator Jones saw in 1920? I think not.

Even now, five decades later, the act that bears his name is still the best safeguard we have against the coercion that would naturally follow the takeover of our coastal sealanes by ships of other nations.

Those coastal sealanes are, by any measure, as vital to the future of this nation, our industry and our people as are the rails that crisscross the land, and the airspace above.

I daresay that inroads by foreign operators into the rail and air cargo business between American states and cities would be beaten back by the sheer weight of public opinion.

I don't believe that a single one of us would stand quietly by and allow Air France to fly the shuttle planes between Washington and New York. Nor would we permit the British National Railway System to run the Metroliners.

To do so is to invite chaos in transportation. And yet, by means both "fair and foul" as Senator Jones put it, we are faced with that situation in our waterborne traffic—the traffic that moves thousands of tons of goods each year, and provides a meaningful and necessary link between our nation's seaports.

I said that there are both fair and foul means being brought to bear against the Jones Act. The fairest methods, it seems to me, are those that come before Congress for enactment. We see bills in each session that would exempt a single ship, or a single sailing.

I think that is the fair way to go about it. Fair, because it gives all sides the opportunity to be heard before the representatives of the people. And fair because, if exemptions are made, they are made in the light of publicity and not by underhanded and devious means.

Of course, the Congress has been reluctant to grant exemptions to the Jones Act because, first, the law is good law, relevant to its time and to ours. And secondly, because the Congress appreciates its value to the national interest and security.

But there are foul means afoot as well. Let me describe one method to you that must be nipped in the bud because it bears not only on the Jones Act, but also on the energy crisis that is just ahead of us.

We all know of the vast, rich oil fields on Alaska's North Slope. And, of course, the American oil companies are jockeying for the best use of the fields when the pipeline is put through.

But one of those companies, Amerada Hess, is attempting to seek a competitive gain by what I would brand a very foul method indeed—a blatant attempt to subvert the Jones Act.

The Jones Act when it was written made a notable exception of the American Virgin Islands. Although all the other U.S. states and territories were included, the Virgin Islands was exempted from the provisions because in 1920, it had virtually no commerce.

The Congress provided, however, that the President by executive order could place the Virgin Islands under the act at any time he deemed necessary. And it is my firm conviction that the America Hess scheme makes that inclusion both necessary and crucial to the nation, even if the Congress must do it by law without waiting any longer for Presidential action.

For Hess has the exclusive right to build and operate oil refineries in the Virgin Islands. And they intend, as my colleague in the House, Les Aspin of Wisconsin has revealed, to circumvent the Jones Act by use of those refineries.

Here's how they plan to do it: They have asked the government of Costa Rica for permission to construct a pipeline from the Atlantic to the Pacific across that Central American nation.

Obviously then, they will be able to send their foreign-flag fleet of tankers ships to Alaska to tap the North Slope resources, not as domestic trade, although they are an American firm, but as import-export trade.

And after the oil is pushed through the pipeline, the Hess fleet can stand by at its eastern end to ship the oil to the Virgin Islands for refining. And then use the Virgin Islands exemption to ship it to the contiguous United States, again in foreign vessels.

That's pretty shoddy business and it certainly violates the spirit of the Jones Act, if not the letter of the law.

It is thus clear that we must protect the integrity of the Jones Act in order to prevent maneuvers like the Hess pipeline. But I think that as far as the Alaskan oil goes we must take it one step farther.

With the grave energy crisis which we know looms over our nation, we must prohibit the exportation of that oil, and indeed the exportation of all our needed domestic oil and gas supplies, for as long a period as we are forced to import so much from so many nations around the world.

That becomes important because of reports that the Japanese, who presently import oil from Venezuela, wish to trade that commitment to the United States in return for permission to tap the Alaskan oil supplies.

Sailing distance, of course, is the reason for such a trade. But the obvious losers in the deal would be American shipboard workers who would lose employment to the foreign-flag tankers of the Japanese that called at Valdez.

I need hardly remind this audience that the need of martime is *more*, not less, job opportunities. And the need of the nation is more, not less fuel supply sources.

So if we diminish jobs, and cut into the amount of Alaskan oil available, by selling some to the Japanese, or any other foreign nation, we do ourselves a double disservice.

We in the Congress have the responsibility of seeing that the Jones Act is strengthened. We have the responsibility of protecting those fuel supply sources that we now have by seeing that Alaskan oil stays in the United States.

And equally important, we have the responsibility of insuring that Alaskan oil is carried on U.S.-flag vessels, manned by American seamen—whether or not that oil is refined in the Virgin Islands.

The time has come for us to start exercising those responsibilities with great firmness. For as Senator Jones said, "no meek turning of the cheek will win."

BICENTENNIAL HISTORICAL EVENTS IN AUGUST

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, the Communications Committee staff of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission has compiled an abbreviated list of historical events connected with the Revolutionary period that occurred in the month of August. There are undoubtedly many companion developments in various sections of the country that are equally significant to those on this list. It is by no means the sum total of actions during the month. It does, however, bring to mind the vast amount of important history in developing this Nation: Dates, events, places, and people that need to be recalled, their courage and contributions told again to guide our people into a third century of freedom.

This list also points out the wide ranging events that can be recognized by communities and organizations throughout the land in celebrating the Nation's 200th anniversary in 1976, and indeed during the bicentennial era ending in 1983, for just the one month cited.

The listing follows:

BICENTENNIAL NEWS

Listed below are significant historical events which relate to the Bicentennial Era.

August 1, 1774—Delegates from Virginia counties meet at Williamsburg.

August 1, 1776—Sir Henry Clinton and his force arrive at Staten Island from Charleston. British expeditionary force now 30,000 strong.

August 1, 1776—Action at Oconore, South Carolina.

August 1, 1776—Action at Essenecca Town, South Carolina. Francis Salvador, first Jew to hold elective office in the New World, killed in this skirmish, thus being the first Jew to die for American independence.

August 2, 1775—Congress adjourns.

August 2, 1776—Signatures affixed to the engrossed Declaration of Independence.

August 4, 1775—Lancaster War Dance. By Captain Cresap and his rifle company enroute to Cambridge.

August 7, 1776—Captain Wingate Newman, privateer, commanding the *Hannah* brings prize ship *Reward* into Portsmouth, New Hampshire. Cargo included turtles destined for Lord North.

August 8, 1775—Captain Daniel Morgan and his Virginia riflemen arrive at Cambridge.

August 9, 1775—Naval action at Gloucester, Cape Ann, Massachusetts (Aug. 9–10). British ships, pursuing two American schooners, capture one, but are driven back by gunfire from Gloucester.

August 11, 1776—Action at Tomassy, South Carolina.

August 22, 1776—Howe lands about 20,000 troops at Flatbush, Long Island (August 22–25).

August 23, 1775—Proclamation of Rebellion. George III declares the American colonies to be in open rebellion.

August 25, 1774—Convention to form North Carolina provincial congress meets at New Berne.

August 26, 1776—British night march to envelop General Israel Putnam's forces before Brooklyn.

August 26, 1776—Action at Valley Grove, Long Island. Preliminary action in the Long Island, New York, Campaign.

August 27, 1776—Battle of Long Island. Continental army defeated by General Howe.

August 28, 1775—General Schuyler begins advance on Canada. Marches from Ticonderoga with 1000 men.

August 28, 1776—Action at Jamaica (Brookland), Long Island. British surprise a small American detachment and take most prisoner.

August 29, 1775—Attack on New York City. (Unexplained item in Heitman; presumably refers to a naval bombardment or a Tory raid).

August 29, 1776—Washington's Evacuation of Long Island (August 29–30).

TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting today a follow-up to the text of the conversation between my constituent Stuart Lotwin of Los Angeles, and Lev Lerner of the Soviet Union, which appeared in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TELEPHONE CONVERSATION BETWEEN LEV LERNER, LENINGRAD, U.S.S.R.; S. J. LOTWIN, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.; OPERATOR, MOSCOW, U.S.S.R.

July 7, 1972

S.L. Hello, Lev?

L.L. Yes.

S.L. This is Stuart, again.

L.L. I hear you very bad.

S.L. Very bad? Operator.

L.L. Hello.

S.L. O.K., I'll get our operator to do something. Operator, Operator.

L.L. Hello.

S.L. Hello, Lev? Can you hear me?

L.L. Yes.

S.L. O.K., good. You must be tired. Are you sleepy?

L.L. No, I wait your call.

S.L. Good. Listen, Lev.

L.L. Yes.

S.L. We had here before some people from . . .

L.L. Hello.

S.L. Hello.

L.L. Hello.

S.L. Hello, can you hear me?

OPR. Conversation in Russian with Lerner—Hello, New York, my party can hear you. The line is broken.

S.L. Can he hear me?

OPR. I hear you, not good.

S.L. Not good?

OPR. Yes. The line is bad.

S.L. The line is bad, huh?

OPR. Go ahead.

S.L. Lev, can you hear me better now?

L.L. Now better.

S.L. Now better?

L.L. Yes.

S.L. Good, anyway, Lev, we were here to call you. People from the Los Angeles Times, the Associated Press and the Columbia Broadcasting System were here but they had to leave because we had a bad connection on our end—we couldn't hear you before very well. So, they are, nevertheless, going to write stories about you, your family, and your desire to go to Israel and will publish it in the newspapers in the United States. Do you understand?

L.L. Yes, I understand.

S.L. And, it will be on the radio.

L.L. Thank you very much for your call.

S.L. Hello.

L.L. Hello.

S.L. Yes, did you understand?

L.L. Yes, I understood and all my family thank you very much for your call.

S.L. Oh, a pleasure! It's always good to talk to a good friend.

L.L. Yes.

S.L. We do have one man here who was with the Associated Press and he will want to say hello and give you his personal greetings. He'll be on in just a second. Before he does, tell me if I'm correct that your visa was denied because they said you had information that related to secret material.

L.L. Hello.

S.L. Hello.

L.L. Hello.

S.L. Hello, hello.

At this point a strange male voice (not Lerner) speaks in Russian to the operator. Then another female voice and the male voice started yelling, "Hang-up, hang-up."

S.L. Operator.

OPR. Hello, my party can't hear you, can't hear you.

S.L. He can or cannot hear me?

OPR. I'm sorry, Mister. Please try another time. The line is broken.

S.L. The line is broken?

OPR. Yes, please get back operator in New York City. Now it is not possible to get line.

S.L. It is not possible?

OPR. Yes.

S.L. Can you tell the party in . . .

OPR. Yes, please get back operator, your party cannot hear you—nothing.

S.L. O.K. Would you tell him something for me?

OPR. Me?

S.L. Will you tell him that I will call him Sunday?

OPR. I don't understand what you say.

S.L. Can you hear me?

OPR. I can hear you.

S.L. You can?

OPR. New York?

S.L. Hello.

OPR. New York?

S.L. The New York operator is not on the line.

OPR. Put down the receiver.

S.L. O.K., I'll flip the receiver.

OPR. Yes, you ought to speak with operator in New York City.

S.L. Alright, alright, very well.

OPR. New York, New York, New York, hello, New York?

S.L. Hello?

OPR. New York?

S.L. Hello?

OPR. Where is it you call in Leningrad.

S.L. Where in the city?

OPR. When, when?

S.L. On Sunday.

OPR. Call tomorrow.

S.L. Sunday, Sunday.

OPR. Sunday?

S.L. Sunday!

OPR. What time?

S.L. Sunday, as usual.

OPR. At what time?

S.L. At what time?

OPR. Yes.

S.L. Tell him at 10:00 at night in Leningrad.

OPR. 10:00 in the morning you call again?

S.L. In the evening.

OPR. Will this be your time or Moscow time?

S.L. Leningrad time.

OPR. Your time or Moscow time?

S.L. Moscow time!

OPR. O.K., O.K.

S.L. O.K., good.

OPR. Get New York operator. You can then hear your party in Leningrad.

S.L. Yes, on Sunday. Good.

MISS INDIAN AMERICA

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. Speaker, Idahoans swelled with pride earlier this month when one of their daughters—Louise Edmo of Fort Hall—was crowned Miss Indian America, the first Shoshone-Bannock woman ever to be honored with this title. I am especially proud that she is a resident of my Congressional district.

This lovely young woman radiates life and enthusiasm. She holds great hopes and aspirations for the future of her people and promises to devote her own future to improving the quailty of life of the Indian people. I have worked closely with Miss Edmo's family at Fort Hall through the years and I know that her dedication will continue to grow long after her reign is over.

It is my great pleasure to offer my heartiest congratulations to this deserving young woman, and to insert in the RECORD a personality sketch of the new Miss Indian America by Tom Hodge of the Blackfoot News:

MISS INDIAN AMERICA VOWS TO DEDICATE LIFE TO HER PEOPLE

(By Tom Hodge)

FORT HALL.—The first Shoshone-Bannock woman ever to win the title of Miss Indian America returned here Thursday to make a pledge to "dedicate my life to Indian people."

Louise Edmo, in a news conference at the site of the ninth annual Shoshone-Bannock Indian Festival, said betterment of the Indian race will be her goal during her year's reign.

"But it won't stop there. I plan to dedicate my life to Indian people as my father has done."

Her father, Kesley Edmo, holds several positions of influence among Indian people. He is chairman of the Idaho Inter-Tribal Policy Board, a member of the Governor's Advisory Committee on Indian Affairs, and is a vice president of the Northwest Affiliated Tribes.

Until this summer he was chairman of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribal Council. He lost that seat by just a few votes in the tribal election.

Following the Shoshone-Bannock festival, the new queen will begin an intensive tour of the country for personal appearances and speaking engagements. The first after Fort Hall is at Casper, Wyo., where she'll address members of the Production Credit Association.

In the Miss Indian America contest at Sheridan, Wyo., Miss Edmo said 30 contestants from 27 tribes participated. "Any one of them could serve as Miss Indian America. They were all real sharp, and knew what their goals and aspirations are."

She said Miss Glenna Jenks of Fort Duchesne, Utah, is her runner-up.

"My goals and responsibilities during the next year will be to be a spokesman for

my people. I'll lose a year of school, but it'll be well worth it."

Miss Edmo said she has had "numerous invitations to appear all over the country—except from around this area." For some reason, the invitations haven't come from Utah and Idaho, she said.

During the upcoming year, "I plan to put emphasis on the lifestyle and ways of the Indian. I hope I can let non-Indians know what our beliefs are."

Her ability to speak well in public, she said, played a large part in her success at Sheridan. "My parents helped me learn this, and speech classes I took (at Blackfoot High School) were very important to me."

Asked if she will use the Miss Indian America position as a soapbox from which to urge betterment of the lives of Indians, Miss Edmo said she will continue to speak out as she has always done.

The Blackfoot and Pocatello area, Miss Edmo said, "Is the best place to begin to fight."

As an Indian student, she said, "I felt I had to prove myself every day, to learn to communicate with each aspect of society."

The All-American Indian Days organization at Sheridan, she said, "is working effectively to bridge the communications gap between Indians and non-Indians."

Miss Edmo said she will not be identified with more "militant" Indian organizations. "They have good objectives. I agree with the goals, but militant action gets only publicity and usually doesn't benefit people."

Known by the Indian name, "Bird Wing," Miss Edmo said young Indians should "work through channels" to attain their goals. "Channels" she agreed, would include the Federal Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Young people of her race, she said, "should dedicate their lives to Indians. What needs to be done can't be done in two or three years."

After the year as Miss Indian America, she'll return to her home state to attend the University of Idaho. She plans to study pre-law there, and may go on to the University of New Mexico to study law.

"All our lives are based on rules, regulations and laws. An Indian person with a knowledge of law can be real useful."

As a lawyer, she said she believes she could fight to keep Indian lands from "going out of trust."

"I would also work to maintain water, fishing and hunting rights of the Indians," she said.

Miss Edmo, 18, is the daughter of two chiefs, Arimo of the Shoshones and Racehorse of the Bannock. Her successful competition at Sheridan was because of a speech she gave, she said.

The speech, originally prepared for a high school presentation, compares the "Value system" of the Indian with "middle class white society."

In the speech, Miss Edmo said, "The values of the Indian treat older people differently. We respect and understand them . . . the non-Indian is simply forgotten at age 65. We feel older people are the most important resource we have. They are our only means of learning the old ways."

HEW APPROPRIATIONS BILL

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

August 17, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Nixon vetoed the HEW appropriations bill because it exceeded his budget recommendations by $1.8 million. It seems that the President has developed a habit of vetoing bills which affect the education and health of the nation. In January 1970 he vetoed an HEW appropriations bill for vital education and health needs because it contained $1.26 billion more than his budget request. Similarly, in August 1970 he vetoed an education appropriations bill because of the $453 million which Congress had added for elementary and secondary education, handicapped, vocational and adult education, student college loans, and libraries.

If the President were truly concerned about "reckless Federal spending" and curbing inflation, he would have cut funds instead from the military budget as I and many of my colleagues suggested.

I deeply regret that due to prior commitments I was unable to be here yesterday to vote to override the President's latest veto of an HEW appropriations bill. If I had been present, I would have voted "yes."

U.S. INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY AND U.S. AGRICULTURAL POLICY

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, this week, Mr. Robert Dierks, representing Cargill, Inc., made an excellent statement concerning U.S. international economic policy and U.S. agricultural policy to the Republican Convention's Platform Committee.

This fine statement, slightly edited by me follows:

INTRODUCTION

A comprehensive and outward-looking U.S. foreign economic policy has become increasingly important. The volume of the international flow of goods, services and capital has grown rapidly. Developed nations have become increasingly interdependent economically, and developing nations are seeking to be included more meaningfully in this process. Longstanding barriers to commercial relations between East and West are coming down.

But the traditional, liberal trade and investment policies of the United States are also facing greater challenges. The international monetary system created at Bretton Woods has collapsed under the strain of prolonged inflexibility in the face of mounting payments imbalances. The economies of Western Europe and Japan have recovered to the point where those regions can compete on a fully equal basis with the U.S. The trading rules of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) have been gradually and steadily eroded by the creation of free trade areas, customs unions and the widening circle of preferential trading arrangements being concluded by the European Community. Finally, segments of the organized labor and business communities in the U.S. have begun to back away from their traditional support for freer trade and to call for import quotas and restraints on the flows of capital and technology across national boundaries. These domestic concerns surfaced most clearly in the "Foreign Trade and Investment Act of 1972".

It is our firm belief that these developments only confirm the need for a renewed commitment to a coherent, comprehensive and outward-looking U.S. foreign economic policy. Very simply, the United States and her trading partners must meet constructively the substantial problems currently facing international economic policy, and they forge solutions which will mesh with the long-term objective of continued world prosperity and economic cooperation.

The interests of the entire agricultural community lie at the heart of this challenge. Both politically and economically, the challenge of liberalizing the conditions for trade in agricultural commodities demands the highest priority in the shaping of an expansive international economic policy for the United States. The future prosperity of the American agricultural community has become increasingly tied to access on liberal terms to foreign markets, and the political support for a comprehensive trade and investment policy which will benefit the nation as a whole rests in large part on meeting this challenge to agricultural trade.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE AGRICULTURE EXPORT MARKET

In the year ending June 30, 1969, the total value of agricultural exports was approximately $5.7 billion. Approximately $1 billion of this total was exports under specified Government programs, with the remaining $4.7 billion representing commercial agricultural exports. In the year ending June 30, 1972, U.S. agricultural exports had risen to $8 billion. With exports under Government programs remaining at about $1 billion, this means that commercial agricultural exports have increased by approximately 50 percent during this period.

With population growth slowing in the United States and with American diets already at a relatively high standard, the continuing comparative advantage possessed by American farmers in major field crops has tied dynamic growth in agricultural production and marketing to expansion of foreign markets.

Looking toward the future, the opportunities for continued market expansion for U.S. farm products lie with export market developments.

The first lesson of this future potential market development is the need for the United States to employ its agricultural resources efficiently to meet this rising worldwide demand. Currently, the U.S. withholds more than 60 million acres of cropland from production. The continually rising world demand for fats, oils and protein meals offers an opportunity substantially to increase U.S. soybean acreage and production.

New market demands for wheat and for feed grains present the challenge of increasing U.S. production of those commodities as well. The challenge of reaching the target of $10 billion of farm product exports can be met. The first step in achieving that objective will be to utilize our vast productive resources more efficiently.

AGRICULTURAL TRADE POLICY CHALLENGES

Beyond this, however, each of these present and potential export arkets possesses special problems which need to be surmounted.

I. EUROPEAN COMMUNITY—It has been and remains a cornerstone of U.S. foreign economic policy to encourage the economic integration and development of Western Europe.

At the same time, however, the Community has pursued certain policies which have secured a part of its growth at the expense of third-country exports. One such policy has been the EC's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) for grains.

While there can be competition among third-country exporters to the EC, the EC farmer is absolutely protected from outside

competition. This system, together with the very high price support levels in the EC, has frequently generated surpluses in the Community. These surpluses are then disposed of either through high export subsidies or through denaturing premiums for wheat used as feed. As a result, the CAP for grains has not only reduced U.S. exports to the EC but has also disrupted U.S. exports to other traditional importing nations.

Enlargement of the Community to include four new members will extend this agricultural trade-diverting system to a market for $640 million of U.S. farm exports in 1970–71. The U.S. can expect to lose a substantial portion of this market. In addition, the high price support levels for grains in the EC retard growth in consumption.

Continuation and extension of the CAP for grains poses a serious barrier to growth of U.S. grain exports to the Community.

Another problem posed by the Community centers on the ever-widening circle of preferential arrangements the EC has negotiated or is in the process of negotiating with nonmember countries. 52 of the present 80 signatories of the GATT enjoy some kind of preferential arrangement with the Community member nations. Such preferences seriously undermine the most-favored nation clause of the GATT.

These facets of the development of Community trade policy present serious problems for all U.S. exports, but they—and especially the CAP—pose especially serious impediments to liberalization of the conditions of agricultural trade and to expansion of U.S. farm product exports. Congress and the Administration will have to work closely together to deal with these agricultural trade barriers effectively.

II. SOVIET BLOC NATIONS AND THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA—On June 10, 1971, President Nixon removed barriers to trade with Communist China arising under the Trading-with-the-Enemy Act, as well as the requirement that 50 percent of U.S. agricultural exports to Russia, mainland China and some Eastern European nations had to move on U.S. flag vessels. This latter restriction had proven a serious impediment to U.S. agricultural exports to these nations, since U.S. flag vessel rates for bulk shipments were not competitive. Since then, the emergence of Russia as a major new market for U.S. agricultural commodities has been very rapid.

At the same time, however, there remain problems which need to be surmounted. Long-term growth of U.S. agricultural exports to Russia will require: reciprocity in our trade relations with the Soviet bloc nations; Soviet capacity to earn foreign exchange; granting most-favored nation tariff treatment to the Russians; agreement on acceptable credit terms to be offered by each nation; an agreed-upon method for settling commercial disputes; and other operational freedoms characteristic of normal commercial relations among countries. In particular, putting commercial relations with the Soviet bloc on a more normalized basis awaits settlement of lend-lease debts. Beyond this, the U.S. must recognize that exports to Soviet bloc countries can only expand as rapidly as the ability of those nations to earn foreign exchange with which to pay for those commodities, and this foreign exchange must be earned through exports to the free-world economies. Similar problems confront expansion of trade with China, and here we can expect the pace of progress to be substantially slower.

III. JAPAN—U.S. agricultural exports to Japan have grown rapidly, to the point where Japan has become the largest single-nation market for American farmers. At the same time, however, the U.S. has experienced recently a large and rapidly deteriorating balance of trade and payments with Japan. Unless measures are taken soon to correct this situation, the U.S. can expect a balance of payments deficit with Japan in 1972 approaching $4 billion.

Progress must be made to close this serious gap. Lasting and long-term progress will hinge upon the success of broad-scale trade and monetary negotiations among the U.S., the EC and Japan.

The basic principles which could underpin such negotiations have been outlined by Ambassador William D. Eberle, the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations. The fundamental character of these principles underline the essentially new circumstances of today's commercial relations—a world increasingly interdependent, where economic change is transmitted across national boundaries more quickly and, in some cases, more massively and where the major economic groupings face each other essentially as equals. Such changed circumstances will require new policies, not only in the sphere of trade policy along the lines developed by Ambassador Eberle, but also in the sphere of monetary policy, where a new international monetary system must be more flexible—providing for adjustments to disequilibria on a more timely basis—with the burdens of adjustment shared equally by surplus and deficit nations.

IV. DOMESTIC ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL PROBLEMS—The other major challenges to securing for American agriculture—as well as for American society as a whole—the benefits of a more liberal atmosphere for international economic relations arise within the United States. Two are especially important.

International trade in agricultural products is highly competitive. Nations which import food and feed stuffs from the United States are understandably concerned about the reliability of the U.S. as a supplier. Nations have shown great confidence in the capacity of the U.S. to produce to meet their import needs. This confidence is reinforced by the productive reserves the U.S. possesses in the form of land withheld from production and by our policy of maintaining adequate reserves. Obviously, however, as world demand for food and feed grains and for oilseeds increases, the U.S. must pursue acreage and production policies which continue to provide adequate supplies to meet this demand.

These policies and this confidence can, however, be undermined when importing nations find themselves closed off from U.S. agricultural exports by recurring dock strikes. This undermining of America's reputation as a reliable supplier is especially unfortunate when grain and oilseed stevedoring is blocked by strikes which do not involve issues arising from those activities. This was the case in the most recent prolonged tie-ups at most of our major ports. Even at peak loading times, grain and oilseed stevedoring requires only about 1200 longshoremen, out of a total national membership of better than 60,000. Consequently, for often unrelated issues arising between parties where agricultural exporters do not have a voice and involving only a few longshoremen, America's farmers must suffer both foregone current exports and further erosion of our reputation as a reliable supplier. An effective solution must provide more effective legal tools to mitigate the victimization of interests other than those involved in contract disputes.

The other major domestic problem arises in connection with growing support for protectionist legislation in the United States. The Burke-Hartke bill is the most obvious example. This and similar proposals would impose quotas across-the-board on imports into the United States, would seriously restrict flows of capital and technology across national boundaries and would alter the tax treatment of foreign earnings in ways which would put U.S. foreign direct investors at a serious competitive disadvantage vis-a-vis foreign concerns, thereby seriously discouraging investments which have demonstrably benefitted the U.S. in a variety of ways.

These proposals must be of serious concern to all who share the goal of the President's Commission on International Trade and Investment Policy—that the U.S. play a constructive role in achieving a "world economic community of nations." But such proposals pose an especially acute threat to the entire agricultural community. Import quotas are inflationary. The farm community would become one of the first and most seriously injured victims of an inflationary spiral. Quotas would also prompt retaliation from our trading partners, since successful trading relations must run on a two-way street. Seeing their exports to the U.S. impeded by quotas, other nations would retaliate against U.S. exports. Past experience and the multiplicity of sources for agricultural products both demonstrate that U.S. agricultural exports would be among the first, and hardest-hit, victims of such retaliation. Restraints on the flow of technology and capital across national boundaries would undermine one of the most important marketing tools for agricultural exports. The ability to invest in and develop U.S. feeding technologies in foreign markets helps generate markets for exports of U.S. feed ingredients, since those feeding technologies are closely tied to U.S. farm products. Policies to tax foreign earnings in ways which would deter U.S. investment abroad would similarly undermine such export-promoting activities.

Trade restraints—through their inflationary effects and the inevitable retaliation which follows—merely transfer the costs of adjustment on to other industries. In this case, these burdens would be passed on to the most dynamic, export-oriented industries, with agriculture being one of the most serious victims. Secondly, trade restriction protects both those firms within an industry which need protection and those which do not, creating a windfall gain for some industries. Protection would also isolate the U.S. from the challenge of competition, impairing our ability to innovate and reducing the real welfare of all of our workers. Fourthly, while one can understand the political pressures to institute quotas—since the costs of such a policy are hidden in the prices consumers must pay rather than apparent in appropriations which must be made to meet real social needs—such policies do not solve the underlying problems; they merely allow those problems—and the substandard wages which are frequently associated with non-competitive industries—to be perpetuated. Finally, in contrast to the once-and-for-all costs of an adequate adjustment assistance program, the costs of protection cumulate overtime.

While rejecting the Burke-Hartke bill, we cannot ignore the very real problems which confront some workers, firms, industries and communities in adjusting to the pace of change in a more interdependent world. Those costs are very real—lost income, lost pension rights, lost health and life insurance, lost dignity.

It is important that supporters of a freer trade policy—which benefits the society as a whole—recognize and meet effectively the social and human costs that a few are asked to bear to secure those benefits. It is equally important to recognize that these costs of adjustment are the same, whether the dislocations which produce them arise from foreign or domestic competition. Indeed, with imports less than 4 percent of our total Gross National Product, the burdens of adjustment to domestic economic changes may well outweigh the burdens of adjusting to foreign competition. The social, economic and human costs of adjustment demand a coordinated industrial and manpower development strategy.

CONCLUSION

The main themes of this presentation can be summarized as follows. First, some of the most important policies affecting the future health and structure of American agriculture will not resemble traditional agricultural policies or issues. With the rapidly growing importance of the export market for American farmers, the progress (or lack of it) which is made in liberalizing the conditions of international trade in farm products and in devising a responsive and flexible international monetary system must be considered among the most important, if not the most important, challenges facing individuals concerned with the future of U.S. agriculture.

Secondly, with agricultural exports currently about one-fifth of total U.S. exports and with the marked potential for future growth in such exports (if the challenges to that opportunity can be met), securing substantially liberalized conditions for trade in agricultural commodities must be among the nation's highest foreign economic policy priorities. If such an objective were achieved, the U.S. balance of payments would be improved, U.S. productive resources would be more fully and more efficiently utilized, U.S. industry would be buoyed by the improved economic well-being of one of its largest customers—the agricultural community—and the society as a whole would gain from the continued commitment of the United States to an outward-looking trade and investment policy.

Finally, a positive and comprehensive trade and investment policy designed to further these objectives would include: (1) a commitment to keeping American agricultural production competitive in terms of price and quality and therefore capable of helping to meet the world's rising demand for food; (2) a commitment to providing U.S. trade negotiators a mandate to liberalize the conditions of world trade, with a high priority placed upon liberalizing the terms of trade in agricultural commodities; (3) a commitment to ecuring an international monetary system which is flexible, able to respond to the needs for adjustments to imbalances on a timely basis and based upon a mutuality of obligations for both debtor and creditor nations; and (4) an industrial and manpower strategy which is geared to achieving improved U.S. competitiveness in international markets and to meeting effectively, efficiently and in a timely fashion the very real economic, social and human needs of adjustments that arise in the increasingly equal, interdependent and competitive economic world in which we live.

We believe that these objectives are among the most important in our common commitment to building a new, lasting and equitable prosperity for the nation.

LEAD AND ZINC ACT OF 1972 AND ZINC ORE DUTY-SUSPENSION BILL

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL) the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, yesterday gave this House a typically lucid and comprehensive explanation of why the two bills introduced are badly needed. I take great pleasure in joining the gentleman from Colorado and other Members in cosponsoring those two bills.

I agree with everything Chairman ASPINALL said about the need for bringing stability to our lead and zinc industries. They are of vital importance to America and to my State. In 1971 Idaho was the second-ranking lead ore producing State, with a production of 65,000 tons of recoverable lead. Idaho also was among the top five producers of zinc ore, producing 43,000 tons of recoverable zinc. In addition, there is a large lead smelter and refinery and a large zinc smelter and refinery in the Coeur d'Alene district in the northern part of Idaho. Directly and indirectly, about 10,000 jobs depend on Idaho's lead and zinc mines, smelters and refineries.

I support this legislation, however, not only because it will benefit the people of my State, but also because it will help our country. This legislation will help America by providing jobs, by helping to ensure adequate supplies of two strategic materials in time of national emergency, by safeguarding consuming industries against possible shortages, and by conserving our foreign exchange reserves.

On May 20, 1971, I remarked to this House that the lead and zinc industries had their backs to the wall. But, as Chairman ASPINALL has noted, the situation has become even worse since then. Meanwhile, foreign producers are pulling ahead.

They are pulling ahead because governmental policies and programs provide foreign producers with advantages that are not available to American producers. For example, in this country we are, quite rightly, taking steps to reduce pollution. In fact, the United States is in the forefront among the nations of the world in the battle to improve the environment. Most foreign countries are not taking the energetic measures we are taking. This means that American lead and zinc producers will have to incur added costs of several hundred million dollars over the next 4 or 5 years, while their foreign competitors will incur only a fraction of those costs.

Moreover, foreign goverments employ a number of tax incentives to encourage new investment, very rapid amortization, sometimes in a single year, being a favorite device. If we also take into account the subsidies and low interest loans which foreign producers receive, plus the fact that foreign wage rates are distinctly lower than ours, we can reach only one, inescapable conclusion: the competition is decidely unfair.

The two bills introduced will take an important step toward correcting the unfair, competitive imbalance that now exists. Thereby they will add to the stability of two industries badly in need of stability.

The Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970—Public Law 91-631—calls on us to take this action. Our national and industrial security requires us to take it.

I join Chairman ASPINALL in the hope that these two bills will find wide support in the House.

SOVIET SHAME CONTINUES

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Monday is the fourth anniversary of the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union. On August 20 and 21, 1968, the frontiers of that tiny satellite were violated by 650,000 Russian, Bulgarian, East German, Hungarian, and Polish troops.

Invasion of other countries by the Kremlin's soldiers was, of course, nothing new. From the day back in 1917 when the Bolsheviks wrested power from the regime that overthrew the Romanoff dynasty until the present hour, the Soviet Empire has coveted the soil of its neighbors.

In the early 1920's it seized several nations, including such ancient lands as Ukraine, Byelorussia, and Armenia. In 1939 it collaborated with National Socialist Germany to take over Poland. Less than a year after that it extinguished the independence of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

During the late 1940's the Iron Curtain descended over a number of countries that had won their freedom from Hitler only to see it terminated by another international gangster, Stalin. Among these new colonies of the Soviet Empire were Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, and Romania. The uprisings staged by East Germans, Magyars, and Poles at various times during the last two decades were put down with great severity when the tyrants in the Kremlin sent in overwhelming military forces.

The dispatch of troops to Czechoslovakia in 1968 was especially shocking because that nation had been a Soviet satellite for 21 years. Some inadequate reforms, were too much for the men in Moscow.

Despite the millions of words that have been spoken and written during the last few years to the effect that the Communists have mellowed and that their leaders have undergone a metamorphosis from socialistic totalitarianism to capitalistic free enterprise, the status of Czechoslovakia shows us that the facts are otherwise. The people who inhabit that unhappy nation can provide eloquent testimony to demonstrate the utter falsity of statements that proclaim the advantages of peaceful coexistence.

Mr. Speaker, the blackest midnight must eventually and inevitably yield to tomorrow's sunrise. Likewise, the people of Czechoslovakia, who witnessed the annihilation of Naziism, can take confort in the knowledge that godless Communism is doomed to eventual destruction. God speed the day when the power of international communism will disintegrate and that its victims, such as the long-suffering people of Czecnoslovakia, will once more walk in freedom.

ONE MAN'S COMMITMENT TO A BETTER WORLD

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, America, in recent years, has become very environmentally aware. We are properly concerned that, as a result of our Nation's expansion, we are making parts of America undesirable places to live. It is encouraging, however, to know that millions of our citizens are aware of the danger and are alert to the opportunities to reverse the past neglect.

There is more to creating a clean, healthful, and enjoyable environment than just ending the pollution of our air and water. It is important to take positive steps to enhance the world around us.

The August 5 edition of the Sabbath Recorder, the weekly publication of the Seventh Day Baptist Church, contains a story of one man's commitment to a better world. Written by the Reverend Leon M. Maltby, editor of the magazine, it tells of the efforts of Earl D. Gardiner, of Watertown, N.Y., who, singlehanded, transformed a barren area into a place of beauty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Sabbath Recorder, Aug. 5, 1972]

A LESSON IN ECOLOGY

We hear much about the ecological crisis that we are getting our country into and not very much about efforts that have been underway for a long time to conserve or rebuild our natural resources. The editor had occasion recently to observe one such local effort which, if repeated many times, would give reason for encouragement.

New York State, though not as densely populated as New Jersey, contains our largest city and many others that drain our resources and pollute air and water. On the other hand, there are large portions of northern New York that have gone out of cultivation and are producing valuable trees and an increasing supply of good, clean water in many creeks and rivers.

In Jefferson County where dairy farming is still prosperous, many marginal farms have gone back to nature by default or by plan. There is a stretch of several miles along the North Branch of Sandy Creek that holds much of nostalgia for the editor. It was the nearest swimming hole and the finest place to catch rock bass and to try to catch several other varieties of fish, including pickerel and pike. As boys we knew every bend, every swale, every tree crossing, and almost every large rock or overhanging bush that was likely to provide shelter for a bass that could be tempted with wriggling worms freshly dug from the moist barnyard. The whole creek bottom was pastured as well as the woods and open fields on the steep hillsides that made up the back end of several farms. The barbed wire fences extending to the banks of the creek were a hazard for overalls and fishing poles but helped one to keep his bearings as he trudged up and down this half-wild, half-tame country. It was the pasturing that made it possible to fish the creek. All this has changed.

There was one small farm on the creek bottom where a small bridge (which seemed big to a young boy's eyes) spanned the creek on a road that ran along the foot of the barren stony hill on the opposite side. We seldom traversed that steep road leading eventually to the village of Rodman a few miles away. Fresh spring water was piped across the bridge from a spring on our side and poured continuously into a big iron kettle to serve the cattle and the people in the Collins house. There were other springs and gurgling rivulets from which a thirsty young fisherman could drink like Gideon's band. We never thought of drinking from the main creek although its quality and its flow were even then being tested for use in the nearest city.

The narrow rocky road on our side of the creek that slanted down the long hillside and doubled back at the foot of the hill to cross the bridge was abandoned several years ago along with the bridge which is now only a skeleton of steel girders. It is reported that mischievous boys twice tore up the planking for the fun of launching the planks down the stream. Although the little farm on the bottom land had long since become inoperative the house and garden could be reached via the dirt road down the opposite hill, so I had heard. The easiest way to get a quick look at that fine old creek might be to approach it by car from the other side, since the unpastured woods on our side had grown up to briers and the hill is a harder climb at 66 than at 16.

Having laid this background we come to the ecology angle of this story with which we began. In company with longtime residents the editor set out to find the other end of that once-barren rocky road and follow it down the hill to that skeleton bridge. Much to his surprise, there was no barren brown hill. We drove through a young forest of pine and larch and native growth that completely overshadowed the road all the way down to the little clearing around the house where there was a tended lawn. On the way we heard an airplane and a helicopter overhead but could not see them or be seen by them as we burrowed through the green bower.

At the foot of the hill we met the owner of the land, a man well along in his seventies with pruning shears in his hand. He had a story to tell that would have done credit to a ranger in a national forest. Since 1927 he had been enlarging his land holdings in that area for purposes of reforestation and improving the ecology of the region.

Starting with a large farm at the top of the hill he had planted trees down the sides and included the little farm. The bottom land was set out to Christmas trees, which he was shaping with his shears. His picnic table was made with twelve-inch untrimmed white pine planks grown from a 1927 planting.

Through the years this one man had hand-planted half a million trees and carefully measured their growth and their contribution to the environment. He called our attention to the closely planted larch trees standing straight and limbless for seventy-five feet. He mentioned judicious harvesting of pulpwood and some other timber. In the nature of the case, he would not live to realize much financial gain from his years of labor, but he had made what seemed to him to be a worthy contribution to life. In spite of his advancing years he was still planting trees and watching the little seedlings put out new leaves as they struggled for light amid the grass. Our new friend was also planting shrubs that would yield winter food for the birds that now frequented the wooded area.

I went back to see the stream that had so much meaning for me as a boy. Though it was far less accessible and had lost some of its romantic charm because its banks were no longer closecropped by grazing dairy herds, I had to observe that there was much less erosion. It was a time of high water due to recent rains, but the stream was clean and clear, not muddy. The farmers had helped by keeping their cows closer to home, but the man who planted trees had more consciously done his part in making up-state New York a better place to live in.

Not everyone can make the same contribution to life, to be sure. We must doff our hats to such men as the one mentioned here who prepare benefits for the oncoming generations with little thanks from the present and keep on working regardless. When we look at efforts like this, we have hope that man will not make uninhabitable the world that God has made to be inhabited and cared for.

RESULTS OF SURVEY OF CONGRESSMAN ROBERT McCLORY'S YOUNG CITIZENS' COUNCIL

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, there are a great many myths which surround the views and attitudes of young citizens of America—particularly the views of those in the age group of 18 to 21—who will be voting in the presidential elections this year—for the first time.

I have been most anxious to communicate directly with as many as possible of these young citizens in order to determine their views—and to indicate my desire to learn and understand their positions. Also, I have sought to express my individual opinions on issues which are of special interest and concern to these young voters.

Mr. Speaker, several months ago, I conceived the idea of establishing a young citizens' advisory council—a loosely organized body of young citizens composed mainly of high school seniors and college students, who can inform me of the concerns of young voters in my district. While the organization is still in the formative stages, it has already demonstrated its utility as a vehicle for communicating some of my positions on subjects such as first, the environment; second, ending the war in Indochina and reducing world tensions; third, extending the legal rights of 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds; and, fourth, other issues.

Mr. Speaker, at the recent county fairs held in Kane, Lake, and McHenry Counties, members of my young citizens' advisory council were able to take a survey of the opinions of hundreds of young Americans on some issues in which young people frequently voice an interest. These young citizens who responded to this survey represent a broad cross section of those in this age group who inhabit this great section of the Nation. The survey demonstrated that, for the most part, these young Americans were well informed and held definite opinions on the six issues on which they were queried. I am confident that the results of this survey will be of interest to my colleagues and to other young Americans throughout the Nation. The results of the survey are as follows:

RESULTS OF THE SURVEY CONDUCTED BY CONGRESSMAN ROBERT McCLORY'S YOUNG CITIZENS' ADVISORY COUNCIL

Question	Yes	No	Don't know	Percentyes
1. Do you feel that full rights of citizenship should be extended to 18-year-olds?	452	71	28	80
2. Do you feel that the Federal, State and local governments are doing enough to protect the environment?	47	468	41	9
3. In view of the pending constitutional change granting equal rights to women, should women be included in any new draft law?	240	245	69	43
4. Do you favor a greater student exchange program for high school and college—including foreign study programs for American students?	441	67	50	79
5. Should busing of students be required to achieve greater racial balance in our schools?	137	350	70	25
6. Do you favor lifting all legal restrictions on marijuana to permit marketing of marijuana in the same manner as tobacco?	216	305	32	39

Mr. Speaker, the questionnaire also contained a question 7 in which those surveyed were invited to suggest other subjects which they felt were of equal or great importance. Only 60 out of 565 considered that other issues were of equal or greater importance—including 33 who mentioned Vietnam, 30 who referred to the existing Illinois 18-year-old drinking law, six who mentioned the economy—inflation, unemployment, poverty, 15 who referred to the existing laws on abortion, and 11 who raised the question of taxes, as well as a few who referred to other issues.

Mr. Speaker, a survey of the members of this body might result in differences of opinion on at least some of the issues upon which these young citizens were polled. However, the differences can be measured in percentage points and not in any diametric opposition to the views which these young Americans have expressed.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I interpret accurately the trend of thinking in this nation in support of respect and concern for those issues which are prominent in the minds of young Americans. Surely, in many instances we can sense a lack of perspective or a need for moderation of positions which many of our young citizens have taken. On the other hand, the results of the survey conducted by my Young Citizens' Advisory Council, and my own observations, establish that there is already a great deal of balance and good judgment being expressed by those who may be voting for the first time in this fall's election.

Mr. Speaker, it seems most significant to note that a substantial majority of these young citizens are opposed to the legalizing of marihuana.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting also to note, that an extremely high percentage of the young students favor an expanded student exchange program—including foreign study programs of American students.

It would seem well for those of us in the Congress to ponder the overall results of this meaningful survey conducted by young citizens—among young citizens—on issues of concern to them—and to all Americans.

McGOVERN: GAINING IN STATURE

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the announcement by AFL-CIO president, George Meany, that his organization will remain neutral in this year's Presidential election has led some observers to predict that McGovern will lose both union money and union votes. It is becoming increasingly clear that these predictions suffer from what Vice President Agnew has termed "instant analysis."

Despite Mr. Meany's influential position among labor unions, he has been unable to prevent a large number of union leaders from bucking his neutral dictum and supporting Senator McGovern for President.

On August 14, 25 unions in the AFL-CIO publicly announced the formation of a national labor committee to work for the election of George McGovern.

Included among these unions were such important groups as the American Federation of Teachers, the International Union of Electrical Workers, the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, the International Association of Machinists, and the Newspaper Guild.

Despite their individual differences of opinion, all of these unions are united in their opposition to President Nixon. As Joseph Beirne, president of the 300,000 member Communications Workers of America, has said:

> We recognize a 12 year record in the Senate that is rated 93 percent right by COPE and that's a damned good record compared with President Nixon's zero-minus record.

It is ridiculous to assume that labor will remain neutral in a presidential election. They are fully aware of the difference between the Democratic and Republican Party. Despite their objections to a few of McGovern's programs, they know that he will better represent their interests than the present incumbent.

Under President Nixon's leadership the working man's wage has been frozen, while the cost of living has continued to soar. At the same time the corporate share of the Federal tax burden is decreasing. It was 35 percent in 1960 and it is estimated that it will fall to 26 percent in fiscal 1972. This of course means that a greater and greater share of the tax burden is being placed on the shoulders of the working men and women of this country.

The repudiation of Meany's policy of neutrality should not be viewed as a repudiation of the man himself. As one California labor executive put it:

> We in the labor movement have the greatest regard for George Meany.... But this time he is wrong. Can labor survive four more years of Nixon?

In the weeks ahead, more and more labor leaders will be answering that question.

At this point in the Record I insert three articles from the August 7 Solano and Napa County Labor Journal.

STATE CARPENTER LEADERS FOR McGOVERN

"But this he (George Meany) is wrong. Can labor survive four more years of Nixon?" With that the two top executives of California State Council of Carpenters last week released a statement calling the attention of all carpenters in the state that "Nixon must be defeated and McGovern must be elected if America is to move forward toward the solution of the problems that are tearing this nation apart."

The following is the statement released by Council President Gordon A. McCulloch and Executive Secretary-Treasurer Anthony Ramos:

"For the past three years, elected officials of the labor movement and the labor press have continuously pointed out the urgent necessity of removing Richard Nixon in the 1972 Presidential election.

"On the basic issues of reducing unemployment, controlling inflation, eliminating poverty, rebuilding our cities, ending the war in Vietnam—the Nixon administration has failed miserably.

"None has been more outspoken in his criticism of the Nixon administration than AFL-CIO President George Meany.

"Now Brother Meany has changed his mind. With the field narrowed down to Nixon or McGovern, Brother Meany's position is that the AFL-CIO should remain neutral.

"We in the labor movement have the greatest regard for George Meany. He has led the fight against the monstrous inequities of the so-called wage-price freeze. He spearheaded the opposition to Nixon's attempt to place outrageously unqualified nominees on the U.S. Supreme Court. He has thrown the support of organized labor behind the fight for consumer protection, for equal opportunity under the Civil Rights Act and for protection of the environment.

"But this time he is wrong. Can labor survive four more years of Nixon?

"While it is true that Senator McGovern has made wrong decisions in the past on some issues important to labor and while it is not to be expected that all labor leaders are going to agree with all of his programs, there is no question in our minds that his overall program will aim to serve the needs of working people, as contrasted to the trickledown, 'What's good for big business is good for the nation,' economic theories of Mr. Nixon.

"Nixon must be defeated and McGovern must be elected if America is to move forward toward the solution of the problems that are tearing this nation apart."

STATE BUILDING TRADES CALL FOR DEFEAT OF NIXON

A resolution calling for the defeat of President Nixon in the November 7 general election won the unanimous approval of more than 400 delegates taking part in the 46th Annual Convention of the State Building and Construction Trades Council of California in San Diego last week.

The resolution, which put the Council "on record as endorsing the defeat of Richard M. Nixon," charged Nixon and his administration with:

Deliberately adopting policies and actions that doubled unemployment.

Taking direct action against all workers by holding back wage increases negotiated in legal collective bargaining contracts.

Conducting "a deliberate policy of character assassination of public officials who support the program of organized labor."

Vetoing "every decent piece of social legislation passed by the Congress."

Manipulating the Department of Justice so that more than 200 labor officials were charged with what the resolution termed "contrived violations of federal laws."

The delegates also adopted a resolution opposing the California Coastline Initiative to appear on the November ballot.

James S. Lee, the Council's president, said that the Building Trades have historically supported sound, reasonable and realistic environmental legislation.

But the problem is that many advocates of ecology and conservation movements have adopted a zero growth philosophy and this philosophy tends to ignore the job needs of workers as well as other human and property rights, he said.

The Building Trades Council's resolution opposing the Coastline Initiative said:

It urged all union members to vote against the initiative.

John F. Henning, executive officer of the California Labor Federation warned the delegates that "a Nixon sweep in California would inevitably mean a return of the Assembly and Senate to Republican party control."

"Unfortunately," he said, "conservatives would dominate the Republican legislative bodies . . .

"A Nixon sweep in California would be disastrous for the labor movement of the State," he declared.

In other actions, the building trades delegates:

Called for enactment of a state law to abolish the Division of Labor Law Enforcement, the agency responsible for collecting wages employers have refused to pay their workers. It charged that the division has deteriorated into a "do nothing body" that is "nothing more than a sham and a waste of the taxpayers' money." Instead, it supported a plan to place the collection of wages and fringe benefits under the jurisdiction of civil courts.

Called on the AFL-CIO National Building Trades Department to develop a new policy to resolve jurisdictional work disputes between building and construction trades unions.

Reelected Lee of Painters Local 595, Van Nuys, and J. J. Twombley of Operating Engineers Local 12 as president and secretary-treasurer respectively, and elected Ray Mendoza of Hod Carriers, Building and General Laborers Local 542 in Los Angeles to be the Council's Executive Board in District 3.

AMALGAMATED CLOTHING WORKERS OF AMERICA—WE BACK MCGOVERN FOR PRESIDENT

George McGovern is the Democratic Presidential nominee, and the Amalgamated and every other union must spare no effort to see that he is elected in November.

Nixon has brought the U.S. closer to economic collapse than any President since Herbert Hoover. In 1972 as in 1932 the majority of Americans are suffering because of a national administration oriented to big business. Now, as then, we've got to return America to its rightful owners.

Today, the corporate share of the federal tax burden is decreasing. It was 35 per cent in 1960, and it is estimated it will fall to 26 per cent in fiscal 1972. This means the public's share of the tax burden has been increasing.

The federal tax structure is rigged against income from work, and in favor of unearned income. There is a triple standard that government applies to income taxes.

One standard applies to wages and salaries. This income is taxed in full.

A second standard applies to income from stocks, real estate and other so-called capital assets sold at a profit.

A third standard is applied to some incomes which never appear on the tax form—interest on state and local bonds, the income that is washed out by phantom costs as oil depletion, fast depreciation write-offs, and bookkeeping farm losses. This type of income escapes taxation completely.

According to I. W. Abel, Chairman of the AFL-CIO Economic Policy Committee, in testimony to Democratic Platform Hearings, there has been a massive shift in income distribution—from low and middle-income people to big business and the wealthy. The unfair tax structure is part of it. The Phase 2 program that began Nov. 14, with the end of the freeze, is part of it. They are all of one piece—reflecting the Administration's view that economic progress begins and ends in the stock market and corporate financial reports. They reflect the Administration's view that the business of America is business.

The people around Nixon call McGovern a "radical" because he wants to reverse this trend. The business of America should be people, McGovern is saying, and we agree.

For the last 100 years or so we've been victims of the trickle-down theory—make businessmen rich, the theory goes, and enough will trickle down to the workers to keep them happy.

It's time to start the "trickle-up" theory of prosperity. This theory says that if there is full employment at decent wages, then businessmen will make profits because people will have money to buy. Businessmen are clever enough to find ways to make a profit. But the first consideration should be to the welfare of most of the people.

At no time in the last 100 years have we had such a significant opportunity to reverse the priorities of our government and put the people first. This is why the election of McGovern is so important and why we must use all of our resources to win in November.

ANOTHER TRAGIC RESULT OF OVERSIZE VEHICLES

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, no one needs to be an expert on the laws of physics to feel uneasy when a huge truck or bus approaches him on the highway. The danger is a fact of life, and has been documented. According to a 1968 report by the Federal Highway Administration, the heavier commercial vehicles constitute 7 percent of the Nation's registered motor vehicles, account for 11 percent of the total vehicle miles traveled, and are involved in 19 percent of highway fatalities.

Also known to practically every driver is the fact that blast and suction effects created by these massive vehicles can cause marked instability in cars overtaking or being overtaken by them.

Some may discount the danger of trucks and buses that push the limits of safety by their size alone, feeling that their turbulence rarely causes accidents. However, when such a tragic accident happens, the victims derive little comfort from being told that their plight is unusual.

On Interstate 80, in Henry County, Ill., July 21, another such accident happened. The report reads as follows:

Driver of Unit No. 1 stated she had just passed a unit and was about to pull back into right lane of traffic when she looked into the rear-view mirror and saw a commercial type bus passing her on the right side. As the bus went by it caused a vacuum between the two units and unit one lost control and tipped over in the median. Unit No. 2 did not stop.

Bleeding wounds were inflicted upon two of the car's three occupants. I am sure all three occupants would agree that other travelers should be spared the horrible experience, and that we are not at present doing nearly enough to protect them.

AIRLINERS IN NEAR MISS OVER TOKYO

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I have previously called attention to the possibility of a "Titanic of the air" through continued absence of collision avoidance systems throughout the airline industry. and the lack of resolution on the part of the FAA in that regard. Such a tragedy almost occurred recently over Japan, as the following article indicates. If it had not been avoided people would have immediately and justifiably called both governments to account for failure to require the incorporation of technology that has existed for years, technology such as McDonnell Douglas EROS system which would have prevented this near miss and a number of fatal collisions in the recent past. The FAA should move collision avoidance another notch up in priority, and work more expeditiously with the world's airlines to insure passenger safety. Comparisons in cost between accidents of the dimension of the one described and a national program of collision avoidance are noted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 118, part II, page 23846.

Herewith follows the article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star and Daily News on August 4, 1972:

PAN AM, JAPANESE JETLINERS IN NEAR-MISS OVER TOKYO

TOKYO.—Pan American and Japan Air Lines 747 jumbo jetliners passed between 100 to 200 feet of each other in the skies near Tokyo Wednesday, endangering the lives of 501 passengers and crewmen, the Japanese Ministry of Transportation reported yesterday.

It said the near-miss occurred at 7:26 p.m. (6:26 a.m. EDT) at about 4,000 feet over Chiba, across Tokyo Bay from Tokyo International Airport.

A ministry spokesman identified the Boeing 747S and Pan Am Flight 820, which had just taken off for Honolulu with 343 passengers and 7 crew members, and JAL Flight 942, en route from Guam to Tokyo with 122 passengers and a crew of 19.

(A Pan Am spokesman in New York identified its pilot as Capt. Kevin Keith and quoted him as saying the two planes were at least 1,000 feet apart when they passed. He said Keith reported he saw the other plane approaching as he was climbing out and made a turn "purely as a precautionary measure.")

INSURING A FREE COMPETITIVE PRESS

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1972, a report was submitted to the Economic Analysis Division, Planning and Marketing Department of the U.S. Postal Service, entitled "A Study of the Demand for Advertising, Newspapers, and Magazine Mail." This report reflects the new approach of the U.S. Postal Service to maximize rates and revenues. The recent decision of the nine governors of the U.S. Postal Service to increase the postal service rates for second-class mail reemphasizes the new attitude of the Postal Service.

The new rate formula is very complicated since it involves differing rates on editorial and advertising material, with distinctions made for distance of delivery as well as a per piece surcharge. Although the overall average increase is 127 percent, this figure is very deceptive. The new increase of second-class postal service rates will affect our Nation's various newspapers and magazines to varying degrees. In many cases, particularly with the smaller publications, the postal rates will actually be an increase of several hundred percent over pre-1971 rates.

Generally speaking, the new increase will be relatively larger for small newspapers and magazines. These publications provide our Nation with the most effective means of expressing controversy, dissent, criticism, and minority viewpoints. They provide the public with a free flow of ideas and opinions which is indispensable to the integrity and vitality of democratic institutions.

In 1787 Thomas Jefferson recognized the vital role played by these small publications when he stated:

> The basis of our government being the opinion of the people, the very first object should be to keep that right; and were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter. But I should mean that every man should receive those papers and be capable of reading them.

I believe the U.S. Postal Service has an obligation to the well-being of the American people. In 1901 the then Postmaster General, Charles E. Smith, said:

> Our free institutions rest on popular intelligence, and it has from the beginning been our fixed and enlightened policy to foster and promote the general diffusion of public information. Congress has wisely framed the postal laws with this just and liberal conception. It has uniformly sought to encourage intra-communication and the exchange of intelligence.

I do not believe that this recent increase which would economically intimidate a vast portion of our country's independent journals would be consistent with the policy outlined by Mr. Smith. Indeed I believe it would be a disservice to the American people and a threat to our democratic institutions.

I believe that the free flow of opinions and information on the public level is seriously threatened by the recent increase of postal service rates.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would reiterate the traditional congressional support for the dissemination of news, information, and opinions through the mails. This legislation was introduced on June 28, 1972, by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, the Honorable GAYLORD NELSON.

This bill would amend section 101(a) of title 39 of the United States Code by adding that "the Postal Service shall also be obligated to provide postal services at rates which will encourage and support the widest possible dissemination of news, opinions, scientific, cultural, and educational matter."

The bill would freeze the second-class postal rates at the level of June 1, 1972, for the first 250,000 issues of papers and magazines sent through the mails. Any increases in postal rates on editorial content for issues over the 250,000 ceiling would be phased in over a 10-year period.

Finally, this legislation would expressly write into law the longstanding congressional policy that the postal service shall not apply per piece surcharges on individual issues of second-class publications. These per piece surcharges place an unequal burden upon the smallest, lightest weight publications.

The Postal Service clearly needs more revenue. But it cannot be permitted to impose a rate increase which will drive hundreds of marginal publications out of business and reduce the quality of those that remain.

Mr. Speaker, economic censorship can destroy the free press just as effectively as political censorship. It is the responsibility of Congress to safeguard the public well-being by assuring the continuing existence of a free, competitive press.

THE APPROPRIATION BILLS OF THE SESSION

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, for the information of Members and others, I am including a table on the appropriation bills as they stand today with respect to the current fiscal year 1973. The table which I am including refers to new budget spending authority in the appropriation bills for 1973.

SUPPLEMENTALS, 1972

At this session, in respect to the fiscal year 1972 which ended last June 30, the Congress considered four supplemental measures and, in those four measures, appropriated a total of $7,105,174,329, representing a net reduction below the President's budget requests considered in those measures of $418,245,119.

In respect to the current fiscal year 1973, the table shows the totals including the vetoed Labor-HEW bill, and the totals excluding the vetoed Labor-HEW bill.

HOUSE ACTIONS

Omitting the vetoed Labor-HEW bill—for which a new bill must be formulated—House actions to date on the appropriation bills for 1973 are as follows:

Budget requests considered	$56,145,266,099
Approved	55,365,860,309
Net reduction in these bills	−779,405,790

In addition to the $28.8 billion of budget requests involved in the Labor-HEW appropriation bill, the House also has for consideration approximately $92 billion of appropriation requests to consider in connection with regular bills not yet reported, namely, Defense; Military Construction; and Foreign Assistance; and a closing supplemental bill.

SENATE ACTIONS

Omitting the vetoed Labor-HEW bill—for which a new bill must be formulated—Senate actions to date on the appropriation bills for 1973 are as follows:

Budget requests considered	$56,339,149,994
Approved	57,467,671,344
Net increase in these bills	+1,128,521,350

CLEARED TO THE PRESIDENT

Again omitting the vetoed Labor-HEW bill, the 10 other bills for 1973 cleared to the President involve the following totals:

Budget requests considered	$51,634,823,394
Approved	51,957,078,075
Net increase in these bills	+322,254,681

PENDING FINALIZATION

In addition to the $28.8 billion of budget requests to be reconsidered in connection with a new Labor-HEW appropriation bill, the Congress has yet to finalize action on about $97 billion in budget requests involved in the State, Justice, Commerce, and judiciary appropriation bill, now in conference; the foreign assistance bill; the defense bill; the military construction bill; and the closing supplemental bill.

FINAL SESSION OUTLOOK

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated on the House floor earlier this week, when the work is all done this fall and we complete all the appropriation bills for fiscal year 1973, I would not be at all surprised if the House has not provided, in total, something materially below the total of the budget requests considered in the 1973 appropriation bills. I refer only to the annual appropriation bills. And I refer only to the House.

But even in respect to final action by the Congress on the annual appropriation bills for 1973, when we consider all the measures which will be before us, it now seems to me that we might very well be, in total, about even, or perhaps a few hundred million dollars below the related budget requests.

Mr. Speaker, I include the table referred to:

NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY IN THE APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR 1973 (REVISED TO AUGUST 18, 1972)

[Note: As to fiscal year 1973 amounts only]

Bill	Budget request considered	Approved	Change, (+) or (−)
IN THE HOUSE			
1. Legislative	$433,627,004	$427,604,764	−$6,022,240
2. State-Justice-Commerce Judiciary	4,687,988,600	4,587,104,350	−100,884,250
3. HUD-Space-Science-Veterans	20,173,185,000	19,718,490,000	−454,695,000
4. Transportation	2,909,181,095	2,791,614,095	−117,567,000
Advance 1974 appropriation	(131,181,000)	(131,181,000)	
5. District of Columbia (Federal funds)	343,306,000	332,306,000	−11,000,000
6. Labor-HEW (H.R. 15417, Vetoed)	[27,327,323,500]	[28,603,179,500]	[+1,275,856,000]
7. Labor-HEW (New bill)			
8. Interior	2,520,340,000	2,529,558,200	+9,218,200
9. Treasury-Postal Service-General Government	5,066,603,000	5,057,145,000	−9,458,000
10. Public Works—AEC	5,489,058,000	5,437,727,000	−51,331,000
11. Agriculture—Environmental and Consumer Protection	12,952,177,400	12,897,010,900	−55,166,500
12. Disaster Relief Supplemental, 1973	1,569,800,000	1,587,300,000	+17,500,000
13. Defense	(79,594,184,000)		
14. Military Construction	(2,661,384,000)		
15. Foreign Assistance	(5,163,024,000)		
16. Supplemental, 1973			
Total, House bills (as passed)	83,472,589,599	83,969,039,809	+496,450,210
Less: Vetoed Labor-HEW bill	27,327,323,500	28,603,179,500	+1,275,856,000
Total, House bills (excl. Labor-HEW)	56,145,266,099	55,365,860,309	−779,405,790
IN THE SENATE			
1. Legislative	519,347,899	514,722,880	−4,625,019
2. HUD-Space-Science-Veterans	20,258,183,000	20,583,370,000	+325,187,000
3. District of Columbia (Federal funds)	343,306,000	313,706,000	−29,600,000
4. State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary	4,704,326,600	4,820,717,769	+116,391,169
5. Transportation	2,909,181,095	2,906,994,095	−2,187,000
Advance 1974 appropriation	(131,181,000)	(131,181,000)	
6. Treasury-Postal Service-General Government	5,066,603,000	5,057,186,000	−9,417,000
7. Labor-HEW (H.R. 15417, Vetoed)	(28,776,633,500)	(31,354,930,500)	(+2,578,297,000)
8. Labor-HEW (New bill)			
9. Interior	2,527,154,000	2,550,922,800	+23,768,800
10. Public Works-AEC	5,489,058,000	5,571,696,000	+82,638,000
11. Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Portection	$12,952,190,400	$13,561,055,800	+$608,865,400
12. Disaster Relief Supplemental, 1973	1,569,800,000	1,587,300,000	+17,500,000
13. Defense			
14. Military Construction			
15. Foreign Assistance			
16. Supplemental, 1973			
Total, Senate bills (as passed)	85,115,783,494	88,822,601,844	+3,706,818,350
Less: Vetoed Labor-HEW bill	28,776,633,500	31,354,930,500	+2,578,297,000
Total, Senate bills (excl. Labor-HEW)	56,339,149,994	57,467,671,344	+1,128,521,350
ENACTED			
1. Legislative	519,347,899	513,787,980	−5,559,919
2. Treasury-Postal Service-General Government	5,066,603,000	5,057,827,000	−8,776,000
3. District of Columbia (Federal funds)	343,306,000	316,393,000	−26,913,000
4. Interior	2,527,154,000	2,548,935,300	+21,781,300
5. HUD-Space-Science-Veterans	20,258,183,000	20,125,951,000	−132,232,000
6. Labor-HEW (H.R. 15417, Vetoed)	(28,776,633,500)	(30,538,919,500)	(+1,762,286,000)
7. Labor-HEW (New bill)			
8. Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection	12,952,190,400	13,434,032,700	+481,842,300
9. Public Works-AEC	5,489,058,000	5,504,914,000	+15,856,000
10. Transportation	2,909,181,095	2,867,937,095	−41,244,000
Advance 1974 appropriation	(131,181,000)	(131,181,000)	
11. Disaster Relief Supplemental, 1973	1,569,800,000	1,587,300,000	+17,500,000
12. State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary			
13. Defense			
14. Military Construction			
15. Foreign Assistance			
16. Supplemental, 1973			
Total, bills enacted (as sent to President)	80,411,456,894	82,495,997,575	+2,084,540,681
Less: Vetoed Labor-HEW bill	28,776,633,500	30,538,919,500	+1,762,286,000
Total, bills enacted (excl. Labor-HEW)	5', 634,823,394	51,957,078,075	+322,254,681

Prepared August 18, 1972, in the House Committee on Appropriations.

COMPREHENSIVE BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. Speaker, I again add that the foregoing table relates only to the annual appropriation bills. Those bills do not encompass all actions—or inactions—that have an impact on the budget recommendations. In that connection, I would again call attention to the periodic budget "scorekeeping" reports issued by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures. These reports are designed to keep tabs, currently, on what is happening in the legislative process to the budget recommendations of the President, both appropriationwise and expenditurewise, and on the revenue recommendations, and not only from actions in the revenue and appropriation bills but also in legislative bills that affect budget authority and expenditures—backdoor bills, bills that mandate expenditures, and so on.

I should say that the budget has been seriously breached by three or four nonappropriation bills this year.

Several of these scorekeeping reports have been issued this year. The latest will be available sometime next week. Copies are sent to the office of each Member.

LES ASPIN'S FIGHT FOR TAX REFORM

HON. ADLAI E. STEVENSON III

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, few Members of the 92d Congress have fought more vigorously and effectively for the public interest than LES ASPIN, of Wisconsin's First District. This is all the more remarkable when one considers that Representative ASPIN is serving his first term and is one of the youngest Members of Congress.

One of LES ASPIN'S most significant achievements has been his leadership in the House in the fight to eliminate special tax bills creating loopholes for special interest groups, commonly called Members' bills. His successful effort in stopping more than a dozen special interest "Members' bills" from being passed by the House constitute one of the most important tax reforms of the 92d Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD two newspaper articles detailing Representative ASPIN'S leadership in the fight to make our tax system fairer and more progressive. The first article appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on March 1, 1972. The second article was published in the Christian Science Monitor on April 20, 1972.

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

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Mar. 1, 1972]

ASPIN ACTION BLOCKS SPECIAL INTEREST BILLS

(By Frank A. Aukofer)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Rep. Les Aspin (D-Wis.) teamed up with Rep. Wright Patman (D-Tex.) Tuesday to block House action on a group of special interest tax bills.

"Some of them were clearly just incredible boondoggles for people in particular situations," Aspin said. "No wonder our tax laws are just like Swiss cheese with these coming in here like this. The whole process stinks anyway."

He was referring to a long standing House procedure under which so called "members' bills"—that is, bills requested by individual members to deal with specific tax inequities—are brought to the House floor and acted on by unanimous consent.

USUALLY PASSED

In the past, Rep. Wilbur Mills (D-Ark.), chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, simply introduced the bills and explained them briefly. They were considered passed if no one objected.

Aspin, with substantial advice from Rep.

Henry Reuss (D-Wis.), started the move against the bills over the weekend. On Monday, he sent a letter to Mills.

"We are being asked to unanimously pass 22 tax bills, only one of which would actually increase revenue, and 14 of which we believe are unjustified," Aspin wrote Mills. "Passage of these bills under the unanimous consent rule will make our expressed concern for tax reform appear hypocritical."

Mills argued that it would be impractical to suggest hearings on bills of this type because, he said, their impact was so narrow.

Rep. John Byrnes (R-Wis.), senior Republican member of the committee, backed Mills.

Aspin received support from Patman, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, when he pointed out that one of the bills involved a $70 million tax break for banks. Patman is a foe of high interest rates and special treatment for banks.

Patman objected to two of the bills, Aspin objected to one. Reuss spoke against another, and four passed. Then Mills gave up and announced that he would not attempt to introduce the others.

Aspin said the worst bills were among those not brought up. One would have changed the method of taxing cigars to give the cigar industry a $9 million tax break this year and a $21 million break next year. Another would have temporarily suspended tariffs on olives to help that industry—at a cost of $3 million.

GAMBLERS COVERED

Among those that passed was a bill which, among other things, would prevent the government from disclosing information about persons who paid a federal gambling tax.

Aspin said he believed eight of the 22 bills were worthwhile. The rest, he said, favored special interests.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 20, 1972]

TAX REFORM IGNITES IN CONGRESS

(By David B. Francis)

WASHINGTON.—Cigarmakers saw a special tax break blow up in their faces Monday.

"Congress has gotten the message that the taxpayer is fed up with expensive tax loopholes for the rich and special interest groups," commented Rep. Les Aspin (D) of Wisconsin, the congressman who led the successful fight against the cigar bill in the House of Representatives.

Under an old tradition, members of the House Ways and Means Committee have pushed through the House without hearings and little or no debate various minor tax bills that often have given sizable tax benefits to private interests.

Such bills are called "members' bills" because they are sponsored by members of the Ways and Means Committee.

HR 3544 was such a bill. It would reduce the excise tax on cigars by $120 million between now and 1979 and $21 million per year after that. It was sponsored by Democratic Rep. James A. Burke, whose Boston, Mass., district has some cigarmaking firms.

41 BILLS EMERGED

This was one of 41 members' bills that emerged from the Ways and Means Committee last October.

These bills are supposed to correct unintended inequities in the tax law. They are not supposed to change basic tax policies.

Tax reformers, however, contend that the bills sometimes amount to giveaways for various industries, corporations, or individuals.

For instance, HR 3544, according to the committee report on the bill, was intended to "make administration of the tax easier. . . ." It would have placed the tax on the wholesale price of cigars rather than the retail price. And it would have replaced a system of setting the tax according to price brackets with a simple 8.5 percent ad-valorem tax.

At the same time, however, the bill dramatically reduced the tax load. In defence, the committee report held that the cigar industry had a "relatively low" rate of return. It was said to be 9 percent on sales in 1970, a recession year. (Many other industies had lower profit levels that year.)

ROADBLOCK SET UP

On February 29, HR 3544 came up for a vote in the House along with 21 other members' bills. Normally, the rules of the House would have been suspended, and the bills would have zipped through without recorded vote.

However, a group of liberal Democrats led by Representative Aspin decided to stop the process. They objected to three bills, thereby blocking the "unanimous consent" of the House needed for suspension of the rules. Fifteen other bills were then withdrawn by their sponsors. Four passed without objection.

HR 3544 was one of the 15. Last Thursday it was put back on the legislative calendar for April 17.

Immediately Mr. Aspin sent a letter to members of the House stating: "At a time when tax reform has become one of the most important issues in the country, I find it incredible that we are being asked to approve a blatant $120 million tax break for the cigar industry without the benefit of committee hearings and without the right to offer amendments to the bill on the floor."

LOBBYING PARTNERS

Mr. Aspin was joined in the lobbying against the bill by Common Cause, Americans for Democratic Action, and Ralph Nader's tax-reform research group.

In a letter to Rep. Wilbur D. Mills (D) of Arkansas, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Albert H. Turkus of the Nader group wrote: "It seems ironic that, on the very day when millions of taxpayers will be completing their struggle to comply with their obligations under the internal revenue code, you and the members of the Committee on Ways and Means will be asking the House to enact this special-interest tax cut."

On Monday the bill was again withdrawn.

The tax reformers saw an important victory. They figured it was withdrawn because it would not have obtained the necessary two-thirds vote for passage under suspension of the rules.

"Congress is not likely to pass any more loopholes—at least for a while," said Mr. Aspin. He figures most representatives don't want to vote for anything that could be regarded as a loophole.

REBUTTAL GIVEN

A key staff member of the Ways and Means Committee, however, held that it was withdrawn because Mr. Mills was in New York making speeches and would not be on the floor to handle it. He held there should be no problem in passing it.

Representative Burke, in a telephone interview, said it was withdrawn because of "some inaccurate information" sent out by Mr. Aspin.

Mr. Burke dispatched a rebuttal to the Aspin charges Saturday in a letter to members. But he held members would have had inadequate time to consider it before the vote on Monday.

In defense of the bill, Mr. Burke held that increased sales of cigars, stimulated by the tax cut, might have reduced or eliminated any revenue losses.

An aide of Mr. Aspin noted that they were using revenue losses estimated by the Treasury that were based on assumption of constant sales.

DEBATE ABOUT INDUSTRY

Mr. Burke argued that the bill would have ended an unfair and regressive tax system on cigarmakers. He said the ad valorem system would help those making cheap cigars.

In reply, Mr. Aspin's aide said they would have had no objection to the bill if it changed the taxation system without reducing revenue. Indeed, it was noted, the tax could be made progressive—that is taxing expensive cigars more than cheap ones.

Mr. Burke said the industry had dropped from some 15,000 producers some 30 years ago to about 200 today and needed help.

This decline, according to the Aspin Staffer, was largely due to the arrival of automation in the cigarmaking industry.

Mr. Burke said his bill will be reintroduced at a later time. Mr. Aspin said he will again fight it.

To the tax reformers, the most significant aspect of the dispute is that it has occurred. Tax reform has become a popular issue.

So much so, indeed, that the Nixon administration may be advocating its own tax-reform program soon. The Treasury's top tax-policy official, Edwin S. Cohen, has a major speech scheduled for April 29 in Boston, preceded the day before by a press conference here. He is expected to make a major announcement on the question of tax reform.

It is not considered likely that any major tax reform will be proposed for this year. But, it is speculated, Mr. Cohen may announce a program for next year. This would presumably take some of the political steam out of the tax-reform proposals being ballyhooed by the various Democratic presidential candidates.

REGULATION TO OBLIVION

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion the last few years concerning the overcomplexity of government and the thousands of regulations which are put into effect every year. An article in the July 10 issue of Industry Week contains a warning of great importance to every elected official. The problem seems to be getting worse; not better. I am submitting for the RECORD a short section of the article in Industry Week:

REGULATION TO OBLIVION

Why not rules for government no less stringent than those it imposes on others? Under a Truth in Government Act we would see legislative labels like these:

"Caution: This legislative package contains unknown costs and may have unforseen consequences."

"Contents: This program includes 78% administrative burden, 19% overhead, and 3% benefits."

"Warning: This regulatory action may be hazardous to economic efficiency."

"Warranty: This law, if unsatisfactory within 12 months, will be cheerfully repealed and taxes reduced accordingly."

Or is it illogical to ask—if a deteriorating environment and rising pollution require government agencies to prepare a detailed environmental impact statement for each action—why a deteriorating economy and rising regulation ought not require a detailed economic impact statement?

For if we stand ready to turn over free markets and private enterprise to regulation, should we not then at least regulate the regulators?

REGULATION ESCALATION

The problem comes down to this: Rising foreign competition demands that our wealth, our resources, and our managerial skills be applied more efficiently and more effectively than ever before to increase economic growth.

Government itself agrees. Yet specious regulations which dissipate that wealth, constrain resources, and inhibit effective management action are escalating out of control.

During the 91st Congress, 20,000 bills were introduced in the House and 4,600 in the Senate. Some 3,000 bills were introduced during 1971 on pollution alone, truly a legislative avalanche.

Yet consider that just one regulatory agency—the Occupational Safety & Health Administration—during that same first year of its existence laid down 15,000 commandments and is readying 15,000 more.

We could find no one in government, including the Office of Management & Budget, who even knows how many agencies exist with such regulatory authority—let alone how many regulations were promulgated during 1971. But there are dozens of regulatory agencies which directly affect industry, and the Federal Register in which their regulations are promulgated bulged to 25,497 pages last year.

The Encyclopaedia Britannica contains only 28,715 pages.

But were it not bad enough that we have cacophony and chaos when we need unity and purpose, the regulatory approach has demonstrated time and time again that it does not solve problems—but creates them.

DECISIONS BEYOND COMPUTATION

It seems obvious why this should be so. The function of the free market, as President John F. Kennedy observed a decade ago, is that of a decentralized regulator of our economic system. "The free market is not only a more efficient decisionmaker than even the wisest planning body," he continued, "but even more important, the free market keeps economic power widely dispersed. It is thus a vital underpinning of our democratic system."

DRU GODWIN, PAPERGIRL

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Albany, Ga., Junior College newspaper Mode there was an article written involving a fine young lady whom I have known for some time. This article deals with her part-time job which is, indeed, unusual for a young lady; but I believe it exemplifies young America at its finest. I present the article for the examination of the Members of the House:

HURRAY FOR WOMEN'S LIB! DRU GODWIN, "PAPERGIRL"

Being a paperboy isn't such an unusual job, but for Dru Godwin it is definitely different.

Dru, a 20 year-old Albany Junior College sophomore, has been "papergirl" on the Albany Herald route through Shoreham Apartments for over a month. So far her only problem has been people's constant kidding.

"I wanted to do something different after working in an office for four years." Dru laughs. "So I got this job!"

Starting on her daily route, Dru reaches into an Albany Herald carrier bag, pulls out a tightly-rolled newspaper and tosses it onto a second-floor Shoreham balcony. An elderly man on the route taught her to throw the papers underhanded during her first week. She estimates that after a month of practice she is on target at least 80 percent of the time.

Dru's 18 year-old brother, Kerry, who also attends Albany Junior College, was responsible for her getting the job. "He has been a paperboy for a long time," Dru explains as she continues on the route. "Kerry brings me my papers in the afternoons. I don't like to pick them up myself at the platform downtown—other paperboys really laugh at me there!"

Recalling an unusual reaction to her job, Dru tells of the ten-year-old girl who ran up to her on the route, saluted her, elatedly proclaiming, "Hurray for Women's Lib! Gloria Steinham can be proud of you!"

After half an hour, Dru folds up the empty Herald bag and starts back to her car. "You know, I'll miss this job when I transfer to the University of Georgia next fall. There aren't many jobs that permit you to wear blue jeans, a jersey, and tennis shoes. But then maybe the Athens paper will need an experienced papergirl . . ."

CENSORED MY LAI REPORTS REVEALED AFTER LONG FIGHT

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2½ years editors of the Daily Oklahoman newspaper of Oklahoma City have sought the release of several Army reports connected with the My Lai incident of 1968. The following article which appeared in the May 14, 1972, edition of the Oklahoman describes the accounts of the struggle which lead to the release of the information.

CENSORED MY LAI REPORTS REVEALED AFTER LONG FIGHT

(By Jack Taylor)

When the news of an atrocity committed by U. S. Troops in Vietnam began to unfold more than two years ago, the American public was deluged with confusing and conflicting reports, statements, evidence and testimony.

What happened at My Lai on that day in the Spring of 1968 would be unraveled, as best the Army could determine, at the hearings and courts-martial that would follow. But why it happened—the circumstances and contributing factors that made it possible—received far less attention, even from the Army.

By analyzing official records, some of which even the Army had not perused. The Daily Oklahoman has found new bits of information that throw new light on some parts of the most debated military controversy since the Dreyfus Affair.

On Dec. 1, 1969, The Daily Oklahoman requested records of the principal unit involved in the My Lai incident under an Army regulation directing release of information from Army records and files. That initiated a 2½-year struggle against Army censorship that included promises made and broken by Army officials, collisions with conflicting Army regulations, bureaucratic bungling and, finally, an appeal directly to the Secretary of the Army.

During the intervening months, Army spokesmen frequently said one thing and did another, censored information the Army already had made public and violated its own regulations—written expressly to forbid such secrecy.

Two weeks after the Army's adjutant general in Washington was asked for release of morning reports—the basic data recording a unit's history—the Army denied the request, citing two regulations "to preserve the privacy of individuals who may be prospective witnesses and to avoid prejudicing the rights of an accused . . ."

Information contained on morning reports, however, is largely statistical, and any narrative is limited to the bare essentials describing the death, injury, hospitalization, promotion, disciplining or transfer of individuals in the unit. And at the time of the Army's refusal to release those records, the names—as well as the comments—of dozens of witnesses already had received widespread publicity.

The Oklahoman then asked the Army for similar records of two other infantry companies in the same task force as the unit whose troops massacred the inhabitants of My Lai. But again the Army refused to release the information, citing the same justification.

More than a year passed while the Army convened an inquiry and courts-martial, filed and dismissed other charges and finally convicted one lieutenant.

When the court-martial of Lt. William L. Calley, the central figure in the tragedy, ended in conviction, the Army was asked on March 31, 1971, for morning reports of the three infantry companies and of a helicopter support company involved at My Lai, plus a copy of the full report of the Army investigative panel headed by Lt. Gen. William R. Peers.

Three weeks later, Maj. General Verne L. Bowers, who had succeeded Maj. Gen. Kenneth G. Wickham, the adjustant general who had first withheld the records, denied the latest request because other litigation was pending. He added, however, that the Army "intends to release" the requested records, including the Peers report, at the conclusion of the trials related to the massacre.

Just before Christmas last year, the last trial was concluded with the acquittal of Col. Oran K. Henderson, commander of the infantry brigade whose troops were involved. Henderson had been accused of participating in a cover-up of the incident.

A week later, on Dec. 28, the Daily Oklahoman renewed its request. Nearly two months passed before a postcard, dated Feb. 22, informed the paper that a reply could be expected within the next month—the first hint the Army might lift its lid of secrecy.

A telephone call determined that the Army had decided to release the morning reports and the delay was necessitated by strenuous censorship officials had decided to impose first.

Finally on March 8, Gen. Bowers wrote that the morning reports would be made available—after expunging certain information for reasons he failed to explain as required by his own regulations. He also reported that the Army, by then, had decided to withhold the Peers report, despite earlier promises to release it. He cited a section of the U.S. Code as justification.

The authority cited for withholding the Peers report is a law exempting public release of "investigatory files compiled for law enforcement purposes . . ." However, the memorandum directing the Peers inquiry specifically restricted the investigation from any such purpose.

The memorandum from then-Secretary of the Army Stanley R. Resor and Army Chief of Staff Gen. William C. Westmoreland directed Gen. Peers on Nov. 26, 1969, that "the

scope of your investigation does not include, nor will it interfere with, ongoing criminal investigations in progress."

In effect, the Army had used the same justification for withholding both the morning reports and the Peers report, then looked for other justification to withhold the Peers report when the initial reasoning was no longer sound.

The highly excised morning reports were finally released on April 10 by the Army personnel records center in St. Louis after the newspaper paid $289.55 for reproduction costs. The records reflected 401 separately censored items of information, all apparently designed to prevent an invasion of personal privacy of individuals mentioned in the reports. Virtually every entry except routine transfers was censored.

However, some censored information—such as names of soldiers killed in action—already had been made public. In fact, the Army routinely releases weekly KIA lists that actually contain more personal information, such as the name and address of next of kin, than is ever included in a morning report entry.

In other examples, particularly involving reductions in rank, the Army censored the narrative but left the individual's names, rank and service number, and ignored the strength figures which would pinpoint just such a reduction by the change in figures listed by each rank.

And in one case, the Army left untouched two paragraphs of an Americal Division special order attached to one morning report which included a more detailed accounting of the very information officials were censoring on the basic document. In this case, two men in a signal battalion were reduced in rank or fined for misconduct.

These were minor examples of how the Army's penchant for secrecy sometimes leads to censoring material already released in some other way.

Another, more serious example, is in the heavily censored summary of the Peers report was made public. In it, one category expunged was the numbers and distribution of allied and enemy troop strength and the numbers of maneuver battalions at the time of My Lai. Yet in Gen. Westmoreland's "Report on the War in Vietnam," written when he left there to become Army chief of staff in mid-1968, not only is troop strength for the same period liberally reported, but a map even pinpoints the location of each maneuver battalion.

That report is sold to the public by the U.S. Government Printing Office for $6.

The House Armed Services Investigating Subcommittee, which conducted its own inquiry into the My Lai incident, inclued in its final report several citations from tactical operations journals. Yet the Army says these are currently classified as Confidential and unavailable to the public without a declassification review. That report also is sold to the public by the government printing office, for 50 cents.

A nine-page appeal for the full copy of the Peers report and for the information expunged from the morning reports has been forwarded to Secretary of the Army Robert F. Froehlke. The Oklahoman is citing 23 reasons under federal law and three different Army regulations why the information should be released.

The secretary also has been asked in the event the appeal is denied, that in accordance with another Army regulation he explain fully in writing the justification for withholding the Peers report and for continued secrecy on each of the 401 censored items on the morning reports.

Copies of the appeal, with cover letters requesting intervention on behalf of releasing the information, were sent to 80 members of Congress—members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senate and House Armed Services Committees and the Oklahoma congressional delegation, as well as to the Freedom of Information Committee of Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalistic society, the Associated Press Managing Editors Association and the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

TELEPHONE PRIVACY—XXXVI

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 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 34th 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:

JULY 20, 1972.

U.S. Representative LES ASPIN.

DEAR SIR: Upon reading an article in the Chicago Tribune, "Action Express," I understand you have a bill, HR-14884 introduced, that would keep solicitors from phoning their wares at the expense of our wearing nerves.

My wife and I are both bothered constantly every day by those hucksters who push their resorts and wares upon us. We would like the phone to be kept for the purpose it was intended for, that's why we have our number listed so that others with a purpose, besides selling, would be able to reach us. But it seems these hucksters use the phone list to hound people, and that is what we do not want.

I do hope you get your bill through, we're with you, keep up the good work.

We hope your bill is adopted, maybe our nerves will settle down again.

If your bill is passed, please see that it gets in print so that we can be notified and take action with the Illinois Bell Telephone company to get on their list or an asterisk before our name.

Thank you, and good luck. I remain.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

DEAR SIRS: I am not much for writing, but I am for getting this bill passed.

——— ———.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.
August 9, 1972.

Re Bill H.R. 14884.
Representative LEE ASPIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I sincerely hope this bill will be passed and an asterisk placed beside the names of people who don't want to be bothered with calls from different companies.

I do not like to have to resort to an unlisted number to get relief from these calls because I have 3 children and a husband who has to travel with his work and in case of an emergency I would want people to be able to reach me, also people from out of town.

When I was recuperating from a long illness I often slept during the day and those phone calls are so annoying. I feel sorry for shift workers and people with babies who are disturbed by these senseless calls and also for the elderly who have difficulty getting to the phone.

I would never buy from someone over the phone or make an appointment with them. I don't like this type of selling.

I think too if this bill passes, anyone calling people who indicate they don't want to be bothered should be guilty of making a nuisance call.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

WARRENVILLE, ILL.

Bravo! I like your bill re: controlling nuisance calls. I'd like a star next to my name. Thank you!

——— ———.

WE NEED OUR STATE MARITIME ACADEMIES

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, for many years our State maritime academies have acted as invaluable sources of merchant marine officer power.

They are to the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point what ROTC and OCS are to Annapolis and West Point. They turn out high quality, broadly educated merchant marine officers at relatively low cost.

In these days of antimilitary feeling among our most promising young men, the maritime academies serve an additional purpose: They provide a way for a bright young man to begin a seagoing profession without compromising any reservations he may have about military or foreign policy.

These maritime academies are entering a financial crisis which may prove overwhelming if increased Federal support is not forthcoming. Federal assistance has remained constant in terms of dollars, but costs have gone up with the general inflation. The result is that only 17 percent of the budget of the California academy is provided by the Federal Government.

I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a portion of a fascinating article

on the academies, which appeared in the June issue of the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings. The article, entitled "Our Imperiled State Maritime Academies," by Capt. William B. Hayler, is most impressive. I hope my colleagues will read it, and as a result become favorably inclined toward increased funding for these academies.

OUR IMPERILED STATE MARITIME ACADEMIES

(By Captain William B. Hayler, U.S. Navy (Retired))

This country has a tremendous asset in its six state maritime academies. These schools are a very small part of the nation's higher education picture, and are little known and less understood. They are, however, a vital source of trained officers for the U.S. merchant marine, and an important secondary source of officers for the naval reserve.

Indeed, it was a naval officer who provided the stimulus for the founding of a nautical college which would improve the quality of the U.S. merchant marine officer. Admiral Stephen B. Luce founded the Naval War College, but perhaps more important was his service to his country in lobbying to assist in the passage of the "Maritime Schools Act," which became law in 1874. This Act encouraged the establishment of maritime schools and authorized the U.S. Navy to assign officers and training ships to them.

The most important rationale for the continuance of the state maritime academy retaining its role in the education of merchant marine officers stems from one of Alfred Thayer Mahan's reasons for a nation becoming a seapower. The national character of a people, he felt, was one factor upon which seapower is built. So, also, he argued, must the people have an instinct for commerce and an aptitude for the sea. Maine is the best example of a state which has a seagoing heritage, and the presence of Maine Academy midshipmen at home on visits becomes a source of regional pride and serves to stimulate an interest in the sea which might otherwise diminish. In addition, it appears that the state academy graduate generally maintains his home ties and ultimately returns home to live. Consequently, the paycheck of the state academy graduate probably will find its way to his parent state for a long time to come. At the present time, about 55% of all academy-trained officers sailing from California ports are graduates of the California Maritime Academy—adding considerably to the enrichment of the state of California's treasury.

Moreover, it is just as impossible for all future merchant marine officers to attend Kings Point as it is for all future Army, Navy and Air Force officers to attend the appropriate federal service academy. This is why the Armed Services have a number of officer procurement sources to supplement the Service academies, ROTC units, officer candidate schools, and commissioning programs for promising enlisted personnel all help fill the Armed Services officer personnel requirements. And, considering the difficulty in recruiting officers these days, the time, effort, and money consumed in establishing these secondary sources have not been mis-spent.

The California Maritime Academy budget, for example, is about $1.2 million, of which the state will pay about $800,000. The remainder is made up about equally by the Maritime Administration (Marad) subsidy and student fees. The Marad subsidy pays for the maintenance of the training ship and helps defray the students' tuition costs. This sharing of costs of the education of a midshipman at a state academy is good business for the federal government. The federally-financed cost of the education of a state academy graduate is approximately $5,000, as opposed to $19,000 for his Kings Point counterpart. From the viewpoint of the individual student, the federal subsidy is something of a bonanza because it enables him to receive a first class education at a cost considerably less than that obtainable in other college level institutions, even those supported by public funds.

In a legal sense, State maritime academy midshipmen legally are cadets in the U.S. Maritime Service. They are civilians who have given up much, if not all, of the freedom which they would have enjoyed had they elected to live the life of an undergraduate at a nearby liberal arts or engineering college. The discipline under which they live is not military discipline in the sense in which it is inculcated at the Naval Academy or West Point. Rather, it is only that which is considered necessary to prepare them to live as licensed officers on board a well-ordered U.S.-flag merchant vessel. The purpose of this system of what might be termed "enlightened discipline" is to prevent instances of a breakdown in authority under stress, or incompetency in time of emergency where a maritime academy graduate is involved. The departure of many crew members of the *Andrea Doria* before all her passengers could be disembarked, and the ineptness displayed on board the *Morro Castle* when she burned off the New Jersey coast in 1934, are examples of shortcomings in discipline and training which the maritime academies are committed to prevent.

So much variation exists among the respective curricula of the state maritime academies, that it is necessary to generalize somewhat. All academies, however, strive to produce a highly qualified third mate or third assistant engineer who will be useful the day he reports on board his first ship and who also has the capability of growing into higher responsibilities both afloat and in the shore-side industry. State academies have been remarkably successful, and their graduates are prominent among the masters of American flag ships and as executives of shipping companies. The state schools are broadening their curricula, shifting away from the old nautical schoolship concept, but this costs money, and many state legislators who must foot the added bill are grumbling at the additional expense. Nor is there universal acceptance of the expanded course by a basically conservative shipping industry, some quarters of which are reluctant to depart from the traditions and practices of the past.

The maritime academy does not try to teach every midshipman to do everything. Unlike the Naval Academy, and in keeping with Coast Guard licensing requirements, the midshipmen are split into those studying for deck licenses and those aspiring to be engineers, Kings Point does have a pilot program enabling outstanding midshipmen to receive a dual qualification, but it will be some time before a significant number of officers are legally licensed to stand both a deck and an engineroom watch.

Just as some naval subjects, such as missile control and electronic warfare, are of no interest at the state academy, so would subjects of intense interest to a merchant marine officer—e.g., cargo handling and maritime labor relations—receive no more than minimal attention from a naval officer. Although it is no longer enough to be able to "splice, reef, and steer," the maritime academy graduate must have these practical skills or their modern counterpart. He must also have a broad background which will assist him as he goes up the maritime ladder, either ashore or afloat. For this reason, and unlike the Naval Academy, the state academy cannot satisfy its requirements simply by providing a drill or demonstration in machine shop practices or diesel operation. Maritime academy midshipmen must receive sufficient time in a diesel laboratory so that they learn how to operate a diesel, to diagnose its ills, and to repair it, possibly by machining a new part. Later in the same day, the same group of midshipmen may sit in a class in thermodynamics or electricity on an academic level in every way comparable to the Naval Academy.

Deck midshipmen must receive similar training. Since the merchant navy boasts no quartermasters or bosun's mates, it follows that midshipmen must be thoroughly proficient in deck seamanship. And they must be far more familiar with the theory and practice of navigation than their Naval Academy counterparts, who can expect the able assistance of a chief quartermaster in keeping out of harm's way. During their first class cruise, California midshipmen must use the Marcq Saint Hilaire method to work out their sights. They will probably never have to use it again, but if they master this, nothing will ever throw them. Finally, by maritime academy standards, the Rules of the Road as covered at Annapolis is scanty and would not provide the average maritime academy student with sufficient knowledge to pass the licensing exam which the Coast Guard throws at the aspiring merchant marine officer. At California, the Rules course covers seven semester hours. Over-emphasis? Perhaps; but the bridge watch of a merchant vessel is a one-man show. The new third mate will be his own junior officer of the deck, quartermaster, signalman, phone talker, and CIC team. If he is not to become an accident hazard later, he must be equipped with as much professional knowledge as he can hoist aboard while still a midshipman.

A maritime academy midshipman must spend six months at sea in order to qualify to "sit" for his license. A unique source of strength of the State Academy is the training ships owned by MarAd but permanently on loan to the various academies. Once a year practically all the faculty—who are licensed officers—and the midshipmen embark on a cruise of two to three months' duration. Kings Point, which prefers not to have a training ship, assigns its midshipmen to U.S.-flag ships for an equivalent period. Although there is something to be said for the Kings Point system, the state academies feel strongly that the academy schoolship is the best solution for afloat training, and the academies are currently engaged in another round of a perennial struggle with MarAd to retain their own training ships. MarAd's motives, as one might suspect, are economic.

A naval officer will think of a midshipmen's cruise as one in which midshipmen are embarked as supernumeraries for training. This is true with regard to a Naval Academy midshipman's cruise, but not true for a state maritime academy midshipman's cruise. California, for example, hires only ten non-faculty crewmen. Their talents range from those found in a Navy or Coast Guard warrant officer to that of a leading seaman. The rest of the muscle and skills necessary to run the ship come from the midshipmen, assisted and instructed by the licensed faculty. Coast Guard regulations require a licensed officer on the bridge and another in the engineroom. The rest of the watch at sea is made up of midshipmen in training, and the major portion of the maintenance is performed by them. In short, without midshipmen, the *Golden Bear* cannot get underway and stand out to sea.

The midshipmen, under the eye of the faculty, run the entire ship. They navigate, stand bridge and engineering watches, and maintain the ship. The faculty officer will step in only *in extremis*. The strength of the schoolship system is that, upon graduation, the new third mate or third assistant engineer is fully qualified to do any job which he may be called upon to perform. If a midshipman is embarked as a cadet on an American-flag merchant ship on a normal voyage the quality of instruction he receives from

the ship's officers will vary from ship to ship. Some ship's officers will take an interest in him. Some can't be bothered. In any case, the midshipman cannot do jobs or perform maintenance which would take work away from an unlicensed member of the crew. The state academies feel, with considerable justice, that their graduate emerges with more practical operational knowledge than does his Kings Point counterpart, although they do begrudge some of the time which their midshipmen must spend maintaining the training ship during the academic year.

As a condition for receiving their MarAd subsidy, the state academy midshipmen must agree to accept a Naval Reserve commission if it is offered. To support this program, the academies all have small Naval Science Departments manned by the only active duty personnel on the campus. All midshipmen take a Naval Science course each academic semester, which course is designed to provide a rudimentary naval indoctrination as well as fill the gaps in the education which he receives as a part of his normal classroom work. Naval Science helps fill in the chasm dividing the education of a third mate and a third assistant engineer. The engineer midshipmen learn their navigation from the Navy, and the deck men learn about naval machinery the same way.

The Reserve program offered at the academies is not a primary source of Reserve officers, and the graduate is not ordered to active duty unless he so requests. The object of the program is to provide the midshipman with sufficient familiarity with the Navy so that he would be at home on the bridge of a merchant ship should he ever operate with naval units or to assist him in his transition to the Navy should he ever be called to active duty. The graduate's military obligation is considered completed if he sails on his license for at least six months a year for three years, or for an equivalent amount of sea time for a longer number of years. The interest in a Navy career varies with the economic climate and, probably, from one academy to the next. The current economic slump may be one of the reasons that the 1971 California class contributed six officers to active duty in the Navy and two to the Coast Guard, as opposed to none and two, respectively, for the Class of 1970. Obviously the small size of the officer input from the state academies does not make much of a dent on the entire officer corps of the Navy, and ashore or afloat, the graduate is a rarity. The author met few during his active Navy service. But those who remain appear in surprising places and achieve success comparable to their civilian counterparts in the maritime industry. They benefit from a thorough grounding in the fundamentals enjoyed by none of their contemporaries from any other source.

State maritime academies are under fire from several quarters these days. A July 1970 *Proceedings* article, "Manpower and the Merchant Marine," by a graduate of the New York Maritime College summarized the difficulties a graduate faces, for example, when sailing on his license in the face of opposition posed by the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association (MEBA). MEBA; incidently, has founded its own school in Baltimore and would probably not mourn too long at the demise of all the state academies.

One would hope that the passage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, and the trend toward larger, more sophisticated and automated vessels would make it most evident to the public that a solid maritime education would be necessary for the merchant marine officer of tomorrow. The current economic slump has hit MarAd along with other federal and state agencies. Funds for state academies are in short supply. Even in normal times, MarAd is by no means a front runner in the race to the Treasury. Federal financial assistance has remained constant in dollar value although the states have had to dip increasingly into their own pockets to pick up the deficit. In California, the percentage of the operating budget provided by MarAd has dipped from 27% to 17% in 1971. The state and federal governments have each tried to convince the other to throw more money into the pot. The arguments used by each side are identical: the program is really of primary benefit to the other. Should this financial shuffling continue to the ultimate limit—that a state academy should go under—both the state and the nation will suffer. The California Maritime Academy has been on the verge of being closed during most of the fiscal year 1970–71.

Although the State Maritime Academy is now and should remain only a secondary source of Naval Reserve officers, a careful reassessment by the Chief of Naval Personnel might well disclose ways to improve the Navy's contribution, increasing the dividends which the Navy enjoys from the program while at the same time decreasing the budgetary outlay. As the Navy is forced to close some of the long-established ROTC units throughout the country, this effort could be channeled to the state academies to the mutual advantage of all.

State academies have been in the business of turning out broadly educated merchant mariners for almost a hundred years. Their graduates are among the most successful leaders of the maritime industry both ashore and afloat. By any standard, the financial requirements of the academies are small, but if they are not met, the schools will founder. If this happens, the nation, the maritime industry, and the Navy will have ample reason to regret their inaction.

THE ALCOHOLIC DRIVER

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, alcohol and alcoholism have taken their toll in our country in both physical and emotional pain, and alcohol has played a distressingly large role in traffic accidents. It is common knowledge that more than one-half of all traffic fatalities are alcohol related, but when we stop to consider that more than 27,000 people died last year in alcohol-related accidents, the impact is staggering.

And yet what serious measures have been adopted to get the drunken driver off the road? Federal funds have been granted for extensive research into traffic safety, and strides have been made, but the statistics continue to rise.

Two men who are seriously concerned with the ever-increasing number of alcohol-related traffic fatalities have proposed a plan which emphasizes the importance of rehabilitation and strict enforcement of punitive measures. They are Martin G. Blinder and Guy O. Kornblum and their proposal recently appeared in Judicature. Because the article presents a unique insight into the problem of alcoholism and the possibilities of alleviating that problem, I now insert it into the RECORD:

THE ALCOHOLIC DRIVER: A PROPOSAL FOR TREATMENT AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO PUNISHMENT

(By Martin G. Blinder and Guy O. Kornblum)

This article is a condensation of a larger work by the authors which is available as a Society Information Report and may be purchased upon request (See page 34.) The authors wish to express their appreciation to Mr. Edward F. Kearney, executive director, National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances, Washington, D.C., for his assistance in the preparation of this paper. They also thank the people with whom they corresponded and who provided them with needed research material. However, unless otherwise indicated, all opinions and conclusions are those of the authors.

Five million Americans, five per cent of the adult population, are alcoholics.[1] The majority of them drive.

Statistics, though inadequate to measure the amount of personal anguish consequent to alcoholism, emphasize dramatically the havoc and devastation to all portions of our society: one-half of all automobile deaths are alcohol related; a quarter of all male admissions to mental hospitals and one-half of all general hospital admissions are associated with alcohol; and nearly one-half of all non-traffic arrests are for the "crime" of public intoxication.

A study just completed by the New York State Citizen's Committee on Problems of Alcohol,[2] with the assistance of the National Study Service of New York, reported that there are more than 800,000 alcoholics in New York, that alcoholism contributes in a major way to crime and over-crowding of our correctional system, and that it is a serious drain on business and the economy. Clearly, the facts mandate a reappraisal of the present system.

In most states, individuals convicted of driving while intoxicated are punished as misdemeanants by fine, imprisonment or both.[3] The method of expressing the offense varies. The Uniform Vehicle Code (UVC) states in section 11–902 (a):

"It is unlawful and punishable as provided in section 11–902.2 for any person who is under the influence of intoxicating liquor to drive or be in actual physical control of any vehicle in this state."

Most states follow this language, although some have not included the "physical control" aspect, or have combined references to drugs with those relating to alcohol or intoxicating liquor.[4]

The most used and most popular sanction for drinking and driving is the revocation or suspension of the driver's license. A number of states make suspension of the driver's license a mandatory penalty for driving while intoxicated.[5] The fear of loss of the driving privilege may have an important deterrent effect on the social drinker. However, it does not affect the alcoholic or problem drinker who continues to drive despite the loss of license. A recent California study indicated that two-thirds of all drivers with revoked permits were arrested (some as many as ten times or more) during periods when their driving privileges were revoked.[6] In addition, most states fail almost entirely to take any practical steps to enforce license revocation.

NEW STUDIES

Judicial re-examination of the criminality of the offense of public drunkenness in the light of new studies regarding the existing penal structure has begun. The United States Supreme Court recently stated in *Powell* v. *Texas*[7] that although the eighth amendment's prohibition of "cruel and unusual

Footnotes at end of article.

punishment" does not bar processing chronic alcoholics who are drunk in public through criminal courts, the criminal structure is not a particularly effective means of dealing with what is largely a "health problem."

The recent federal cases of *Easter* v. *District of Columbia* and *Driver* v. *Hinnant*,[8] which held that alcoholics cannot be convicted of public drunkenness emphasized the importance of developing alternatives to punishment for dealing with alcohol-related offenses. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice recommended that drunkenness in itself should not be a crime, that civil detoxification procedures should be developed, and that comprehensive treatment programs, including "after care" facilities to bridge the gap between the detoxification center and the assimilation into society, should be established.[9]

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice [10] studied drunkenness offenses and concluded that the public drunk should no longer be treated as a criminal unless he is disorderly or engages in other criminal conduct such as driving while intoxicated. The drinker who only appears in public in a drunken state should not be treated as a criminal but should be detoxified in a community detoxification center. Similarly, when an alcoholic commits a separate criminal act while intoxicated, not only should the commission of the act be punished but an effort should be made to rehabilitate the offender. If, however, he is unwilling to be rehabilitated, then he should be prevented from committing the prohibited act again.[11]

Since drinking and driving offenses are generally punished as crimes, the usual procedural safeguards apply, including the right to jury trial.[12] However, prosecutors are reluctant to bring even strong cases to trial because they crowd even more the already crowded dockets. Furthermore, juries are frequently sympathetic to the defendant.[13] There are other roadblocks to successful prosecution of arrest for driving under the influence with the result that a plea is usually bargained and the defendant pleads guilty to a minor traffic offense (not involving alcohol) and is placed on probation, retaining his right to drive.[14]

REHABILITATION PROSPECTS

The prospects for rehabilitating the alcoholic driver (who is rarely a skid-row drunk with no family or community ties) are good. The San Francisco Committee on Crime reported:

The Bureau (San Francisco Bureau of Alcoholism) knows that the vast majority of alcoholics in the city are not on skid-row. The National Council on Alcoholism has estimated that, for every skid-row alcoholic there are 15 to 20 working alcoholics doing jobs as house painters, teamsters, secretaries, bankers and attorneys. The Bureau knows too that alcoholic rehabilitation stands a good chance with patients who have enough ties to family, church or work to want to make it back. . . . One Bureau doctor pointed out that, in all his professional practice, he had never encountered a case in which a skid-row alcoholic was arrested for drunken driving. "By far the most dangerous alcoholics are those who drive," he said, "yet criminal justice does no more to solve their problem than it does to solve the problem of the guy on the skids." [15]

To date, several programs for rehabilitation of the drunken driver have been tried. Although results are incomplete, reports from a program in Nassau County, New York, indicate that rehabilitation has been achieved by a substantial number of alcoholics through small discussion groups with the goal of helping the individual recognize and admit his uncontrollable appetite for alcohol. The objective is to lead him to a realization that he needs medical assistance voluntarily.[16] A rehabilitation program for convicted drunken drivers has been developed at Phoenix, Arizona, by the Phoenix Municipal Court and the Phoenix Alcohol Research and Re-education Project. For more than four years, every resident convicted in Phoenix has had to spend four consecutive Wednesday evenings (ten hours) in an Arizona State University extension course or lose his license to drive. The student is given information about the effects of drinking and driving, and is encouraged to assess his own behavior. Fewer than 10 of the 2,000 individuals who have completed the course have been re-arrested in Phoenix on a charge of driving while intoxicated. However, the primary focus in this program is not only on the problem drinker but on a combination of punishment and education to expose the participants to the dangers of even moderate drinking and driving.[17]

A recent report of the Highway Safety Research Institute reviewed ten published accounts of court-related alcoholic treatment programs in the United States over the past 20 years. The programs were reviewed for their success as based on the following criteria: reduction in the number of arrests, number in treatment for full length of program, improvement in drinking pattern, family and social adjustment, occupational adjustment, and physical status. The report states that the review "consistently indicated that court-related treatment could be successful for at least one-half of the clients seen." [18]

SOCIAL VERSUS PROBLEM DRINKERS

Any program for enforcing "driving while intoxicated" laws should recognize that the social drinker must be treated differently than the problem drinker. Methods should be devised so that a judge has the flexibility to emphasize punishment and education for the former and rehabilitation and education for the latter. The program should also give a judge criteria for identifying those defendants who are alcoholics or problem drinkers a background investigation and interview should be conducted. Alcoholism is not easily recognized in its early stages. This is further complicated by the tendency of most alcoholics to deny that they have a problem. For this reason, conviction for driving while intoxicated could benefit the defendant by introducing him to medical facilities for treatment which he might otherwise have avoided, because he did not recognize his condition, was reluctant to seek treatment, or was not aware that treatment was available.

When making determinations of disposition it is not necessary for the court to become involved in the causes of the particular traffic offender's alcohol abuse or to wrestle with distinguishing between an irresponsible social drinker and an alcohol addict. The traffic court may define the problem drinker as one who has repeatedly demonstrated a driving problem when he drinks.

Some courts have attempted to refer alcoholics and problem drinkers to community medical facilities and social service agencies such as Alcoholics Anonymous, but the Department of Transportation states that what little data is available on the results of these referrals is not encouraging. This is probably due to the informality of such casual referrals. In most cases, the alcoholic is the last to realize he has a problem and it is therefore unusual for him to ask for help unless he has been coreced in one way or another into seeking help for his problem.[19]

CONSTRUCTIVE COERCION

Constructive coercion has been successful in alcoholic rehabilitation programs in industry, penal and correctional institutions, and in courts and hospitals. Thus, it should be susceptible to successful integration into a probation scheme.[20] Usually these rehabilitation programs are a combination of group therapy and individual counseling which work toward a reintegration of the individual into the community.

The use of authority as a means of motivation can be a valuable tool in making an otherwise reluctant individual seek the assistance he needs. Before applying the concept of judicial coercion however, the court should be assured that effective treatment techniques are available in its jurisdiction, and that adequate funds have been secured to implement them.

The use of constructive coercion to achieve rehabilitation is not a new technique. In fact, it would seem that examination and therapy programs such as the Phoenix experience can be put into effect without statutory authorization, as long as the defendant has the choice of the prescribed punishment or the rehabilitation alternative, and as long as the objectives of the alternative are legitimate (rehabilitation, correction and education).

The problem has been summarized in this statement:

. . . Since a major portion of drunken driving is to be found in the small alcoholic population rather than in the general population of social drinkers, serious consideration must be given to quick recognition of the person with a drinking problem and his removal from the road. It has already been suggested that a prior history of non-traffic alcohol-related arrests is i dicative of problem drinking. Certainly, drunken driving between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and noon is a strong indication of alcoholism.

Removing such a person from the road is difficult. Merely revoking the license is not, apparently, sufficient. Alcoholics are more likely to have citations for driving with a revoked or suspended license than drivers with other medical conditions despite a probable equal frequency of license revocations and suspensions. The answer, while by no means simple, appears to lie in the early identification of alcoholism as a disease and prompt referral to treatment, in addition to revocation of license or other legal measures.[21]

A program combining strict enforcement of punitive measures with educational and rehabilitation programs should give the court the flexibility it needs to select the most effective means of processing convicted drunken drivers through the criminal system. This is consistent with what seems to be one of the objectives of the present reform of the penal system: to provide more realistic opportunities for rehabilitation. Hopefully, the above recommendations will encourage courts to work with community agencies in designing a corrective, educational and rehabilitative scheme which is designed to meet the needs of the individual defendant, and is also consistent with the community interest in discouraging future offenses.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Authorities vary as to the definition of "alcoholic" or "alcoholism". The Cooperative Commission on the Study of Alcoholism speaks of "problem drinking," which includes alcoholism. "Problem drinking" is defined as a "repetitive use of beverage alcohol causing physical, psychological and social harm to the drinker or to others." This definition stresses an interference with functioning rather than any specific drinking behavior. The amount or frequency of drinking is not a primary criterion. "Alcoholism" is defined as a "condition in which an individual has lost control over his alcohol intake in the sense that he is consistently unable to refrain from drinking or to stop drinking before getting intoxicated." Plaut, *Alcohol Problems—A Report to the Nation by the Cooperative Commission on the Study of Alcoholism* at 37–

39 (1967) (hereinafter cited as *Alcohol Problems*).

The Uniform Alcoholism and Intoxication Treatment Act adopted in 1971 defines alcoholism in these alternative ways: "a person who habitually lacks self control as to the use of alcoholic beverages, or uses alcoholic beverages to the extent that his health is substantially impaired or endangered or his social or economic function is substantially disrupted . . ."

[2] *Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism in New York State: Programs, Problems and Promise* (Citizens' Committee on the Problems of Alcohol, State of New York, 1971).

[3] U.V.C. § 11.902.2.

[4] The Canadian Criminal Code refers to "driving while ability impaired by alcohol," in addition to "driving while under the influence." (Can. Crim. Code, § 285, subd. 4(a).) New Jersey, New York and Virginia have adopted this concept and made "driving while impaired" a lesser degree of the violation while under the influence of alcohol (N.J. Stat. Ann., § 39:4–50(b); N.Y. Vehicle and Traffic Law, § 1192(1); Code of Va. § 18.1–56.1).

[5] De-licensing action is mandatory upon first conviction for drunken driving in 45 states and the District of Columbia. It is discretionary in only five states (Hawaii, Nevada, Arizona, Colorado and Georgia). However, only 18 states require the licensing action for one year as in the U.V.C. (§ 6–208). *See Suspension and Revocation of Drivers' Licenses* (Highway Users Federation for Safety and Mobility, 1776 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C., 1970).

[6] U.S. Department of Transportation, *Alcohol Safety Countermeasures Program* at 207 (June 8, 1970).

[7] *Powell v. Texas*, 392 U.S. 514 (1968) rehearing denied 393 U.S. 989. In *Powell*, the court held in a 5–4 decision that conviction for public drunkenness of an alcoholic did not amount to cruel and unusual punishment, where there was a question as to whether the defendant was "compelled' to drink, and where the defendant was prosecuted because of his public behavior which could present substantial health and safety hazards to the defendant and the general public, and not because of his "status" or "condition." If the reasoning of the dissent in *Powell* had been followed, the constitutionality of drunken driving laws when applied to alcoholics, who have an irresistible compulsion to drink, may be in issue. *But note* Justice Fortas' dissent, 393 U.S. at 559, note 2.

[8] *Easter v. District of Columbia*, 361 F. 2d 50 (CA—D.C. 1966); *Driver v. Hinnant*, 356 F. 2d 761 (CA–4 1966).

[9] President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, *Task Force Report: Drunkenness* at 4 (1967).

[10] *Id.* 4–6.

[11] Still, suspension or revocation of the license is unsatisfactory as it is not successful in preventing the alcoholic from driving. "Our studies have shown that the traditional fine and suspension or revocation do not work for problem drivers; they'll continue to drive with or without a license. Perhaps a rehabilitative approach will be meaningful to some defendants. Perhaps harsher, more stringent penalties, long-term revocation, would be the most effective method with others. It may be that with a small percentage of these drunk drivers, only permanent revocation of a license, with strict enforcement and supervision, will keep them off the highways." Wagner, "Problem Drinking v. Public Safety," *Trial Magazine*, at 30 (May–June 1971).

[12] The scope of the constitutional right to jury trial was recently redefined by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Duncan v. Louisiana*, 391 U.S. 145 (1968). The court held that "the right to a jury trial in serious criminal cases is a fundamental right and hence must be recognized by the states as part of their obligation to extend due process of law to all persons within their jurisdiction." 391 U.S. at 154. Petty offenses, however, were excluded from the jury trial requirement. The primary indication of what constitutes a "serious" offense is the severity of the penalty authorized by statute. *See Bloom v. Illinois*, 391 U.S. 194 (1968) (jury trial required where defendant is charged with criminal contempt, the state law does not set a maximum punishment, and defendant was sentenced to 24 months' imprisonment; here whether the crime is "serious" is determined by the penalty actually imposed).

[13] In addition to a fine or imprisonment (juries generally do not consider the possibilities of probation), a conviction for driving under the influence or while intoxicated or while ability is impaired is ordinarily followed by some action against the defendant's license, with considerable variation in the results. In some states, license action is permissive, and it is possible that no license action at all will follow; in others there may be either a revocation or suspension of up to two years. In the case of a minor, suspension may be for the period of minority, N.J. Stat. Ann., sec. 39:4–50(a); N.Y. Vehicle and Traffic Law, sec. 510(6). Where a license is suspended, there is generally automatic restoration of license privileges at the end of the suspension period. When the license is revoked, the licensee is required to "start over" and qualify for a new license. Where there is a mandatory fine or jail sentence, the sentence may be suspended or the licensee placed on probation. Unless a mandatory jail sentence is accompanied by a provision prohibiting its suspension, such a requirement may in practice be nullified by routine sentence suspension. Limiting the court in such a way is often criticized, however, as a legislative infringement upon the prerogatives of the judiciary.

Department of Transportation, *1968 Alcohol and Highway Safety Report*, at 102–103 (hereinafter cited as *DOT—1968 Report*). This report resulted from the National Highway Safety Act of 1966 which required the Secretary of Transportation to submit to Congress a report on the extent of alcohol involved in highway accidents.

[14] DOT—1968 Report, 103.

[15] The San Francisco committee on Crime, A Report on Non-Victim Crime in San Francisco, Part I, Basic Principles, Public Drunkenness (1971) at 37.

[16] Wagner, *Trial Magazine* (May-June 1971), *Supra* note 11, at 30.

[17] Weeks, "Educating Society's Most Lethal Criminal" (reprints of a series of five undated articles appearing in the *Phoenix Gazette* provided the authors in a monograph by the ABA Standing Committee on Traffic Court Programs, Section of Judicial Administration).

[18] U.S. Department of Transportation, *Alcohol Abuse and Traffic Safety: A Study of Fatalities, DWI Offenders, Alcoholics, and Court-Related Treatment Approaches* at 261–279 (Final Report, Preliminary Printing, submitted June 26, 1970, by the Highway Safety Research Institute to the U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Safety Bureau.)

[19] Soden, "Constructive Coercion and Group Counselling in the Rehabilitation of Alcoholics," 30 *Fed. Prob.* 56, 57 (1966). Mr. Soden states: "The doctor has intimated that death would be inevitable; the psychiatrist has implied that insanity will result; the clergyman has said that the end will be disastrous; the wife has threatened to leave or has already left; the boss has either fired him or has threatened to do so; the community has branded him a drunk. Or he has become so disgusted with himself that he has lost his self-respect. As a final desperate measure, he seeks help. Often there is no sincere or realistic desire to find help or to be helped. He seeks help only to relieve the pressures which are bearing down on him on him and to 'take the heat off'." Mr. Soden also states that 'constructive coercion can hardly be challenged if it will bring about a change in thinking that will result in the person's doing something about his problem. Considering the harm caused by alcoholism to the person himself, to his family, and to society in general, it is difficult to understand why there would be opposition to the use of constructive coercion in the field of corrections when in reality, circumstances resulting from uncontrolled drinking have actually coerced the individual into seeking or at least giving 'lip service' to some kind of a solution to a critical problem." *Id.*

[20] *Id.*

[21] Waller, "Pattern of Traffic Accidents and Violation Related to Drinking and to Some Medical Conditions," *Quart. J. Stud. Alcohol* 118, at 135 (Supp. 4, May 1968).

WHO BLASTED BEAVER DAMS ON PINYON MESA?

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Grand Junction, Colo., Daily Sentinel, for Friday, August 11, was brought to my attention by Mr. Howard H. Caudle, director of the Colorado branch of International Defenders of Animals, Inc. At his request, I am inserting it into the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

It is most unfortunate that such incidents as the one described apparently take place with little forethought.

The article follows:

WHO BLASTED BEAVER DAMS ON PINYON MESA?

(By Ken Botham, Jr.)

Strange it is in this age when man is capable of launching a missile from hundreds of feet under water near Miami and placing that same missile on the pitcher's mound at Yankee Stadium, that a beaver must justify his reason to live.

By now most outdoorsmen that frequent the Glade Park-Pinyon Mesa area are aware that some of the prettiest beaver dams in the state, unspoiled and in the grandeur that only a natural setting can allow, recently were dynamited.

The half tame beavers in the lower ponds were not caught and moved to another area, but were killed.

The 60 to 70 pound patriarch of the lower pond we called "Oscar" was either blown up, shot or trapped.

Many others were killed also, but Oscar was the greatest loss.

This dignified, greying gentleman looked forward to shoots of willow handed to him by people he thought he could trust. It had to be great sport for the man who killed old Oscar as a club would have done the job easily.

This was the only area, less than 40 minutes from Grand Junction, that a man could take his wife and children along with a camera and easily take pictures of deer, elk, bear, ducks and cats, and the beaver, without leaving his log. This was a photographer's mecca.

Oscar delighted in having his picture taken and undoubtedly looked on intently from about 5 feet as the explosive charges were being set. The heartbreak that the author

felt as he saw the devastated dams is impossible to explain, and more difficult still is explaining to a 3 year-old son.

Certainly there must have been a good reason for this, so we set out to find it.

The first contact was with Louis Bertlshofer, district ranger, U.S. Forest Service.

Although Bertlshofer did not blow up the dams himself, he took credit for doing so.

After stock civil servant-pass the buck answers, Bertlshofer rationalized the following: There were two reasons why the dams were blown. (1) As the dams were located about Fruita Reservoir 3, the dams had to be the reason for an abnormally high fecal count in said reservoir. (2) Should the beaver dams in question break, this would pose a severe threat on the Fruita Reservoir dam.

Both of these reasons we would have to accept as valid, but let's look at them more carefully.

The beavers were located more than a quarter of a mile above the reservoir, which, had the stream been flowing, would have nearly purified itself. The fact remains that the stream was (and is) bone dry and has been for some time.

When Bertlshofer was asked about the hundreds of sheep on the land and about their effect on the fecal count, he denied that any sheep were in the area although at the moment the sheep were graciously redoing the entire landscape to their liking.

After several attempts to change the subject, Bertlshofer admitted there were "some" sheep in the area. No mention was made of the beaver colony that resides in Fruita Reservoir 3.

The flood hazard reasoning was better.

The beaver dams posed a threat to the Fruita dams because if the beaver dams should break, the earthen structure could wash out. However, if the dams were dynamited, this stress would not occur.

Occasionally a beaver dam on shale or bedrock will wash out, but how many beaver dams, located on a site such as this, have washed out while an entire beaver colony maintains it full time?

Bertlshofer also was asked who had the right to fence off the jeep trail going into the area.

Again he denied that such a situation existed but rather attributed such a blockage to windfall.

That should go down as the greatest coincidence of all time because the aspens had fallen precisely on top of each other, cutting themselves to the correct length and wiring themselves together.

Bertlshofer said he did not know who had blown the dams but acknowledged he was responsible.

Our next contact was with the Grand Junction office of the Colorado Game, Fish and Parks. Manager Glen Rogers was most polite, but after exhausting his stock answers had another appointment.

He did say that he knew nothing of the blasting and that the man to contact was Dwight Owens, wildlife conservation officer, as that was his area.

Again we received the stock answers, only this time with a little more spice.

Owens submitted that he had authorized the killing as the beavers were not needed in that area and that the sediment in the ponds was not to his liking. In view of this he had authorized the town of Fruita to remove both dams and beavers.

Owens said he did not know who had blown the dams.

The Town of Fruita was contacted and we were told that Danny Williams is in charge of the water, including the reservoirs on Pinyon Mesa. We also were told that this is a part-time job with Williams, that he had no office and that reaching him is impossible. Attempts to reach Williams at his home failed.

Although pure speculation it would seem that the owners of the sheep blocked the road to keep you off your land and drive the wildlife out by blowing up the dams so you would have no reason to go there.

Strange it is that the livestock people have so much control that they can take you to court for trespassing on the land that you own and pay for.

It's time for the over-taxed working man to speak out. It's time for the family man who is not familiar with the ways of politics to take a stand for what he knows is morally right.

What will become of the few remaining beaver that reside on the small amount of public land on Pinyon Mesa? Why is it that tragedies like this are allowed to occur? If the men and women who carry the load would band together by sending a letter or speaking out for what they know is right, we could weed out personal interest politics and join in the cause of keeping Grand Junction, our state, and our nation fit for our children and those to come.

WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR?

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, one examines the arguments of those who still support our insane adventurism in Indochina, and you will notice that positive reasons for our intervention are completely absent. Our intervention is so indefensible that the only way to defend it is to distract people's attention by self-righteously pointing to the cruelties practiced by the North Vietnamese. By calling attention to the mote in our brother's eye, we hope that no one will notice the beam in our own eye.

Yet, the recital of these cruelties is completely irrelevant. It would be easy to come up with stories from Bangladesh, from the Soviet Union, from Brazil and Indonesia that far surpass anything the North Vietnamese have done. Yet no one suggests these as a reason for armed intervention, for a bombing policy that forces American military men to spread far more devastation than the most sadistic bully. The real question we must ask is: Does our action decrease the possibility of atrocities, or, on the contrary, does the suffering and bitterness we cause increase the possibility of revenge and cruelty?

The people who are forced to rely on this sort of argument are especially fond of the streams of refugees leaving the North Vietnamese zone. This tragedy seems to make them proud, seems to them to prove that somehow the Vietnamese people are choosing us over the North Vietnamese. And yet the explicit aim of our bombing policy is to force these people out of their homes. The moral blindness of this demagogic finger-pointing is frightening.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enclose a story from a distinguished correspondent in Vietnam that tells us what these people were fleeing from. There is nothing in this story to make Americans feel proud. I hope every Congressman who still has some concern about the moral value of our national actions will read this story and think deeply about it. The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 1, 1972]

LIVED 3 MONTHS IN BUNKERS: QUANG TRI REFUGEE HAD LOST HOPE, EXPECTED TO DIE SOON

(By Jacques Leslie)

HUE, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"We had no hope at all. We thought we would die very soon."

With these words a 64-year-old farmer who had just reached safety summed up his experience in living in a bunker in North Vietnamese-held Quang Tri province almost continuously for three months.

Like 15,000 other refugees who reached reception points here in the last three weeks, the man had stayed in his bunker to avoid South Vietnamese and American air strikes and artillery fire.

American officials here estimate that in addition to the 15,000 refugees who have already reached Hue, another 35,000 to 75,000 are still living in bunkers in Quang Tri.

In addition, based on refugee accounts, officials have tabulated "at least 5,000" civilian deaths caused by South Vietnamese and American air strikes and artillery fire. Since many hamlets and villages in Quang Tri are still unrepresented among the refugees, the final figure will undoubtedly be much higher.

The refugees had an opportunity to flee Quang Tri as South Vietnamese troops recaptured parts of the province where they were living. Since reaching Hue they have told stories of suffering and tenacious survival.

These accounts have come to light in interviews with hundreds of refugees.

Among the accounts are these:

Families frequently divided up into two bunkers so that even if one bunker was destroyed, some family members would survive.

Because of continual air strikes and shelling, many refugees did not dare to go outside even to bury the bodies around them. One refugee said he saw dogs eating civilian corpses.

An American official said refugees from one hamlet told him their bunkers were half-filled with water on the two occasions of heavy rain during the three months. They took advantage of the flooding in the bunkers to run to a nearby stream, find pregnant fish, replace the fish in the bunkers, get back in themselves, and then gradually eat the fish offspring.

A 65-year-old man fled from Quang Tri while carrying his 72-year-old invalid wife on his back for 12 miles.

Naval shelling in one area was so regular that people devised accurate schedules of when the firing would take place, and walked outside during the intervals.

CAPTURE OF CITY

When Quang Tri city fell to the North Vietnamese May 1, tens of thousands of people were trapped. Many refugees say they tried to flee south at that time, but North Vietnamese Army soldiers (NVA) stopped them and told them to go back or else artillery fire from both sides was too intense to escape.

In some villages air strikes and naval shelling began immediately after the NVA takeover, while in others it started up to two weeks later. Within two weeks, Quang Tri became a province virtually underground.

When people emerged from their bunkers during the last three weeks, they saw destruction. "Everywhere, everywhere," as one refugee put it. Said Gene Niewoehner, the American war victims adviser in Hue, "The destruction in Quang Tri has been pretty thorough."

SOME GO TO NORTH

Refugee accounts of treatment by North Vietnamese soldiers vary.

North Vietnamese soldiers drafted many young men as laborers, requiring them to carry ammunition, dig bunkers, move supplies and evacuate wounded. In addition, many people were encouraged or forced to go to North Vietnam.

Refugees who have just arrived in Hue said that during the last few days North Vietnamese threatened to kill people who did not go north, but none said he knew of any instance in which the threat was carried out.

Where there was time, NVA soldiers set up political indoctrination sessions for the civilians. In many cases attendance was voluntary. The session ended when shelling and bombing became too heavy.

LITTLE HOSTILITY

At the same time, little hostility was expressed toward the NVA. "They were the same as us—living in bunkers," said one man. In some villages, NVA soldiers apparently left civilians alone. In another they showed civilians how to dig bunkers or suggested the civilians put them in rice fields because hamlets would be more likely to be bombed or shelled.

In early May NVA soldiers in many villages told civilians that Quang Tri and Thua Thien, the province of which Hue is the capital, had already been captured, and that Da Nang, 60 miles south of Hue, would soon be taken.

But some civilians had radios and listened to news broadcasts contradicting the NVA claim. According to one account, NVA soldiers offered to buy the radios. People who made the deal threw away their North Vietnamese money when they came south for fear they would be accused of cooperating with the NVA.

Most civilians lacked materials to give their bunkers solid overhead cover. They used bamboo poles, wood, mud and tin sheets if available. A typical bunker was 5 feet deep, 10 feet long and 6 feet wide, and housed several people. In a few hamlets bunkers were connected by tunnel systems.

DIDN'T TALK IN BUNKER

"The bunker was very unpleasant and very hot," said one refugee. "We didn't talk, we didn't do anything while we were in them. We just lay down and fear dying."

A woman refugee said, "We just sat there quietly. I just held my little girl, She cried almost every day. I prayed to Buddha and my ancestors."

The woman said that when she reached the refugee center she was so dirty she was afraid her relatives would not recognize her.

B-52 strikes were most feared. One villager described how children near a B-52 strike were killed by the shock waves when blood gushed out of their ears. Those who survived were temporarily hard of hearing or acted crazy, he said.

"Unlike the artillery and tactical air, the B-52 strikes were not controlled by people in the field such as marine and airborne advisers." Niewoehner said. "The advisers have been good on shutting off tactical air strikes in areas where we think there are still civilians; but they don't control the B-52's.

"The B-52 targets are selected in advance, and it takes all kinds of higherups to shut one off once the process is begun. We told them about civilians in one area in Quang Tri two weeks ago, but it took about seven days before the B-52s stopped."

Refugees from Quang Tri are first taken to a reception center at a village north of Hue, then to camps several miles from the city. Arrivals at these camps often were emotional. Family members who separated during trips south were aften reunited there.

In some cases, the emotions were not happy. One woman arrived at a reception center to be told that one of her two brothers responsible for her support had been killed. Already wailing, she reached an intermediate point where she was informed that her other brother had also been killed.

One refugee at the reception center said, "The civilians are the people who suffer most. Only when we reached this place did we know we would survive." Almost all refugees interviewed said they wanted to return to their homes, even if only to see what is left.

FHA AND THE FAMILY FARM

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the Farmers Home Administration, under the outstanding leadership of our former colleague Jim Smith, will soon have expanded responsibilities when the new Rural Development Act becomes law. As a cosponsor of the House version of this legislation, I am confident that the FHA will meet the challenge of a larger role with the same dedication that they have shown in the past.

An excellent example of the valuable assistance rendered to rural America by the Farmers Home Administration was recorded in the August 14 issue of the Clarinda, Iowa, Herald Journal. The article follows:

THE FAMILY FARM: A PLACE IN AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

A man who left a job as a mechanic to become a full-time farmer believes there's a place for the small family farm in modern American agriculture.

Bill Henry, a Missouri native, moved his family onto a 556-acre spread about a mile east of College Springs in March of this year. Living in Burlington Jct, Mo. he had been working at Maryville garage since 1964.

"I just decided I wanted to farm full-time" Henry said, adding that he had farmed part-time in Missouri for two years. "There were several reasons for the change; one of them was I just wanted to get away from the public and have a little privacy. And of course, like most farmers, I wanted to be my own boss."

Learning of the availability of a farm in Page County, Henry entered into a lease agreement with M M Dockendorf of Pella, and then applied for a loan from the Farmers Home Administration in Shenandoah in October of 1971.

The operating loan, approved Jan. 7, 1972, was a seven-year arrangement to help pay the costs of machinery, livestock feed and seed purchases.

Outlining his operations, Henry said the land on the farm was more conducive to marketing livestock than to growing grain for sale and that about 200 acres would be used for pasture. Stock cows and hogs, he said, will be the primary items.

He currently has 70 head of cows and about 40 sows, of which he owns half interest with the landlord. He said his plans are to eventually market from 400 to 500 hogs yearly plus as many feeder calves as he can manage.

"The way the land is on the farm I don't think a person could make it on selling grain alone," Henry said. "He would have to use a combined livestock-grain operation, which I hope, will work for us."

Henry is handling the farm on a livestock-share arrangement under which the landlord meets half the expense of the feed, seed, fertilizer and other products while the tenant supplies the labor and the machinery. Profits are also divided between the two parties.

"As a temporary set-up, this is satisfactory," Henry said. "Our goal, of course, is to some day own our own farm, but to get started the lease agreement seemed the most practical way."

Henry's spread is classified by the Agriculture Department as a family farm because it employs no outside help for the day-to-day operations.

"This is it for us," he said, pointing to his wife Dora Jean and their two children, Rhonda, 11, and Roger, 9. "We'll either make it or won't make it on our own."

"I believe the family farm does have a future in agriculture today, but certain factors will have to be in your favor."

One of the factors Henry feels is vital is the size of the farm.

"The farm would have to be at least the size of this one before it could pay on its own. On anything smaller there just isn't enough margin of return to make it," he said, pointing to the fact that many persons on farms of 200 acres or less are forced to supplement their incomes by taking non-agricultural jobs at various times or by offering other services from their operations, such as milking, custom baling or stock inseminating.

"There is a certain minimum limit under which one can operate profitably," Henry said, "and for these farmers a real crisis exists. Fortunately, a family farm can be big enough to show a profit and yet not too big to be operated by a single family. And this is where its future is. If the set-up is satisfactory—market prices have a lot to do with this—then I think the family farm can survive."

He added that government support is "looking up every year. They seem to be taking more interest in us and are wanting to help us maintain and keep our farms." Help from the government, he said, must be paired with responsible action on the part of individual farmers.

"They can help us along, but we have the main responsibility for making the operation work."

Since he is a family farmer, Henry is naturally opposed to the proposal to consolidate small farms into large agricultural corporations on the grounds that they would be more efficient and productive.

"Sure their gross profits would be more, but costs are going up all around, too, so I doubt if their profit margins would be high enough to justify eliminating the small farmer from the agricultural scene," he said.

He added that he agreed with those who say higher yields are the key to higher income for the farmer, but said on a cost basis the family farm could produce a large enough yield to survive.

Henry said he wasn't opposed to large-scale operations on their own, but was against building up one phase of agriculture at the expense of another.

"There's a place for both the large farm and the small," he said. "And if the small farm can make it there's no reason to have it absorbed by a corporation."

Other than earlier this spring when weather was unfavorable, Henry said he hadn't encountered any major unexpected problems in moving onto the land.

"We knew it would be a lot of hard work, and it has been," he said. He is currently completing a soil bank, putting up hay, building fences and preparing to farrow sows.

"When we are able to buy our own place we'll probably stay in this area," he said. "It's a pretty good location, especially for marketing livestock."

Gary Beggs, FHA representative, said the operating loan was designed to help farmers get started and enable them to switch over

to bank or production credit mortgages later on.

"Usually the farmer doesn't carry the loan much over five years," he said.

Beggs added that applications are being accepted and processed at the FHA office for fiscal 1973, and that sufficient funds are expected to be available to qualifying county farmers.

"We hope that these loans can help the family farmer stay in existence," he said, "because we feel there is definitely a place for these operations. After all, the small farm formed the basis for much of what agriculture is today."

He said several younger men had indicated plans to go into farming, although not as many this year as in 1971.

McGOVERN TAKES A TWISTING ROAD

HON. DAVID W. DENNIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues, and of the public, the following perceptive column by William S. White, on the subject of Senator McGOVERN, taken from the Washington Post for August 18, 1972.

McGOVERN TAKES A TWISTING ROAD

(By William S. White)

Of the McGovern campaign a question of the most somber concern to reasonable people must now be asked. If this is the tone of it in August, at the very beginning of the contest, what will it be like when the climax is reached in October?

The Democratic candidate, all the while weeping at the "unfairness" of the Republicans, is setting a series of ugly precedents of which he himself would be deeply ashamed, and his whole leadership deeply wounded, should he in fact reach the presidency of the United States.

George McGovern is the first presidential aspirant in history to accept without disavowal or real demurrer the public support of an enemy power—in this case Communist North Vietnam—simultaneously engaged in killing the soldiers of the United States and its allies in a shooting war.

George McGovern is the first presidential aspirant in history to tolerate a backer, former Attorney General Ramsey Clark, who is willing to stand in an enemy capital—in this case Hanoi—and denounce the motives of his own country. Clark goes farther, too. He brings back from Hanoi a suggestion from a member of the North Vietnamese propaganda apparatus that some American war prisoners will be freed on the day George McGovern is inaugurated. This gross interference by an enemy power in the American election is another "first," indeed.

Again, George McGovern is the first presidential aspirant in history to flub the elementary obligation to know something about his runningmate before selecting him and then privately driving that runningmate from the ticket while publicly professing a compassionate support for him of "1,000 per cent." And then McGovern permits associates to continue secretly to seek the destruction of Thomas Eagleton even after he bows his head and resigns.

The George McGovern whose people ceaselessly anoint him as uniquely the good, the kind and the "moral" guy is the George McGovern who compares President Nixon's course in Vietnam with Hitler's extermination of the Jews. And this is also the George McGovern who, when Nixon subordinates counter-attack Ramsey Clark for his infamous behavior, mournfully complains that it is the President who is "taking the low road."

Many had hoped that the addition of Sargent Shriver to the McGovern slate might add some touch of civility. Shriver unhappily has proved instead to be only an apt pupil of his chief. Having gladly served for a year and a half as President Nixon's ambassador to Paris, Shriver now discovers nearly four years later that Hanoi was positively aching for a peace denied by the President in early 1969. Vice Presidental nominee Shriver is unable, however, to offer so much as a piece of paper to support to this discovery or any evidence that Ambassador Shriver ever once pointed out this glittering opportunity to the Nixon administration.

Now, nobody should suppose that the Republicans for their part are in this game to play pat-a-cake or that they are dealing or will deal with McGovern and Shriver in all loving kindness. All the same, when it comes to who is "taking the low road" it is only simple fairness to say that by contrast the Republican campaign is almost benign. The fact is that while the "Old Politics" of the GOP is plently tough and rough, the "New Politics" of George McGovern is simply incredible.

One of its techniques is to attack with limitless savagery—and then to moan aloud when the victim responds with one-tenth the venom that had been flung first at him. Another technique is to practice smear politics and to shout out tirelessly that the other fellow is practicing—what? Why, smear politics.

Indeed, the whole nature of the McGovern campaign recalls the wry observation of Marshal Foch of France in the first World War. The German, he said, would first try to beat you with his sword—and then with his tears.

DEFOLIANT STUDY REPORTED

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, recent news articles have reported an Army study of herbicides in future conventional conflicts using simulation theory techniques. These reports are based on an article that appeared in Science and Government Report, August 18, 1972.

Everyone understands the need for contingency planning by the Army but if the allegations reported in Science and Government are correct, the study sounds like a flight of fancy right out Dr. Strangelove; a real nightmare of computer lunacy. Use of herbicides in the NATO areas— Liege and Mainz and Bonn and Kassel—is highly questionable on military grounds, potentially politically destabilizing to continued unity of NATO partnership and reprehensible on moral grounds as well.

Congress deserves an explanation from the Pentagon and Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird as soon as possible with regard to the use of chemical defoliants in Western Europe and elsewhere.

The article from Science and Government follows:

DEFOLIATION: SECRET ARMY STUDY URGES USE IN FUTURE WARS

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has secretly proposed rewriting the Army's basic battle "scenarios" to allow for the use of herbicides in Western Europe to destroy foliage that might shield advancing Warsaw Pact forces, SGR has learned exclusively.

The Corps' proposal comes at a time when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has refused to act on the Nixon administration's request for ratification of the 1925 Geneva Protocol, banning first use of chemical weapons, because the administration insists that herbicides are not within the meaning of the Protocol.

Classified secret, the Engineers' proposed revision of the scenarios also includes the use of herbicides in "a conflict in which U.S. forces invade Cuba, defeat the Cuban armed forces and occupy the country pending establishment of a civil government acceptable to the U.S." Scenarios involving the use of herbicides are also given for counter-insurgency operations in Venezuela and Ethiopia, and in conventional warfare in Korea.

The original scenarios, contained in a secret Portfolio of General Purpose Force Requirements, code named SPECTRUM, are in the category of contingency planning, which means they may or may not be invoked in actual combat situation.

Originally drawn up in 1968 to cover 1970–75 and updated last year to cover 1972–79, SPECTRUM consists of 106 scenarios for military situations around the world. What the Corps did was to modify these scenarios to allow for the inclusion of defoliation operations, on the grounds that removal of foliage would substantially reduce U.S. manpower requirements.

The SPECTRUM scenarios are extensively referred to in a three-volume report, "Herbicides and Military Operations"—one classified secret, the others for official use only—that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers prepared in response to the furor over herbicide use in Vietnam. The three-volume report, completed earlier this year following comprehensive study by the Corps' Engineer Strategic Studies Group, reviews the Vietnam experience, cites the roles that herbicides can play in the SPECTRUM scenarios, and strongly defends the retention of herbicides in the Army's weapons inventory.

Though the Corps' own interviews with hundreds of officers who served in combat in Vietnam produce a mixed picture on the military value of herbicides, the Corps strongly argues in behalf of herbicides on the grounds of military utility.

Thus, in refering to the SPECTRUM scenarios for Ethiopia and Venezuela, the secret study states that "in both of the insurgency scenarios, counterinsurgency force requirements are reduced because factor W (average search width of a patrol) is increased when herbicides are used." The study goes on to state that "offensive forces in Venezuela are reduced to approximately 40 percent of the forces required in the original SPECTRUM analysis and offensive forces in Ethiopia are reduced to approximately 35 percent of those needed without herbicides."

Herbicide use, it continues, "would improve visibility in the evergreen forest, shrub and small tree forests (of Korea), and in the sugar cane fields of Cuba."

The study states that "SPECTRUM Situation D" envisions "a deliberate attack by Warsaw Pact forces to seize Western Europe. France is assumed to participate and the NATO forces are logistically supported" over a line extending through France and the Benelux countries. "This analysis," it states, "investigates the maneuver of forces between Liege and Mainz and Bonn and Kassel," continuing:

"Because the effect of herbicides is to expose the enemy positions while the defender remains concealed in foliage, herbicides have the effect of creating a prepared position . . . (T)he use of herbicides permits NATO forces to prepare successive de-

fensive positions by selecting defoliating areas where the attacking forces must assemble."

Since days or weeks are required for defoliants to take full effect, the use of herbicides in Western Europe is presumably predicted on intelligence warnings preceding an actual attack.

While the three volumes are unstinting in their endorsement of herbicides, synopses of earlier secret studies of defoliation efforts in Vietnam indicate serious reservations on the part of analysts and combat officers who have closely observed defoliation operations. Noting that President Kennedy gave approval for herbicide use against presumed Vietcong croplands "after additional assurance that enemy crops could be distinguished from friendly crops," the Corps of Engineers report notes that a secret 1967 Rand Corporation study concluded that "it appears that the crop destruction program has little effect on VC consumption. Despite the shortcomings of the data and the methodology used, the (Rand) analysis indicated the program is ineffective and that the negative effect on the peasant is too severe to continue the program."

It also reports that a secret study conducted by the Air Force in 1969 found, "There is no system for comprehensive evaluation of each project on the basis of the result it was supposed to achieve." That same study, the Corps reports, also concluded that "the public information program about herbicide operations was never adequate to overcome the resentment associated with the herbicide program."

The Corps' report also takes note of a "computer analysis (of defoliation operations) based on 12,526 sorties on 119 targets in 35 different provinces" in Vietnam. The conclusion: "Historical records of friendly and enemy-initiated incidents and of friendly and enemy personnel killed in action provide an inconsistent picture of the advantage and disadvantage associable with herbicide spray from fixed-wing aircraft."

Questionnaires filled out by several hundred combat officers, ranking from battalion commander and up, who served throughout South Vietnam from 1965–70, produced a generally favorable response concerning the military utility of herbicides, but the favorable responses were far from overwhelming, and in most cases, a small percentage of the officers concluded that defoliation actually worked to the tactical and political advantage of opposing forces.

In response to the question, "Where defoliants were used on wooded areas of VC shelter, friendly cross-country movement was:" the responses, by number, were as follows:

Seriously impeded (5); Impeded Somewhat (33); Unaffected (57); Assisted Somewhat (139); Greatly Assisted (38).

"Where defoliants were used on wooded areas of VC shelter, friendly casualties from enemy ambush were:"

Significantly reduced (65); Slightly reduced (120); Unaffected (67); Increased slightly (2); Increased Significantly (0).

"Where defoliants were used on wooded areas of VC shelter, enemy casualties from air support were:"

Significantly Reduced (2); Slightly Reduced (4); Unaffected (51); Increased Slightly (146); Increased Significantly (39).

"Where defoliants were used on enemy infiltration routes, enemy movement was:"

Seriously Impeded (33); Impeded Somewhat (157); Unaffected (43); Assisted Somewhat (12); Greatly Assisted (2).

In overwhelming numbers the responding officers reported favorably on the utility of herbicides for "perimeter defense," which actually accounts for a tiny proportion of the 5 million acres that have been defoliated in Vietnam, but on the politically sensitive issue of defoliation of food crops, the returns were extremely mixed as to reliability in identifying crops intended for hostile forces and the military and political effects of crop destruction.

In response to the question: "Where herbicides were used on food crops, the distinction between crops grown for use by the enemy and crops grown by noncombatants who were not supporting the enemy was:"

Completely Reliable (21); Usually Reliable (53); Fairly Reliable (63); Not Usually Reliable (5); Unreliable (3); Of Unknown Reliability (14).

THE McGOVERN VIETNAM OFFENSIVE

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I have followed the recent controversy over alleged peace overtures made by North Vietnam in 1969 with some concern. It has been brought up now, 3 years later, that the administration ignored this supposedly unequivocal "signal" that the North Vietnamese were ready to end the war. These charges are displayed against a background of former Attorney General Ramsey Clark's melodramatic and rather hastily considered remarks about his trip to North Vietnam. To add to the confusion, we also have the not-too-consistent remarks of Senator McGOVERN and Mr. Pierre Salinger concerning the latter's "peace mission" to Paris.

I feel the following article from the Wall Street Journal, August 18, 1972, is very helpful in putting this melange of statements and charges into perspective:

THE McGOVERN VIETNAM OFFENSIVE

Senator McGovern is obviously trying to get his stumbling campaign on some sort of track by reigniting the war issue. Far from dispelling the stumbling image, though, the efforts so far leave a feeling that when it comes to Vietnam Senator McGovern and his friends have lost the capacity to draw any distinctions whatever.

To put the Ramsey Clark episode in some context, for example, imagine that John Mitchell had toured Greece or South Africa under an itinerary arranged by the government in power there, had visited one prison and interviewed a few selected prisoners, then returned issuing statements with the thrust that prisoners are being treated humanely. He would of course be alternately flayed and laughed at, and anyone who defended him would immediately be recognized as having utterly lost all critical faculties.

Mr. Clark has just taken precisely such a tour of North Vietnam, with a few added twists. A reporter on Hanoi radio, for example, quoted him as saying "I cannot understand how Nixon could commit such hideous crimes against a village living in peace amid rice fields like this.' Back in the U.S. with a chance to disavow such quotes, Mr. Clark instead announces that if his candidate is elected President the Communists promise to release their prisoners on inauguration day. When Republicans strike back, Senator McGovern charges they are taking the "low road."

Meanwhile, Senator McGovern is refusing briefings with Henry Kissinger on the announced grounds that he can learn more by reading the newspapers. He has, however, designated Paul Warnke to receive any information "that the White House thinks would be useful." He has also dispatched Pierre Salinger to talk with the North Vietnamese in Paris.

The press had initially understood Senator McGovern to deny connection with the Salinger mission, but the Senator says there "is not the slightest discrepancy" between his initial statement and the later confirmation. The first, he explains, merely meant that he hadn't instructed Mr. Salinger to urge the North Vietnamese to settle before the election. Rather, the Senator says, "I would like to get our administration to make a peaceful settlement right now."

The centerpiece of the McGovern Vietnam offensive, though, is the charge by vice presidential nominee R. Sargent Shriver that "Nixon had peace handed to him literally in his lap. He blew it." The charge has been more-or-less backed by W. Averell Harriman and Cyrus R. Vance. It turns out that peace in Mr. Nixon's lap involved the withdrawal of certain North Vietnamese forces from South Vietnam after the collapse of the Communists' "third wave" offensive in 1968. This, say Mr. Harriman and Mr. Vance, was a "signal" that the Communists wanted to settle the war.

Now, one of the important things about the McGovern offensive is the cast of characters. Averell Harriman, Cyrus Vance, Sargent Shriver, Pierre Salinger, Paul Warnke, Ramsey Clark. Every last one of them a high official of the administrations that created the mess in Vietnam. They are second-guessing Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger in their efforts to clean it up.

The ex-officials argue, of course, that they opposed the policies of their administrations. In fact they won some and lost some; in particular, Mr. Harriman's advice prevailed at the time of the Diem coup, a crucial juncture in our expanding commitment to the war. But even if they were in fact totally absolved of the mistakes of the Kennedy and Johnson years, their criticism of the Nixon administration should be recognized for what it is: the roasting of their domestic adversaries for failing to follow policies they could not sell to their friends when they held seats of power.

This is the context in which to understand the 1968 "peace signal." Since Hanoi did not accompany its troop movements with any diplomatic hint of compromise, the Johnson administration felt they were no great signal. Mr. Harriman and Mr. Vance interpreted them that way as part of their effort to sell their own notion of a settlement, involving some kind of a coalition government practically certain to lead to Communist control. In that sense they are right, the United States could have settled in 1968—by agreeing to a Communist victory. This week's McGovern offensive is merely a rehash of the debate over whether that was a wise idea in 1968, or now, for it is precisely the policy the Senator and his supporters urge today.

Urge with a passion, in fact, that seems to blind their ability to make fine judgments. Judgments, for example, between nebulous signals and peace in our lap. Or between the intransigence of the Communists and the position of the Americans at Paris. Between Kissinger briefings and newspaper accounts. Between the North Vietnamese prisoner-of-war policies and their showcase tours.

Most of all, finally, between an immoral aggressive war which would be justly ended by Communist victory and American atonement, and a mistakenly ambitious defensive war which the Americans must find a way to end without too grievously undermining their position in the rest of the world.

CIPS ACTS TO IMPROVE ENVIRONMENT

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, everyone is talking about pollution and the environment today. Central Illinois Public Service Co., an electric utility company in downstate Illinois, is doing something about it.

A test project using coal residue from the Coffeen Power Station has just begun, and it offers a promising solution to a mounting waste disposal problem for all electric utilities.

Litchfield Bituminous Corp. of Hillsboro presently is in the process of removing 125,000 to 150,000 tons of boiler slag from the storage pile at Coffeen Station. The slag is being used as a base material in construction of two overpasses on Interstate Highway 55 near Litchfield.

If the material proves suitable in the overpass construction, as thorough testing has indicated it will, other similar uses can be expected to develop and create a sizable market for the product.

Boiler slag, fly ash and bottom ash are natural by-products whenever coal is burned for industrial application. Since electric utilities burn more coal than any other industry in the United States, they produce the most ash and slag. How to dispose of this material is becoming a serious problem for most utilities.

The extent of the coal ash disposal problem facing CIPS is emphasized by the fact that even 150,000 tons represents only about a fourth of the residue pile at Coffeen Station. According to company calculations, the storage area contained approximately 560,000 tons of slag as of May 31.

The original storage area at Coffeen Station rapidly is filling up, with only about 2 years of use left. Another storage area, more than twice as large as the first, has been constructed and will be used for the station's new 600,000-kilowatt second generating unit.

In addition to Coffeen's situation, storage areas at the utility's other three Illinois power stations also contain hundreds of thousands of tons of ash. These stations are located at Hutsonville in Crawford County, Grand Tower in Jackson County, and Meredosia in Morgan County.

In time, continued operation of coal-fired power stations will require use of more and more land area for ash storage, unless practical uses for the material are developed to solve the problem. That is why the present project at Coffeen Station is encouraging.

Litchfield Bituminous began hauling slag from the station in mid-May and had removed 72,864 tons through June 30 for an average of 2,082 tons per day. The company is using up to 24 tandem and dump trucks on a shuttle operation between the power station and construction site.

The slag is being deposited in four large excavations located approximately 300 yards west of route 66 and 2 miles north of Litchfield, where Interstate 55 will bridge the tracks of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad. The original soil at the site of the twin overpasses was considered too unstable to provide a solid base for the construction.

Coal residue from Coffeen Station was approved as a substitute base material after meeting all gradation specifications in tests conducted by both Litchfield Bituminous and the Illinois Department of Highways.

Central Illinois Public Service Co. is to be commended for its initiative in cleaning up the environment. Hopefully, this experiment will prove to be an outstanding success and point the way for other electric utilities across the Nation to follow.

"AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL" YEAR: 1973

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, remembering the words of the ancient philosopher who said that he would rather write the songs of a nation than write its laws, I commend to the attention of Members of the Congress the following article from the Falmouth Enterprise, Falmouth, Mass. It was a Cape Cod woman, Katharine Lee Bates, the distinguished poet and educator, who wrote our Nation's most beloved song, "America the Beautiful." As we can now see, the words of that hymn express in their own way the philosophy of conservation, preservation, and enlightened planning—those needs that are becoming more urgent by the day in this country. Next year, as the article reminds us, will be the 80th anniversary of "America the Beautiful," written on Professor Bates' first trip west in 1893. The suggestion that 1973 be dedicated to a practical and creative kind of remembrance is worth our serious consideration.

The article follows:

[From the Falmouth (Mass.) Enterprise]

REQUEST FOR A PROCLAMATION—THAT 1973 SHALL BE KNOWN AS "AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL" YEAR

(By Robert H. Simmons)

Next year, 1973, will be the 80th anniversary of "America the Beautiful." This moving hymn, by the poet and educator, Katharine Lee Bates—who was born on August 12, 1859, in Falmouth, Massachusetts, and who grew up in our town—was written in the summer of 1893 on the poet's first trip west.

"After visiting at Chicago the World's Fair," Miss Bates recalled in an article published April 6, 1918, "where I was naturally impressed by the symbolic beauty of the White City, I went on to Colorado Springs. Here I spent three weeks or so under the purple range of the Rockies, which looked down with surprise on a summer school [at Colorado College.] This had called to its faculty several instructors from the east. . . My own subject, which seemed incongruous enough under that new and glowing sky, was English Religious Drama. [Miss Bates was Professor of English Literature at Wellesley College, Wellesley, Massachusetts.]

"We strangers celebrated the close of the session by a merry expedition to the top of Pikes Peak, making the ascent by . . . prairie wagons. . . We were hoping for half an hour on the summit, but two of our party became so faint in the rarified air that we were bundled into the wagons again and started on our downward plunge so speedily that our sojourn on the peak remains in memory hardly more than one ecstatic gaze.

"It was then and there, as I was looking out over the sea-like expanse of fertile country spreading away so far under those ample skies, that the opening lines of the hymn floated into my mind. When we left Colorado Springs, the four stanzas were pencilled in my notebook, together with other memoranda, in verse and prose, of the trip. . . ."

One of the summer faculty at Colorado College was Professor Woodrow Wilson of Princeton. At the time Miss Bates wrote the above recollection, Wilson was President and the country was embroiled in World War I. The poet ended her article with the following note:

"That the hymn has gained, in these twenty-odd years, such a hold as it has upon our people, is clearly due to the fact that Americans are at heart idealists, with a fundamental faith in human brotherhood—that faith for which our Nation, in this crucial hour of history, stands ready to risk and suffer all."

According to custom, we should wait for its centennial year to honor this hymn that, without official fiat of any kind, has captured the hearts of Americans, year after year, for the past eight decades.

Realistically, however, we do not have time to wait. A special kind of celebration should, and must, begin next year at the latest.

"America the Beautiful" has taken its own place in American life and thought, without official assistance, because it, better than any other set of words ever written, reflects the vision, the dream, of what our country can be and should be.

The official National Anthem, "The Star-Spangled Banner," was written at a moment that nearly was the dark ending of this Nation's then brief history. It stated, and still states, the thrill of realization—after the anguish of expected defeat—that the greatest and most immediate battle had been won, that the Nation had survived and was safe to resume its chosen life, according to the vision of its rightful citizens.

"America the Beautiful" celebrates that vision itself. Today, it is both a celebration and a challenge.

Traditionally, as noted, we should wait for the 100th anniversary and then observe a ceremony of honors for "America the Beautiful." But we do not have time to wait. By 1993, the words of "America the Beautiful" may be ironic ghosts, with meanings lost in the archives of history. That is the challenge.

Instead of waiting, therefore, it is proposed that a Proclamation be drafted (by someone such as a Governor or a President) designating 1973 as "America-the-Beautiful" Year.

"America-the-Beautiful" Year would be dedicated, with or without ceremonies, to massive practical efforts toward turning back the tide of ugliness and pollution, both of the environment and of the spirit, that continues to threaten the life of this country.

These practical efforts would be carried out in the tradition of the pilgrims—from all nations—who packed up and left the unbearable conditions of their homelands to seek freedom and a better life in America. This time, however, the pilgrims would stay at home, while the homeland itself made the journey—into a better future.

"America-the-Beautiful" Year would represent a practical and re-invigorated beginning

to the celebration that is to reach a climax in 1976—the Bicentennial of the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the founding of the United States of America as a Nation.

We have the dreams, in plenty, of what America should be. Our creative citizens—artists, poets, architects, writers, preachers, musicians, conservationists, philosophers, physicians, statesmen, builders, educators, landscape designers, engineers—possess both the vision and the know-how to transform America into a paradise for man and nature.

This vision of what our Nation intends to be was given expression in the hymn, "America the Beautiful." But, while the language of the hymn has become an accompaniment to most of the official functions of the Nation's recent history—inaugurations, graduations, etc.—it, like history texts, is often recited without real understanding or commitment.

In 1973, in this forthcoming symbolic year, the Nation would take a deeper look at the four stanzas of "America the Beautiful" and attempt to find there the guideposts for the year's special activities and chores.

These verses state that America is:

(1) "beautiful for spacious skies"—for unspoiled, fruitful, and abundant nature;

(2) "beautiful for pilgrim feet"—for the strong men, the forefathers, who ploughed and hammered a "thoroughfare for freedom" across the land;

(3) "beautiful for heroes proved"—for the courage of those who were willing to suffer and to die in defense of their principles and dreams;

(4) "beautiful for patriot dream"—for the vision itself, for the goal of a better life for all, for beautiful cities, created out of the wilderness to protect and nourish their citizens, physically and spiritually.

In brief, the hymn, "America the Beautiful," celebrates nature's creativity, man's physical strength and skill, man's spiritual strength and courage, and man's creativity.

We Americans, it states, were given four great gifts—the abundance of a natural wonderland, great strength of body and productive skills, profound courage of principle, and the vision to see a better life toward which to work, utilizing, with enlightenment, the first three gifts.

The hymn asks for the grace of God to illuminate this mission.

With the words of the hymn before us, as we all have sung them a thousand times over, we could, in the practical achievements of "America-the-Beautiful" Year, set straight the course toward that which we all want for the future of the United States of America.

A NEW RACKET

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, it is not my custom to put commercial ads in the RECORD. On the other hand, when members of the U.S. Army are getting rich doing commercials, I feel that it should be called to the Members' attention. Reading the entire commercial that follows, do you get the impression that Sp4c. Stan Smith, U.S. Army, has more than one racket going for him?

The article follows:

[From Newsweek, Aug. 21, 1972]

HOW I WON WIMBLEDON

(By Stan Smith)

I've been preparing for Wimbledon for about a year. Ever since I lost to Newcombe in the finals last year. So I was determined to be 100% physically fit. I did a lot of running beforehand and a lot of stretching exercises. This has been helping my movement on the court and also kept my limbs limber. I've also been doing some yoga for the past six months—not the psychological part, but the physical part.

I've also spent months preparing myself mentally. I know that being seeded number one and being the favorite was something that added a bit of pressure. But then you realize that there's no other tournament in the world that has the tradition, charisma or atmosphere of Wimbledon.

When I walked out on the court for my first match the one thing that I thought about was how much longer the grass was. I was also a little uncertain about it, since I hadn't played on grass since Forest Hills, but then you quickly get mentally involved in the match. I think about the plan of attack or strategy that I'm going to use against that particular player, and if you think about that enough you don't really think about all the other elements involved. My biggest problem was the return of serve. Coming from the clay courts of Mexico City, during the Davis Cup Matches, my style was much different. On clay, I usually chip the return and try not to hit too aggressively. On grass, I'll try to hit a more aggressive return. I concentrated on hitting the ball as early as possible because the ball would come off the grass much faster than I was used to.

Also, I tried to stay down low to the ground, because I have a tendency to jump up as I hit the ball. I wasn't satisfied with my serve during the early matches, so by the time I got to the finals against Nastase I knew I had to try to serve well and get my first one in.

Nastase had been playing extremely well during the entire tournament so I knew I had to eliminate any unnecessary errors against him. Nastase is so fast he gets many balls that most players don't. Which gives you a tendency to overhit.

My strategy in the finals was to put a lot of pressure on his serve. He's got a good serve, but not a great serve and if I could make him get a little worried—especially after he misses his first serve—I could keep the pressure on him. I thought a turning point came in the fifth set on my serve when we were tied four games apiece. I was down Love-30 after he had just played two fantastic points. Then he hit another great shot that I reached for but didn't think I could get, and it hit right off the wood of my Autograph racket and was a perfect drop shot that gave me the point. If he had gotten the point I would have been down Love-40, but taking that point let me go on to win the game and eventually the match. All of a sudden it was over. My first emotion was it couldn't be over and then I realized it was. My feeling at that point is impossible to describe, because after a combination of 25 years and many hours of practice it was one of the happiest points that I can remember in my tennis career.

It was one of these marvelous days when everything was working beautifully—right down to my racket—which incidentally was great throughout the tournament. It's really important to be completely confident in the racket you play. But, I know from past experience with my racket that it will always play great for me.

I helped Wilson design my Stan Smith Autograph racket so I feel really good about it. It has more wood in the construction of the handle and tapers down, so there's less weight in the head of the racket. This lets you get a little more feel and a little more flexibility in the head, so that the ball will stay on the string a bit longer than with a different construction.

The Stan Smith Autograph racket.

Wilson, No. 1 in Tennis Wood rackets for serious players.

Wilson is a registered trademark of Wilson Sporting Goods Co.

THE REAL GEORGE McGOVERN

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I addressed myself to a call that the real GEORGE MCGOVERN please stand. It is important in this election year of choice, that the American people should know the real GEORGE MCGOVERN, what he stands for, what he would do to the country, and what he has done on the record, compared with promises.

In this connection a few more MCGOVERN "firsts" are described in a column in this morning's Washington Post by William S. White.

All in all, that record is a sorry spectacle.

The column follows:

MCGOVERN TAKES A TWISTING ROAD

(By William S. White)

Of the McGovern campaign, a question of the most somber concern to reasonable people must now be asked. If this is the tone of it in August, at the very beginning of the contest, what will it be like when the climax is reached in October?

The Democratic candidate, all the while weeping at the "unfairness" of the Republicans, is setting a series of ugly precedents of which he himself would be deeply ashamed, and his whole leadership deeply wounded, should he in fact reach the presidency of the United States.

George McGovern is the first presidential aspirant in history to accept without disavowal or real demurrer the public support of an enemy power—in this case Communist North Vietnam—simultaneously engaged in killing the soldiers of the United States and its allies in a shooting war.

George McGovern is the first presidential aspirant in history in tolerate a backer, former Attorney General Ramsey Clark, who is willing to stand in an enemy capital—in this case Hanoi—and denounce the motives of his own country. Clark goes farther, too. He brings back from Hanoi a suggestion from a member of the North Vietnamese propaganda apparatus that some American war prisoners will be freed on the day George McGovern is inaugurated. This gross interference by an enemy power in the American election is another "first" indeed.

Again, George McGovern is the first presidential aspirant in history to flub the elementary obligation to know something about his running mate before selecting him and then privately driving that running mate from the ticket while publicly professing a compassionate support for him of "1,000 per cent." And then McGovern permits associates to continue secretly to seek the destruction of Thomas Eagleton even after he bows his head and resigns.

The George McGovern whose people ceaselessly anoint him as uniquely the good, the kind and the "moral" guy is the George McGovern who compares President Nixon's course in Vietnam with Hitler's extermination of the Jews. And this is also the George McGovern who, when Nixon subordinates counter-attack Ramsey Clark for his infamous behavior, mournfully complains that it is the President who is "taking the low road."

Many had hoped that the addition of Sargent Shriver to the McGovern slate might add some touch of civility. Shriver unhappily has proved instead to be only an apt pupil of his chief. Having gladly served for a year and a half as President Nixon's ambassador to Paris, Shriver now discovers nearly four years later that Hanoi was positively aching for a peace denied by the President in early 1969. Vice Presidential nominee Shriver is unable, however, to offer so much as a piece of paper to support to this discovery or any evidence that Ambassador Shriver ever once pointed out this glittering opportunity to the Nixon administration.

Now, nobody should suppose that the Republicans for their part are in this game to play pat-a-cake or that they are dealing or will deal with McGovern and Shriver in all loving kindness. All the same, when it comes to who is "taking the low road" it is only simple fairness to say that by contrast the Republican campaign is almost benign. The fact is that while the "Old Politics" of the GOP is plenty tough and rough, the "New Politics" of George McGovern is simply incredible.

One of its techniques is to attack with limitless savagery—and then to moan aloud when the victim responds with one-tenth the venom that had been flung first at him. Another technique is to practice smear politics and to shout out tirelessly that the other fellow is practicing—what? Why, smear politics.

Indeed, the whole nature of the McGovern campaign recalls the wry observation of Marshal Foch of France in the first World War. The German, he said, would first try to beat you with his sword—and then with his tears.

FREEDOM IS EVERYBODY'S JOB

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a communication from one of my constituents, Sp5c. Steve Larkin, of St. Joseph, Mich., presently stationed with the association of the U.S. Army in Europe. Mr. Larkin has sent me a copy of an address recently delivered by former Chief of Staff, Gen. Harold K. Johnson, USA, retired, and, because it is a thoughtful message—one which should be heard by all Americans, I am quoting portions of it herewith:

GEN. JOHN J. PERSHING MEMORIAL DINNER ADDRESS

(By Gen. Harold K. Johnson, retired, Garmisch, Germany, June 3, 1972)

I have debated a long time about what I might talk to you about tonight and I think that I finally came around to something that might be titled "Is It Worth It" which I drew from a lieutenant colonel about one and a half years ago at one of the War Colleges. He came up to me before I spoke to this class and said, "Sir, have I been marching to the beat of the wrong drum all these years?" Wherever I go, not only in the Army, but elsewhere, this question tends to recur.

Is what we are doing important? Is there a future in this day for a military force? Should I be doing something else? Well, for each person I think there is a different answer because each must satisfy himself. But, I think that there is a better answer for all of us and I am going to talk about that tonight. Kipling said, "God and the soldier all people adore, in time of war but not before." Somewhere in the early 1600's an English poet said, "Our God and soldier alike adore, when at the brink of ruin but not before. After deliverance, both our God forgotten and our soldier slighted."

These have been difficult years because much of the public attitude has gone beyond slight, and to a certain extent drifted into an area that one might call contempt. When one serves under conditions like that it's kind of difficult to keep your cool so you have to go back and establish a perspective for yourself and a perspective for the people with whom you associate.

I do it by going back into a little book by Will and Ariel Durant called "The Lessons of History" which says that "War is one of the constants of history and has not diminished with civilization or democracy. In the last 3,421 years of recorded history only 268 have seen no war."

Peace is an unstable equilibrium which can be preserved only by acknowledged supremacy or equal power. I would expect you would find some historians who would debate the equal power because there are times in the world when force of aggression recognized basically only raw, naked superior power. The point I think we all need to remember is that people are greedy. People seek things which are not theirs. This has gone on since there has been man on this earth and until the heart and the mind of man change, it is likely there will continue to be greed and avarice no matter how much we would like to see something else.

At the Freedoms Foundation we have an awards program in which we invite "Letters from Armed Forces". I would like to read what one Army captain said last year about "What is an American":

"If one can look at America's towering, snow-capped mountains and realize that she is beautiful and see her miles upon miles of waving fields of grain and realize that she is fruitful, and watch her mighty rivers flowing to the sea and realize that she is powerful, then he is an American.

If one can look at America's vast, dry wilderness and know that she is harsh and walk through her lush green forests and know that she is wild and observe her soggy, damp swamps and know that she is full of adventure, then he is an American.

If one can gaze at America's towering skyscrapers and know that she is progressive and watch her men walking on the moon and know that she is constantly seeking knowledge and watch machines probing into her abundant natural resources beneath the surface of the earth and know that she is rich, then he is an American.

If one stands a little taller when he hears her national anthem and senses a thrill when he sees her flag waving in the gentle breeze and realizes her freedom when he watches her great bald eagles winging silently in space, then he is an American.

If one can be proud when she is faithful and hurt when she has been wronged and fearful when she is restless and violent, then he is an American.

If one can read her history and realize that she is not perfect and look upon her many races of people and cultures and see only one and attend one of her numerous religious services and know that she is devout, then he is an American.

If one is willing to speak in her behalf when she has been criticized and willing to fight for her when she has been threatened and willing to die for her if she calls him to her aid, then he is an American.

If one can dream impossible dreams and know that America dreams also and hope with all one's heart for a better and more perfect tomorrow and realize that she is trying with all her might and have faith in her when she fails but dares to try again, then he is an American.

When one can watch her long straight lines of men in uniform and know that she is strong and watch her gather the needy of the world to her bosom and know that she is compassionate and observe her courts' process and know that she is just, then he is an American.

If one can speak one's thoughts without fear of punishment and write one's ideas for the whole world to read and finally be allowed to be oneself without fear of critics, then he is an American.

If one can sing when America sings and shout about when she shouts and laugh when she laughs and cry when she cries and struggle when she struggles and pray when she prays, then he is an American.

What you are doing is protecting. How, what are you protecting? There is nothing as constant as change, there is nothing as difficult to accommodate as change and there is nothing as essential as change. We have got to recognize that we are living in a world that is changing at a pace that we cannot keep up with entirely. Things are happening that we do not completely understand. Changes are taking place that we don't like. But there are other changes taking place that we do want, that we need. Change is going to continue to take place.

There is a topic that is highly emotional—Amnesty. Why should a man who runs away be given a consideration? And yet, we don't know why the man ran away and isn't this country all about giving him an opportunity to tell us why before we judge? Sure it is, and that's why your lives have been on the line over many, many years. In my lifetime four wars, every single one of them to uphold a principle that "man is entitled to be free." Man, wherever he is and under whatever condition he lives and serves, wants to be free and we have got to help him. Now, for a moment we seem to be pulling back. But this isn't new, we did the same thing in 1919 and 1920 after World War I.

In 1920 Gen. Douglas MacArthur went up to the United States Military Academy as the youngest superintendent since Thayer, charged with revitalizing, revamping the Military Academy. He had everybody up in arms over the changes he made but changes had to be made just like changes that are going to take place in this society, and you are going to guard the way the change takes place. You are not going to make the change, you are not going to be responsible for the change, you are not merely going to guide it, but you are going to maintain and protect the environment in which that change takes place.

Is it worth it? Do you know how many people have come to this land since we have been a free nation? Forty-one million. Forty-one million from other shores have liked what we have in the United States of America. They wanted to share and they came to share and those of us who were there shared. Perhaps not equally, perhaps not equitable. We have lots of injustices to correct but we have so much that is right about us that we must not forget what's right in our concern about what's wrong. Here's where you have to maintain a balance and here's where you have to maintain perspective.

What is more important then defending your country? Try to name it. The teacher can say I am more important because I am expanding your minds. You don't expand many minds in a closed society. You do this in the kind of free society that the force provides. The preacher can say I do because I am getting you acquainted with your God. Not in a closed society; you do this only in a free society. You are the people who keep it free. The doctor, dentist, lawyer, you name it, none of them can follow their vocation in a society where a man is not free—they can't follow it fully.

That's what you are doing—maintaining a free society. No more noble purpose can you have than defending your country and when people carp and criticize, remember that you have provided them with the opportunity to

do just that because without the actions and performance that you have given they couldn't do it. This is what you are doing and it's a great, great privilege you have to be serving in your country's uniform and it's a great, great goal to have of continuing to keep us a free nation. I would like to wind up with one man's description of freedom—something you can take with you when you leave.

Dear God has given to each of us a gift beyond compare.
It is like a polished precious stone with many facets rare.
In one we find the sky and sea, the beauty of this world.
Another shows America with stars and stripes unfurled.
We see the people kneeling in deep and thankful prayer and homes with joyous faces that tell of loved ones and again we find men speaking and writing hopefully their conscience is telling them the truth shall make you free.
The scientist and artisan are working unafraid so man may find new challenges in everything they need.
One facet shows those noble bonds that grow betwix man and man with sacrifice and love and in their daily living plan
This gem of many facets is old yet ever new. It has the name of freedom—its other name is you.

This you can never forget. Freedom is everybody's job. Freedom is everybody's job. Freedom is everybody's responsibility, but a few are chosen to protect and preserve it from violent overthrow and you are among those chosen few. So be proud of what you are and be proud of what you do, above all be proud of the United States of America.

MINERAL KING

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, the future of the mammoth development planned at Mineral King by Walt Disney Enterprises is still in doubt as a result of the Supreme Court decision on April 19.

Because of the confusion surrounding this issue, I was pleased to read a detailed status report on Mineral King in the June issue of Not Man Apart, published by Friends of the Earth. An article by Tom Turner and Patricia Sarr explains some of the implications of the Court's decision, and outlines the ways conservationists hope to overcome that temporary setback.

I commend this timely article to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

On April 19, the Supreme Court dismissed a case, brought before it by the Sierra Club,

MINERAL KING: DID WE WIN OR LOSE?

in which the club sought to prevent the despoliation of a valley in the Sierra Nevada. The dismissal turned on a point of law known as "standing to sue," a point of critical importance to environmental organizations seeking redress in the courts.

"Standing" is recognition by the court that the plaintiff is a legitimate party to bring a given lawsuit. For example, if an airplane crashes into my house, I am obviously the proper person to sue the pilot, the airline, and perhaps the CAB for the damage to my house. If the plane crashes into my neighbor's house without injury to me, it is unlikely that the court will let me be the one to bring suit. One is expected to fight one's own battles.

When the environment is involved there is obviously a question about who should be able to go to court to defend it. For years, the courts insisted that only someone with an economic injury could bring suit, and routinely tossed out cases brought by conservation organizations seeking to protect the public domain on the grounds that they had no pecuniary interest in jeopardy.

Then in 1966, the Scenic Hudson Preservation Conference and others got the U.S. Court of Appeals (second circuit) to recognize that they had standing to participate in Federal Power Commission licensing proceedings to try to stop Consolidated Edison from building a pumped storage power facility at Storm King Mountain on the Hudson River.

The Conference demonstrated that it represented several thousand members who would be harmed by the building of the Storm King Plant, through the loss of aesthetic and recreational values, and claimed the right to sue on their behalf.

So the precedent was set, and more and more environmental cases began to be accepted by courts all over the country.

The Sierra Club used this precedent in June 1969 when it filed suit in the Federal District Court in San Francisco to prevent the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior from issuing permits for the development of Mineral King Valley, by Walt Disney Enterprises, as a ski resort. The club objected that the proposed development is so extensive as to completely subvert the purpose of legislation passed in 1926 setting Mineral King aside as the Sequoia National Game Refuge; that the proposed highway and power line through Sequoia National Park, to service Disney, would be illegal; and that the Forest Service could not, in any event, issue permits to private companies in excess of 80 acres under the law (Disney wants 13,000 acres).

The club claimed its right to standing solely since "one of the principal purposes of the Sierra Club is to protect and conserve the natural resources of the Sierra Nevada mountains." The District Court held that this allegation made the Sierra Club "sufficiently aggrieved" to have standing to sue on behalf of Mineral King, and issued an injunction barring the issuance of any permits to begin construction of the ski resort.

The Forest Service and Disney appealed the decision, and the U.S. Court of Appeals (9th circuit) overturned the earlier decision, ruling that the club did not have standing since it had not shown that the club itself would suffer injury. The club petitioned the Supreme Court to hear the case, and the High Court upheld the decision of the Court of Appeals. The Court, however, upheld the 9th circuit only on the precise pleading concerning standing, and did not rule on the merits of the case.

GAMBLING

The Sierra Club's case was dismissed because it tried to get the Court to affirm this broader view of standing, which the District Court had recognized. Rather than claiming a right to standing on the ground that it sponsors outings to Mineral King in the summer, and that it has hundreds of members who enjoy Mineral King in the summer, and that it has hundreds of members who enjoy Mineral King in its pristine state, the club argued that it should have standing to sue simply by virtue of its existence as a stable, reputable, respectable organization with a long-time interest in the environment. The court didn't go for it, but it was close, and there are some very hopeful words both in the majority opinion and in the dissents. (Voting with the majority: Burger, Marshall, Stewart and White; dissenting: Blackmun, Brennan and Douglas.)

(Before the case went to the Supreme Court, Friends of the Earth, The Wilderness Society, and the Izaac Walton League filed an *amici curiae* brief with the Court, setting forth four alternative grounds upon which the Court could support the club's claim to standing, including the outings and other activities the club carries on at Mineral King. The club chose not to adopt that argument in its final Reply Brief to the Court. The majority opinion, written by Justice Brennan and handed down on April 19, referred to that brief: "In an amici curiae brief filed in the Court by The Wilderness Society and others, it is asserted that the Sierra Club has conducted regular camping trips into the Mineral King area, and that various members of the Club have used and continue to use the area for recreational purposes. These allegations were not contained in the pleadings, nor were they brought to the attention of the Court of Appeals. Moreover, the Sierra Club in its reply brief specifically declines to rely on its individualized interest, as a basis for standing. . . .")

So the club lost its gamble. It can, however, amend its complaint to include allegations of use by members, and therefore injury to the club, and refile it with the District Court in San Francisco. In fact, the High Court very nearly recommended this course: "Our decision does not, of course, bar the Sierra Club from seeking in the District Court to amend its complaint by a motion under Rule 15, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure."

But has standing suffered a blow? Probably not. In denying the club's claim to standing, the Court actually moved to broaden the basis for standing, though not quite as far as the club wanted or FOE would have liked.

THE DECISION

In this case, the first time the issue of standing in an environmental case has been ruled on by the court, the majority said, "The injury alleged by the Sierra Club will be incurred entirely by reason of the change in the uses to which Mineral King will be put, and the attendant change in the aesthetics and ecology of the area. Thus, in referring to the road to be built through Sequoia National Park, the complaint alleged that the development would destroy or otherwise affect the scenery, natural and historic objects and wildlife of the park and would impair the enjoyment of the park for future generations. We do not question that this type of harm may amount to an 'injury in fact' sufficient to lay the basis for standing under (section) 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act. Aesthetic and environmental well-being, like economic well-being are important ingredients of the quality of life in our society, and the fact that particular environmental interests are shared by the many rather than the few does not make them less deserving of legal protection through the judicial process. But the 'injury in fact' test requires more than an injury to a cognizable interest. It requires that the party seeking review be himself among the injured."

THE DISSENTS

Three Justices in dissent would have extended the standing doctrine even further than the majority. Justice Blackmun, speaking for himself and Justice Brennan, wrote, "This is not ordinary, run-of-the-mill litigation. The case poses—if we choose to acknowledge and reach them—significant aspects of a wide, growing and disturbing problem, that is, the Nation's and the world's deteriorating environment with its resulting ecological disturbances. Must our law be so rigid and our procedural concepts so inflexible that we render ourselves helpless when the existing methods and the traditional con-

cepts do not quite fit and do not prove to be entirely adequate for new issues? . . .

"I would permit an imaginative expansion of our traditional concepts of standing in order to enable an organization such as the Sierra Club, possessed, as it is, of pertinent, bona fide and well-recognized attributes and purposes in the area of the environment, to litigate environmental issues."

Justice Douglas wrote a second dissent, which contains a jurisprudential theory that may well represent the key to protecting the environment through the judicial process. He said that the real problem lies with the concept of the law which limits its protection to people and their property. Justice Douglas wrote, "The critical question of 'standing' would be simplified and also put neatly in focus if we fashioned a federal rule that allowed environmental issues to be litigated before federal agencies or federal courts in the name of the inanimate object about to be despoiled, defaced, or invaded by roads and bulldozers and where injury is the subject of public outrage. Contemporary public concern for protecting nature's ecological equilibrium should lead to the conferral of standing upon environmental objects to sue for their own preservation . . . This suit would therefore be more properly labeled as *Mineral King* v. *Morton*.

"Inanimate objects are sometimes parties in litigation. A ship has a legal personality, a fiction found useful for maritime purposes. The corporation sole—a creature of ecclesiastical law—is an acceptable adversary and large fortunes ride on its cases. The ordinary corporation is a 'person' for purposes of the adjudicatory processes, whether it represents proprietary, spiritual, aesthetic, or charitable causes.

"So it should be as respects valleys, alpine meadows, rivers, lakes, estuaries, beaches, ridges, groves of trees, swampland, or even air that feels the destructive pressures of modern technology and modern life. The river, for example, is the living symbol of all the life it sustains or nourishes—fish, aquatic insects, water ouzels, otter, fishes, deer elk, bear, and all other animals, including man, who are dependent on it or who enjoy it for its sight, its sound, or its life. The river as plaintiff speaks for the ecological unit of life that is part of it. Those people who have a meaningful relation to that body of water—whether it be a fisherman, a canoeist, a zoologist, or a logger—must be able to speak for the values which the river represents and which are threatened with destruction. . . .

"Those who hike the Appalachian Trail into Sunfish Pond, New Jersey, and camp or sleep there, or run the Allagash in Maine, or climb the Guadalupes in West Texas, or who canoe and portage the Quetico Superior in Minnesota, certainly should have standing to defend those natural wonders before courts or agencies, though they live 3,000 miles away. Those who merely are caught up in environmental news or propaganda and flock to defend these waters or areas may be treated differently. That is why these environmental issues should be tendered by the inanimate object itself. Then there will be assurances that all of the forms of life which it represents will stand before the court—the pileated woodpecker as well as the coyote and bear, the lemmings as well as the trout in the streams. Those inarticulate members of the ecological group cannot speak. But those people who have so frequented the place as to know its values and wonders will be able to speak for the entire ecological community.

"Ecology reflects the land ethic; and Aldo Leopold wrote in *A Sand County Almanac*, 'The land ethic simply enlarges the boundaries of the community to include soils, waters, plants, and animals, or collectively, the land.'

"That, as I see it, is the issue of 'standing' in the present case and controversy."

To that, we can only say, amen.

PROSPECT

As to Mineral King itself, the decision by the Court is not final. The door is still open for the Sierra Club to go back to court to stop the Disney ski development, and club attorneys are confident of eventual victory. Says Jim Moorman, Executive Director of the Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund, "There will never be a ski development at Mineral King."

The major short term problem with the decision is a psychological one. Unsympathetic judges may throw out some cases that they might otherwise have felt compelled to accept. And, ironically, the decision may hurt other groups more than it does the Sierra Club. The club, with its large membership and its extensive outings program, can allege injury to itself and its members in cases involving nearly any area in the country. Other groups may find the scope of their litigation narrowed.

For them, we will have to wait for the wisdom of Justices Blackmun and Douglas to gain the majority.

—TOM TURNER.

Late in May, three members of the NMA staff went to Mineral King Valley for the weekend. It was the kind of trip conservationists can go on and call a business trip, but it was mostly fun. We went, prompted partly by a new volume in the fine series of Sierra trail guides published by the Wilderness Press in Berkeley, wanting to see what the fuss was all about, and wanting to see Mineral King in its natural state, for perhaps the last time. These photos are taken from that trip. We arrived late Thursday night, and set out south for Franklin Pass in the morning. The sky was darkly overcast, and by mid afternoon a light snow began to fall. We made camp and slept, waking up the next morning to find a foot of snow had covered our whole world. By Saturday afternoon, most of the snow on the ground at lower elevations had melted. The peaks were covered with snow while the slopes were green and brown, with white trees on them highlighted by clear, bright sunlight. On a day hike to Sawtooth pass, two of us saw a wolverine thought to be extinct in this part of the Sierra, and close to extinct in California.

Try to imagine, as we found ourselves doing often, the valley covered with buildings, the slopes disfigured by ski tows, the high country jammed with hundreds and thousands of people. Disney expects to cram one million people a year into Mineral King; that's half as many people as visit Yosemite, and Yosemite is seven times the size of Mineral King. Imagine what will happen to the "game" in Mineral King National Game Refuge—to the deer and the marmots and the picas, to that lonely wolverine—when there are 5000 people arriving for a weekend of skiing, laden with gear and looking for a fast run down the slopes. Mineral King does not deserve a ski resort of whatever size. It belongs in the Sequoia National Park, which surrounds it on three sides.—P.S.

HOUSE ERRS IN PASSAGE OF BUSING BILL

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, since the landmark Supreme Court decision in Brown against the Board of Education in 1954, the Congress has taken a definite back seat to the executive and judicial branches in the advancement of school desegregation throughout the Nation. The congressional role has been unfortunately minimal during the last 4 years when progress has been particularly outstanding: In 1972 only 10 percent of the schoolchildren in 11 States of the South will attend all-minority schools as opposed to 70 percent in 1968. During this period of remarkable progress, Congress has done little to encourage desegregation. Indeed, in 1971, the House even rejected the Emergency School Aid Act, proposed by the Nixon administration to make Federal financial assistance available to school districts in the process of desegregating. That legislation finally passed the House only after it had been tacked on to an omnibus education bill which included strong antibusing amendments.

At this late date in the development of desegregation, the House has finally entered the fray again. But instead of advancing the progress of school desegregation through our belated entrance on the scene, we have passed a bill calculated not only to slow down this progress, but quite possibly to contribute materially to reversing it. I opposed H.R. 13915 in the Education and Labor Committee. The House added a series of amendments which made this bill even more restrictive and potentially harmful than the original committee version, and I, accordingly, was strongly opposed to its final passage.

The impetus for congressional action on school desegregation at this point in time is the public furor over the widely misunderstood issue of pupil transportation, or busing. Over the years busing students has been used as a tool to achieve many different educational goals, including consolidation of schools, special education for the handicapped, and vocational training. In each instance, busing was used so that the quality of education would be improved. Now that it has been proposed as a tool to help desegregate schools, the old familiar schoolbus has suddenly become an object of wrath. Yet its goal in this new use remains the same: To improve the quality of education. As President Nixon has noted:

> Quality is what education is all about; desegregation is vital to that quality—

In some instances, busing is the only feasible tool to achieve desegregation. For this reason, it is vital that this tool remain available to be used by school districts which are either seeking voluntarily to desegregate or are under court order to desegregate. H.R. 13915 seeks to limit the use of that tool. There is a fine line between limiting the use of busing and actually hindering the progress of desegregation, however, and in crossing that line, H.R. 13915 becomes more than just an antibusing bill. In fact, the bill not only endangers the future progress of school desegregation in this Nation, it also goes against the progress that has been made in the 18 years that have elapsed since the Brown decision.

Making an already harmful bill even

more dangerous, the House has restored to the bill section 406, which the Education and Labor Committee had deleted. This section permits the reopening of desegregation plans already ordered by the courts in accordance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, so that such plans may be modified to conform with the provisions of H.R. 13915. The clear and regrettable implication of this provision is that Congress wants to do more than guide and limit what can be done about school desegregation in the future; Congress is also willing to witness and even condone the undoing of what has been accomplished so far.

Yet another serious weakness of H.R. 13915 is that it walks on shaky constitutional grounds. First, although the 14th amendment does grant Congress the "power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions" of the amendment, this power does not include the right to reduce the extent of equal protection. Therefore, the attempt in H.R. 13915 to narrow the definition of what constitutes equal protection becomes highly questionable.

Second, H.R. 13915 tries to limit the ability of the Federal courts to remedy constitutional violations. This attempt may in fact amount to a denial of due process of law under the fifth amendment.

For all of the above reasons I voted against H.R. 13915. I am convinced that this bill, as passed by the House, would create far more problems than it could ever solve. Congress would be better off to continue to drag its feet on school desegregation and do absolutely nothing than to approve such potentially harmful legislation as this bill.

THE "PEER PRESSURE" DRUG CURE

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on July 5 I had the pleasure of taking members of the Select Committee on Crime on a field trip to the small town of Davie, Fla., for a look at an apparently successful drug rehabilitation center which concentrates on rehabilitating large numbers of adolescent girls and boys.

This visit occurred on the evening following the first 3 days of hearings in Miami on the problem of drug abuse and narcotic addiction among school-age children.

Two articles reporting on these events follow:

"PEER PRESSURE" DRUG CURE GAINING FRIENDS AND CRITICS

(By Doug Clifton)

FORT LAUDERDALE.—Debbie's mother looked at her 14-year-old daughter, newly free from the grip of drugs, and proudly confided: "I have a piece of canvas and stone from the old Seed building. I'll keep it always."

Her devotion to the two-year-old drug rehabilitation center near Fort Lauderdale is typical. It is shared by a growing group of prominent people.

Rep. Claude Pepper took his Select Committee on Crime to the newly purchased 26-acre compound in Davie. The following day, Art Barker, the center's director, testified before the committee.

Later in the day, U.S. Commissioner Edward Swan, father of a Seed success, offered testimony to the same committee.

Criminal Court Judge Alfonso Sepe refers all his drug-related cases to the Seed and has called it a "miracle." Sen. Edmund Muskie went to the Seed to see and be seen while his presidential campaign was still alive. Actor-singer Sammy Davis stopped by.

And the Seed story, "The Seed of Hope," was told in documentary fashion on television.

Debbie's mother and the others hail Barker as the creator of the program that saves youthful drug users. They claim the Seed transforms 90 per cent of all the youths who enter the program.

But not everyone is convinced that the Seed is the answer. Some doubt the claimed success rate. Others oppose the referral system. Still others fear that the treatment center is too "closed" and may overtreat.

Among critics are members of the Mental Health Association, psychologists, scholars, probation officers and psychiatrists.

How has Art Baker, a one-time Playboy Club comic and reformed alcoholic, convinced so many people that the Seed has the answer—perhaps the only one—to the rampaging drug problem?

It's quite simple, says Barker and his enthusiastic supporters: The program works.

"I save kids," says Barker, "And I don't get involved with the bureaucratic crap that makes all the other programs fail."

For the politician who sees the growing drug problem as trouble at the polls and the judge who sees it as crime in the streets, a simple, cheap ($200 a head) and massive program that works is like a miracle.

Barker tells at least one important person a day that 1,800 youths are "straight" because the Seed made them that way. Almost as frequently, he gives a demonstration of how he saves them through a device he calls an "open meeting."

The open meeting is similar to a revival. Participants stand and confess their drug-riddled past, renounce it and assert their long-abused love for parents.

Parents and children exchange "I love you's," the password of the Barker-Seed subculture. The evening is concluded with the 500 or 600 children singing "America the Beautiful," "Battle Hymn of the Republic" and other patriotic songs.

"I did everything from pot to downs. I started when I was 12. I robbed stuff from six different houses . . ."

Such confessions do not accurately reveal the extent of a child's drug use, say some critics.

Dr. Robert R. Jones, a Nova University professor of psychology and once a candidate to evaluate the Seed program, says admissions may be exaggerated to win status.

But Seed supporters close ranks with Barker on the basis of the performance at the open meeting and parents' testimonials.

Recently Barker has won financial support along with the vocal acclaims.

With the help of the political influence of one of his supporters, the National Institute of Mental Health awarded the program a $177,000 grant, renewable yearly for eight years.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration provided a $30,000 grant through the Broward County Narcotic Guidance Council.

Last week the Metro Commission awarded a $12,500 grant to Barker to treat 100 Dade Youth. He has also won wide private support from the community, and several Broward cities are donating $100 for each youth from its limits who attends the Seed.

The support is linked directly to the claim of a 90 per cent success rate.

Merrill Schuers, a Nova University researcher in drug rehabilitation and one of the evaluators of another Broward drug program, says, "It is inconceivable that anyone could seriously advance the proposition that a two-year-old drug program is 90 per cent effective."

Furthermore, says Schuers, the Seed has little or no follow-up program to keep tabs on "graduates."

Schuers and other critics say the program is basically a good one, based as it is on a variety of tested techniques, but judgments about its success must wait.

Barker calls a "Seedling" a success even when he still is undergoing rehabilitation.

But there are many two-term Seedlings and many who have been in the program's 24-hour-a-day surveillance phase—12 hours in therapy and 12 at a foster home—for longer than the prescribed two weeks.

According to a show of hands, at least one-fourth of the several hundred drug users at the Seed one day last week had been on the 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. regimen for at least five weeks. About half had been there more than three weeks.

Half of those present that day had been back to the Seed for a second visit after earlier being released as rehabilitated. Some of those who returned for the second time were at the Seed for "attitude" problems.

One girl had been on the 10–10 program for 54 days, was released and then returned by her parents after she started "playing games." She was 44 days into her second stay.

A boy said he'd been in the program three times. He was on the 10–10 program for 42 days. His story was cut off by Barker because he was "an exceptional case."

A married woman of 22, mother of an infant, admitted to smoking pot 20 times in two years. She was on her 23rd day of a scheduled 30-day stay at the Seed.

The Rev. Robert Kelley, a former Seed board member and, on the whole, a Seed supporter, said:

"Sometimes I think the children are left in the program too long. I know a boy who was left in it for 11 weeks, and it was just too much. That's one of the reasons I wanted more professionals in the program," Kelley says.

Mrs. Powers Sharretts, director of the Broward Mental Health Association, and a less-temperate critic, calls the tool of confrontation and confession employed by the Seed a "dangerous tool when you don't know when to stop it."

Barker says his 10 senior staff members and 12 junior staff members know what makes "druggies" tick better than anyone. All senior and junior staff members are graduates of the program. The Seed has one "professional," a Roman Catholic nun with degrees in psychology, to conform with dictates of the National Institute of Mental Health grant.

Barker regards professionals with disdain, dismissing them in a sweeping comment: "They can't do a damn thing with kids on drugs."

If the professionals and all other drug programs can't work, as Barker says, how can the Seed?

According to Barker, it works on major principle—peer pressure.

"Peer pressure turns them on to drugs, and peer pressure can get them off," he says.

It is Seed-created—peer pressure that does the job, he adds.

Dr. Raymond Killinger, a psychiatrist in private practice and the state's regional chairman for drug rehabilitation programs, says: "For some people, the system Barker uses may have some benefit. But there are those who can be hurt by the program. I think it works best with (drug) experi-

menters who respond to an authoritarian structure."

And an underlying claim that 75–85 per cent of the boys and girls in schools are heavy users of drugs is disputed by several school officials and Chief Juvenile Court Judge Frank Orlando, who says his experience places the figure much lower.

In support of Barker, however, is School Board Chairman Lyle Anderson, a Seed director.

Seed peer pressure is developed in the program with the basic principles of Alcoholics Anonymous—the system that won Barker from the whisky bottle. The heavy confessional aspect of the Seed and the moral-inventory concept are lifted almost directly from AA.

Basically the program breaks the participant down so that he develops dependence on the group. His good behavior then is rewarded by the group and bad behavior is punished.

In theory, he is placed in the group after an intake interview designed to estimate the depth of his drug habit and the complexity of his personality problem.

Fort Lauderdale child psychologist William Ryan, now with the Lauderdale psychiatric group but formerly a Nova staff member, calls the intake phase of any program vital.

"The intake procedure, as the rest of the program, must be fully evaluated. Children referred through the schools are never examined to determine their suitability for the kind of treatment at the Seed.

If someone came to me with a problem, I wouldn't just put him in shock therapy without first evaluating the nature of his problem," says Ryan, who has occasionally referred patients to the Seed.

In many cases, the person doing the intake interview at the Seed is a junior or senior staff member and not the program's one professional. Sometimes it is Suzy Barker, the director's 19-year-old niece—not a former Seedling, not trained in psychology.

That is not to say all youthful drug users referred to the Seed are not evaluated before being admitted.

In Broward, the chief Juvenile Court judge and the head of the probation division have refused to comply with Barker's request that all drug offenders be routinely paroled to the Seed.

Says Squire Hanni, Probation Department head: "I allow my probation officers full professional integrity. They fully evaluate the child and refer him to the drug rehabilitation facility they believe best suited for his particular personality."

Barker has no kind words for Judge Frank Orlando or Hanni.

Hanni, like nearly everyone else in Broward officialdom, offers restrained comment. Most reserve judgment on the program and refuse comment on Barker.

They would like to give the program a chance and don't like to judge it on their feelings about Barker.

But Barker IS the Seed, as both friends and enemies say.

His is perhaps the only program of its kind that has one man serving as executive director, president and chairman of the board. In the corporate structure, the other position of real importance is held by Barker's wife, Shelley. She is secretary-treasurer.

According to sources close to Barker in the days before he started the Seed, he incorporated with several helpers, including Municipal Court Judge James Balsinger, still a board member.

In a fact sheet about Seed, Barker does not mention that he used a church house provided free by the First Lutheran Church in Fort Lauderdale. The fact sheet does not mention modest funding provided by Broward's poverty agency and generous loans that made it possible for him to move into a second site after he had a falling out with church elders.

Tom Reagan, a Fort Lauderdale businessman who knew Barker in New York, admires the man.

"When Art got something in his head, he'd really argue the point, be adamant about it. He has an ego, sure, but this you have to have if you're ever gonna get your head above the crowd . . . and there's gonna be someone out there to throw rocks," he says.

And people do throw rocks.

"He has a rotten temper," says one former acquaintance. "He's the kind of guy who plays charades at a party and when nobody can guess what it is he flies into a rage and calls everybody stupid."

In the words of Phil Cheaney, a Broward County banker and former Seed board member, "Art burns people out."

"He is so intense a flame, you just can't keep up with him. Barker is an evangelist. If you want to follow him, you have to commit yourself wholeheartedly or not at all," Cheaney says.

[From the Miami (Fla.) News, July 10, 1972]

TWELVE-YEAR-OLDS BUY HEROIN AT SCHOOL

(By Rick Abrams)

"Twelve-year-olds are experimenting here in Miami with heroin which they can buy in the schoolyard; young girls and boys are popping pills of all kinds; and 13-year-olds are buying dope from their 15-year-old friends."

This statement, by U.S. Rep. Claude Pepper (D-Fla.) was backed last week by many witnesses who appeared before the House Select Committee on Crime, investigating the "Drug Crisis in Dade County Schools," of which he is the chairman.

The other members of the committee are Congressmen Frank Brasco and Charles Rangel of New York, James Mann of South Carolina, Morgan Murphy of Illinois, Charles Wiggins of California and William Keating of Ohio.

The committee questioned dozens of witnesses. If the opinions of former addicts, drug-rehabilitation officials, school-board members, doctors, and parents whose children became addicted and may have died because of drugs are true, Miami is indeed, to use Pepper's words, "gravely in need of help by state, local and national government."

One 18-year-old ex-addict told the committee he robbed stores once a day to support a $200-a-day heroin habit.

A heroin addict's mother testified that her son strangled his 5-year-old sister while in a "drug stupor." The woman told the committee she tried to get help for her son several times.

She said she could not get help from local probation officials, although the boy had been convicted of shoplifting to support his habit.

Art Barker, a founder of The Seed, a Broward County drug rehabilitation program, said he could send any child to any school in Dade County with $10 "and in 20 minutes they could come back with drugs."

"The drug-abuse situation," Pepper said, "has assumed deadly proportions in the Miami area. Over the last five years, more than 450 people have died of drug overdoses or drug-related causes. In the last two years school-age children's drug deaths have more than doubled."

Each day, Pepper began the hearings by saying, "There are presently between 7,000 and 14,000 heroin addicts in Dade County. This means that one in every 137 residents is a hard-core drug addict. In Dade County, of the $58 million worth of property stolen each year, more than half can be attributed to addicts."

Pepper promised that the committee would urge federal legislation so that funds could be given to drug-rehabilitation projects and drug-education programs in schools.

"The federal government," Pepper said, "must take an active and prominent role. We can not let young children's lives turn to crime, degradation and death. We hope that these hearings will be . . . the beginning of a national commitment to assure drug-free schools."

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD a current statement of my financial assets and sources of income.

The information given follows the form of the official financial disclosure statement required by rule XLIV of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I also include a complete statement of my securities holdings and their value as of this date, some of which are not required to be disclosed in the official statement:

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS

Securities holdings	Shares	Value
Massachusetts Investment Trust	255	$3,320
Advance Ross Corp	50	275
General Motors Corp	25	1,872
Sea Containers, Inc	200	4,700
Union Carbide Corp	50	2,463
Xerox Corp	50	8,232
A.T. & T. 8¾ percent bonds	6	6,667
Cash account	$332	
Total value of securities as of Aug. 18, 1972		27,529

2. Income from Professional organizations—None.

3. (a) Income from a single source exceeding $5,000 and not reported in Section 2, above—None.

(b) Capital gains from a single source exceeding $5,000—None.

(c) Reimbursement for expenditures from a single source exceeding $1,000—None.

(d) Source of honoraria aggregating $300 or more from a single source—(1971 and 1972 to date): University of Notre Dame; North American Publishing Company; Indiana University; Education Press Association; Sweet Briar College; School Management Institute. Inc.; Children's Rehabilitation Institute, Baltimore; Indiana Statewide Rural Electric Cooperative; University of St. Louis; New England Program in Teacher Education; Amherst College; IBM Conference; Association of American Publishers; and Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities. Total—1971 and 1972 to date $9,559.00.

4. Unsecured Indebtedness exceeding $10,000—None.

THE AMERICAN DREAM AND THE AMERICAN REALITY

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, a recent letter I have received from a

constituent has so perfectly portrayed the dilemma of an average citizen of these United States in a period of intense national frustration, uncertainty, anger and bewilderment that I am moved to bring it to the attention of my colleagues. To an extraordinary degree it reveals not only the sources of our great national frustration but illuminates as well causal relationships between such important issues as unemployment, education, welfare, the war in Southeast Asia and the treatment of veterans.

President Nixon, in his now-famous remarks at the Connally Ranch last May concerning the American "work ethic" and the need to revive it in this country, could have found no better representative than the writer of this letter when he described "millions of fine Americans that work hard, are proud of their work—(who) have made—(and) built this country, and (who) are going to build it bigger in the future."

There is a terrible temptation to comment on other aspects of this excellent letter. I will forego the opportunity, commending it to your attention on its own merits as one of the best presentations of the overall U.S. dilemma to come to my attention in a long time.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: I'm writing this letter to thank you for your recent stand against the war in Vietnam. My wife and I support Senator McGovern wholeheartedly in his efforts to bring this conflict to a swift conclusion. A second matter of concern is the economic chaos created by this war, a portion of which has touched my family.

I'm a veteran of service in the army from 1956 to 1959. My job included typing classified reports on far eastern countries including Vietnam. Upon my separation from the unit I was awarded a letter of appreciation for the manner in which I conducted my duties. My personal opinion has always been that this war was purely a Vietnamese internal matter and did not warrant the intervention of the United States.

Recently I graduated from Portland State University with a B.S. in geology. At the time of graduation I had maintained a GPA of 3.03 the entire four years, in spite of not finishing high school. A lot of hard work and sacrifices has been rewarded by the prospect of no job in the near future in my field and a loss of seniority and chance to regain my former job. The GI Bill to be successful in retraining veterans can't be coupled to a lame economy. At the present I have a GS 7 rating with the federal government as a geologist. I qualified for the higher rating under the superior academic achievement requirement. In spite of federal reinstatement rights for employees, I find it impossible to reenter the federal service if no position can be filled due to the present ceilings.

Prior to 1969 I was employed for ten years by the Postal Service. Taking into account military service I was a thirteen year federal employee. I entered the Postal Service during the last Republican recession in 1959–1960. The pay was only $2.26 per hour and the superintendents worked the substitutes 50 to 65 hours a week with no time and one half for overtime. Considering my army pay of $78.00 per month at the start of my tour and $146.00 per month at the end of it, this was luxury. Just prior to the postal strike I resigned, as did many of my co-workers. Fifteen years seniority was needed to obtain a summer vacation and the pay had lagged far behind what was needed for a man with a family. This is the reason I decided to accept the terms of the GI Bill and complete my education. I had been thoroughly sold on the idea that if I wanted out of the rut—education was the route. I figured that if I worked under the very worst the government had to offer I should at least be given the chance for something better.

During my education I received no other federal or state assistance. My wife and I managed to earn the remainder of the money we need to support a family of five by our own efforts (and wits). The GI benefits came to only $256.00 per month. We ended up spending my entire federal retirement fund to make ends meet. College work study grants are not geared to the needs of a veteran with a family; the machinery to implement such a grant is usually very slow and the jobs are not generally allocated according to amount of need. When I first started to attend full time I applied for a work study job and none was available in spite of the fact that a veteran who had attended the university prior to his military service did hold down such a job while working elsewhere part time, receiving GI benefits, and while married to a working registered nurse. Luckily we are very resourceful people.

Tomorrow I will go to an interview for the position of furniture mover, one of the few jobs available. What's bothering me is the fact that the harder we try the worse things seem to get. Federal regulations at the time prevented my mother from earning enough money to support her family and still retain her social security survivors insurance benefits, which were sorely needed. Federal and state regulations on hazardous work for minors prevented me from holding better paying jobs in my teens and forced me to spend even longer hours in harvest fields for little pay. I am beginning to tire of it!

Having lived like a peon in my younger years I identify strongly with people on lower incomes, this is why I support Senator McGovern. Young people in this country should have an equal opportunity to attend college, should be able to advance to responsible jobs if they are capable, should not be compelled to accept less then a decent standard of living so a privileged minority can profit excessively from a system that could provide well for all. I believe firmly in America, but I will not accept the conditions that I have observed in my lifetime as all that America has to offer.

If conditions don't improve soon our government will be faced with a gradual withdrawal of the consent to be governed by the people. Many otherwise honest people will resort to whatever means they can muster to earn money to pay bills and the U.S. will slip even closer to anarchy. If crime is to be sharply curtailed and the welfare roles reduced, for God's sake lets put Americans back to work.

Sincerely yours

RALPH C. FEELY.

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.'S LATEST NEWSLETTER

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, PETE BIESTER's latest newsletter to residents of the Eighth Congressional District of Pennsylvania:

AUGUST 1972.

DEAR CONSTITUENT: I am very pleased to report that the results of my sixth annual constituent poll have been tabulated, and the breakdown of responses on each question is printed below for your information.

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No response
1. Which of the following do you consider the most preferable course of action in Vietnam?			
a. Continued phased withdrawal of American forces consistent with the President's program	38	-----	6
b. Immediate withdrawal of all American forces	16		
c. Withdrawal of all American forces by a definite date conditioned on release of POW's	40		
2. The National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse has recommended that the possession of marihuana for personal and private use no longer be an offense. Would you favor such a change in Federal law?	34	63	3
3. Do you favor the President's recent efforts to open more normal relations with China?	85	11	4
4. Do you favor the establishment of federally supported voluntary day care centers for the children of working mothers?	43	52	5
5. How successful have the wage-price regulations been in reducing the pace of inflation?			
a. Highly successful	1	-----	20
b. Moderately successful	43		
c. Unsuccessful	36		
6. Do you favor the continuation of wage-price controls?			
a. For 6 months	12	-----	23
b. For 1 year	22		
c. For 2 years	27		
d. Not at all	16		
7. Would you favor the adoption of a no-fault auto insurance program on the national level if the States fail to adopt a no-fault system?	77	17	6
8. Do you favor the construction of nuclear power plants at Newbold Island and in Bucks and Montgomery Counties?	54	38	8
9. Do you favor legislation to stop new and additional student transportation to achieve racial balance in schools?	75	21	4
10. Do you favor continued efforts to work toward a more racially integrated society?	57	27	16
If so, what steps should we take:			
a. More housing opportunities	35	-----	
b. Increased accessibility to job opportunities and better transportation facilities	50	-----	
c. Other _____	15	-----	
11. With the completion of the Apollo space program, would you favor:			
a. Development of a space shuttle as proposed over the next 6 years?	50		13
b. Radical reduction of the entire program	37		
12. The House Judiciary Subcommittee of which I am a member is presently considering legislation to suspend the death penalty for 2 years.			
a. Do you approve of such a suspension?	21	64	15
b. Would you favor the abolition of the death penalty except in cases where conviction resulted from the death of law enforcement officers?	9	64	27
c. Would you favor the abolition of the death penalty in all instances?	18	59	23
d. Do you favor the death penalty?	66	19	15
13. Would you oppose granting amnesty to draft resisters upon the end of our involvement in Vietnam conditional upon the men involved completing 2 years of military or alternate service?	52	45	

Approximately 172,000 questionnaires were mailed to District residents, and replies were received from over 20,000. As in the past, I was encouraged by the substantial response to the mailing, and the letters which accompanied so many of the questionnaires were particularly helpful in interpreting the results.

After having used the questionnaire as a means of gauging constituent opinion since I first arrived in Washington, I am more convinced than ever of the vital role it plays in the communication process between Congress and the people. In our country today there is a searching on the part of citizens for a vehicle of expression and dialogue with government officials. This can be realized, to a significant extent, through the mechanism of the questionnaire. In fact, the questionnaire prompted letters from people who had never before written to a government official.

One gentleman from Morrisville wrote: "The complexity of government seems to have alienated most of this country's citizens—they no longer feel as if they can make any significant contributions to the process of government," and went on to say he thought the questionnaire realized this objective.

Many of the respondents didn't feel they could adequately express their true sentiments in a simple "yes" or "no," but in order to facilitate tabulation it is necessary to so structure the alternatives. I fully recognize the difficulty of answering complex and far-reaching questions in such a manner since I am often required to do this when I cast my votes on the House floor.

ON THE HORIZON

In recent weeks, Congress has been involved with a number of pieces of legislation I am co-sponsoring and have been actively supporting.

Revenue Sharing—The State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972, more commonly known as Revenue Sharing, passed the House on June 22nd and the Senate will consider its version on the Senate floor in September where the prospects for passage are very good. Once the Senate acts, the bill would go to conference to iron out any differences.

Under the provisions of both versions, $5.3 billion would be available for 1972 with the remainder of the $29.8 billion to be disbursed over the next four years. According to the House's distribution formulas, Pennsylvania's first year entitlement would be $98.4 million at the state level and $202.5 million for local governments, totalling over $300 million (under the Senate version, Pennsylvania would receive almost $42 million more). All governmental units in Bucks County would receive a total of $7.3 million with the county government receiving $3.3 million, boroughs $1 million and townships almost $3 million. The total amount scheduled for Montgomery County would be $10.3 million, and Lehigh County would be entitled to $4.9 million in the first year.

Revenue Sharing is President Nixon's proposal to provide desperately needed assistance to state and local governments for financing efforts designated by the state and local governments themselves rather than those dictated by the Federal government. Funds to the state are for its unrestricted use while those to local governments are for high-priority objectives in four broad areas—public safety, environmental projects, sanitary protections and public transportation.

The House and Senate versions of the bill contain the fundamental and essential elements of the President's proposal. I am co-sponsor of the original Revenue Sharing legislation and have actively supported its passage. In 1971 I headed a Congressional Task Force team on Revenue Sharing which traveled to Richmond and several cities in the Los Angeles area, speaking before civic and business groups and newspaper editorial boards on the merits of Revenue Sharing.

Health—Two bills I am co-sponsoring in the health field—one to establish a National Advisory Commission on Multiple Sclerosis and another to establish a program of treatment and research into Cooley's anemia—passed the House on August 1st.

The purpose of the National Advisory Commission is to determine the most effective means of finding the cause of and cure and treatment for multiple sclerosis. M.s. is a chronic, usually progressive disease of the nervous system, generally striking individuals between the ages of 20 and 40. The paralysis, extreme weakness and shaking of the body which result can cut life expectancy by at least a dozen years. Most of us know someone afflicted with m.s. and appreciate the need for further investigation into some of the promising theories being considered as its causes.

Cooley's anemia is an inherited blood disease affecting approximately 200,000 Americans, mostly children. It is an incurable blood disorder requiring regular and frequent blood transfusions. Characteristics of the disease are poor bone growth, small stature, susceptability to other ailments, fatigue and lack of energy. Its victims seldom live to maturity. The legislation would provide for research projects into the diagnosis, treatment and prevention of the anemia. One of the dozen Cooley's anemia regional chapters is located in Cornwells Heights. A large number of our local residents have been active in leading the attack on the anemia, and I know they must be heartened with this show of Congressional support behind their efforts.

State Department Grievances—A bill I have introduced to establish grievance and appeals procedures for Foreign Service employees has received several days of hearings by a House Foreign Affairs subcommittee.

In testimony I presented to the subcommittee, I noted that, unlike other Federal agencies, the State Department has no formal system of due process through which its employees can appeal arbitrary or unjust actions regarding their employment status. While other Federal employees have such recourse through the Civil Service Commission, Foreign Service personnel do not, and this has caused serious moral problems among State Department employees. Many cases can be cited in which they have had their careers permanently marred by administrative insensitivity and intransigence.

This legislation, I feel, would provide reasonable management practices for a personnel problem which, if left unchanged, will continue to have an adverse impact on the day-to-day execution of our nation's foreign policy. This institution of due process will be in the public interest by creating a stronger climate for free and open debate and challenge, and will in turn promote a well-developed, responsive foreign policy. The Senate has already passed this bill, and I am hopeful the Foreign Affairs Committee will favorably report out the bill for full House consideration.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

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

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

How long?

ARMY HERBICIDE STUDY

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, a provocative article appeared in the Washington Post, Sunday August 13, 1972 dealing with a reported U.S. Army study investigating proposed use of herbicidal agents in future conflicts. Despite the abysmal record of defoliants in Vietnam, the Army is apparently making every effort to see that this aspect of warfare will be used in future conventional conflicts. Implications of this development would be profound.

The article follows:

ARMY STUDY ASKS USE OF HERBICIDES—SEES DEFOLIANTS HELPING STOP EUROPEAN INVASION

(By Jack Fuller and Tim O'Brien)

A U.S. Army strategic studies group has recommended that herbicides be included in top-secret contingency battle plans ready in case of war in Western Europe, Cuba, Korea, Ethiopia and Venezuela.

Despite its prediction that the controversial chemical defoliants used in the Vietnam war would be of limited effectiveness as a weapon in conventional warfare, the Engineer Strategic Studies Group of the Army's corps of Engineers concluded that defoliation of European forests could help NATO forces slow down an invasion by Warsaw Pact nations.

The group's analysis of possible warfare in Cuba, Ethiopia and Venezuela was based on a counter-insurgency style of fighting, and the conclusion was that in such warfare stripping away heavy vegetation with herbicides can drastically reduce the number of American troops necessary to put down an insurgency.

The group's secret recommendations are reported in a forthcoming issue of Science and Government Report, a private, Washington-based newsletter published by Daniel S. Greenberg. The recommendations are part of a three-volume study of the military effectiveness of herbicides. The volume containing the recommendations is classified secret, and the two others were prepared for official use only.

The five top-secret battle plans analyzed by the study group are part of the Portfolio of General Purpose Force Requirements, code-named SPECTRUM, a compilation of contingency plans which might or might not be invoked in the event of war.

According to Greenberg, the study group examined the impact of defoliation in 106 hypothetical war situations or "scenarios."

One of the scenarios evisions "a deliberate attack by Warsaw Pact forces to seize Western Europe. France is assumed to participate and the NATO forces are logistically supported" over a line extending through France and the Benelux countries. Greenberg quotes the secret report as saying: "This analysis investigates the maneuver of forces between Liege and Mainz and Bonn and Kassel."

These four cities are boundaries for a major corridor through Germany into France, Holland, Belgium and Luxembourg. The corridor was used by German forces in World War II to invade its Western neighbors, and the study group envisions it as a route that might be used by attacking Communist armies.

"Because the effect of herbicides is to expose enemy positions while the defender remains concealed in foliage, herbicides have the effect of creating a prepared position

. . ." the study reportedly says. "The use of herbicides permits NATO forces to prepare successive defensive positions by selecting defoliating areas where the attacking forces must assemble."

Since days and sometimes months are required for defoliants to take full effect, the use of herbicides in defending Western Europe would presumably have to be based on intelligence warnings preceding an actual attack.

The U.S. military presence in Western Europe is generally thought to serve two functions: to assure the Soviet Union that an attack on Europe means the involvement of American forces, aid to help slow down, although not stop, invading Communist troops. Defoliation, presumably, would serve the latter purpose.

The recommendation that defoliation be included in contingency plans for war in Western Europe was based on an analysis of "conventional (linear) warfare."

"In a defensive posture," Volume I of the Army report said, "the effect of herbicides is to increase the days of delay achieved in a sector." Hence, herbicides would contribute to the "trip-wire effect" of American presence in Western Europe.

However, the study did not find that herbicides would allow for much reduction in the manpower necessary to defend a position in a conventional war situation. "In conventional (linear) military conflicts, herbicides (when applied early enough) can yield, at most, localized reductions in force requirements along an entire front and in depth are small," the study said.

In fact, the study concludes that defoliants would be of more value, in terms of troop requirements, to forces attacking Europe than to those defending it: "When the herbicides are used by the attacking force, the estimated impact is a reduction of 3 to 4 per cent of the offensive force requirement for the entire theater. When herbicides are used by the defending force, the force reduction is somewhat less over the entire theater."

According to Greenberg, the secret volume of the Army report also proposed scenarios for using defoliants in a conventional war in Korea.

The recommendation was made despite a finding that about the same number of troops is needed to attack or defend, with or without the aid of defoliants, in a conventional war.

However, the study found herbicides considerably more effective in counter-insurgency situations.

Based on computer and manual simulations of the impact of herbicides on counter-insurgency operations—with special reference to the Ethiopia and Venezula—the study concludes that "in both of the insurgency scenarios, counter-insurgency force requirements are reduced because factor W (average search width of a patrol) is increased when herbicides are used."

More specifically, the study says that "offensive forces in Venezuela are reduced to approximately 40 per cent of the forces required in the original spectrum analysis and offensive forces in Ethiopia are reduced to approximately 35 per cent of those needed without herbicides."

Use of herbicides, the study continues, "would improve visibility in the evergreen forest, shrub and small tree forests (of Korea), and in the sugar cane fields of Cuba."

"The patrol is regarded as the primary offensive element in counter-insurgency," the study says.

"In each of the two specific insurgency scenarios investigated, offensive counter-insurgent forces required to resolve [win] conflicts are reduced by over 50 per cent by using herbicides to reduce foliage. The impact of herbicides on the defensive counter-insurgent forces was not treated quantitatively; but qualitatively; the improved visibility would tend to reduce these [defensive] forces as well."

"The analysis indicated that, under the respective theories of combat, herbicides are a significant aid to military operations in counter-insurgency and of less value in terms of force requirements in conventional (linear) warfare," an unclassified volume of the report said.

The report was careful to point out the limitations of projecting actual troop-level requirements on the basis of simulation theory.

"Nevertheless," the report says, "the results of this study's analysis of the record of herbicide spraying . . . in (Vietnam) . . . tend to confirm the direction if not the degree of the above theoretical estimates for counter-insurgency forces".

A "for official use only" summary of the project concludes that "herbicides produce only two assured military effects." One is increased "horizontal and vertical visibility" where foliage "obstructs liens of sight." The second is that an enemy's crops "can be destroyed in a matter of hours or days at suitable times in their growing cycles."

Even these effects require "special circumstances, the report says—factors relating to enemy determination, his available alternatives, sufficent time to employ defoliants, climatic conditions, and so on.

In a survey of military personnel, including chemical officers, commanders and advisers, the study reports that 518 of them thought herbicides would be required in future conflicts. Only 67 of the surveyed officers said herbicides would not be needed.

But military belief in the need for an arsenal of defoliants is not shared by everyone. Widespread use of herbicides in Vietnam touched off a wave of controversy—partly environmental, partly moral and partly practical.

The military first asked for permission to use herbicides in Vietnam in 1961, according to the report, and their use became most widespread in 1967 and 1968 at a time when the U.S. troop level was also climbing to its highest point.

In April 1970 the most commonly used chemical—Agent Orange—was eliminated. All aerial spraying of herbicides ceased in May 1971. After that, the report says, herbicides were used only to keep down jungle growth surrounding military bases.

In Vietnam defoliation had two aims—to eliminate hiding places used by enemy guerrilla units and thereby make Allied patrolling easier and to destroy rice crops believed to be controlled by the enemy in South Vietnam.

At the same time the use of herbicides was reaching its height public criticism of these military tactics began building up.

In November 1967 two of America's foremost biologists charged that defoliation in Vietnam was both militarily ineffective and extremely dangerous to the long-term health of the Vietnamese environment.

Dr. Arthur Galston, then president of the Botanical Society of America, and Dr. Jean Mayer, Harvard professor of nutrition, charged that the crop destruction tactic had not hurt the Vietcong but rather had caused a food shortage affecting innocent Vietnamese cvilians. They also claimed that defoliation to deprive the enemy of hiding places had little military effect but rather had severely damaged fruit and rubber trees, spinach and bean crops.

In October, 1969, the White House severely restricted the domestic use of Agent Orange as being "potentially dangerous" to humans and in need of further study. The White House move did not affect the military use of Agent Orange.

Early in April, 1970, two associates of consumer advocate Ralph Nader claimed that Agent Orange caused birth defects and demanded that its use be prohibited. At that time the defoliant, which had been developed in the 1940s by Army chemical warfare specialists, was still being used in the U.S. to control weeds along roads in nonagricultural areas.

A little more than a week later the Agriculture Department, which had disputed the Nader associates' charges, imposed drastic restrictions on the domestic use of Agent Orange in the United States. Simultaneously, the Defense Department announced it would stop using Agent Orange and replace it with Agent White in Vietnam.

Some of the critics of herbicides claimed that the Defense Department's move merely replaced one toxic substance with another. The American Association for the Advancement of Science had already asked the Defense Department to stop using the chemicals in Agent White because they could cause birth defects.

Meantime, the Nixon administration struggled with the Senate over the question of whether herbicides were instruments of chemical warfare banned by a Geneva Protocol the administration had submitted for ratification.

The Nixon administration said the protocol's term, "chemical warfare," applied only to chemicals that caused permanent disability or death. Some senators and the Federation of American Scientists sharply criticized that definition's exclusion of herbicides and tear gas.

Last March the administration proposed at the Geneva Disarmament Conference a new ban on chemical warfare which concentrated mostly on chemicals with no civilian use.

The Army study group's report revealed other, secret criticism of the defoliation effort.

Greenberg said the study group wrote that a secret 1967 Rand Corporation report concluded that "it appears that the crop destruction program has little effect on VC consumption. Despite shortcomings of the data and methodology used, the (Rand) analysis indicated the program is ineffective and that the negative effect on the peasant is too severe to continue the program."

Greenberg said the study group also wrote a synopsis of a secret 1969 Air Force report which concluded that "there is no system for comprehensive evaluation of each projection the basis of the result it was supposed to achieve," and also that "the public information program about herbicide operations was never adequate to overcome the resentment associated with the herbicide program."

In 1970 Congress ordered the Defense Department to contract with the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) for a study of the environmental effects of defoliation in Vietnam. The Engineer Strategic Studies Group report was designed as a "counterpart" to the NAS study.

In evaluating the possible use of defoliation in future wars, the Army study group employed highly complicated computer techniques which involve the simulation of various sequences of events, war objectives, terrain and other factors—"scenarios"—under various conditions.

From these computer simulations, programmed to include the effects of a defoliation campaign, and from other, less technical methods of analysis, the Army study group reached its conclusion to propose changes in five SPECTRUM scenarios.

Widespread use of this kind of contingency planning—though at a much higher decision-making level—was revealed in the Pentagon papers, and some Vietnam War critics have claimed that such planning too often ripened into fact without adequate discussion.

The Army study group also compiled and analyzed much data about herbicides' military effect in Vietnam, though it ran no laboratory or field experiments on the chemicals.

Summarizing its finds, the report states: "Herbicides were useful in supporting military operations in RVN (Republic of Vietnam) in selected instances." It recorded the following conclusions:

Herbicides were useful in operations against enemy infiltration routes and base areas, particularly when Allied forces followed up defoliation with observation and surveillance missions. In dense mangrove forests, defoliation made the enemy "unable to maintain an effective force in these areas."

Herbicides helped prevent ambushes near roads and waterways and around military bases.

"At most, the crop destruction program harassed the enemy." It did not succeed in depriving the enemy of much food.

There was evidence that defoliation reduced the number of men needed in some areas.

"The herbicide program in RVN (Republic of Vietnam) has been inexpensive when judged against military systems in general."

The Army study group surveyed military people acquainted with defoliation in Vietnam. The results showed that most believed defoliation helped them in their missions.

The report includes numerous before-and-after photographs of defoliated areas. One set shows how the enemy succeeded in concealing a 100-ton ocean-going ship in the tidewater mangrove forests of the Camau Peninsula at Vietnam's southernmost tip. "By securing trees from the stream banks over the ship," the report states, "the ship's position remained undetected for from several weeks to several months."

INEQUITIES IN THE SOCIAL INSURANCE AND INCOME SUPPLEMENTATION SYSTEM

HON. RICHARD W. MALLARY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. MALLARY. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the thousands of older and disabled citizens who have been denied the benefit of the recent 20 percent increase in social security payments.

Approximately 120,000 citizens receive aid to the aged, blind, and disabled as well as social security. Their AABD payments will be reduced dollar-for-dollar with their increase in social security.

It is estimated that 20,000 veterans receiving pensions for other than service connected disabilities will lose their entire veterans' pensions due to the social security increase.

Past social security increases have usually included, or been followed by, a pass along to these citizens of at least part of the increase, so that they receive an increase in their total income.

Unfortunately, these people receiving Federal assistance based on need, in addition to social security, have been left out by the most recent increase in social security payments.

The speed with which the legislation was considered, and the parliamentary situation at the time prevented Members from taking action to insure that this increase would not adversely affect some citizens.

It is obvious that many reforms in the Federal insurance and retirement programs are needed. I am hopeful that many of the provisions in H.R. 1 will receive favorable action by the Senate. Until these changes can be made through a single measure such as H.R. 1, some changes are needed now to help thousands of needy citizens to counteract the adverse effects of the recent social security increase.

I have introduced two bills to allow recipients of AABD or veterans' pensions as well as social security to retain one-half of their social security increase. The need for this legislation is real.

In this Nation, more than 2 million people receive old age assistance. Of these 2 million, 60 percent also receive social security benefits. In my home State of Vermont, 75 percent of the people receiving old age assistance also receive social security.

None of these people will receive any net benefit whatsoever from the recent 20 percent increase in social security payments. They will lose in their AABD checks, rounded off to the nearest dollar, the amount of the increase in their social security checks.

Some veterans and veterans' widows may even be in a worse position. It is estimated that 20,000 people now receiving pensions will be pushed over the $2,600 income limitation by the increase in social security, and will totally lose their VA checks.

As an example, I discovered that one of my constituents in Burlington, Vt., is a veteran of World War I and is the widow of a World War I veteran. Before the social security increase, she received $2,318 in social security benefits, and $868 in veterans' pensions. With the 20 percent social security increase, her social security income rose to $2,782, and she has received notice from the VA that her veterans pensions will be discontinued. Thus, the social security increase has caused her loss of a net total of $404 per year.

Certainly, no one in the Congress intended to reduce any person's total income by our action, but that is clearly what we did.

Under the bill which I have introduced, H.R. 16371, only half of her social security increase would be counted, so that for VA purposes her total income would be $2,550, and she would be allowed to retain approximately $648 in veterans' pensions. Thus she would receive a net increase of about $244 per year, under the terms of H.R. 16371. This is an increase of nearly 8 percent over her income prior to the social security increase.

Most of the remaining two million recipients of veterans' pensions will notice a marked decrease in their pension checks. In approximate figures, a veteran receiving $1,800 from social security with no other income receives a veteran's pension of $780. With the social security increase, his social security checks would be increased by $360, and his veterans' pension would decrease by $259. Under the terms of H.R. 16371, his pension would be decreased instead by $120. Thus, under this bill, his total income would increase by $240. Even with this improvement, this increase in his total income would be 13 percent—far short of the 20 percent increase passed by the Congress.

When the Social Security Amendments of 1965 increased social security benefits by 7 percent, $5 of this increase was passed along to public assistance recipients. The Social Security Amendments of 1967, which increased social security benefits by 13 percent, increased the pass along to $7.50 per month.

The Tax Reform Act of 1969, which included a 15 percent increase in social security benefits, provided for a $4 pass along. This pass along has been extended, but not increased, despite the enactment of a 10 percent increase in social security benefits in 1971. This heightens the need for a significant pass along of social security increases to public assistance recipients.

Payment schedules for veterans' pensions have also been revised as social security increases have been enacted. As a result of the 1967 Social Security Amendments, income brackets for determining pensions were increased from 3 to 18, and the income limitation was increased by $200.

After the Tax Reform Act of 1969, the income limitation for veterans' pensions was increased by $300. Last November, to counteract the effects of the most recent 10-percent increase in social security benefits, the Congress adopted a formula system to relieve the problems for many veterans, who had a large loss of veterans' pension income caused by a small increase in income. The income limitation was also increased by $300, effective January of 1972.

The need for relief for recipients of veterans' pensions and old-age assistance are at least as serious at this time as those needs were when relief was provided previously.

I am sure that most of us will continue to support major reform of the Federal social insurance and income supplementation programs. Yet it is obvious that there is a great deal of disagreement in the Congress over broad reform proposals.

The two pass along bills which I have introduced, H.R. 16285 and H.R. 16371, are not the ultimate solution to the inequities in the social insurance and income supplementation system. Until major reform can be agreed upon, this limited, specific relief should be enacted.

BILL TO PLUG LOOPHOLE IN TRUTH IN NEGOTIATIONS ACT

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to plug a loophole in the Truth in Negotiations Act. Under present law, individual contractors who refuse to disclose cost and price data can still win a Defense Department contract under a waiver granted by a service Secretary or the Secretary of Defense.

I believe this practice has been overused and abused by the Department of

Defense and the defense contractors. If defense contractors face the choice between losing business or disclosing their cost and price data, they will disclose.

More than $200 million has been granted in contracts in the last 9 years to defense contractors without any knowledge on the part of the Department of Defense about the contractor's actual costs, prices and profits. I believe this loophole should be plugged up. The legislation I am introducing today will amend the Truth in Negotiations Act and prohibit the waivers currently permitted according to that law.

THE ASME CONGRESSIONAL FELLOW

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the opening of the Washington, D.C., offices of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers and the Institute of Electrical & Electronics Engineers, Inc. This is the beginning of a major communications link between the technical community and the Congress. Mr. Bill Miller of the ASME and Mr. Ralph Clark of the IEEE have assured me that they will cooperate with Congress in obtaining information, reports, and technical witnesses on any subject within their respective fields.

In addition, the ASME is taking what I believe to be an important and encouraging step by advertising in their journal for applications for the position of ASME congressional fellow. I cannot think of a better method of encouraging men of science to become involved in the governmental process, while giving the Congress the benefit of their expertise. I would hope that other technical societies will follow their lead.

The advertisement follows:

NEW PROGRAM ANNOUNCED: THE ASME CONGRESSIONAL FELLOW

A program to sponsor ASME Congressional Fellows has recently been authorized by the Executive Committee of the Council. The program calls for ASME to send engineers for a year at the Nation's capitol in Washington and for each to be associated with a congressman or a congressional committee as a resource person. This sponsorship would be shared with the engineer's employer, who would treat the time away from his regular job, in the nature of a sabbatical leave. While the prime purpose of the program would be to assist the legislative process by making technical expertise available, both the individual Fellows and their employers would benefit from the experience. In the long run, the program is seen as a step toward better technical input in the setting of public policy.

The program, patterned on the highly successful experience of the American Political Science Association, has developed from a suggestion which came out during a joint meeting of ASME members with congressional leaders last December. It is a direct response to a number of the ASME goals, particularly the Overriding Goal: "To move vigorously from what is now a society with essentially technical concerns to a society that, while serving the technical interests of its members ever better, is increasingly professional in its outlook, sensitive to the engineer's responsibility to the public's interest, and dedicated to a leadership role in making technology a true servant of man."

The Congressional Fellow would be closely associated with a congressman or committee concerned with legislation on subjects for which an understanding of mechanical engineering is important. He would have available to him the facilities of the office of William P. Miller, ASME's Washington representative, in calling on the resources of the Society.

For the first year ASME will provide up to half of the cost for one man with the understanding that his employer would provide the other half. Facilities of the Congress will make office space and secretarial support available. In taking this action, the Executive Committee of the Council views this one-time cost as seed money, for which reserve funds are available. The action also called for the exploration of other sources for funding in future years.

Members May Apply. The first step for a member of ASME interested in applying for the fellowship available in 1973 would be to establish with his employer the basis under which he could be made available. Applications will be held in confidence and should be directed to Dr. Rogers B. Finch, Executive Director and Secretary, ASME, 345 East 47th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

Each application should include:

1. A résumé covering education, engineering experience, and pertinent personal factors.

2. A statement describing the terms of the applicant's leave from his employer. This should state his current salary and the total amount of financial support which the employer would provide.

3. A letter describing the way the applicant views this position and how his experience and abilities qualify him for the post.

Applications will be received up until Nov. 1, 1972, and should cover a period of one year beginning no earlier than Jan. 1, 1973, nor later than Mar. 1, 1973.

NATIONAL AVIATION DAY

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is celebrated as National Aviation Day, having been so declared by Congress to coincide with Orville Wright's birthday.

Today at Dayton, Ohio, the occasion is being celebrated at an annual Aviation Day luncheon during which the speaker will be Federal Aviation Administrator John H. Shaffer.

Also during the luncheon there will be a presentation of an article written by Fred F. Marshall of Xenia, Ohio, "Wright Brothers of Dayton, Ohio, Solve the Mystery of Winged Flight" which will appear in the winter edition of the Ohioana Library Association Quarterly. Mr. Marshall has been a long-time student of the Wright Brothers and their historic achievements in the development of flight of which the bulk of experimentation and work was carried out at the Huffman Prairie Simms Station experimental flying field which lies east of Dayton in Greene County in the Seventh Congressional District which I represent.

In addition to this article, which I am submitting for publication in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues, Mr. Marshall is also author of the book, "The Wright Brothers Chronology" (1903–09), and is the former editor and publisher of the Slipstream, one of the early-day aviation trade journals. Mr. Marshall is also a charter member of the National Aviation Hall of Fame.

The article follows:

WRIGHT BROTHERS OF DAYTON, OHIO, SOLVE MYSTERY OF WINGED FLIGHT

(By Fred F. Marshall)

Since man came upon earth it is apparent that he coveted with child-like and wistful fancy the winged flight of birds.

This insatiable passion to fly is evident in ancient myths and in the stone figures or petroglyphs depicting both humans and animals with wings. Of these there was Pegasus, Media's Dragons, and with the similar forms appearing on ancient Egyptian bas-reliefs.

What school youngster but who is not familiar with the classic legend of Daedalus and his son Icarus who for some unknown reason fled from Greece to the Isle of Crete. Here Daedalus constructed a famous labyrinth for King Minos. Subsequently, Daedalus with his son Icarus were imprisoned in this same labyrinth stronghold. We are told that they saved the feathers from sea birds and eventually fashioned wings for themselves by means of which they soared out over the sea and toward freedom. Daedalus had forewarned Icarus to keep high enough to avoid the dampness of the sea but meanwhile to avoid flying too high lest the heat of the sun melt the wax which held the wing feathers together. But the youthful Icarus, like so many impetuous teenagers of present times, disregarded this latter part of his father's counsel—he zoomed too high, the wax softened, the wing feathers fluttered apart, and Icarus fell into the sea and was drowned.

Amazingly enough, authentic records going back as far as 67 AD indicate that serious experiments were being undertaken in human flight.

And so it was that to the turn of the 20th Century there had been a ceaseless struggle to solve the mystery of flight, and with this impulsive, though futile, outlook persisting through fifty centuries. Though early inventors and scientists seemingly were well on the road to solving some of the basic principles of aerodynamics, they failed repeatedly to make practical application of their findings.

Today the chronology of human flight—from the period of early ballooning experiments, and some years before the era of the Wright Brothers—reveals that many talented scientists were deeply engrossed in the effort to fathom the baffling secrets of flight. Among these notable pioneers we must list Stringfellow, Ader, Lilienthal, Henson, Sir George Caley, A. Penaud and Sir Hiram Maxim.

But now viewed in retrospect, and with the discoveries of the Wright Brothers at hand, their accomplishments cannot be accorded higher distinction than that they present noteworthy milestones in the conquest of human flight.

How utterly improbable, therefore, and how highly tinged with romance it comes about that two unassuming bicycle mechanics of Dayton, Ohio—Orville and Wilbur Wright—go down in history as the first men to fly, and as the inventors of the first engine-driven airplane to get free of the earth and to land safely with its pilot at its controls. This epochal achievement took place a full lifetime ago, December 17, 1903, on the

bleak sand dunes of Kitty Hawk along the North Carolina seaboard.

The detail facts of this history-making feat need not be reviewed here in further detail, with the story now being intimate knowledge to peoples, young and old, throughout the world.

How strange, in reassessing the magnitude of the accomplishment and the immensity of its impact upon human advancement, that it was not immediately heralded with universal acclaim! It is also in strange sequence that the sensational aspects of the Kitty Hawk flights did not bring to the Wrights immediate world prominence and affluence.

Actually, only meager bulletin mention was accorded the first Kitty Hawk feat in the press, in the newspapers of Dayton, the home town of the inventors. There is also the fact that despite this day of personal triumph for the Wright boys, and with their three successful flights just before them, it was not to end without sore misfortune if not complete disaster! For, while they stood by in contemplation of their history-making achievement, an errant wind blast caught up their machine and tumbled it over and over leaving it a jumble of wreckage. So, now with Christmas close at hand and with the weather becoming more and more inclement on the bleak dunes, the brothers decided to return home.

First they scribbled off a message to their father, Bishop Milton Wright, back in Dayton, which the nearby life-saving station operator agreed to forward to the telegraph station at Elizabeth City. The message included data on the successful flights and concluded with the word that they would be home for Christmas.

They forthwith crated up their wrecked machine for shipment back to Dayton, boarded up their shop-shack, and engaged a fishing launch to take them and their gear to the Elizabeth City railhead. When they arrived home there was no welcoming fanfare, no delegation of dignitaries, no welcoming party. Shortly they were back in their "West Side" bicycle shop and resuming their customary routine. Nor was there a train of industrial tycoons or of their agents beating a path to their door seeking to acquire an interest in their marvelous flying machine invention. Nor were they promptly visited by foreign agents or notable scientists seeking to learn more intimate facts pertaining to their discoveries.

So with the Wright boys settled back again in their shop they straightway laid plans for building a second flying machine rather than attempt to repair the damaged craft. And, in the process of building the second machine they would employ stronger frame members and supports.

They also set their chief shop mechanic, Charley Taylor, building another engine, hopefully one that would produce more horsepower without much additional weight. Amazingly enough, they accomplished both these projects during the remaining winter months.

There follow now the inexplicable hiatus period, from the years 1904 to 1908, with the Wright Brothers still in the role of virtual unknowns.

Early in 1904 they had made arrangements with a "West Side" banker acquaintance to rent his pasture at Simm's Station, some six miles north of the City of Dayton, for use as an experimental flying field. Here they set up a shed shelter and a launching track for their machine.

Thus, all through the late spring and summer the Wrights were unobtrusively conducting flight experiments. Strangely, Dayton citizenry took little or no note of their flying activities here, nor were they or the world at large cognizant to any degree of the progress the Wrights were making. To point up what would seem utter public indifference toward the Wright flying experiments, let us review briefly a listing of their record flight accomplishments from the years 1904 to 1908.

On September 20, 1904, the first circled flight of record was executed, and then shortly followed "S-shaped courses" and with dives and upward zooms. By the end of that year's flying season they had made two flights of 5-minutes duration!

Then in May, 1905, they perfected a means of placing the pilot in a seated position beside the engine rather than compelling him to take the tiring prone position. Amazingly on September 26, there was a flight of eleven-odd miles in 18 minutes, and the next day a flight of fifteen and a half miles in 19 minutes, followed the next day by a flight of over twenty miles in approximately 24 minutes.

Yet the *Scientific American*, in its issue of December 16, 1905, risked no more than to say that "The only flying machine news worth reporting was the 'box-kite' machine of the Wright Brothers." The entry concluded by saying that ". . . the only successful flying that has been done this year must be credited to the balloon or gas-bag type." At this time the Wrights had flown a total of over 160 miles!

On May 22, 1906, the Wrights finally received a letter patent for their invention of a "Flying Machine."

So, it was not until late 1907 that the Wright Brothers were able to consummate a deal with a Franch syndicate, giving this foreign group the rights to manufacture, sell or license the use of the Wright plane in France, that things appeared to take on a more promising turn.

About the same time (December, 1907), it came about that the U.S. Government became sufficiently impressed with the Wright flying machine that the Ordnance Board, through the Signal Corps, made preparations to issue sealed bids for the purchase of a flying machine after a set of rigid specifications.

Although it had been anticipated that the Wright machine would prove the only one able to meet the specification requirements in the flight tests, there were, surprisingly enough, 41 sealed bids returned. But subsequently most of these were thrown out through lack of the 10 percent bid bond deposit. Then first one and another of the remaining bidders, except the Wright Brothers, chose to eliminate themselves on the promise their bid bond would be returned. Though some further complications arose in light of the single legitimate bid dilemma, means were found to lawfully make award to the Wrights—this on February 8, 1908.

Three weeks later they closed a contract with Lazare Weiller, the wealthy Frenchman, to form the foreign syndicate.

The U.S. Government flight tests would be held at Ft. Myer, Virginia, near Washington. Delivery of the machine to be made August 28, and the acceptance tests to start shortly thereafter in September. But now one of the brothers would have to make demonstrations in France. Neither had flown for months on end, and not much time remained. They could not depend on uncertain wind currents at their Dayton Simms Station test grounds, so would return to the scenes of their initial triumph at Kitty Hawk.

It was decided that Wilbur should conduct the demonstrations in France. Orville would remain at home to get a machine ready and to make the Ft. Myer acceptance flight tests. Wilbur sailed for Europe on May 21. Orville arrived at Ft. Myer in August with two mechanics, Taylor and Furnas.

With the great stretches of open level country about Le Mans in the Sarthe district of France, some 125 miles southeast of Paris, this sector was chosen for Wilbur to stage his flight exhibitions.

Leon Bollee, a popular automobile manufacturer and sports enthusiast, offered Wilbur shop space at his factory, with the Hunaudieres race track grounds selected for the first flight exhibitions being nearby.

An imposing monument now stands in the City of Le Mans in commemoration of the spectacular flight performances conducted by Wilbur Wright in the late summer and autumn of 1908.

Among the teeming, highly emotional throngs who witnessed these flying feats, there were members of the staid, scholarly Aero Club of France as well as high ranking officers of the military. Then, with news spreading of these unprecedented flying performances at Le Mans, there was an influx of foreign scientists, officers of the military staffs, and Royalty. Griffith Brewer, the veteran balloonist, came, as did Charles Rolls of the Rolls Royce auto firm. In September, Wilbur was guest of honor at a dinner in his honor staged in Paris by the Aero Club of Sarthe.

In mid-September, Wilbur received reports of the excellent flight performances that Orville was executing at Fort Myer. Then, on the heels of this, a cable with the horrifying news of the tragic crash of the day before wherein Lieutenant Selfridge, Orville's passenger, was killed and he, Orville, badly injured. But, happily, by late autumn Orville, with his sister Katherine, was able to join Wilbur at Pau, the posh Pyrenees resort where winter flying exhibitions were being continued. Here the Wrights were heralded by the elite of European society and Royalty. They met King Alphonso of Spain, and in the spring of 1909 they met King Edward VII of England, together with Lord Balfour and Lord Northcliffe. There followed plans for the Wrights to stage flights in Rome, where they would train two Italian officers to fly.

The Wrights subsequently went to London to receive gold medals from the Aero Club of the United Kingdom.

The Wrights arrived back in America in early May, 1909. A few weeks later, on June 17 and 18, their hometown of Dayton, Ohio, staged a rousing homecoming for them. It was the greatest celebration in all the city's history. Directly after these ceremonies, the Wrights boarded a train for the nation's Capitol, where they were received at the White House by President William Howard Taft.

In a recent testimonial at the hand of Major Alexander P. de Seversky, notable inventor and member of the Aviation Hall of Fame, he said ". . . the technology started by the Wright Brothers opened the door into space and made possible the exploration of the universe that stretches beyond the gravitation of the earth. The impetus they provided for aerospace research and development has yielded enormous benefits to mankind.

"It resulted in new materials, new technological processes and new industries. It enables us to offer more goods and services to a greater number of people at home and abroad.

"If our youth will emulate the spirit of adventure and perseverance as personified by the Wright Brothers, America's continued greatness is assured."

PROBLEMS OF DRUG USE AMONG SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, members of the Select Committee on Crime re-

cently concluded 3 productive days of hearings on the problem of drug sales and use among school-age children in the Miami area.

These hearings were the second in a series which will take our committee to Chicago, San Francisco and Kansas City in the months ahead to hear from the people what the facts are and what the Federal Government can do to help.

In addition to Miami, we have also held hearings in New York City. We were pleased to note as recently as August 16 that School Chancellor Harvey B. Scribner of New York had taken constructive action recommended by our committee requiring the names of student drug users to be reported to the city's narcotics register where they might receive help.

Following our Miami hearings the school officials there announced a project to begin this September at a cost of $128,000 to determine the extent of drug usage in the schools. It is a first and an important step in recognizing that there is a serious drug problem within our schools.

The news reports referring to these events are placed in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 16, 1972]

SCRIBNER SAYS LAW IS FORCING SCHOOLS TO REPORT ADDICTS

School Chancellor Harvey B. Scribner said yesterday that city laws had forced a change in policy on reporting the names of student drugs users, and said the rule "may well be inconsistent with current efforts by the schools to fight drug abuse among students."

In a statement "to make clear to the people of New York City" the context in which the new order was given, Dr. Scribner said it was based totally and exclusively on a requirement of law—specifically, the New York City Health Code."

Dr. Scribner gave the order requiring school officials to report the names of student drug users to the city's narcotics register on July 20, after a State Commission of Investigation report criticized the city's schools for refusing to cooperate with the reporting law. The schools had previously only provided summaries of the total number of drug addiction cases discovered among students.

Counselors and drug-education specialists who work in the schools have expressed serious doubts to me that they could successfully obtain the confidence of the students and counsel them away from drugs while also reporting drugs to the central register," Dr. Scribner said in his statement.

The city law, Dr. Scribner continued, "provides no counseling which students need. It provides no drug education, which students need," he said.

Noting the criticism directed against his reporting order by school officials opposed to giving out the names of drug users, the Chancellor concluded:

"I hope that these persons and groups that object to this register report will direct their attention not merely to a school regulation, but primarily to the law which requires the issuing of the regulation."

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, July 6, 1972]

MOTHERS TELL HOUSE PROBERS HOW DOPE KILLED THEIR SONS

(By Tom Morganthau)

A sobbing mother opened three days of hearings before the Congressional Committee on Crime and Drug Abuse Wednesday with testimony that her heroin addict son strangled his younger sister while she beat helplessly on her locked bedroom door.

Mrs. Prescola Beneby, of 1100 N.W. 50th St. told members of U.S. Rep. Claude Pepper's House select committee that her son Alvin strangled her daughter Beverly in their home after taking heroin last January.

"There he was, strangling my little daughter," she said, near tears. "He strangled her until I couldn't hear her little voice any more, and she was dead."

Mrs. Beneby, whose son is now a patient at South Florida State Hospital, said he got his introduction to heroin while a student at Miami Jackson Senior High School. She was one of three mothers appearing before the travelling committee to testify on drug abuse in Dade County Schools.

Mrs. Beneby, Mrs. June Mock and Mrs. Shirley Fletcher said that drugs, including heroin, are readily available in junior and senior high schools in Dade. Mrs. Beneby and Mrs. Mock, whose son died of a heroin overdose in 1969, told committee members that school authorities had not notified them that their sons were suspected of drug abuse.

Mrs. Mock, a divorcee mother of three who lives at 1010 NW 147th St., said her son Edward began to use marijuana at Valley High School in Las Vegas, Nev., while living with his father.

When he returned to Dade County to live with her, she said, he obtained drugs at Thomas Jefferson Junior High School.

"My 13-year-old daughter tells me that nearly everyone is on pills or pot at Jefferson," Mrs. Mock said.

She said her son's friends had not been influenced against drug use by his death. "They were upset," she said, "but they considered him a hero. They thought it was a great way to go."

Mrs. Fletcher, whose son Michael died of an overdose of heroin in 1971, told the committee that her son's death was murder.

She said she turned the name of her son's pusher over to police two months before his body was found in the parking lot of Mount Sinai Hospital.

The pusher and a key witness in the trial of two youths later convicted of third degree murder in her son's death were later found dead, also by overdoses of heroin, she said.

"I can only guess that organized crime had a great deal to do with these three deaths," she said.

Committee members also sharply questioned Dr. Marvin Burt, a Washington D. C. researcher who is now evaluating eight Dade County drug rehabilitation programs for County Manager Ray Goode.

Prodded by Reps. Frank Brasco (D., NY.) and Charles Rangel (D., N.Y.), Burt said his research team had asked school administrators to survey Dade students on drug use.

School officials initially agreed to do the survey, he said, then failed to follow through.

Board member Dr. Ben Sheppard, who will testify before the committee Friday, later confirmed that he had been "unofficially" delegated by the board to review the request.

Sheppard said he and a group of school administrators decided against participating in the study because Burt's questionnaire "wasn't worth anything" because no provision was made for checking the truth or falsehood of students' responses.

"The idea seems to be prevalent that the schools haven't done anything," Sheppard said. "That's wrong. This is a large sociological question that can't be answered by 10 congressmen bent for election."

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, July 7, 1972]

TEEN-AGER TELLS PANEL OF DRUG AND THEFT LINK

MIAMI.—Sally Pace, blonde, pretty and 16, told a congressional committee Thursday that 80 per cent of the students in one of south Florida's largest high schools are on drugs and steal to support their habits.

Sally, a former student at Fort Lauderdale's Plantation High, told the U.S. House Select Crime Committee headed by Florida Congressman Claude Pepper that most of her teachers would just let her sleep when she came to school stoned on drugs.

"If you wanted to get stoned at school," she said, "you went to the bathroom or to the parking lot."

Sally and other teen-agers now participating in "The Seed," a Fort Lauderdale drug rehabilitation program for school-age children, were witnesses in the second of three days of hearings on local high schools by Pepper's committee.

Asked by committee members for advice on combatting the school drug problem, the teen-agers said the only thing drug addicts will respond to is "peer pressure," that anti-drug programs need vast improvement, and that schools should have authority to force addicts into rehabilitation programs if parents won't.

Larry Pellegrini, who said he began smoking marijuana at the age of 13, told the congressmen he became addicted to heroin and finally turned to armed robbery to support his habit. He estimated he had committed more than 100 crimes.

Pellegrini, 18, said he committed more than a dozen armed robberies and had been arrested at least six times on a variety of charges.

Libby MacDonald testified she and another Florida girl were sent to a 150-student New York boarding school and wound up turning nearly all their classmates to drugs.

"When I got there, there were only a couple of us on dope," Libby said. "Three of us turned on about everyone there during the one year I was there."

"Kids today won't listen to parents, teachers, police or anybody except their peers," said Miss MacDonald. "Peer pressure is the only thing that is going to take the kids off drugs.

"Churches aren't doing any good at all. They provide another recreation place where the kids can sell drugs and get stoned."

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) Tribune, July 7, 1972]

MARIJUANA: BEGINNING OF THE END

All those people who wonder whether there's some validity in the argument that marijuana should be legalized because it really isn't any more harmful than liquor, should have read the account of the three mothers who testified before the committee on Crime and Drug Abuse in Miami this week.

The mothers told of their sons' addiction to heroin which began, they testified, with smoking marijuana. The heroin was the end of the road.

One of the mothers told of how her 18-year-old son, high on heroin, locked himself in a room and strangled his five-year-old sister while the mother frantically tried to beat the door down. The son now is in a mental hospital.

The mother of another boy said her son died of a heroin overdose and his body was dumped by two teenagers in a hospital parking lot. A third boy who was to testify at the House hearing also died of a heroin overdose.

Again it has been demonstrated in this hearing that marijuana is but a beginning step in the road to death by hard drugs.

[From the Tampa Times, July 7, 1972]

COMMITTEE HEARS DRUG ADDICTS' FATHERS

MIAMI.—I thought I was the top expert on drugs in Miami, then I found out my own 15-year-old daughter was hooked on cocaine," said U.S. Commissioner Edward Swann.

"I handled all kinds of drug cases, from customs, the FBI and other agencies. I knew it all.

"But I've been re-educated in the last 90 days," Swann continued. "I knew just this much:" He held up his thumb and forefinger spaced close together.

Swann, father of six children, was testifying before Rep. Claude Pepper's House Select Committee on Crime late yesterday. Pepper, Miami Democrat, and four other congressmen are conducting three days of hearings, ending today, in the Miami area on the problems of drug abuse among school-age children.

Swann told his personal experiences alongside another father, Dr. E. (Jack) Taylor, vice president of student affairs at Fort Lauderdale University, who told of his 19-year-old daughter being rehabilitated after three years as a heroin addict.

Both fathers said they had the means and the drive to "try everything" to straighten out their afflicted children.

"I wasn't a bad parent," said Taylor and Swann nodded agreement that neither was he. Their daughters, they said, had both started with marijuana under pressure to stay in step with their school friends.

When none of the treatments and consultants worked, both wound up forcing their children to enroll in "The Seed," a project in nearby Fort Lauderdale aimed at rehabilitating school-age children hooked on drugs.

Testimony earlier yesterday from four teenage "graduates" of The Seed and from its director, Art Barker, estimated 75 to 80 per cent of junior and senior high students in both public and private schools are using some sort of drugs.

When I put Kathy in the program, she was 15 and had been using drugs for two years," Swann said. "She screamed for her lawyer.

"After two weeks, when we attended one of the meetings, she still tried to con us, whispering 'take me home.' Her mother and I just smiled and whispered back, 'we love you.' The experience will tear your heart out."

"Love" is the big word in the seed program, which teaches the youths 9 to 20 years old to love and respect themselves, their country and their parents and to be honest with everyone, the testimony brought out.

For Swann and Taylor there are happy endings. Both daughters are "straight" now and the families have learned new awareness, attitudes and knowledge about each other, the fathers said.

"When I tell some of my acquaintances, lawyers and professional men, that my daughter was a drug addict," Swann said, "They pat me and say, 'You poor man.'

"Funny thing is, my daughter was shooting drugs with some of their kids.

"We have a brand new beautiful daughter in our home now," Swann declared. "And I don't have to worry about the other children in my home. I have the best CIA agent in the world in my house."

[From the Miami (Fla.) News, July 6, 1972]

"I Begged Them to Help My Boy," Tearful Mom Says

(By Rick Abrams)

Prescola Beneby pleaded with probation officers for drug rehabilitation for her 18-year-old son, Alvin. He had recently been arrested on a charge of shoplifting—on which profits he supported a heroin habit, his mother said.

"The probation officers told me no—they said they would send him to the stockade," she recalled.

When Alvin was a student at Jackson High, he pumped his first syringe of heroin into his arm, Mrs. Beneby said. Shortly after, he was hooked, she declared—although the youth denied it.

When Alvin was arrested a third time on a shoplifting charge, "I begged the probation officers to send him to a hospital," she said.

Instead, her son was sent to the Dade County Stockade for one month. "I'm sure if he was given help he could have stopped the habit. If only he was given help . . ."

Ten days after leaving the stockade, Alvin, in a drug stupor, locked his five-year-old sister's door, then strangled her, as his mother tried in vain to break in, according to police records.

Through a flood of tears, Prescola Beneby told her story yesterday to the House Select Committee on Crime, holding hearings here on the drug crisis in Dade County schools.

Mrs. Beneby told the Congressional committee she has finally been given the help she so often requested—her son is in the Florida State Hospital.

"The place I asked to get him into—they said no. And so, my daughter had to be killed."

She, along with two others who had lost sons to drug overdoses, was assured by U.S. Rep. Claude Pepper, committee chairman, that "something would be done, to try and prevent these things from happening."

"It's not an easy thing," Mrs. Beneby told the committee. "Even if one person is helped by my testimony . . . even one person."

U.S. Drug Probe Here Sparks Clash Over Schools

An apparent failure to communicate between the Dade County School Board and a doctor seeking a survey of drug use in schools triggered the dissatisfaction yesterday of a congressional committee investigating the drug crisis in Dade County schools.

The committee of 10 congressmen, led by Rep. Claude Pepper (D., Fla.), heard testimony from Dr. Marvin Burt, who has a $25,000 grant from the county manager's office to compile a survey on heroin addiction here.

When the committee asked Dr. Burt how many addicts there were in local schools, Burt said he didn't know, because the school board had not conducted a survey which he said he had recommended.

However, school board member Phyllis Miller, testified later that "there was never any type of survey asked of us.

"I don't think it's fair to criticize the board for denying the survey when it wasn't even brought to our attention," she said.

Burt's testimony elicited heated response from some committee members, who asked him what good the survey did if it did not include the schools.

Rep. Charles Rangel (D., N.Y.) told Burt: "I'm trying to be objective—it seems that most everyone in this town would be concerned as to the number of school youngsters who are drug addicts . . . It seems to me you're sitting on a powderkeg by denying them recognition."

And Rep. William Keating (Rep., Ohio), told Dr. Burt, "I can't tell what you're doing—and any school board that does not conduct a survey in its schools is really derelict."

However, Mrs. Miller told the committee, that Burt's request for a survey was apparently elicited only at the administrative level.

Burt denied this, saying that the matter was discussed with administrators "and at least one school board official."

Mrs. Miller shook her head, and Ross Stone, in charge of public relations for the board, said the matter had not been up for approval.

The committee, meeting today and tomorrow, is expected to hear from other Dade School Board members tomorrow.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, July 7, 1972]

Pepper Urges New Antidrug Programs in Schools

(By Tom Morganthau)

U.S. Rep. Claude Pepper said Thursday that the Dade County school system should establish broad new programs to identify and rehabilitate student drug users.

"There's no doubt that the schools should have a part in the rehabilitation and recovery of drug abusers," Pepper said, adding that such programs would require new—and unspecified—amounts of state and federal aid.

Pepper made his remarks at the end of two days of hearings on drug use among Dade County secondary school students before his House Select Committee on Crime and Drug Abuse. A third day of hearings, at which School Board member Dr. Ben Sheppard and a group of school administrators are scheduled to testify, will be held today.

"I don't want to pass judgment on the school authorities until we hear from them tomorrow," Pepper said, "But it's pretty clear . . . that adequate recognition has not been given to the problem."

"I'm not blaming the schools for not doing what they don't have the money to do," he said. "But they should be crying on our shoulder about the problem. They should identify the scope of the problem and then go to the Legislature and Congress for funds."

He cited testimony given before the committee on Wednesday that school authorities last year refused a request that they conduct a survey of student drug use.

Dr. Sheppard Wednesday said the schools had declined to administer the study because "it wasn't worth anything."

Pepper's committee, which held similar hearings on drug abuse in New York City schools last week, Wednesday spent over six hours listening to students, parents and staff describe a Broward County drug rehabilitation program, The Seed.

The students—Ann Ryser, 14, Sally Pace, 16, Libby MacDonald, 18, and Larry Pellegrini, 18—told the congressmen that 85 per cent of the high school students they knew used drugs at some time or another.

Three of the four said they had been addicted to heroin prior to entering The Seed program, and Pellegrini said he committed over a dozen armed robberies to support his drug purchases.

Pellegrini, who said he regularly used drugs in school, said few teachers made any attempt to control drug abuse in the classroom.

"The teachers are afraid to say anything because the parents don't want to hear that their kids are on drugs," he said.

"You've got to start cracking down on the schools and make the teachers stand up and do what's right," Miss MacDonald added. "Unless something is done, in five years there won't be any younger generation left—they'll all be dead or in jail."

Other witnesses, however, asserted that school principals thwarted teachers' attempts to control drug abuse by limiting their disciplinary powers.

The committee also heard Criminal Court Judge Al Sepe recommend the creation of involuntary commitment centers for drug rehabilitation.

Sepe said that suspensions from school only compounded the drug abuse problem. "By suspending kids from school, we just give them another holiday and make it easier for them to get involved with drugs," he said. "What we need is involuntary commitment centers . . . where parents can take their children for treatment whether they like it or not."

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, July 8, 1972]

Accessory to Crime

Marijuana, its defenders say, is a nonaddictive drug, no more harmful than beer or whiskey.

But listen to what witnesses told the House subcommittee on crime, headed by Congressman Claude Pepper, in hearings at Miami:

A mother whose 18-year-old son strangled

his 5-year-old sister: "He started smoking marijuana when he was 16, in junior high. In two years he was hooked on heroin. He's now in a mental hospital."

The mother of a son who died at 21 of an overdose of heroin: "He started on marijuana, at school."

A 14-year-old girl, now in a rehabilitation program: "I started on marijuana at 11 and went to heroin. I went to school many days stoned. I would steal from stores and cars to get money for drugs."

An 18-year-old youth who testified he had committed more than a hundred crimes, including a dozen armed robberies: "I began smoking pot at 13 and then started shooting heroin. I stole constantly to buy dope."

Two prominent men, one a Federal commissioner, the other a college administrator, who discovered their teen-age daughters were heroin addicts. Both, they said, started smoking marijuana "to stay in step with their school friends" and moved on to hard drugs.

And this statement by the director of the rehabilitation program at Fort Lauderdale: "When I started on this job two years ago, the average age of the junkie coming to me was 20. Now it's 15—with three years of drug experience."

It all adds up to a horror story, in which marijuana, if not a principal in crime, is at least an accessory to the destruction of American youth.

BILL SCOTT REPORTS

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, since coming to the Congress, I have sent a regular newsletter to citizens of the Eighth District of Virginia and I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a copy of the August 1972 newsletter:

BILL SCOTT REPORTS

CONGRESSIONAL RECESS

Congress is nearing the end of the present term and will be in recess during the last two weeks in August so that Members will have an opportunity to attend the Republican National Convention in Miami. There was a similar recess in July for the Democratic Convention. It is expected that we will be in session throughout the month of September, but Members are hopeful of adjournment by the first of October. Past experience, however, indicates that adjournment plans are often delayed.

Because we are nearing the end of the session, it might be timely to mention my attendance and voting record during the 6 years I have served in the House of Representatives. According to statistics compiled by the Library of Congress, I was present 93.5% of the time in 1967; 92.7% in 1968; 96% in 1969; 97.8% in 1970; 95.3% in 1971; and 97% so far in 1972. A quorum call or roll call vote often occurs unexpectedly, and a Member may be only a short distance away with constituents and inadvertently fail to be present. Therefore, I am particularly pleased with this record of attendance during the time I have represented you in the Congress.

SPENDING CEILING

The President has recommended and I have co-sponsored legislation that would put a limit of $250 billion on spending for the fiscal year 1973. Frankly, it is much more than I feel we should spend, but our committees are recommending spending at higher levels than the President's budget and oftentimes amendments on the Floor of the House result in additional spending. It is understood that so far this year Federal spending has been authorized at $16 billion over the Administration's budget. Therefore, without some control such as provided by this measure, deficit spending can continue to increase, add to the inflationary spiral, and result in higher prices to consumers.

A CASE IN POINT

A few days ago, the President vetoed the Labor, HEW, and related agencies appropriation bill. It was $1.8 billion above the budget estimate and contained an open ended proposal whereby an additional $3.5 billion could be spent for social services to welfare recipients. Deficit spending and higher prices could jeopardize improving economic conditions, result in damage to individual family budgets and higher taxes. Therefore, I voted to sustain the veto. Hopefully, it will be enacted within a short time in a lower amount with the objectionable features removed.

AMATEUR SLEUTHING

Over the past several months, Members of Congress have been contacted by persons they do not know and oftentimes residents of other states asking to examine the files in a Member's office. These individuals are said to be working under the leadership of Ralph Nader, for the purpose of gauging the effectiveness of the entire Congress and grading the individual members. I understand Mr. Nader has supplemented his regular staff with approximately 800 summer volunteers who are mainly college students. Our staff has been instructed to advise the volunteers that correspondence with constituents is not open to public inspection, but that I would be glad to talk with Mr. Nader if he cares to contact the office for an appointment at a mutually agreeable time. We have also received a 98-page questionnaire which apparently was mailed to each Member of Congress and which I have not answered but filed among our records.

While the office is always open to visits from constituents and others, it seems unreasonable to take time from legislative duties to answer a 98-page questionnaire or to open our files to a self-appointed critic. Constituents often contact their Congressman about personal matters and include statements they would not want to be disclosed to the general public. Nevertheless, the Nader people have reviewed my financial statements filed with the Clerk of the House, contacted former employees and other Members, asking a wide variety of questions. Of course, the general public is entitled to be informed of the activities of their elected representatives and I have recognized this by monthly reports, daily correspondence, and frequent meetings with individuals and groups. Evaluation of Members of Congress can best be made by constituents on election day, and most Members have reservations about the sleuthing being done by Mr. Nader and his associates.

ACADEMY APPOINTMENTS

The Civil Service examination required of all qualified 8th District applicants for nomination to the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Merchant Marine Academies will be held this year on Saturday, September 30. To take the examination, eligible persons should file an application with our office no later than September 10. Those who apply will be notified by letter in advance as to exact time and place of examination. Results of this examination are used as the basis for selection of nominees. Applicants must have attained the age of 17 and not reached their 22nd birthday at the time of admission. Those interested in the Coast Guard Academy are urged to contact the Director of Admissions directly (New London, Conn. 06320) since those appointments are on the basis of an annual nationwide competition without geographic or other quotas.

NATIONAL HEROIN HOTLINE

One of the Federal government's newest tools in the battle against drug abuse is the establishment of a national heroin hotline that will be manned around the clock. Any citizen with information on drug traffic can call 800-368-5363. The hotline is entirely volunteer, and the identity of the caller will be protected if he prefers. Information obtained will be turned over to state and Federal enforcement agencies, including the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. This new system will permit individual citizens to do their part in our efforts to win the war on this major national problem.

BUSING

For a long period of time there has been a concern over the transportation of children from one neighborhood school to another for the purpose of obtaining racial balance. A Federal court in Richmond, for example, has ordered that school children in the City of Richmond be transported by bus either to Chesterfield or Henrico County and children from the county be transported by bus into the city for the purpose of having the same percentage of black and white children in each school in the city and adjoining counties.

A poll of all of the homes in our District indicate that 91 per cent of the people responding were opposed to this practice. Various bills have been introduced in the Congress to maintain the neighborhood school concept and to prohibit the cross-busing of children. One of them was considered in the House of Representatives a few days ago and passed by a fairly substantial majority even though concern was expressed by some members that the measure would be declared unconstitutional by the courts.

Copies of my remarks on this subject during the consideration of the bill will be forwarded to you upon request. However, the remarks were in favor of preserving the neighborhood school as the best method of obtaining quality education for all of our children. It seems reasonable that families should decide for themselves where they will live, where they will work, and where their children will attend school. This decision appears to me to be a personal one to be decided by each family group. Many amendments were offered on the Floor of the House and most of them strengthened the measure reported by the House Committee on Education and Labor. One of the amendments adopted provided for re-opening of law suits ordering the busing of children such as the city of Richmond, Henrico and Chesterfield Counties. The busing measure passed by a margin of 282 to 102. Nevertheless, I would still like to see a constitutional amendment adopted because in spite of the action taken in the Congress and the strong desire of most people to eliminate busing for racial purposes, the courts could still declare the bill passed by the House to be unconstitutional. Let me also mention that the measure adopted in the House will still have to be passed by the Senate and signed by the President before it becomes law.

FEDERAL JOB INFORMATION

The Civil Service Commission now has toll-free long distance telephone service in Virginia. By dialing 800-582-8171, you can learn of available Federal employment opportunities, including such information as job requirements and qualifications; hiring programs for special groups such as Vietnam veterans or the physically handicapped. Centers serving Virginia are in Norfolk, Richmond, and Washington. However, if you are interested in a particular examination or application form, upon written request our office will attempt to obtain it for you.

APPOINTMENT OF PAGE

Our office was fortunate in obtaining the appointment of a young man from Spring-

field, Joslin J. C. Neidlinger, as a Page in the House during his summer vacation. We were pleased because only 5 of the House Pages are assigned to Republican Members, and competition is keen when a vacancy occurs. Appointments in the past have been restricted to young men between the ages of 16 and 18 who are in the 11th or 12th grades.

SOMETHING TO PONDER

"The only debt greater than the Federal debt is the one we owe our country."

—Everett Dirksen.

SUBSIDIZING OF PERIODICALS

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Los Angeles Times published four letters to the editor which relate to subsidizing of periodicals by the Postal Service. Because these letter raise important points that should be considered in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which I am a member, I recommend it to my colleagues for review.

[From the Los Angeles Times, July 12, 1972]

SHOULD LOW POSTAL RATES SUBSIDIZE PERIODICALS?

Perhaps there is more to the second-class postal rates (July 6 editorial, "A Matter of Opinion") than meets the eye.

If enough publications feel the increase squeeze, and it appears many will, they may, as your editorial suggests, have to cease existing. Or will they? Since government now likes to have a hand in everything, it may wish to dash to the rescue by subsidizing the firms involved. While it would probably refer to the action as preventing an economic crisis, it would, in effect, assume a powerful position in the publishing business.

It seems that eventual control of the press by government is its goal anyway. The recent Supreme Court decision, continuous criticism by public officials and gag rules imposed by lower courts all seem to be indications that the First Amendment may someday soon be a joke.

Viewing the rate increase on a long range basis, I can't help but wonder if this is not just another step by the government to someday control everything. I have never thought in terms of my own government being my biggest enemy, but I must admit that it does seem within the realm of possibility.

ROBERT E. HOPPER,
Huntington Beach.

Indignantly Carey McWilliams laments the increase in postal rates for magazines and newspapers. What The Times general proposes editorially has no regard for increased costs, more government employment and of course higher taxes. For the same services and the same employes, the post office would increase its rate to offset general inflation in any case.

Rather than take their lament to Congress to ask for a dole or subsidy for periodicals. The Times might ask for revolutionary economy in the postal service. Half of our post offices might be closed in our wheeled society. Individaul home delivery might be abandoned with street boxes every four blocks. Saturday delivery might be eliminated and delivery made only three days a week to homes.

As a private citizen, I would like to see postal rates reduced back to 3 to 5 cents, but realize I must cheerfully give up something for this.

DAVID G. REYNOLDS,
Whittier.

The Times assertion that it is up to Congress to bring down the postal rates is invalid and only complicates the problem.

The most effective step that can be taken is to sell the U.S. Postal Service and leave the mails up to free enterprise. Efficiency would not only go up several points, but costs could be held down due to competition between several companies.

TOM PALMER,
Huntington Beach.

Dissemination of information and enlightenment of the citizenry by the only means possible at the time were the original justifications for postal subsidies in behalf of periodicals. With today's complete coverage by television, radio, newspapers and magazines can it be argued that continued subsidies benefitting only one medium are desirable?

Does it not follow that all media are important and deserve equal consideration? And what in the way of subsidies is justified to perform the desired function? Does The Times claim that currently popular slick paper pornographic sheets disseminate knowledge and enlighten the public?

Carey McWilliams claims justification for subsidies of all publications because of the good done by a few with limited circulations. Surely there is sufficient private wealth that could be attracted to provide the continued existence of worthwhile publications of all shades of philosophy.

McWilliams also states that, since so many other hands are in the public grabbag why not the publishers. It seems to this reader that this is specious reasoning below the dignity of a writer of McWilliams' stature. It also seems to me that The Times has reversed some of its former policies of opposition to indiscriminate subsidies for everything by promoting subsidies for its own industry.

J. C. DAVIS,
Irvine.

HEARINGS ON H.R. 714

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, on September 29, 1971, the Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures held hearings on S. 2087, the administration-backed proposal to pay a $50,000 gratuity to the survivors of police officers killed in the line of duty. At that time, I testified in opposition to this measure.

Since then, the House Judiciary Committee has taken up consideration of similar legislation, and in May of this year I testified again before the House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 1, this time in support of H.R. 714, legislation which I have introduced in the past three Congresses.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives will be considering this important issue, hopefully in the next few weeks. So that my colleagues may better appreciate the full context of the administration-backed measures and H.R. 714, I insert here my testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN ANDREW JACOBS, JR., BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL LAWS AND PROCEDURES, SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, on August 1, 1969, Senator Bayh and I introduced legislation to extend Federal survivors' benefits to the families of police and firemen killed in the line of duty. The legislation which extends coverage under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to all public safety officers would provide up to 75% of the deceased officer's base pay to the widow and children until her remarriage and until the children's 18th birthday.

In April of 1968, President Johnson signed Public Law 90-291, which extended coverage under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to all State and local law enforcement officers who are killed while enforcing a Federal law or while maintaining custody over a Federal prisoner.

It was late in the 90th Congress when Senator Bayh and I introduced our bill; too late, in fact, to solicit Administration support with an eye toward passage in that Congress. So in March, 1969, Senator Bayh and I introduced identical legislation in the 91st Congress. The reaction to our legislation was rapid and gratifying. By mid-summer of 1969 there were 135 co-sponsors in the House of Representatives as well as endorsements from the National Fraternal Order of Police, the International Firefighters' Association [AFL-CIO] and the American Trial Lawyers' Association.

After several phone calls, some prodding, and six months delay, the Administration voiced its opposition to the principle of Federal benefits to the families of slain local public safety officers in an October 8, 1969 letter from Deputy Attorney General Richard Kleindienst to Chairman Celler:

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., October 8, 1969.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice on H.R. 7989, a bill "To extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty."

Public Law 90-291 (5 U.S.C. 8191-8193) extended the benefits of the Federal Employees Compensation Act (5 U.S.C. 8101 *et seq.*) to eligible State and local law enforcement officers and their survivors. That law defines eligible officers to include a State or local law enforcement officer killed or injured while seeking or attempting to apprehend a person for the commission of a crime against the United States or as a material witness in a criminal proceeding instituted by the United States. Also eligible are law officers protecting a person held for the commission of a crime against the United States or held as a material witness in connection with such a crime. A final category of eligible law enforcement officer is one who, when injured or killed, was attempting to prevent the commission of crime against the United States. In all instances, eligibility for compensation, pursuant to Public Law 91-291 is dependent upon some connection between the death or injury of the law enforcement officer and the enforcement of Federal law.

H.R. 7989, recognizing the valuable service of law enforcement officers and firemen throughout the United States, would amend section 8191 of title 5, United States Code to extend its benefits to professional and volunteer State and local police and firemen; as well as to all other members of legally

organized law enforcement agencies. Eligibility for compensation would not be dependent upon any nexus between a injury or death and the performance of a federally connected activity.

The Department of Justice is unable to recommend enactment of this legislation, despite its high regard for those who risk their lives in law enforcement or fire fighting. If the principle of this legislation is sound, it could apply with equal force to retirement benefits and even salaries of public safety officers. In our judgment it is incumbent upon the States and local communities adequately to compensate such personnel when employed, when injured or killed, and when retired. Further, it would appear to be an unreasonable intrusion into State and local government activities for the Federal Government to underwrite the proposed compensation benefits.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

RICHARD G. KLEINDIENST,
Deputy Attorney General.

The administration persisted in its opposition to this principle for 20 months, until June 3, 1971:

[From the Washington Post, May 27, 1971]

NIXON, HOOVER DISCUSS POLICE DEATHS

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

President Nixon summoned Attorney General John N. Mitchell and FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover to his office yesterday to discuss ways in which the federal government can help prevent the slaying of policemen.

White House press secretary Donald L. Ziegler said after the unexpected meeting that the President feels the recent slayings in New York and Washington were "tragic" and "reprehensible."

"Mr. Nixon will write letters of sympathy to the families of two New York policemen who were shot in the backs last week and of two Washington policemen who died following gunshot wounds suffered in the line of duty, Ziegler said.

The New York policemen killed last week were Waverly M. Jones and Joseph A. Piagnitini. They were shot after having responded to a call for help in a Harlem apartment.

In Washington, William L. Sigmon was killed Tuesday when he attempted to apprehend two robbers of the National Permanent Federal Savings and Loan Assn. office on MacArthur Boulevard NW.

Another policeman, Jerard F. Young, was buried yesterday. He was shot in the head while attempting to make an arrest April 21.

Last November, the President directed the Justice Department "to make available all appropriate investigative resources" to local and state police "when requested in any case involving an assault upon a police officer."

The President said at the time that he had discussed his directive with Hoover and D.C. Police Chief Jerry V. Wilson.

The President "primarily wanted to discuss the scope of the problem and to see what assistance is being provided," Ziegler said yesterday of the late afternoon meeting.

The FBI's main help is in providing laboratory tests and assisting in out-of-state leads on those involved in attacks on police, Ziegler reported.

"The President asked me to express his hope that these tragedies will remind people of the debt we owe policemen for many services, of the protection they so selflessly provide and of the respect and support we owe them for what they do," the press secretary said.

Also attending the meeting in the President's office were John D. Ehrlichman, assistant to the President for domestic affairs, and Egil Krogh, deputy assistant.

Zeigler said that narcotics control also was discussed at the meeting.

THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT WAS DELIVERED TODAY BY CONGRESSMAN ANDY JACOBS (D-IND.) AT A NEWS CONFERENCE IN THE CAPITOL

In response to the recent tragedies of policemen killed in the line of duty, President Nixon on Wednesday expressed his hope that "these tragedies will remind people of the debt we owe policemen for many services, of the protection they so selflessly provide, and of the respect and support we owe them for what they do."

I share that hope. And I am encouraged to think that the President's concern might indicate that this administration will reconsider its opposition to my three-year effort to enact legislation to compensate the widows and children of police officers and firemen killed in the line of duty.

If it does not reconsider, if it does not withdraw its opposition then one must interpret the true White House message on Wednesday as being, "I can't give you anything but love. . . ."

[From the New York Times, June 4, 1971]

FOR SLAIN POLICEMEN'S KIN

(By Robert B. Semple, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, June 3.—President Nixon called today for Federal legislation to provide $50,000 to the family of any policeman slain in the line of duty.

At the same time, his Attorney General reiterated the Nixon Administration's opposition to new controls on the sale of handguns.

The new proposal was announced by Attorney General John N. Mitchell at a White House briefing following a morning meeting between the President, nearly two dozen chiefs of police and sheriffs from around the country, Mr. Mitchell, J. Edgar Hoover and several Senators and Congressmen.

The meeting had been called to discuss recent police slayings, to demonstrate the Administration's concern and to unveil the new proposal. By the end of the day, however, the Administration had found itself caught up in new controversies over the motives behind its concern, its stand on gun control legislation and even the composition of the meeting.

Among the prominent absentees were two critics of some aspects of the Administration's policy—Police Commissioner Patrick V. Murphy of New York and Quinn Tamm, executive director of the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

Without going into detail, Mr. Mitchell said that legislation providing a lump sum of $50,000 to the survivors of slain policemen would be forwarded to Congress soon "in further indication" of the Administration's support of law enforcement officers across the country. He said that benefit levels for slain policemen varied widely from state to state and were in some cases insufficient.

The proposal was denounced by Representative Andrew Jacobs, Jr., Democrat of Indiana. He submitted legislation in 1968 that would amend the Federal Employee Compensation Act to provide the widow of a policeman slain in the line of duty 40 per cent of her husband's salary plus 15 per cent per child up to a total of 75 per cent of the total salary.

Asserting that his version would provide larger annuities, Mr. Jacobs said that the Administration submitted an opinion in October, 1969, opposing his measure as "an unreasonable intrusion into state and local government activities." The fact that the Administration had reversed itself on the question of "intrusion," Mr. Jacobs said, suggested that it wished to gain political profit from the concern generated by the recent shootings.

Mr. Chairman, nearly 200 police officers lost their lives in the line of duty and over 50,000 assaults were made against police officers while the Administration opposed this legislation.

There are several salient features which distinguish and favor the Bayh-Jacobs legislation over that of the Administration.

(A) S. 1081/H.R. 714 will grant benefits more closely related to need by basing the annuity in part upon the number of dependents.

(B) The Administration machinery for the implementation of S. 1081/H.R. 714 is extant. In moving the consideration of the Conference Report of what became Public Law 90-291, the Chairman of this subcommittee commended placing the Administrative function of that similar legislation in the Department of Labor, to insure that a disparity did not exist between benefits received by a Federal officer and a non-Federal officer killed enforcing a Federal law. I suggest we should not allow a difference between two non-Federal officers, one of whom dies enforcing a Federal law while the other dies enforcing a State law, but both protecting American lives and property.

(C) S. 1081/H.R. 714 include benefits for permanently disabled public safety officers. The Administration proposal does not. Once more, Mr. Chairman, we are faced with a potential disparity. If a local law enforcement officer is disabled by a car thief from across the State line, he will receive Federal benefits. If the automobile was stolen in the State, the benefits will not accrue to him. It would be shameful if a totally disabled policeman under such circumstances were to wish for the sake of his family that he were dead.

It is well to note that of the 105 claims made to date under Public Law 90-291, nearly one-half [47] have been for disability. 100 police officers are assaulted every day. Some of these assaults result in no more than a bruise, others in total paralysis. Equity requires benefits for disability as well as death.

(D) S. 1031/H.R. 714 provide for the inclusion of firemen in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. The Administration-backed proposal does not.

In 1970, 115 paid firefighters lost their lives in the line of duty and 38,683 were injured, 195 in civil disorders and an additional 113 as a result of individual acts of violence. 208 firefighters were injured answering and returning from false alarms. 320 firefighters were injured in the line of duty in 1970 to the extent that they had to leave firefighting. 224 left because of occupational disease disability, while another 235 died of occupational disease. Mr. Chairman, according to the F.B.I. statistics for 1970, nearly 10,000 arrests were made for the crime of arson. Though precise figures are not available, all indications point to the probability that deaths and injuries in the line of duty are as high, if not higher, for volunteer firemen. For the purposes of this legislation, amendment should be made to consider volunteer firemen as having a certain GS rating, as is currently mandated for volunteers in VISTA and the Peace Corps who are killed under certain circumstances.

(E) Comparison of the financial benefits which would be paid under the two major proposals for Federal benefits indicate that the annuity method is preferable to the gratuity method. The International Firefighters Association and the National Fraternal Order of Police have indicated that they would rather see their families receive a monthly annuity check than a lump sum which might well have a tendency to evaporate rather quickly. Even if the $50,000 gratuity were invested in 6% bonds, the yield would be only $3,000 a year, a figure which does not approach 75% of the base salary of most pub-

lic safety officers—nor, for that matter, does it even reach the poverty level of $3,944 a year.

Senator Bayh and I—and, I trust, this Committee and the rest of Congress and most of the country—think the families of those who fall in the fight to make us safe deserve better than that.

THE WONDERS OF A CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Sidney Hillman Foundation gave one of its awards for community service to Neil Sheehan, of the New York Times, for his work in exposing the so-called Pentagon papers.

In his remarks to the assemblage, Sheehan reminded them of certain truths about our constitutional form of government that we should never forget.

I would like to introduce Mr. Sheehan's remarks into the RECORD at this time.

LESSONS FROM THE PENTAGON PAPERS

(By Neil Sheehan)

I have a friend, Brendan Gill, the drama critic for *The New Yorker Magazine*, who says that no good deed goes unpunished.

You gave me an award and you invited Robert Coles to give the main address here today. Mr. Coles injured his back and you now have to listen to a reporter preach. Your charity, ladies and gentlemen, has been justly punished. You should take a lesson from the majority of the trustees of Columbia University who yesterday managed to do a good deed and disassociate themselves from it at the same time.

Since you have given me an award for my work on the Pentagon Papers, I shall do my preaching by first drawing some lessons from that archive of American involvement in Indochina over the last three decades. One of the values of the Pentagon Papers is that they provide us with a vast body of facts through which we can see how our government really functions in contrast to how we imagined it to function. There are two central lessons to be drawn from the Papers, as I see them.

The first lesson is that the constitutional system of checks and balances in government envisioned by the Founding Fathers of our country no longer exists in fact. The American Presidency and the state machinery that has grown up under it in the Executive Branch since World War II now far outweighs in power and influence the other two, supposedly counter-balancing branches of government, Congress and the Judiciary. The Executive Branch of our government has become a centralized state in the European sense of the word. The Executive Branch has become the state in America for all intents and purposes.

The second lesson is that the requirements of the Executive Branch to maintain and enlarge our overseas empire has become incompatible with the preservation of our domestic liberties. And I do not use the word empire here in a pejorative sense, but rather in its simplest meaning—to describe the system of overseas dependencies and interests we have acquired in the course of the Cold War.

CITIZEN AND STATE: WHO SERVES WHOM?

What is emerging from the current structure of our government and its constant struggle to maintain this empire is the working concept that the citizen exists to serve the needs of the state. This concept is directly contradictory to the idea that was central to the thinking of the Founding Fathers—that government exists to preserve the liberties of the citizen.

Unless we can find some way to bring the American Presidency and the state machinery of the Executive Branch under control, unless we can find some means to restore a system of checks and balances to our government, unless we can somehow dismantle our overseas empire, we are, I believe, going to see this centralized state gradually turn into an authoritarian state. Unless we can reverse the historical trend that has us in its grip, we are in danger of losing the domestic liberties that have made this country, in the words of Lincoln, "the last best hope of earth."

To some of you I must sound like a Cassandra. You perhaps take comfort in the feeling—I once did—that what is done overseas in the name of America does not fundamentally affect our lives here at home. But I no longer take comfort in that feeling. There is a dynamic that relates foreign and domestic events. They are intertwined in their effects.

Let us take, for one example, the legal battle last summer between the newspapers and the Nixon Administration over the Pentagon Papers. The war in Vietnam led to the compilation of the Pentagon Papers. The compilation of the Papers led to their being published in a series in *The New York Times*. The publication led the Nixon Administration to obtain court orders after the first three articles had appeared, which restrained further publication for 15 days, while the government unsuccessfully fought through the court for a permanent injunction to suppress the material. The First Amendment to the Constitution says that "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech or of the press. . . ." The language is very simple. The words are: "no law". We also know from the speeches of the Founding Fathers that the First Amendment was specifically designed to prevent restraint of publication, what is known as "prior restraint" in legal parlance, because the English kings used this device to quash political opposition. Yet we had prior restraint in the Pentagon Papers case for the first time since King George.

ROLE OF A FREE PRESS

And what was the main argument that the Solicitor General, the President's chief advocate, relied upon in the Supreme Court? It was not that *The Times* and the other newspapers were breaking the law. The Nixon Administration had initially charged *The Times* with violating the Espionage Act in the Federal District Court here in New York and had been rebuffed. So the Solicitor General argued in the Supreme Court that the publication of the Pentagon Papers would make it difficult for the President to conduct his foreign policy by embarrassing other nations. Therefore, the Solicitor General contended, it was inherent in the power of the President—that is an interesting and ominous phrase, *inherent in the power of the President*—to abridge or to abrogate the right to publication under the First Amendment when the President saw fit. I had always thought that one of the reasons for the existence of the First Amendment was to enable Americans, through the information provided by a free press, to make it as difficult as they liked for a President to conduct his foreign policy. To me that freedom of nonviolent dissent was the miracle of America. And the sole justification for the existence of a free press, if it is to overcome its inherent evil of abuse with the greater good of preserving creative dissent, lies in the right to publish. But the right to publish clearly conflicts with the need the Executive Branch perceives to conduct a war that is unpopular at home yet necessary to its preservation of empire abroad.

Let me give you other examples of this interrelationship between foreign and domestic events.

The decision to go to war in Vietnam leads to inflation at home. The Executive Branch does not stop the war. The war must go on. Instead, the Executive Branch imposes price controls.

Conscripting the sons of the middle class to fight a war of empire, discredits the draft. The Executive Branch then moves towards the creation of what is officially called a volunteer army. The volunteer army, as it is now envisioned by the Pentagon, would not be the small professional force that much of the citizenry associates with that description. Instead, if it materializes, it will be a large standing mercenary army that will constitute a grave potential threat to our freedom.

SUPPRESSING DISSENT

Opposition to the war creates dissent, some of it extreme. Again, the Executive Branch does not stop the war. Rather, it seeks greater ability to suppress dissent, this time through unlimited electronic surveillance. We find the Solicitor General in the Supreme Court once more, arguing that inherent in the power of the President—again that phrase, *inherent in the power of the President*—is the authority to delegate to the Attorney General the power to tap anyone's telephone or bug anyone's home or office or automobile or whatnot whenever the Attorney General decides that the national security might be endangered.

Not only is a court warrant for such surveillance unnecessary, given this inherent power of the President, the Solicitor General argues, but permission should not be sought from judges because they lack the necessary expertise to decide when matters of national security are involved. In other words, the state is restrained by no law in poking into the privacy of the citizen whenever the leaders of the state decide that something called national security is involved.

These signs and arguments of authoritarianism are not the result of any one political party or President. The Pentagon Papers show them developing over a succession of administrations by both major parties. They are the evidence of an Executive Branch that has grown to the point where it now exists more to serve itself than to serve the Republic, and which defines its good as the national good.

GOVERNING BY DECEPTION

The power manager at the top of the machinery sees the world outside the Executive Branch—Congress, the news media, the public, other nations, international opinion in general—as permanent adversaries. They are, to borrow the language of the policy documents in the Pentagon Papers, audiences to be influenced and targets to be moved in a given direction. The credibility gap did not open because horse-trading was part of President Johnson's Texas heritage . . . and it does not persist because President Nixon likes to reserve his confidences for Bebe Rebezo. The credibility gap exists because deception—news management, if you wish to use a polite term—is an essential element in the way the Executive Branch does business. The Executive Branch views information as a tool to further policy, not as a means to inform the public. The greatest evidence I can give you of the effectiveness of secrecy and deception as it is practiced by the Executive Branch is the Indochina War itself. We now know from the Pentagon Papers that the Indochina War was not an accident, it was not a quagmire into which the United States stumbled. Rather, the war resulted from a series of decisions deliberately taken, almost always in secret, by a small group of men at the top of the

Executive Branch of our government through a succession of administrations.

The Constitution says that Congress shall have the power to declare war. One of the prominent evils of the Eighteenth Century world in which the Founding Fathers lived was the prerogative of the European despots and their cabinets to make war. A small group of men set in motion a series of events that affected the lives and fortunes of nations. The Founding Fathers wanted to bar this evil from the American system of government. Before this country embarked upon war, that gravest of human acts, the Founding Fathers wanted the decision to be subjected to lengthy and searching debate by the representatives of the people.

TO WAR: WHO DECIDES?

This country might go to war for the wrong reasons. It might go to war unjustly, as we undoubtedly have, in some of our wars, but the decision to go to war would be made by the representatives of the people.

No such debate took place in the case of the Vietnam War. Congress and the people were ignored of most of the important decisions that committed them to war. The most egregious instance of secrecy and deception occurred during the Tonkin Gulf crisis of August, 1964, when the Johnson Administration tricked Congress into passing the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, a blank declaration of war which the Executive Branch wanted in order to launch open hostilities when it saw fit. Mr. Johnson and his senior foreign policy officials deliberately withheld from Congress and the public, information demonstrating that the President and his advisors may well have provoked intentionally or unintentionally the very attacks on our destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin which they exploited to drive the resolution through Congress in a moment of patriotic fervor. Even that patriotic fervor we also now know was manipulated by the efficient news management.

Through these decisions taken in secret, the Executive Branch of the Government of the United States has made war in Indochina either indirectly through French or indigenous forces or directly with American troops for most of the past twenty-three years. The conflict has cost the lives of 95,000 members of the French Expeditionary Forces . . . some 55,000 American servicemen so far, and no one knows how many Indochinese; the estimates run from a million to two million men, women and children. A billion to a hundred and fifty billion dollars of the Treasury of the American people has been lavished on this war.

I submit that the power to make war on this scale is power indeed. It is a measure of how much authority the Executive Branch has arrogated to itself. It is a dramatic warning of how gravely the Constitutional processes of our system of government have been distorted and thrown out of balance.

Newspapermen ought to be brief and so I will end here. What I have been trying to say, in sum, is that if we do not find a way to again make the Executive Branch of government our servant, then the Executive Branch is going to make servants of us.

Neil Sheehan, a reporter for The New York Times, was awarded a Sidney Hillman Prize Award for his 1971 series of newspaper articles on the Pentagon Papers. This address was given by Mr. Sheehan in New York City on May 2, 1972, on the occasion of the presentation of the Award.

Sidney Hillman Prize Awards are given in honor of the memory of Sidney Hillman, one of America's greatest labor statesmen and first president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. Through the Awards program, the Sidney Hillman Foundation seeks to promote the ideals of service in the community that were cherished by Sidney Hillman in his lifetime. Since the initiation of this program in 1950, Sidney Hillman Prize Awards have been given to 113 authors and reporters for books and magazine and newspaper articles, and to script writers and producers of radio and television programs.

THE SOCIAL SERVICES AMENDMENTS OF 1972

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of controversy has arisen recently over the lack of a ceiling on appropriations for Federal grants to share the cost of social services provided by the States in areas such as drug abuse control, alcoholic treatment, family counseling, and nutrition services for the elderly.

Various short-range solutions have been proposed to limit the impact on the Federal Treasury, but insufficient attention is being given to the long range need to establish comprehensive social services on a sound footing.

In cooperation with the National Association of Social Workers, I have developed legislation which would provide a long-range approach to the problem.

Under the bill I have introduced today, the Federal Government would fund up to 80 percent of the cost of community social service centers established by the States and local communities to provide a full range or social services to all who need them, regardless of financial need.

Individual and family assistance would be provided in the following areas: personal counseling, adoption, child welfare, homemaking services for the aged, blind and disabled, family planning, foster care, housing, marriage counseling, nutrition, protective services, emergency services, and special services for the blind and disabled.

A full summary of the bill follows:

THE SOCIAL SERVICES AMENDMENTS OF 1972

SUMMARY

This Bill is needed to provide the statutory basis for a public social service system independent of the Public Assistance Cash Payments program. It was designed to solve the increasing controversy over costs of service programs of those in need.

Currently both services and income are interwoven throughout the language of the Social Security Act as amended.

Recently the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has moved to create separation of the services function from the income programs. By regulation and guidelines the Department is requiring states to establish separate administration, program planning and accountability for the state services effort. In addition, the Administration has twice proposed in FY 1971 and 1972 appropriations request that a ceiling be placed on funds available for social services. Under existing Social Security Act provisions the Federal funds are available without limit to match state dollars which increase or decrease as service needs in the state fluctuate.

Clearly the services programs are receiving widespread attention and are undergoing changes. The Bill which is proposed seeks to accomplish that change in an orderly fashion. It would establish a comprehensive, state administered program of social services entirely separate from public assistance. It would create the specificity of definition of services which would make possible accountability and evaluation of effectiveness. It would require a comprehensive study to devise a plan and formula for increased fiscal accountability and restraint in the operation of social services programs. This is needed due to the rising costs of services programs. Yet an arbitrary limit on federal participation in these programs would impose unanticipated hardships on states which have drawn up plans for necessary state and local services.

Accessibility of services is stressed by creation of community multi-service centers which have the responsibility to provide some services directly and to arrange for others.

Consumer participation in planning is required at all levels of policy making.

For those individuals and families of low income all services would be without charge. For those above the established low income level a user charge is established except for a number of basic services which would remain universal and without fee.

The Federal matching is 80% for basic funds to the states. Based on current levels of expenditure ($1.8-billion in FY 1972), the proposed Bill is estimated to require an outlay of $3.8-billion in FY 1973. This increase reflects the increasing acceptance and utilization of service programs by the states and consumers of social services.

Future restraints in funding levels would be based upon a rational study of needs.

DISCUSSION

1. What is the structure of the proposed delivery system?

The social services program will be a state program with Federal financial assistance and standard-setting. The Bill requires the designation or establishment of a single state agency either to administer the program or supervise the administration. The agency designated is to be that agency, if an appropriate one exists, generally recognized in the state as having already a broad range of services—sometimes called an umbrella agency. The reason for this proviso is that the Bill aims to encourage consolidation and coordination of services—an urgent need because services at both state and community levels are usually fragmented and uneven and there are often gaps in types and locale of coverage.

A coordinated continuum of services is encouraged by several means in addition to the required designation or establishment of an umbrella agency to administer or supervise the program. A second means is the granting of Federal funds to finance the planning of coordinated services, research, experiments, and evaluations. A third means is a proviso giving the Secretary, authority to modify plans or requirements for any health, education, welfare, or manpower programs under his direction—including the requirements in this title—if such modifications are needed to achieve a coordinated approach.

Each state is to select local agencies, to administer the program in its political subdivisions. Local officials are to have an opportunity to appeal directly to the state if they are not satisfied with any aspect of state supervision or administration, including state directives, priorities, and interpretations.

2. What services are provided?

The Bill specifically defines all services the program covers. It indicates those the states must provide at the outset and those optional for a time but eventually mandatory. Rather than using general terms like "strengthening family life" or "helping to realize the individual's potentials," the Bill breaks such general services down into hard, visible components. Definitions have been carefully drafted so that the services are

broad and comprehensive, although specific. This was done to make sure that there are no gaps in services because authorization is lacking.

Services to be offered are as follows:

Access Services.—Adoption services, Caretaker services, Child Welfare services, Day Care Services for adults, Family Planning services, Foster Care services, Homemaker services, and Information and referral services.

Outreach Services.—Marriage Counseling services, Nutrition services, Protective services for adults, Protective services for children, Self-care services, Services to meet special health needs, Special services for the blind, and Temporary emergency services.

Services are to be provided, in part, through community multi-service centers, to be so located throughout the states that they afford maximum accessibility to the population. Such centers are to provide—as a minimum—information and referral services, temporary emergency services, services to meet special health needs, family planning services, and housing services. The centers may offer "core services," which may be offered either through the centers or other governmental agencies or by grant, contract, purchase, or other arrangements with voluntary agencies. These core services initially are to include information and referral services, adoption services, foster care services, protective services for adults, protective services for children, homemaker services, and special services for the blind. From among the other services the Bill covers, the Secretary from time to time is to select additions to this list, with the objective that by July 1, 1976 all the services will be provided throughout each state. States may initiate on a less-than-statewide basis services they select among the non-required services.

Staff for carrying out the services will have a wide range of skills and educational qualifications. They should include neighborhood workers, new career personnel (low income neighborhood people trained and employed to provide social services), professional social workers, and members of other professional groups. The social services program is to be coordinated, not only with public welfare agencies, but also with vocational rehabilitation, health, and education agencies, as well as all types of voluntary agencies. In addition, plans are to be coordinated with area and community economic development agencies, such as regional authorities interested in broad planning.

3. Who is eligible for services?

The Bill is based on the assumption that public social services should be made available as rapidly as possible throughout each state to all persons requesting them. In moving beyond minimum core services, states may set up a system of priorities for the services they will provide, but they must emphasize the needs of low income people. In addition, states must put into effect methods prescribed by the Secretary to make sure that they bring to the attention of the needy the services presumably available to all in the community. There is to be no charge for services rendered to persons of low income, and above the income line a user's fee is charged on a scale established by the Secretary.

4. Is consumer involvement in policy and planning provided for?

The Bill includes several provisos assuring community involvement in administering and evaluating the program. It establishes a National Advisory Council on Individual and Family Services, to be composed of members representing various geographic sections of the country and including beneficiaries of the services. This council is to have authority to advise and make recommendations to the Secretary regarding major policies, scope, objectives, and operation of the program. There are to be parallel state councils with similar authority.

There is ample provision for program analysis and evaluation, both by the Federal agency and by the states, independently of the Federal Government and in conjunction with it. Results of evaluations are to be made available to the national council and the Secretary's annual report on this program is to include the national council's comments on program evaluation studies.

5. How is the program financed?

The states pay the costs for provision of services, administration, and training and the basic percentage of Federal funds paid to the states toward these costs is 80 per cent. There is special funding, with the percentage of Federal funds going up to 100 per cent, to finance projects having specific objectives. The Secretary will have some money to finance training, research, and experiments. He can use a variety of means, including grants to states and contracts with public and private nonprofit organizations. The Secretary will have another fund from which he can make grants to states to facilitate the provision of coordinated, comprehensive services. Grants can also be made for new career programs. In addition, the Bill includes an amendment to Title II of the Social Security Act, authorizing the transfer of up to $50-million a year from the Social Security Trust Fund to finance the cost of protective services for aged, blind, and disabled adult beneficiaries and child beneficiaries of social security when such services are essential to individuals for the effective use of their social security benefits. This money is to be transferred by the Secretary to the state and local agencies providing the needed protective services. Currently, such urgently needed services are either not provided or are provided irregularly and undependably by public or voluntary agencies.

HOUSING PROGRESS IN PITTSBURGH

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, with the recent announcement in Pittsburgh of a plan to construct 500 private homes and a new high rise apartment building for low-income residents, our city has taken a giant step forward in answering the housing needs of its neediest citizens.

Planned on a site that has been the location of a long-time public housing project, complete with all the inherent problems of same, the new project in the Glen Hazel section of town offers hope for homeownership and pride that traditional public housing never contained.

I would like to introduce an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette discussing this new project in Pittsburgh.

The editorial follows:

GLEN HAZEL PLANS EXCITING

If innovative housing answers are the key to saving the big cities, then the New Glen Hazel project just announced is momentous beyond just Pittsburgh.

For the new program to transform this 30-year-old public housing area in the Hazelwood district on the Mon into a mixed private and public development seeks to use the many costly lessons learned in recent decades to come up with solid answers.

Specifically, two developments totaling nearly $13 million have been approved by the Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh. One is a $10 million private 500-home development with homes for rent or sale, and in which public housing residents would have the option to rent or buy on the same basis as private renters and purchasers. Of this, 305 units will be private, and 195 for public tenants. The other development would be an eight-story high rise for the elderly, costing $2.7 million.

But those bare statistics don't really tell the story. For the Glen Hazel project, the first of its kind in the nation, has components and implications far beyond these aspects.

It represents one of the last major tracts of land available for housing development within the city limits of Pittsburgh. In a land-short community here is the opportunity to build a "new town within town" of the sort being talked elsewhere as the answer in aging urban areas.

Second, the Glen Hazel project is being planned to overcome many of the problems which have plagued public housing projects. It will have a scattered site arrangement, mixing various income levels, rather than the "fortress" type public housing arrangements which have proved so unworkable.

Low income persons will be able to choose homes befitting their family circumstances and have their rent subsidized, living without stigma among their neighbors. They will have an option to buy.

The beauty of this mixed arrangement is that it will enable the sons and daughters to go on to college and upgrade their employability . . . and still be able to return to live in the same neighborhood as their relatives and friends. A great thrust of public education in our country is to open opportunities for the deprived. It has worked (many college graduates have come out of Glen Hazel, for instance). But it also has had a self-defeating aspect. Under the present system, for the children of a public housing family moving up also means moving out, because they are barred by income restrictions from returning to the place where they grew up . . . a disincentive if ever there was one.

Public officials and private architects and builders working on the project also have utilized many new ideas about social and recreational services for such neighborhoods.

Two aspects auger well for the project, aside from its innovations. One is that present tenants of the area—who have waited many long years in steadily deteriorating World War II barracks-type housing—have been involved deeply in the process. The other is that from City Hall down all agencies involved have become excited about the job, making the commitments (streets, sewers, utilities) necessary for success.

Utopia isn't around the corner. But we wish the Glen Hazel project well, for much rides on it. It well could be the most significant experiment in national terms to come out of Pittsburgh since the downtown Renaissance.

EARTH RESOURCES SATELLITE—ERTS–1

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, on July 23, 1972, NASA launched this Nation's first earth resources satellite, ERTS–1. This spacecraft was designed and con-

structed by the General Electric Co. in Upper Merion Township, Montgomery County, Pa., in the record time of 2 years from contract initiation to launch.

The successful launch of this spacecraft represents a most significant milestone in our continuing effort to utilize space and space technology "for the benefit of all mankind," and it signals the beginning of a new era of environmental improvement. With the earth resources information gathered by ERTS–1, local, State and Federal agencies can respond to factual data, and not suppositions, fears, or special interest pressures, in taking corrective actions to end the steady undoing of earth's life support systems.

Food crop health and yield can be more efficiently, and continuously, assessed providing man with an information base from which vastly improved planning decisions can be made for better distribution of food for the world's population. An accurate and continuing inventory of our timber resources can be achieved for the first time in history. Water quality data from all over North America can be gathered and evaluated in a few weeks.

Land use and misuse, various kinds of geological and geographic information, and many more facts about our limited life supporting resources can be obtained from ERTS–1, and these are just a few of the objectives of this vitally important spacecraft.

The early imagery being obtained by ERTS–1 is exciting and more informative than the many user agencies and experimenters had expected. NASA has already released many 100-by-100-mile ERTS scenes of these United States which dramatically portray the data return which can be expected from this "milestone" satellite.

Over the past decade, the General Electric Co. has made major contributions to our Nation's space programs. GE men and women in Pennsylvania and in other communities around the Nation have established impressive records for building extremely reliable, long-life space hardware including the highly successful Nimbus weather satellite and major subsystems for spacecraft and space systems widely recognized for exceeding their life and mission expectations.

At a recent earth resources open house held at General Electric's Valley Forge Space Center, I heard GE management describe a companywide best buy program designed to give its customers the best buy in quality, service, and value. For this open house, community leaders and taxpayers were invited as GE Space Division's best customers. Programs like ERTS–1 are indeed the taxpayers' best buy and I believe the American people should be made more aware of the value of these programs which directly benefit us all.

I congratulate NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center, the General Electric Co., and the entire ERTS industry-government team for their outstanding achievement in building this Nation's first earth resources satellite.

NINTH DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY: LEGISLATIVE REPORT TO SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD a legislative report which I have prepared for the senior citizens of the Ninth District of New Jersey.

The report follows:

LEGISLATIVE REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN HENRY HELSTOSKI FOR OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

INTRODUCTION

Despite the wage/price controls imposed by the Administration over a year ago, prices continue to soar. Rents, property taxes and food prices especially seem subject to no controls at all. The controls which exist in these areas are wholly inadequate and full of loopholes.

The resulting inflation hits Senior Citizens on fixed incomes the hardest. It is imperative that the Congress act promptly not only to tighten the nation's price controls, but also to relieve the financial crisis afflicting older Americans.

At the end of June, the House of Representatives, with my strong support, and the Senate passed a 20 percent increase in Social Security monthly benefits. This increase, which was reluctantly approved by the President, despite his stated objections, becomes effective this September 1. Having long urged such an increase in Social Security benefits, I was particularly gratified that the Congress at last took the initiative and acted vigorously.

This 20 percent increase augmented 10 percent benefit raises enacted with my full support in early 1971. And, Congress is approaching final action on companion legislation to raise Railroad Retirement benefits by 20 percent. These overdue costs of living increases should go a long way toward relieving the financial burden carried by older Americans. But there is much more which needs to be done.

SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM IN H.R. 1

Last year the House passed a comprehensive Social Security reform plan called H.R. 1. Unfortunately, this legislation has been stalled in the Senate for months, largely because of the controversial welfare reform features added onto the bill in committee. Nevertheless, I hope to see some action on this important bill during this session of Congress.

Under HR 1, Social Security benefits would increase every January in proportion to the increase in the cost of living. In addition, the amount that a beneficiary can earn in a year and still receive full benefits would be automatically increased each time there was a cost of living benefit increase.

Widow's benefits would be increased from 82.5 percent of the husband's retirement benefits to the 100 percent of the retirement benefit the husband would be paid if he were alive.

Finally, the amount that a social security beneficiary can earn and still be paid all of his social security benefits would be increased from $1680 to $2000 a year. Again, this is an improvement over existing law. But I have proposed a bill that would increase allowable income to $3000 a year. This bill, HR 5688, is still awaiting action by the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR SENIOR CITIZEN

There is much more that the government should do for our senior citizens. In addition to acting on Social Security benefits increases, the Congress should enact legislation to provide relief to senior citizens, homeowners and apartment dwellers.

I have introduced a bill HR 12609, which would provide an income tax credit or payment of up to $450 for Senior Citizens of limited means to compensate for taxes paid on property they own or rent. In addition to a tax subsidy for homeowners, persons who rent their dwellings would be eligible for an income tax credit or payment amounting to 25 percent of rent paid up to a total of $450. I am hopeful that the Ways and Means Committee will agree to consider this bill as part of its tax reform hearings promised for the near future.

To provide further relief from excessive housing costs and as an alternative to HR 12609, I believe that the federal government should contribute to payments of rent subsidies for elderly persons who have small incomes. Specifically, I have proposed a bill, HR 12608, which would authorize the government to pay the difference between 25 percent of the elderly person's income and his total annual rent, provided that this amount does not exceed $1200. HR 12608, represents significant improvement of existing rent supplement programs. I think this proposal, if adopted, would go a long way toward insuring a decent place to live for all elderly Americans.

THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

One of the most important recommendations of the 1971 White House Conference on Aging was the call for a minimum annual income program for Senior Citizens. While the welfare reform section of HR 1 provides such a program, the annual benefits proposed would not allow older persons of limited income to rise even above the poverty line. The time has come, I believe, to go beyond such half-measures and to insure that all older persons have the right to a decent income.

Other recommendations of the Conference are embodied in my bill, HR 15701, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1972. Some of its major provisions are:

1. To strengthen the role of the Administration on aging as a focal point of federal concern for our Senior Citizens.

2. To develop a comprehensive system of community-based services for Senior Citizens.

3. To provide emphasis on certain specific areas of concern such as nutrition, transportation and services in connection with specialized housing for the aging.

4. To extend the research, training and national volunteer programs of the Act, and

5. To establish a National Information and Resource Center for the Aging.

A bill embodying these proposals passed the House with my strong support on July 17, 1972 and is now awaiting Senate action.

EMPLOYMENT FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

One of the most shameful situations in our society is that which forces skilled and talented persons to remain idle because they are told that they "are too old to be hired" for regular jobs. I have co-sponsored a bill, HR 3671, which would establish a Senior Citizens Skill and Talent Utilization Program. It would authorize the government to hire and train low income individuals 55 years of age and over so that they could help themselves and make useful contributions to their communities. These persons would be hired to work on local community projects and would be regarded as federal employees.

TRANSPORTATION FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

Transportation within our major cities is a problem that is evident to anyone who has gone to a city as a commuter, a shopper or a tourist. This problem is especially critical for the elderly who cannot always walk from place to place easily. I have therefore

proposed H.R. 11259, a bill that would amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize grants and loans to private nonprofit organizations to assist them in providing transportation services, meeting the special needs of elderly persons.

Further dealing with the problem of transportation, I have introduced H.R. 15702, which would prohibit common carriers in interstate commerce from charging elderly people more than half fare for their transportation during non-peak travel periods.

RECREATION FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

I believe that it is very important that Senior Citizens have a means of putting their leisure time to good use. Therefore, I have introduced H.R. 15700, which is a bill to provide financial assistance for the construction and operation of Senior Citizens' Community Centers. I am continuing to urge early consideration of this bill by the Committee on Education and Labor where it is now pending.

HEALTH CARE

Although Medicare has gone a long way toward relieving Senior Citizens of the high cost of health care, there are still a number of reforms which deserve to be enacted. For example, I have introduced H.R. 5679, H.R. 6430, and H.R. 11249, which would, respectively, include the services of Optometrists and Chiropractors as well as prescription drug costs under Medicare. Additionally, I have filed H.R. 10285, which would allow citizens over 65 to deduct from their income taxes the full amount of medical costs. Although several of these measures have received consideration in Committee, the progress of Congress this year makes it seem unlikely that final action will be taken before the 92nd Congress adjourns.

CONCLUSION

It is clear that a great deal remains to be done by the federal government to meet the needs of America's Senior Citizens. Unfortunately, for the past four years, the present Administration has not realistically faced the problems of the nation's elderly. But if we remain indifferent to these problems, we diminish the dreams of all our people.

It is my hope that the Congress will act soon on the reforms I have outlined here so that the government will be able to respond to the needs, hopes and just demands of the people who helped build this country, her Senior Citizens. I would welcome your thoughts an comments on these proposals. For your further information, I am listing all of the bills I have filed in this Congress relating to Senior Citizens. If you wish a copy of any of these measures or should you have suggestions for further proposals, I would be more than happy to hear from you.

H. Res. 158. Creates a Select House Committee on Aging.

HR 2478 Creates a comprehensive system of federally financed national health insurance.

HR 3658 Conquest of Cancer Act. Establishes special, crash program within NIH to seek a cure for cancer. Similar legislation is now public law.

HR 3671 Establishes a Senior Citizens Skill and Talent Utilization Program.

HR 3823 Pension Reform Act. Provides full protection for individuals' contributions to qualified pension plans. Under active consideration in House and Senate.

HR 5679 Provides for payment of optometrists' services under Medicare.

HR 5688 Increases the Social Security outside earnings limitation to $3000.

HR 6430 Authorizes payment for chiropractic services under Medicare.

HR 9567 Authorizes reduced-fare transportation on a space-available basis for persons who are 65 or older.

HR 11249 Amends the Social Security Act to include qualified drugs under the hospital insurance program.

HR 12138 Strengthens and improves the Older Americans Act.

HR 12608 Establishes a Senior Citizens Rent Supplement Program.

HR 12609 Provides a property tax exemption for Senior Citizens.

HR 12610 Establishes a minimum income program for elderly persons.

HR 12728 Provides a 20 percent increase in Social Security benefits (with a $100 Minimum), increases the earnings base to $15,000 for benefit and tax purposes and requires that ⅓ of the revenues required for Social Security programs be contributed by the federal government. Similar legislation is public law.

HR 13811 Establishes an Office for the Aging in the Executive Office of the President.

HR 13933 Liberalizes the eligibility test for receipt of disability benefits.

HR 14626 Provides grants to the States for eye examinations for Senior Citizens.

HR 14839 Enacts the Social Security Reform provisions of HR 1. Passed House.

HR 15700 Authorizes funds for establishment of Senior Citizens Community Centers.

HR 15702 Prohibits common carriers in interstate commerce from charging elderly people more than half fare for the transportation during non-peak periods of travel.

HR 16264 Provides that Social Security or Railroad Retirement payments shall not be regarded as income for purposes of determining eligibility for or amount of a veteran's or widow's pension.

HR 16399 Amends Title II of the Social Security Act to provide for an exchange of credits between the old-age, survivors and disability insurance system and the civil service retirement system. Enables individuals who have some coverage under both systems to obtain maximum benefits based on their combined service.

HR 16400 Provides that State and local taxes paid by individuals shall be allowed as a credit against their liability for federal income tax instead of being allowed as a deduction from their gross income.

HR 16401 Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow a tax deduction to tenants of houses or apartments for the proportionate share of the taxes and interest paid by landlords.

LAOS FOREIGN EXCHANGE OPERATION FUND

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star of August 14, 1972, contained another news article on the U.S. financed Laos Foreign Exchange Operations Fund which should be of serious concern to our colleagues and the public.

Only a short while ago—on August 10, 1972—the House passed H.R. 16029 authorizing $769 million for fiscal year 1973 under the Supporting Assistance provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act. Congress should be made clearly aware that $162 million—21 percent—of this supporting assistance authorization is to be given away to uncontrollable funds as follows:

Laos Foreign Exchange Operations Fund, $20 million;

Cambodia Exchange Support Fund, $17 million;

Vietnam Economic Support Fund, $50 million; and

Vietnam Economic Development Fund, $75 million.

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Government Operations called upon our AID officials last year to bring to an end these economic shenanigans in our foreign assistance being provided to the Orient—all to no avail. It is disgraceful that $162 million of the taxpayers' money will be given away with little if any benefit to the poor people it was intended to help.

I again call to the attention of my colleagues inserts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this subject matter which appear on pages 46605 of Dectmber 13, 1971; 12255 of April 11, 1972; 21211 of June 15, 1972; 21549 of June 20, 1972; and 23759 of June 30, 1972. The Washington Star article by Tammy Arbuckle of August 14, 1972, follows:

DIPLOMATS CHARGE "BIG STEAL" OF LAOTIAN AID FUNDS

(By Tammy Arbuckle)

VIENTIANE.—Diplomats here are hardly critical of the American AID mission and the Lao government for failing to take meaningful steps to halt corruption and mismanagement in the foreign exchange operations fund established to stabilize the Lao economy.

The fund consists of more than $25 million, of which the U.S. contributed more than $16 million.

Diplomats here call the effort "the big steal," and claim the fund almost totally goes to the powerful Lao mandarinate, the Sananikone family, and a handful of Chinese businessmen.

One diplomat described the attitude of the donor nations other than the United States—Britain, France, Australia and Japan—as, "the British treasury feels they need this program like they need a hole in the head, the French and Japanese are squirming to get out of it, and the Australians will follow the British lead."

Diplomats are upset because the fund is for the third time in 10 months running low because they say, of the dollar-hungry Lao elite and Chinese businessmen, and they have no intention apart from the United States of contributing further.

The main complaint about the fund is that it allows the Chinese to import into Laos cheaply by giving them dollars at 600 Lao kip to one, but the merchants do not pass the benefit on to the Lao. Instead, they sell goods at a minimum of 850 Lao kip to the dollar.

There are no price controls effectively enforced by the Lao government because the whole situation is enmeshed in Laos internal politics. The power-hungry Sananikone family is giving the merchants police protection and encouraging them to raise prices at the expense of fellow Laotians, Finance Minister Sisouk Na Champassak says.

Their objective, according to other Laotians, is to eliminate Sisouk as a serious contender for the premiership when Souvanna Phouma steps down, and install as premier their own man, Works Minister Ngon Sananikone. This elimination can be achieved by ruining Sisouk fiscal policies which, of course, is also the U.S. view of how best the aid money should be used.

At the same time, the Sananikone purses become heavier as the leading commercial family in Laos lives off U.S. financial support program, deals with the Chinese and smug-

gling of luxuries from Laos back into Thailand.

What incenses diplomats most is the failure of U.S. Aid Director Charles Mann to put pressure on Sananikones through the fund Mann reportedly spends his efforts in raising more money for the fund through economic juggling of U.S. AID money instead of cutting it off or increasing the kip-dollar exchange rates, thus soaking up surplus kip and saving the fund's money.

Diplomats assess the U.S. mission as knuckling under to political pressure from the Sananikones, a pressure which is applied by that rightist family by threatening neutralist Souvanna Phouma's position as premier, a position the U.S. judges imperative for Souvanna to retain if there is ever going to be a political accommodation with Lao Communists with honor of some sort.

"The Sananikone has been smelling money and they are not going to let go now," diplomats said. A measure suggested to stop the drain on the U.S. and other donor nations is to stop the fund from allowing the kip-dollar ratio, to rise out of sight, and to put the Sananikone's and the merchants out of business by stopping their high profits. Merchant profiteers would leave Laos and by ceasing to tie the kip to the U.S. dollar, a tie imposed by Americans themselves, price stability could be obtained for ordinary Lao.

Sources note that in certain Lao concerns where proprietors have not felt it necessary to convert their kip profit into dollars, prices remained steady. Soures say much of Lao's imports are unnecessary luxuries which the country only buys because of the U.S. AID policy of soaking up kip with imports in the first place.

The U.S. Embassy fears the Sananikones would retaliate with a coup against Souvanna, but diplomats say the U.S. could prevent this because it pays the army. The Lao budget deficit, which equals the amount of the exchange fund, would be overcome by paring war costs from it and putting them into U.S. military aid, where the money is not stolen, and the U.S. could avoid the blame from ordinary Lao for the cost of living mess.

Diplomatic disgust stems not just from the fact that the FEOF doesn't work, but from revelations of FEOF corruption in the Lao vernacular press.

Vientiane's prestigious Satlao newspaper this week revealed the fund is losing $3,000 per week because government officials are drawing money for holidays abroad, ostensibly for medical treatment by forcing physicians to falsify documents.

Also, the Lao commission which oversees documentation for imports takes 10-percent rakeoff from merchants to process their papers quickly, a tariff which the merchants pass on to the Lao consumer.

ONE STEP CLOSER TO REALIZATION AFTER LONG YEARS OF ARDUOUS EFFORTS A VETERANS HOSPITAL IN SOUTHERN NEW JERSEY

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, there are 1.2 million veterans in New Jersey and any veteran who has tried to secure medical attention in a veterans' hospital is well aware of the problems of securing admission. It is like a voice crying in the wilderness. There is just not enough room.

At this writing all of us in New Jersey are greatly pleased that the President has signed the fiscal year 1973 appropriations bill for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Space, Science, Veterans and Other Independent Offices, that I vigorously supported—now known as Public Law 92-383—which appropriates $3.7 million for the construction of a new Veterans' Administration Hospital in southern New Jersey/Philadelphia, Pa. metropolitan region.

The long-fought battle in New Jersey's veterans' interest has been scored with many, many years of effort by veterans organizations and concerned municipal, county and State officials—all seeking Federal action that would permit the construction of a desperately needed Veterans' Administration Hospital in southern New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I can speak from firsthand knowledge of these extensive efforts, having personally participated in these endeavors. In my former position in the Governor's cabinet as State commissioner of conservation and economic development having within my department's jurisdiction the State division of veterans services, I have worked with our veterans and veterans' organizations in attempting to secure Federal sanction to locate a veterans hospital in southern New Jersey. On November 8, 1971 I introduced legislation (H.R. 11618) seeking the construction of a Veterans' Administration Hospital in the southern area of New Jersey. This bill, however, was not new to the Congress. In fact, Congressmen from the State of New Jersey in the years before I came to serve in the House had attempted to secure passage of a similar measure.

In addition to the desperate need, there are other significant benefits that can be added to our petition to urge the Veterans' Administration to locate this hospital in southern New Jersey. Governor Cahill has advised me that the State has already undertaken the initial planning work for the establishment of a new medical school of the New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry in the south Jersey area which would utilize the proposed Veterans' Administration hospital as well as existing community hospitals for the clinical training of medical students, undergraduate clerkships, intern and residency programs, allied health training and continuing education of physicians. I know from my discussions with prospective students and administrators of medical education facilities in our State that many of our young people in New Jersey have been finding it necessary not only to go out of our State but, in many instances, out of our country to accommodate their needs for an education in medicine because of the sparseness and inadequacy of medical school facilities here in our country to meet the demand and needs of our populace for the education of medical doctors and nurses, medical training programs, and medical care.

The Board of Chosen Freeholders of Camden County has adopted a formal resolution offering 100 acres of land to the Federal Government for a Veterans' Administration hospital at their Lakeland facility near the border of Gloucester County, N.J., which is readily accessible to both Philadelphia and south Jersey via some of the main transportation arteries in this region: the Atlantic City Expressway, Interstate Highway I-295 and the New Jersey Turnpike.

With these built-in advantages of the donation of land, construction of a new neighboring medical school, and the funds to construct a new veterans hospital in southern New Jersey, by accepting this site location in New Jersey, there are indeed overwhelming benefits to be derived by all concerned—our veterans and their families, the Veterans' Administration, and all of the people of our State and Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank you and my colleagues for your support of this appropriations bill and, through this historic journal of Congress, I reach out to my constituents and all of our veterans throughout New Jersey to alert them to this near realization of their efforts. Our battle is almost won and their support with the Veterans' Administration who must now decide on the location of the hospital facility to be constructed with these appropriated funds is of utmost importance.

OMNIBUS HIGHWAY SAFETY ACT OF 1972

HON. RICHARD G. SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, I am today announcing my support of Congressman WILLIAM H. HARSHA'S, Republican, of Ohio, Omnibus Highway Safety Act of 1972, House bill H.R. 13538. As many of my colleagues, I have become increasingly distressed over the number of accidents and loss of life, which take place yearly on our Nation's highways. The numbers and cost in Montana alone are enough to give cause for concern. For a 5-year period, the statistics are as follows:

	Reported accidents	Deaths	Economic loss
1967	15,697	319	$57,620,000
1968	16,669	289	57,800,000
1969	17,683	339	69,495,000
1970	15,276	318	69,960,000
1971	18,247	328	82,000,000

Additionally, the death count on Montana highways is 39 ahead of last year's count on the same date, August 8. The figures nationally are equally appalling. Perhaps the most significant statistic is that highway deaths outnumber combat death losses in Vietnam over the period of the war by a factor approaching 10 to 1. It is most important that Congress act now to attempt to alleviate this problem before the Nation's Highways become even more crowded.

Congress has, in past years, attempted to deal with the problem of highway safety. Unfortunately, funds which were

to be set aside for safety programs were not sufficient to meet the need. Congressman Harsha's bill, which is cosponsored by all members of the Committee on Public Works, would go a long way toward the promotion of safety on the highways. Through an 11-point program, the bill would provide additional funds for already existing programs while also stimulating the development of new safety concepts. Such stimulation of new programs is definitely needed if we desire to attain any degree of safety upon our national highways.

There is, however, one particular area to which I would draw special attention and that is that portion of the bill calling for spot improvements of high-hazard locations. The problem with this portion of the bill lies in the difficulty which will be encountered in evaluating the off-system locations and justifying requested construction expenditures. One-third of the moneys to be appropriated under this section of the bill are to be spent on projects, not on the Federal-aid system, making this a particularly important problem. Highway departments have had problems in the past justifying projects which are on the Federal-aid system. Problems result from determining exactly what locations are actually hazardous and determining exactly how the hazard could be eliminated as well as anticipating reduction in accidents should a certain improvement be made. Since such difficulty is found in regard to justifying projects which occur on the Federal-aid system in light of the abundance of records kept thereon, the problems faced in trying to justify off-system projects may be impossible to overcome unless the total system of justification was reduced to minimal requirements.

Thus, although I concur generally with the proposals in this bill, I am apprehensive in regard to any specific requirements for off-system expenditures. Yet the bill is one which is desperately needed, particularly in light of the carnage which takes place daily on our highways.

DRUG ABUSE IN OUR SOCIETY

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, three seminars on the subject of narcotics and drug abuse were presented over WMWM-Radio in Wilmington, Ohio, some months ago. Panelists included law enforcement officials at all levels, a juvenile judge, a pharmacist, a minister, and students from the local high school.

Mr. Gerald Lee Steese recently sent me a summary of these programs which contains many thoughtful observations on the scope of the drug problem and possible solutions to the crisis.

"The Problem of Drug Abuse in Our Society and Some Suggestions for a Cure or Holding Action for the Problem," is submitted herein with permission of Mr. Steese.

THE PROBLEM OF DRUG ABUSE IN OUR SOCIETY AND SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR A CURE OR HOLDING ACTION FOR THE PROBLEM

(By Gerald Lee Steese)

(Edited by Susan Steese)

Three seminars on the subject of narcotics and drug abuse were presented over Radio Station WMWM, in Wilmington, Ohio, on three consecutive Sundays in October and November of 1970. The panels included law enforcement officials from state, county, and local levels, ministers, a narcotics parole officer from Dayton, a juvenile judge, a pharmacist, a narcotics expert from the Cincinnati Police Department, and officials and students from the local high school.

The conclusions reached by the panels, and those reached by the author and moderator as a result of further study and research are many and varied. First, current methods of drug abuse prevention, and attempts at education, are simply not working. One main reason for this is that for too long, the question has been handled by our society in the same manner that the subject of sex was handled in past generations.

That is, the subject has been largely glossed over and treated as if it were nonexistent, and those who violated the standards which society had set concerning the subject, were ostracized and treated as if they too did not exist, and in fact, were less than nothing. Any education on the subject in question consisted merely of telling a child that a certain activity was "wrong" and should be strictly avoided.

Parents can no longer afford the luxury of believing that unreasoning, dictatorial decrees and half-truths, or even out-and-out lies, intended as "scare tactics" will carry any weight with the younger generation. Unfortunately, for generations, this has been the only way in which the problem of drug abuse has been handled. Even if a given narcotic, such as heroin, is labeled "bad", this is insufficient cause for most kids for not trying it.

First of all, what is meant by the word "bad"? Second, why, and by whom, was the subject so labeled? We now have, in our teenagers, the most intelligent, curious, and well trained generation ever known on earth, and they are not going to easily accept things at face value.

A program is now being started in the services for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse. I do not believe that this program will work. The services, traditionally, have expected their members to accept everything at face value, on the basis that they should believe, without question or reason, all that they are told by those in authority,

The current group of recruits will not, for the most part, accept this policy. They flatly reject the idea that any one thing is necessarily "right," and another wrong," and must have concrete reasons and explanations for any value judgment that they are expected to accept. In all probability, the only credentials that would be required by the various services for teaching a class on drug abuse would be a general teaching credential or Chaplain's bars, or a certificate of completion from a Service course in instruction.

If a person so qualified goes into a classroom situation, he will very likely meet a problem which extends beyond the scope of the instruction manual. If he is unable to cope with a situation of this type, he will do very little good, and very probably quite a bit of harm in the long run. If the instruction is not credible in the matter of moral judgments or common sense, then that instruction will not be accepted.

To teach a course in narcotics is much different than teaching a course in seamanship or military courtesy; the latter is law, while the subject of narcotics consists, in many areas, of values and morals judgments.

Another matter to be considered by the military and by the Federal programers is the problem of rehabilitation. If a drug abuser is simply dried out and cut loose, he will very probably have to go through the process again, maybe several times. The prevention of recidivism in a drug-oriented youth depends on being able to make a life all over again, to be rehabilitated and then have someplace to go to make a fresh start. This in turn, depends on being able to work, get a job, and be accepted by "straight" society.

The narcotics addict of this decade is in about the same position as the prostitute of another century, or a girl "in trouble" not too many years ago. The only words used in a polite society to describe him or her are "bad", "no good", "irreparable", etc. At this time, the only society which will accept the person who has been on drugs, even if only once, is the drug society. In many places, drug abuse is a felony, and a felon cannot secure much in the way of employment.

As far as the "straight" productive society is concerned, the drug abuser is an outcast, a leper, an untouchable. If the programs which are set up do nothing more than dry out the addict, they have failed miserably.

The Federal Hospitals at Lexington, Kentucky, and Fort Worth, Texas claim a six percent cure rate. This rate is a product of the admission policy, which provides that each admission is recorded as a "first time" admission. In other words, no record is kept of the number of times any one person is re-admitted to the facility. And still their reported cure rate is a low six percent. There may be two reasons for this.

First, the people sent to these two facilities have virtually no choice in the matter. A person must *want* to be helped before any real rehabilitation can take place, as witness Alcoholics Anonymous. Groups such as Synanon and Encounter House work with drug abusers who go there by choice, wanting to be helped, and these groups can claim a sixty-five percent cure rate.

The second reason is that there is nothing for a drug abuser to turn to after he leaves the Federal facility. The addict must be able to rebuild his life before he can stay off drugs, and very often, the same weaknesses which made him dependent on drugs also make him unable to begin a new life without outside help. Government programs, at this time, do not provide this help, and this is what makes it impossible to do an adequate job of rehabilitation.

One of the major obstacles to overcome, in the process of obtaining an adequate rehabilitation program, is the attitude of the society in which the program is attempted. This is probably almost impossible, and a total reversal will most likely never come about, but the efforts of interested individuals can improve the general conditions, and accomplish at least a start at partial, if not total reform.

The "Big Brothers of America" program could provide a part of the pattern for a drug rehabilitation project. Each "Big Brother" deals with one fatherless boy; this individual type handling is also the most effective way to handle a drug abuser. A group cannot so easily work as a group with another group in something of this nature because of the lack of set rules and guidelines.

In the radio seminars, two panel members from Encounter House noted repeatedly that there is no such thing as an ex-addict, just as Alcoholics Anonymous does not believe that there is any such a thing as an ex-alcoholic. For a former abuser of drugs or alcohol, there is always the chance that a slight stress, less than the original stress, will cause them to return to their old habits.

Alcoholics Anonymous has long held, and Encounter House has more recently confirmed, that the best help for drug or alcohol abusers is therapy, and the best therapy is given by those who have encountered and

overcome the problem themselves. The best person to straighten out a former drug abuser is a former drug abuser, one who knows the problems being faced, and the best way to overcome them and to find help for the problem which initially caused the user to turn to drugs.

For school and military drug education programs, the most effective job can probably be accomplished by a combination of a former abuser, and an educator who has received special training in drug education. Thus, the educator can give concrete facts on the dangers and effects of drug abuse in the areas of physical and mental health, the ways that the different drugs act, etc., while the former abuser can provide first-hand views and knowledge on the psychological effects of drugs, reasons for not taking them, and the emotional impact of the abuse of drugs.

I believe that three things which an addict needs most are: an authority figure, a feeling of esteem from his peer group, and self-respect. The self-respect cannot come without the group esteem. The type of program which Encounter House provides furnishes a peer group which will put pressure on the individual in the direction in which it wants him to to, i.e., off drugs.

This reinforces the abuser or former abuser in his personal struggle to get off drugs or stay off drugs. A program such as that of Encounter House can also provide an authority in that it can help the abuser in establishing a willingness to accept responsibility and to trust and rely on his own reasoned moral judgments. Authority can also come from law enforcement agencies and from organized religion.

Many former drug abusers turn to the "Jesus Movement" for help in staying off or getting off drugs, as this organization provides them with both an authority figure and an influencing peer group. Thus, the church would be one of the best institutions to help, if they would, the drug oriented youth.

The "Jesus Movement" claims a "get off and stay off" rate of 85%, the highest rate of any drug abuse prevention, control, or education program.

One of the most important aspects of the problem should be the education of children before they begin to take drugs. This can best be accomplished within the family unit, because in the younger children, before they are of school age, the family has the greatest influence.

The average American family of today is far different from that of the turn of the century. There is much more independent movement by the members of the family. Often the mother works, and the younger members of the family unit have a much greater responsibility and personal mobility than any previous, comparable group.

This makes it very urgent that greater emphasis be placed on instilling values and moral guidelines at a young age. No longer can the child be coddled within the bosom of the family until he or she is mentally mature.

How a child is exposed to myriad situations and outlooks at a very early age. Often he is expected to make decisions for which he or she is totally unprepared. Parents must make clear to their children as never before that there are certain standards and guidelines which the society in which they must function and live and are living expects them to follow; that there are many ways of coping with problems that are socially unacceptable.

The children should be given an authority figure and a background upon which they can fall back in times of crisis. Parents should strive to instill within the child a feeling of self-respect and self-confidence, a certainty that he can make the right decisions on his own, and know that they will be right and acceptable.

The child must be informed about the choices that he or she will have to make as he goes through life. He should be given the strength to meet his problems rather than try to escape from them. He must be made to realize that if he uses drugs as a means to escape, the problem will still be there when he comes down, and may be much worse for the fact that he is even less able to cope with it due to his flight into the fantasy of drugs. In short, the problem of drug abuse education is going to take some considerable work on the part of the family.

One great problem is the average American medicine cabinet. This can be one of the greatest advertisements for the value of taking drugs to get out of a tight situation or just to feel better. Children can understand the taking of drugs for a specific medical problem, but if they see their parents taking a pill to pep them up, put them to sleep, keep them awake; pills for stress, pills for activity, pills to lose unnecessary weight or weight unnecessarily, etc.; this will confuse the child as to the true value of and reason for drugs, and give him the idea that pills and drugs are made just to help one cope with the everyday problems.

Children learn best by example. The parents should realize that their children are going to imitate them. To a child's way of thinking, his parents are right, and he is going to follow, but without the knowledge or background of his parents' experience. So parents should overhaul their own attitudes as to the efficacy of overusing or abusing drugs in their own daily lives.

Another essential point is that as long as a society or family keeps saying that no problem exists, then that much longer will they be unable to hear the pleas for help which immediately precede a drug problem right in the home. As was brought out in one of the seminars, "The most lost and most needed art is the art of listening, hearing, and acting on the listening.

"A child may be overloved, underloved, or normally loved, but this makes little or no difference if he has someone who will listen to him when he has a problem and will help him to overcome that problem, or conversely if he has no one to talk to, the problems which start small may become insurmountable or may disappear in a very short time with or without this help." Especially true if that problem is the fact that he has been faced with the decision of taking drugs. As one ancient philosopher once said, "as long as one's mouth is open, one's ears are closed".

The problem can be solved by education, whether by the non-drug addict, the ex-user, the parents, the teacher, but only at a very young age can the child be trained in the matter of drug abuse attitudes. To educate, the truth about each drug must be told, even if that truth does not seem to the teller to be a strong enough case against the abuse or use of the drug.

This younger generation is going to find out the truth, whether you tell them or not. As long as we attempt to educate through lies, those lies will be found out and discounted. One lie will discolor a whole book of truths. The instructor or parent who has attempted to practice this form of deception and his entire organization or peer group will be found out and become useless or worse as a disseminator of information to the youth.

As for the legal aspects, of the problem, for the source, the seller, make the second conviction for selling of illegal drugs, or possession for sale punishable as second-degree murder. For the young, first-time drug abuser, make it possible for him to redeem himself for that first mistake, for which he is now held accountable, often to his personal ruin. Seal the record of his first mistake, and bring it against him only if he, after considerable personal rehabilitation and counseling, fails again.

Those who teach about drug abuse, and the parents, should realize that drugs are different; should tell the youngsters that the effect of one drug is not as bad or as strong as another. They should also quit talking about the "drug problem". It is a problem with heroin, a problem with marijuana, or a problem with a mixture known mostly as "fruit salad".

The effects, and the treatments are different. Referring to the problem as the "drug problem", under one lump heading, is just another method of escape from the total problem, and a putting-off of the use of an effective solution. The problem must be broken down into manageable categories and entities. Individuals must become involved in any program. As pointed out earlier, groups are too bulky to do much good as a group, it will take the involvement of many individuals on an individual basis.

This is the key to a successful program. We must become more interested in solving the problem, preventing its recurrence, than in punishing the person who has made the mistake. I know a young man who made the mistake of experimenting with a drug, but three individuals took an interest in him, and vowed that he would never go that route again. Because of this, that young man is now employed in a good job, and has a much better outlook on life than before. This kind of individual involvement is just what it does and will take to get the job done.

The time is past when a person could feel that he had contributed to the eradication of the drug problem simply because he could say that he personally does not indulge in the abuse of any drug. A person must also help others, and especially, must not condemn. Parents should stand behind their children if the children do become involved in drug abuse. Now, frequently, a child is condemned by his parents on the slightest suspicion. Smoking one joint, or popping one pill may not constitute a habit, but parents should realize that a child can very easily be pushed into a habit by condemnation. Parents must also watch what they themselves use legally. Finally, again, the truth about all drugs must be told, and individuals are going to have to do the work, by getting deeply involved in a problem which can be licked by hard work. Or which, by being ignored, can ruin us.

RAISING OF CHICKENS IS NOT NECESSARILY A PALTRY BUSINESS

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the poultry industry is an important one throughout the Nation and is especially so in my home State. Eliot Janeway, an economic consultant and columnist whose reputation needs no elaboration here, recently devoted a column to one of the leaders in that industry in Arkansas and across the Nation.

I insert in the RECORD at this point the column published in the Chicago Tribune on August 10 under the heading: "Raising of Chickens Is Not Necessarily a Paltry Business." The column follows:

RAISING OF CHICKENS IS NOT NECESSARILY A PALTRY BUSINESS

NEW YORK, August 9.—Chicken feed does not mean big business. But feeding chickens scientifically, efficiently, and economically can grow into big business.

America's poultry raising and marketing revolution of recent years has provided a constructive case history of advanced technology shoring up the traditional social structure of the old institution.

Arkansas' hill country is one of America's poultry producing showcases. Its small farmers had been shut out of America's historic grain and cotton booms. They are being dealt into today's new deal for poultry. Don Tyson, chief executive officer of Springdale-based Tyson Foods, Inc., is one of this new industry's leaders.

JANEWAY. How has the poultry business evolved in this country?

TYSON. It started out as an industry of individual farmers who bore all the risks of fluctuating markets both for the birds they were selling and the feed they were buying. Then the feed dealers and dealer-manufacturers began setting up contractual arrangements with individual farmers under which the dealers would have a sure market for their grain and the farmers would be guaranteed against loss. The next step in this evolution was that the dealer started supplying baby chicks and feed to the farmer and paying him for the birds he raised. The farmer would supply only the tools of his trade and his labor. In most cases, the dealer spread his risk by going into the processing business as well.

JANEWAY. Is this how your operation is set up?

TYSON. Yes. Except that we go one step further; we pay the farmer on a weekly basis while he has birds in his houses, and then a bonus depending on how well he has done. I put it on this basis because I figured that a farmer who has to wait 10 weeks for his pay needs more money than one who gets paid by the week. As it turns out we're one of the main props of the economy in our area and we're helping to perpetuate the small farm in an era when most small farms have become uneconomical.

JANEWAY. Where are you located and where are your markets?

TYSON. Our home base is Springdale, Ark., and our production area is about 2 million birds a week from small farmers in a 25-mile radius area in Northwest Arkansas, half a million a week from an area below Hot Springs and another half million a week from Tennessee. Our markets are from Detroit west. I'd say our number one market is California. Illinois is second and colorado third. We laso have markets in Washington state and Texas. In other words, our production is reasonably close to the Iowa-Illinois grain belt, but is itself in an area where there are no economically feasible land-use alternatives to chicken farming. And our markets are in areas where by doing our own trucking we can capitalize on a freight advantage over our competitors. We have seven manufacturing plants in Arkansas, one in Oklahoma, one in Missouri and two in Tennessee, and we do about $100 million in sales a year.

JANEWAY. What are your products?

TYSON. We have three basic products: chicken meat for the housewife, preweighted and prepackaged; Rock Cornish game hens; and frozen cooked poultry for institutions and restaurants.

JANEWAY. Do you advertise your brand in the supermarkets?

TYSON. We have just started to in the last year. It gives us more opportunities for profit and it cuts the cost of processing for the supermarket chain as well. It seems a natural direction for us to go since we're doing so much of the processiing anyway in order to prevent spoilage.

JANEWAY. Has the higher price of beef affected the price of chicken?

TYSON. No. Not only is chicken selling at 50 per cent below its price 10 years ago but the whole price structure seems to be dominated by the 29 cent special. As beef prices rise the housewife does switch to buying chicken more often so this helps us build volume. The price doesn't go up, however, because the supermarkets use chicken as an everyday low special all over the West. The housewife is so used to this now that she doesn't even bother to stock up when she sees it priced down. It's a loss leader for the stores and for us, but they buy other products from us at markups to cover our losses.

JANEWAY. As food prices rise in general do you see the American consumer cutting back on spending on food?

TYSON. No. I think Americans generally insist on at least maintaining if not improving their food standard of living no matter how much it costs, tho to some extent they switch between high and low cost items or eating out or in to stay within a budget.

JANEWAY. Is there an export market for poultry?

TYSON. It's negligible now. The poultry industry has never been able to hold on to the foreign markets it created. No sooner would we open up a market, in say Germany, than that country would spawn poultry producers of its own and slap tariffs on imports. Five or six years ago we opened up in Japan; now it's starting to produce.

THE SIXTH DISTRICT SPEAKS OUT

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the results of my 1972 public opinion poll. Returns ran upward of 25 percent; this is one of the best responses I have ever had in all the years I have sent out annual polls. As always, a great many letters accompanied the returns. On two questions in particular I had a surprisingly large number of qualifying remarks either in letters or jotted on the margin of the poll cards. These will be discussed further on; the qualifying statements mean the percentages of "Yes" and "No" on these two questions are not quite accurate in and of themselves, even though the percentages givn reflect the tabulation.

Following are the results, in percentages of those who gave a "yes" or "no" answer to each question. Incidentally, the number of those who had "no opinion" on any question or questions was quite low.

	Yes	No
(1) Do you favor busing school children for racial reasons?	4	96
(2) Should draft evaders and military deserters who fled abroad be allowed to return without penalty?	8	92
(3) Do you favor a nationwide, federally-financed child care system?	12	88
(4) Do you favor legalization of marihuana for personal and private use?	10	90
(5) Do you favor total abolition of the draft and reliance solely on an all-volunteer Army?	30	70
(6) Environmental spending is high, and climbing. Federal outlays went up 600 percent between 1969 ($431,000,000) and 1973 ($2,500,000,000 proposed). Private industry will spend $4,900,000,000 this year and must spend another $22,800,000,000 to meet current antipollution regulations. Do you feel this indicates progress?	65	35

BUSING

I did not ask this question on last year's poll but received a very large number of letters and comments concerned with busing. From those who added a comment on busing it totaled up to unanimous opposition, for 1971, to the idea of busing school children for racial reasons. This year I asked it; the return served to confirm last year's sentiments.

The most recent vote on busing was on the Equal Education Opportunities Act, taken last night and in the early morning hours of today. This overwhelming vote against busing, despite constant efforts by social planners to promote busing to achieve a racial balance, demonstrates "democracy in action." The will of the people is having this effect. Congress, at least the House of Representatives, is hearing the people.

Many of us in Congress have, for several years, been attempting to stem this tide of busing pupils hither and yon. The Education and Labor Committee of the House, the committee which must clear such legislation has steadily refused to report a meaningful bill against busing for House action. We have attached amendments to block busing to educational bills but the results have been inconclusive as it is difficult to make a bad bill good by adding amendments.

A bill dealing with higher education, which came up last summer, had some good, strong antibusing amendments attached to it by the House. In some other respects this legislation left much to be desired. Unfortunately, the House's antibusing amendments were badly weakened and distorted in a House-Senate conference, to the point where the bill became, according to one Capitol Hill expert, a "probusing bill." I voted against it.

Finally, antibusing forces have attained at least a temporary victory. Yesterday, Thursday, August 17, 1972, the Equal Education Opportunities Act came before the House of Representatives. It was a fair bill. It banned long-distance busing through the sixth grade. Courts are forbidden from ordering any busing for such students beyond the closest or next closest school to their home. For students in higher grades, busing any farther is only to be used as a last resort.

The House of Representatives, staying in session until well after midnight, added amendment after amendment to this bill to stop busing. This bill passed in the early morning hours of August 18 and went beyond what even the White House had asked. Amendments to the Equal Education Opportunities Act forbid courts from ordering long-distance busing for high school and elementary school students, and also allow reopening of many previously decided court cases where busing had been ordered. I voted "Yes" on both amendments.

An even stronger amendment, which I also supported, would have banned all court-ordered busing for racial purposes; this would have allowed busing only to the closest school. This failed, 211–174. The Senate has not yet acted on this legislation.

What we have here, in these actions by the House, is an example of democracy in action. A large majority of the American people, both black and white, have made it absolutely clear they want

an end to busing, for once and for all. Congress must and did act in response to and in accordance with the wishes of the people. It is now up to the Senate to follow the example of the House.

The supporters of busing to achieve integration have borrowed trouble and thrust upon the rest of us things we neither desire nor need. The fight is not over yet; it will go on. The social planners have not given up. The Senate must act favorably to achieve the results the American people are demanding. Has American public opinion gotten through to the Senate? I hope we are getting closer to seeing the end of the day when planners and theorizers use our children as pawns, and seek to inflict on the rest of us things they would never remotely consider for themselves.

AMNESTY FOR DRAFT EVADERS?

Interestingly enough, even those who checked "Yes" to this question frequently threw in qualifying statements, such as "If they will perform, for 2 years, some sort of public service work, such as in hospitals, city ghettos, depressed areas or schools" or "With the provision that they are never entitled to any kind of veterans' benefits." There were, relatively, very few checking "Yes" who would allow these men to come home on an "all-is-forgiven" basis.

I found violent reaction from those checking "No." "Strip them of their citizenship," was common. "Make them feel the full penalty of the law; no one else gets off scot-free when they break the law," was frequent. One comment impressed me in particular: "I have no doubt that many, many young men who were sent to Vietnam also had reservations about the war. But they went, and they died, or were wounded. How can it be fair to their memory—for they were sincere and honest—to pardon men who ran away?"

Some pointed out the fact, often ignored, that "for every one who deserted and fled abroad someone else had to go in his place." Others asked "what kind of a precedent would we be setting for the future if we adopted some kind of overall amnesty, now?" I hope that we will never again find ourselves in a situation approaching the one we are now getting out of, in Vietnam. But maintaining the defenses of this country is something that we are going to have to do for a long, long time. I do not see any chance at all of allowing selective objection, on the part of any one individual, to any particular conflict in which we may become engaged.

No one knows how many of these men there are. Most seem to be in Canada; some have said they never wish to return. That is their choice. Estimates range from as low as 10,000 to as high as 70,000, and an accurate tally is impossible. But, on the strength of this poll, and other nationwide polls I have seen, I do not believe the American people are ready to scrub the entire thing and let these men come back without any penalty when so many others came back—in caskets.

CHILD CARE

Last year President Nixon vetoed an OEO bill that would have created a national child-care system. I had voted "No" on passage of the bill; the President's veto was upheld. Now a new version of this legislation has passed the Senate, but I find nothing in it to make me change my original opposition.

On the surface, the idea of child care may certainly seem attractive to many. However, some very serious objections have been raised by persons who cannot be questioned on their sincerity.

Many poll comments raised the all-important question, what effect does this have on the child? Everyone knows that it will be impossible to have enough people at these proposed day-care centers to have one person for every child. This is especially important at a young age. Dr. Ernest van den Haag, of New York University, told a Senate subcommittee:

> Nothing could be more harmful than the repeated disappearance of adult figures in whom the child has invested affection. Depending on age, the development of object relations and later of a superego will suffer if the child is repeatedly having important relationships with people who disappear. And nothing could be more cruel to impose on small children than these perceived abandonments.

And how about the cost? This was asked by many. Total price tag for the day-care plan would be $2.9 billion, now estimated, over a 3-year period. Will it stop there? The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare warned in 1971 the cost of these child-care centers could run to $20 billion annually. A New York Times writer said it "could easily cost $2,600 a year a child." And, if the day care plan became nationwide, the Emergency Committee for Children figured total cost would hit a yearly figure of $39 billion.

One writer said:

> A Federal program of child care could mean a cumbersome, unwielding, quarreling, jealous and conflicting bureaucracy, constantly squabbling among itself, for authority, and with the Congress, for more money.

The idea may have good intentions but at least public opinion has grave doubts about any meaningful results.

MARIHUANA

Last March the Gallup poll showed use of marihuana among Americans 18 and older had tripled over the last 2½ years to where an estimated 15 million have tried it, or use it. However, in the same poll, 81 percent opposed legalization, which was down only 3 percent from the 85 percent opposed to legalization in 1969.

In March of this year the National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse, in its report to the President, recommended legalization. However, the report has some contradictions. A study of these contradictions is interesting.

The Commission said short-term or occasional use of marihuana is not harmful—medical experts still disagree widely, incidentally, on this point. Yet, the Commission also recommended a $1,000 penalty or a 1-year jail sentence for driving under the influence of the drug.

The Commission recommended keeping penalties on large-scale marihuana transactions, but abolishing those on small-scale deals. Why should giving marihuana away be alright, but selling it be bad? What makes selling it bad, if smoking it is not bad?

The Commission admits marihuana is a long-term risk. Then, why allow it to get a short-term start?

The Christian Science Monitor summed it up in one perceptive paragraph in a lead editorial, March 27, 1972:

> But marihuana, is a mind-affecting drug, is also a cooperative cousin to the other members of the drug family which is taking lives, ruining careers, accentuating personal frailties, and generating crime. In the aggregate, society loses from their use.

I think that is an injunction we should all bear in mind.

A VOLUNTEER ARMY?

I quite honestly expected to find overwhelming support for this idea. No one likes the draft; military service has been unpopular for a long time. With draft calls diminishing to almost nothing, I would have thought the volunteer army idea, where no one has to go unless he wants to, would find great favor.

It was not to be. Those saying "No," of course, made it quite clear they did not think we could maintain a satisfactory defense establishment without the draft.

But those checking "Yes" filled their answer with qualifiers, in marginal notes on the card, and with some long, well-thought-out letters. One of the very best and most perceptive came from a young man, a draftee, who had just gotten out of the Army and had been in Vietnam. Relatively very few felt that simply turning things over to a volunteer system would work. Practically all those saying "Yes" had remarks like "Better keep the draft mechanism handy, just in case," or "What about the cost? Has anyone thought of that?" Quite a few said things like, "Yes, but military service never hurt anyone. There should be some form of compulsory service for young men, to give some time to their country, in some form."

This question, with qualifiers in the answers, means the raw percentages themselves are inaccurate. It has been very, very difficult to decide any other figure but, based on the large number of comments, I would have to say that only about 15 precent favored a volunteer army concept with no draft mechanism and no form of compulsory service. It shows that the issue of keeping a strong and ready national defense is still very much alive and the responses to this question gave me much-needed insight into what promises to become a hotly debated and very thorny problem.

ENVIRONMENTAL SPENDING

Again, I was somewhat surprised at the results, and like the question on the volunteer army, the qualifiers surrounding the answers—probably 70 percent had additional remarks to make—shade the actual percentage figures and make it impossible to get an accurate numerical assessment.

One thing is quite certain: among the respondents to this poll, there was no trace of the panic mentality that has, unfortunately, plagued the environmental issue from time to time.

Those saying, "Yes," they did feel progress was being made, frequently added a comment to the effect that "But should not we stop and see just what we are getting into and how far we are going?" Those who said "No" made it quite clear that they were afraid, in this area, the Federal Government was slipping into that bottomless swamp where spending billions is synonymous with curing a problem.

Well, the billions I cited in my question are already outdated. The President's Council on Environmental Quality, in its latest report, released on August 7, 1972, says the United States will spend an incredible $287 billion in the 10 years through 1980. This is almost triple the amount that had been forecast for the first 6 years 1970–76.

Of this, $93 billion will be on new capital equipment, and $194 billion on operating costs. This is not all Government spending alone; it is total, business, Government, everyone, everything.

Fortunately, there are some very real signs that Congress is putting the brakes on panic spending on the environment. The House had before it, recently, a $5-billion make-work bill that would have put an estimated 500,000 people to work, "fighting pollution."

This was in spite of the fact that a 3-year water pollution bill, with an $18 billion price tag, had already passed both House and Senate, and the deficit in the budget was hovering around the $30 billion mark. However, by 205–192, the House defeated the bill.

I voted "No" on the measure; panic spending is worse than useless and to be avoided at all costs. It is interesting to note that 97 of those who voted for this bill, voted against raising the debt limit a few days earlier. If the debt ceiling had not been raised none of these bills could be paid.

Now, no one closes his eyes to whatever environmental problems there may be and assumes they will go away. Raising the matter to the level of national concern, where it now is, was something that certainly had to be done.

But the poll returns make it clear that the respondents do not think a clean environment is to be instantly achieved by billions. If we do not get our money's worth, then the whole cause is wasted and fruitless. Every individual citizen knows that, and the Congress must bear it in mind, as well as the Federal Government.

SUPPORT OF STUDENT AID

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the manner in which this House has so promptly and properly met and corrected the problem which has arisen in the adminstration of the guaranteed student loan program. I have always been a stanch supporter of assistance to deserving students for continuing their education beyond high school.

We all know the importance of higher education to the individual and to this Nation. And in this day of spiraling costs we must extend a helping hand wherever we can to insure that those of our young people who are qualified will not be denied the opportunity to further their education because of a lack of funds.

The history of legislation on student assistance demonstrates that we in this House of Representatives have endeavored to find always more avenues and means to overcome financial obstacles to higher education. And this was our purpose in amending the guaranteed student loan program—to extend and expand the number of students eligible for assistance through a program of cooperation between the Federal Government and private lending institutions. We understood that those students from families with incomes of less than $15,000 would need help in meeting the present day costs of higher education and we allowed Federal payment of the interest on their guaranteed loan for the period while the student was in school.

In addition, we realized there were occasions when even a student from a large family with an income of more than $15,000 would need help. So the Education Amendments of 1972 amended this program to allow Federal payment of interest, if need was determined at the local level, to these latter students as well.

There never was any intention of eliminating from these benefits some students previously eligible. But somehow the language of the law has been misinterpreted and the regulations could have the effect of excluding some deserving students. It is right to avoid this misfortune and to postpone implementation of these regulations for students receiving loans for this school year until all ambiguity can be clarified. I strongly support this action.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF ORDER OF AHEPA

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to a distinguished organization, the Order of Ahepa, which recently celebrated its golden anniversary.

The Order of Ahepa was founded on July 26, 1922, in Atlanta, Ga. Since that time this fine organization has spread to all but one State in the Union, with 430 local chapters throughout the country, 23 of these in my home State of Massachusetts.

In addition to the Order of Ahepa, the name of which is an acrostic derived from the first letters of American Hellenic Progressive Association, there are three other organizations within the AHEPA family. These are: the Daughters of Penelope—senior women's auxiliary; The Sons of Pericles—junior young men's auxiliary; and Maids of Athena—junior young women's auxiliary.

While the membership of AHEPA is drawn primarily from men of Greek descent, AHEPA's effects have spread far beyond this base. In addition to promoting the ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic culture, AHEPA has contributed financially to many worthy causes both nationally and internationally. Among these contributions have been relief to hurricane victims, aid to war orphans of Greece, support for the Truman Library, aid to Turkish earthquake victims, and support for the George Papanicolaou Cancer Research Institute in Miami.

AHEPA consists of men from all walks of life, united by the common goal of good fellowship and common understanding. The nine objectives of AHEPA represent a commitment to good citizenship, education, and understanding.

I am proud that AHEPA has been particularly active in Massachusetts, and I wish to salute the chapters of AHEPA in my congressional district and their officers: Fitchburg: George Steffanides, president; Christo Bicoules, secretary; Harris Karris, treasurer; Clinton: Peter Kamataris, president; Arthur Pappas, vice president; Charles Georgeson, secretary; Harry Despotopulo, treasurer; Watertown: Nicholas Chronis, president; William Ravanis, vice president; George Patterson, secretary; George Spiliotis, treasurer; Framingham-Hudson: Andrew Tsantelis, president; James Tzellas, vice president; Harold Garvey, secretary; Ted Tzellas, treasurer; Sterling: Louis Chiamis, president; Andrew Vetras, vice president; Dr. Nicholas Despotopoulos, secretary; Edward Gibbons, treasurer; Brookline: Aristomenes Lydotes, president; George Sakillaris, vice president; George Sarantakos, secretary; John Sinanis, treasurer.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, although the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission is currently embroiled in controversy due to some of its members' activities, I do not believe that we should lose sight of the great events of 1775–76 which the Commission was established to help commemorate.

In preparing for the Nation's 200th birthday, I believe we must address ourselves once more to the ancient ideals of freedom and representative government which motivated the Founding Fathers. Drawing from the thoughts of philosophers who preceded them by centuries, Jefferson, Adams, Franklin, and the others did not reject these "old" ideas, but embraced them and breathed new life into them. It is for us, too, to reach back to the ideals of our revolutionary forefathers, to embrace them, however old or outdated they may seem, and to apply them to our own national circumstances in the late 20th century.

The ideals of the Founding Fathers

are best and most fully embodied in the Declaration of Independence, the anniversary of whose adoption forms the focal point for bicentennial activities. This, too, is an old document, but one which has provided philosophical guidance for two centuries to patriots and lovers of freedom the world over. I hope that the Bicentennial Commission will focus its activities around the content of that document and not merely the birth of a new nation which it represents. All Americans should be encouraged by the Commission to reread the noble words of Jefferson and to ponder how our ongoing democratic system can best be made to conform to the ideals of the Declaration of Independence. It is an old document to be sure, but one which is as relevant today as the day it was written.

FIVE HUNDRED MASSACHUSETTS RESIDENTS VOTE TO END THE WAR IN PEACE POLL

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as we in this Chamber debate amendments which would end American involvement in that long and damaging war in Indochina, citizens across the Nation are expressing their sentiments about that conflict. They are voting in response to a poll sponsored by Peace Alert U.S.A., a bipartisan organization with the support of 72 Members of Congress. This poll provides the first chance for Americans to vote directly on the war, by posing the question: Should Congress bring an end to the war by cutting off funds?

Opinion polls have often measured public sentiment on this issue. These generally reliable polls, which measure only sample groups, have yet to provide a clear-cut answer to measure true feelings in this Nation on such an involved and emotional issue. We have been told of an undefined "majority" in favor of continued American involvement in Southeast Asia, while at the same time many professional opinion polls are reporting that more than three-fourths of the American public desire immediate American withdrawal.

The Peace Alert effort, of which I am proud to be a sponsor, has worked to make available for every American an opportunity to vote on the war. To date, votes have been running 20 to 1 against continued funding of the war. I am proud today to insert into the RECORD the names and hometowns of 500 residents of my home State of Massachusetts who have voted to terminate American involvement in Indochina, including bombing and all other military operations. Of course, many more in Massachusetts have voted against the war, joined by thousands of others across the Nation. By inserting these names as a symbolic gesture, however, I implore my colleagues not to ignore the pleadings of these citizens who are urging you to cut off funds for the Indochina war. When you receive the results of balloting in your State in this poll, I implore you to weigh the opinions of your fellow citizens who are expressing their heartfelt feelings about our misadventure in Southeastern Asia.

The list of Massachussets residents follows:

Mary Lou Eukson, Arlington, Barbara Favout, Winchester, Clone S. Buckley, Arlington, Carol McTutosh, Winchester, Joan Mondecar, Holliston, Tom Lombardo, Winchester, Mary M. Miller, Wakefield, Mrs. Richard E. Liebich, Winchester, Susan Erikson, Arlington, Mrs. Jeanne Cammarata, Winchester.

Lorraine M. Shea, Medford, Saurette Bunzel, Winchester, David E. Cincotta, Winchester, Joseph Montori, Springfield, Gloria Bizelia, Arlington, Maryrose Wilson, Winchester, Mrs. Anna V. Sullivan, Watertown, Lois Kuglin, Winchester, Ann Appenherme, Winchester, Mr. John Zaray, Medford.

Ms. Clairn Goroni, Arlington, Duncan Page, Boston, Carl F. Ickerbloom Jr., Winchester, Deborah Page, Boston, Rev. John J. Bishop, Winchester, Sandra Kaplan, Brockton, Ruth A. Cincotta, Winchester, D. R. Sanadi, Lexington, Myriel C. Eykamp, Arlington, Mrs. Lelham Barour, Dorchester.

LuAnn Kuder, Cambridge, Gabriel J. Gauveria, Arlington, Leonard I. Morobacai, Hollistone, Jeanne Emerson, Arlington, Grace Stelark, Somerville, Elizabeth Pepedicurian, Arlington, Mrs. G. G. Wunder, Winchester, Joanne Bishop, Woburn, Barbara Sepore, Arlington, Louise McCarley, Woburn.

Michael McCabe, Arlington, Jean Williams, Winchester, Tina DeBiasi, Plymouth, Arthur White, Winchester, Kathryn Dirocco, Lexington, Jean Frangas, Cambridge, Rosalie Lamson, Winchester, A. M. Smith Jr., Woburn, David Kreider, Winchester, Ailien Rixe, Roslindale.

Ira Coan, New Bedford, Diana Kinsy, Cambridge, Laura Wyman, Melrose, Andrea Mountain, Winchester, Eric Jankel, Franklin Maureen Brennan, Waltham, E. M. Purcell, Cambridge, Jeffrey Green, Watertown, Paul Vohl, Lexington, Hollis Wyman, Melrose.

Dr. Stephen Mott, Beverly, Marcella Matarese, Boston, Nancy Jeltsch, Lunenberg, Prosser Gifford, Amherst, Sheila Harrison, Groton, Mrs. S. C. Mott, Beverly, Arnold Jeltsch, Lunenberg, Judith Green, Watertown, Virginia Jones, West Tisbury, Olivia A. Cabot, Dover.

Kenneth Hules, Watertown, Audrey Drummond, Winthrop, Rev. Donald Thompson, Boston, Samuel A. Stone, Somerset, Celia Gilbert, Boston, Gilbert Cohen, Springfield, Joseph B. Nogels, Amherst, Leonora Hayford, Sunderland, Jean Lawrence, Northfield, Leare G. Page, Deerfield.

Nancy Bogert, Heath, Hayden Bogert, Shelburne Falls, William S. Tilton III, Greenfield, Jon R. Nyberg, So. Hadley, Milton Clerk, Turrells Falls, Walter H. Burnham, Jr., Montague, Christopher Zentraf, Plymouth, Audrey Waryas, Montague, Bernard C. J. Zentera, Jr., Mountain Centre, Barbara Ann Hern, Turners Falls, Brian F. McKenna, Greenfield.

Timothy J. Donovan, Bernardston, Robert Cambell, Greenfield, Phil Cousins, Jamaica Plain, Cathy Clifford, Arlington, Chris Antonellis, Weston, Alice Barrett, Dorchester, Robert Cunnave, Waltham, Paul True, W. Roxbury.

Mrs. Deirdre Patrich, Westwood, Paula Toland, Arlington, Charles D. McQuattie Jr., Peabody, Dennis J. Sullivan, Arlington, Juliete Laufer, Chestnut Hill, Mr. John Wosina, Winchester, Gerald O'Gonosky, Medford, Berridt Erickson, Arlington, Mary Boudreau, Woburn, Michael S. Strabs, Winchester.

Mrs. James S. Miller, Milton, Mrs. Ionis Knupp, Chestnut Hill, Rose Rosenberg, Brookline, Bernice Santz, Newton, M. Freedman, Brookline, Reuce Miller, Winchester, Denise Sterner, Malden, Maryellen Buckley, Arlington, Mrs. Kapp, Newton Centre, E. Menken, W. Roxbury.

M. Jacobs, Chestnut Hill, Donald R. Sterner, Malden, Susan Schultz, Winchester, Patrice Toland, Arlington, Mrs. Estdee M. Guban, Woburn, Raureth Sharma, Winchester, Deborah Daisa, Newton, Mrs. Elaine McNally, Woburn, Randi Mink, Boston, Clayton E. Heywood, Woburn.

K. M. O'Brien, Somerville, Maurice McFaughlin, Mattpan, David Miller, Winchester, Janet Lipson, Chestnut Hill, Mrs. Irving Banner, Needham, S. Simmon, Mattapan, S. Rampert, Newton Centre, Sadie Porter, Brookline, Mrs. James Cardan, Framingham, Mrs. Eugene F. Black, Newton Centre.

Thomas Groden, W. Roxbury, Tony Sachs, Chestnut Hill, Mrs. S. Greenberg, Newton, Pauline Grand, Brookline, Arthur Dublin, Mattapan, Mrs. David Laghery, Brookline, Mrs. M. Koslon, Newton, Judith Smith, W. Roxbury, Mrs. Rosman, Roslindale, Rose B. Kafman, Chestnut Hill.

Marilyn Gonte, Amherst, J. David Tholl, Needham, Jeronica Johnson, Cambridge, John A. Barb, Marlboro, Rev. Henry Hickey, Saugus, Alan Jehlen, Somerville, James Arpante, Pittsfield, Lorraine Charney, Carlisle, Robert J. Munnelly, Saugus, Muriel Williams, Cambridge.

Robert Jettsch, Lunenberg, S. Paul Schilling, Centerville, Steve Begbidere, Westwood, Joyce McCourt, Natick, Don Hunter, Newton, Rev. John Creed, Saugus, Mark Forant, Westwood, Timothy Blodgett, Concord, Charlotte Jeltsch, Lunenberg, Dr. Jacob Fine, Chestnut Hill.

Maxine J. Balkus, Byfield, Mrs. R. J. Munnelly, Saugus, Peter Goodman, Natick, Marlynn Drebs, Montague, Grace Lubin Finesurger, Cambridge, John Clayton, Montague, Howard Stoudt, Lincoln, Abram Segel, Brookline, Roth Marsden, Springfield, Ira Cohen, New Bedford.

Mel Gadd, Somerville, Dr. Jerome Klein, Chestnut Hill, John C. Eddison, Lexington, Milton Trebach, Boston, Robert E. Segal, Newton Highlands, Thomas Plaut, Framingham, Mrs. Gadd, Somerville, Stanley Shipulski, Saugus, A. S. Evers, Longmeadow, Mrs. M. Kosev, W. Newton.

Rhoda Varn, Springfield, Paul W. Walter, Stockbridge, Eugene P. Falco, Medford, Mrs. S. Shipulski, Saugus, Prof. Fred Warren, Springfield, Helen Stoneman, Delmont, Peter Buttner, Weston, Claire Mountain, Winchester, Mrs. E. P. Falco, Medford, Susan Berardi, Boston.

Kenneth Beechis, Cambridge, Raila Attinson, Natick, Gilman D. Harn, Lunenburg, Ann Johnson, Sterling, Rev. William Ziadie, Worcester, J. S. Canner, Waban, Mrs. W. Kisiel, Andover, Jean Brown, Mattapen, Tamar Smith, Haydenville, Nancy Goldstein, Norwood.

Victor Guez Reid, Hopedale, Ruey Pakcard, Boston, Kathryn Lemmel, Arlington, George Whitehouse, Brookline, Beth Moss, Boston, Rosemary Beerk, Housatonic, Peter Myette, Duxbury, Larry Lemmel, Arlington, Marvin Flevrit, Springfield, Nancy Myette, Duxbury.

Mrs. J. H. Ewing, Brockton, Mr. J. H. Ewing, Brockton, Gertrude Asimor, Cambridge, Thomas Adens, Lincoln, Mary Schilling, Centerville, Thomas Hodgson, W. Tisbury, Steve Peaul, Brookline, Janet Reardon, Bellingham, Hannah Sidofsky, Chester, Mrs. Gilman Horr, Lunenberg.

Jerome Early, Stockbridge, Joan T. Rosasco, Northampton, Jean Schibener, Lunenberg, Leila Schnitzer, Waban, David Edwin, Somerville, Ethel Kremer, Hyde Park, Charles Schiberer, Lunenberg, Vernon Wayne, Bridgewater, Julia Colen, Auburn, Cynthia Caldwell, Allston.

Marilyn Halevi, Cambridge, Pamela Gastins, Groton, Shirley Jersky, Hyde Park, Karen Lenbeke, Brookline, Norreer Hennessy, Allston, Miriam Wood, Needham, Steve Riggall, Haydenville, Selma Ganz, Cambridge,

George Putman, Dedham, Beatrice R. Beird, Northampton.

Mrs. Samuel Gilbert, Chestnut Hill, Frances M. Selbir, Brookline, Tillie Becks, Chestnut Hill, Yaslight Weymoth, Chestnut Hill, Rose Mantel, Newton, Josephine Breen, Brookline, Charles Campe Jr., Roslindale, Pauline Burch, Newton Centre, Gertrude Lesnick, Brookline, Carol Sherman, Brookline.

Ame Birman, Hyde Park, Samuel Gilbert, Chestnut Hill, Ida Gilbert, Hyde Park, Lorraine T. Reilly, Milton, May Sanno, Woburn, John Sullivan, Chestnut Hill, George Desed, Winchester, Clara Kontos, Roslindale, Anita Vaitarrian, Winchester, Richard Heryet, Readville.

Robert M. Reilly, Milton, Ruth B. Donovan, No. Cambridge, Barbara Bailey, Winchester, Mary Radman, Newton, Sidney Fromen, Hyde Park, Mrs. Kathleen Murphy, Somerville, Rev. Jack Zorrheide, Winchester, Agnes Murphy, Brookline, Edith Ellison, Chestnut Hill, Mrs. Frances M. Joyce, No. Cambridge.

Walter B. Davis, Winchester, Kathleen K. Criswell, Arlington, C. McLaughain, Mattopau, Mrs. L. M. Mevlen, Winchester, Karie Miller, No. Eastham, Deborah Ellington, Brookline, Claire M. Bryant, Arlington, Joseph L. Sholkin, Newton, Mendy Sikkison, Shelburne, Francis L. Galligan, Arlington.

Margaret M. Anzalone, Wakefield, Valerie Civtti, Belmont, Robert Kittredge Jr., Winchester, Frank Patrick, Westwood, D. Galdman, Newton, Charles Krinsky, Chestnut Hill, Elaine Leon, Brookline, Joseph W. Lyons, Winchester, Eleanor MacPhee, Arlington, Dr. William J. Mallio, Winchester.

Mrs. Joyce Strah, Winchester, Edwin Kembel, Cambridge, Betty Levin, Lincoln, Margaret Becon, Yarmouth Port, Milton Coantor, Amherst, Thomas Wilson, Belmont, Susna Hegarty, Boston, R. G. Murphy, Montague, Rogert C. Vernon, Westwood, C. Wolfson, Worcester.

John Paine, Weston Douglas C. Griffiths, Jr., Boston, Susan Weader, Winchester, W. Gibson, Stockbridge, J. C. Van Itallie, Charlemont, Philip Mason, Manchester, Mrs. James B. Ames, Cambridge, Carl Pedersen, No. Scituate, Gary Laredo, Newton, Rockwell Kent III, Upton.

Armand Siegel, Brookline, Peter W. Brown, Manomet, Mrs. Maritn Zelin, Peabody, Milton Kosen, W. Newton, Michael Morris, Winchester, Claire Emerson, Lincoln, Marie Hughes, Pittsfield, Debra A. Machaby, Holbrook, Jacob Fichman, Revere, Dina Givern, Newton Centre.

Peter J. DeNatace, Winchester, Barbara Burr, Belmont, Peter Robinson, Wellesley, Rev. Albert Baller, Clinton, Rev. John duBois, Auburn, Mrs. Harriet Miller, Worcester, Rev. Henry Coper, Uxbridge, Rev. John Dorna, Fitchburg, S. P. Gorzocoski, Northfield, William F. Oberr III, Oak Bluff.

Ruth Sargeant, Brighton, Carolyn McDade, Newton, Frances Lawrence, Winchester, Donna McGarigal, Duxbury, Manfred P. Friedman, Lexington, Daniel Cobbledick, Oak Bluff, Paul E. Johnson, Centerville, Abbie Jackson, Sheffield, Dr. Barbara S. Powell, Cambridge, Berge Tatian, Stonehay.

Mrs. Paul Marks, Framingham, Glenn Tindee, Lincoln, Mr. A. S. Goldin, Winchester, John Griefen, Belmont, Walter Wagerknecht, W. Newton, Mrs. B. Kobvson, Lexington, Elizabeth Ann Gaumer, Cambridge, G. Sterling Grumman, Boston, Mr. Rene H. Gingras, Lynn, Mrs. A. Goldin, Winchester.

Anthony Pilla Jr., Bedford, Mrs. Frank F. Mann, Winthrop, Burt Kolovson, Lexington, Steve Weiss, Weston, Gloria Tinder, Lincoln, Mrs. R. H. Gingras, Lynn, Gary Fontaine, Boston, Shirley Daphnis, So. Boston, Mrs. R. Hohn Griefen, Belmont, Lillian Cerostan, Framingham Center.

Pual Hickman, Scituate, Robert Duggan, Cambridge, Mrs. Norman Hamlin, Wakefield, Ann Rodney, Longsworthy, Gertrude McGill, Marblehead, Luella Hubault, Fall River, Jane Keddy, Wakefield, William Wilson Jr., New Bedford, Alan W. Jenest, Greenfield, Emily M. Jones, Warwick.

Masibeth McCarthy, Worcester, Dr. Paul E. Johnson, Centerville, Rebekah M. Baitler, Wilbereham, J. Wynn, Norwood, Jana Wagenseller, Brookline, Truman Winsor, Boston, James Gacioch, Westover, Adele Shectman, Brookline, Laurence Batchelder, Cambridge, Dan Galatis, New Bedford.

Arnold Metzer, Newton Center, Bernard C. Graves, Oxford, John A. Klobucher, Sudbury, Michael McCarter, Belmont, Priscilla Winter, Lexington, Mrs. J. A. Klobucher, Suxbury, Paul T. David, Lancaster, Margaret Gagcioch, Westover, Covet, Tiffit, Brookline, Bruce Miner, Boston.

Dr. Kent Slater, Worcester, Louisa Redfield McElwain, Weston, Susan G. Whitaker, Acton, Sophia Kahn, Wabain, James L. Zall, Lynn, Amy McElwain, Weston, Morton Engsteom, Watertown, Victoria Apsit, Wrentham, Louise S. Audet, Brockton, Roberta Thompson, Boston.

Mary Hunt, Dorchester, Lisa Allen, Weston, Leonard Unger, Wretham, Koris Baratz, Chelsea, Alice Hart, W. Roxbury, John Martin, Natuck, Peter C. Baker, Duxbury, Emily Horm, Cambridge, Ann Taylor, Brighton, Kevin Corrigan, So. Boston.

Richard L. Payne, E. Orlians, Joseph A. Johnston, Oak Bluffs, James L. Nelson, So. Yarmouth, Elizabeth Maxfield, Concord, Bert Zenaty, Longmeadow, Mrs. Edgar Cathcart, Wellesley, Wallace Taylor, Weshort, Jacqueline Rencee Tessler, Boston, Mrs. Regina Putnam, Dedham, Peggy Van Valkenburgh, Arlington, Doris Hartshorn, Weymouth.

Sr. Pauline Kalagher, Holyoke, Thomas Shelly, Cambridge, Eluert Miller, Brookfield, John Jelatis, Lexington, Ann Capidilupo, Dedham, Mrs. David Hottentein, Wexeham, Judith Yeager, Housatonic, Pat Edwards, Northfield, Marion Wilson, W. Springfield.

Faith Madzar, Natuck, Dr. C. B. Crampton, Vineyard Haven, Clara Barnard, Shelburne, David Ross, Northampton, Thomas C. Hollocher, Sudbury, Philip W. L. Cox, Vineyard Haven, Ethel Alper, Brookline, Bessie Beal, Hingham, Sarah Bradt, Boston, Karl Manner, Duxbury.

Robert Lindsey, Boston, Susanne Melbye, Wayland, Katherine Meyer, Brewster, Jean Cramlick, Bernardston, Robert Sykiia, Hyannis, Helen Grannam, Cambridge, Linda Crawford, S. Boston, Doug Bailey, Brighton, Helen Gray, Cambridge, Barbara Cushive, Salem.

Mary Hicery, Somerville, Susie Folk, Belmont, Mrs. J. Samuel, Newton Centre, Malcolm Rilborn, Stockbridge, Richard Stoeler, S. Dedham, Angelica Barnaas, Fitchburg, Phillip Ward, Chicopee, John Yellm, Allston, Dominic Capodilupo, Dedham, Jim Beaine, Edgartown.

Lynn Peterson, Edgartown, Mrs. Paul Sturtervent, Halifax, Belle Montaue, Cambridge, Ann Tucker, Newton Center, Ted Heuchleg, Concord, Rita Moss, Newton, Alfonsas Dainis, Cambridge, Bertha Reynolds, Stoughton, Joan Clark, Colrain, W. Harking, Cane.

Ruth Marshall, Cambridge, Marlene Miller, Highland, Juenita Weed, Lee, Donna Alexandianch, Worcester, Alba Chitauras, Somerville, Lucy Palfrey, Plymouth, Theresa Gilbert, Norwood, Merriell Callender, Everett, Seor Barnet, Newton, Paul Carming, Dorchester.

Robert McCockee, Carve, Joni Deven, Allston, Sharon Fay, Lexington, Shirley McCrary, Highway, Jerel Twiss, Colrain, Maurice Shriburn, Sharon, Ron Wilmot, Osser, David Huaschild, Branston, George Duthamo, Springfield, Ronald Hikel, Jefferson.

TERRY PRAISES DISASTER RELIEF; CALLS FOR FURTHER ASSISTANCE

HON. JOHN H. TERRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, the victims of Agnes have begun to rebuild. They are going home to clean up and put the pieces back together. The key words have been coordination and cooperation.

The coordination at all levels—Federal, State, and local—has been admirable considering the scope of the devastation. In my congressional district, the county, city, town, and village governments went into action immediately and were soon providing rapid emergency aid to victims. They moved quickly to help people find shelter, food, and clothing. Their work and cooperation has been phenomenal. The Federal Government likewise has moved quickly. They set up field offices and began helping flood victims in a very short time.

Thomas R. Casey, Regional Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness in New York City is running the disaster office in Horseheads, N.Y. His leadership in coordinating the assistance efforts has been commendable and he and his staff have provided immense help to the victims in my congressional district. They are to be praised for these efforts.

The Federal Government, at the inception of this disaster, had an elaborate apparatus for assistance. Under the direction of OEP, more than 100 different services were available to communities and individuals to help with the rehabilitation of homes, businesses, public facilities, and private property. But more was needed because of the scope and severity of the flooding.

Several areas were and are still in need of assistance that has not been forthcoming. Outdoor recreation, for example, suffered severe losses. Parks and recreation areas owned by cities, towns, villages, and counties could not receive disaster relief. They are, in fact, strictly prohibited from receiving such assistance.

The Secretary of the Interior, seeing this as a problem that must be dealt with, has made this a top priority and will provide project grants up to 50 percent of the costs for the restoration of parks, recreation areas and facilities damaged by Agnes. The facilities must be open to the general public and not limited to special groups.

This will help a great deal, but the losses in my district were quite high since much of the economy in the Finger Lakes congressional district is tourist oriented. More needs to be done to get the recreation areas back in shape and prevent further loss of revenues.

Another area of concern is the Corps of Engineers. They have a vast amount of work to do in both cleanup and prevention of future similar catastrophes. I fear that the staff they presently have is not sufficient. I have recently learned that, according to the corps, they will

only be able to accomplish their tasks in one end of Livingston County, the hardest hit in my district, this year. This means that the other end will be vulnerable to similar devastation until next year.

I fear that other counties in New York and throughout the flooding area are in a similar situation and that something must be done to give the corps the added capability needed to prevent further tragedy.

A third area of concern is FHA loans to farmers who sustained large crop losses. Currently, loans can be obtained for a period of 1 year with no maximum. Several farmers in the Potter Muck area of Yates and Ontario Counties and in areas of Livingston County in my district have losses of $100,000 or more. These losses are impossible to recoup in 1 year, yet the FHA crop loans are for only one growing season. More assistance to the farmers, the backbone of our economy, is needed.

Finally, one of the major problems I found that I had as a Member of Congress was a lack of knowledge of what to do and how to do it in the case of such an emergency. Something that was lacking and that is sorely needed is a disaster plan for congressional offices. I have written to Gen. George Lincoln, Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, on this subject and I conveyed to him the following suggested plan:

SUGGESTED DISASTER PLAN FOR CONGRESSIONAL OFFICES

I. STEPS A CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE SHOULD TAKE TO BE READY IN THE EVENT A DISASTER OCCURS

A. Be aware of the types of disasters that might occur in the district and the weak points in the defense of such a disaster.

B. Have on hand the OEP Disaster Handbook and the information kits OEP uses for disasters.

C. Keep an up-to-date list of all OEP offices, their addresses and telephone numbers, and the people who run them.

D. Keep an up-to-date list of names and telephone numbers of Civil Defense, Corps of Engineers, Small Business Administration, Farmers Home Administration, and other pertinent offices, and State and local officials who have responsibility in a disaster situation.

E. Keep an up-to-date list of local disaster plans (if not available, suggest that they be drawn up).

F. Have on hand the OEP list of eligibility criteria for assistance. It should be very detailed so potential questions can be easily answered.

G. A list of potential sites for emergency information centers to be operated by the Congressional office should be drawn up and kept up-to-date. This will facilitate and expedite emergency operations when they become necessary. Suggested locations include, in addition to district offices, Civil Defense offices, Chamber of Commerce, local officials' offices, State officials' offices, etc.

II. THE DECLARATION OF A DISASTER

A. Definition of a Disaster

B. Procedure for declaring a disaster

C. The role of OEP

D. A list of procedures and criteria for an area to be declared a disaster area.

1. Legislative procedure and legal aspects of a disaster. Legislative history (include such things as the agreement between FHA and SBA on their overlapping programs).

2. Should include a careful explanation of the disaster declaration procedure such as the fact that a Presidential declaration does not necessarily mean OEP will confirm a particular county.

3. Explanation of the differences between an OEP declaration of a disaster area and an SBA declaration.

III. WHAT TO DO IF IT IS IMMINENT THAT A PRESIDENTIAL DISASTER WILL BE DECLARED

A. The Member should immediately contact and coordinate with State and local officials, OEP, Civil Defense.

B. Set up the information centers in the pre-selected spots throughout the district.

1. These offices should be available to answer any and all questions about the disaster.

2. The opening of the offices, their locations, and the telephone numbers, should be widely publicized.

3. The offices should gather statistics and damage estimates and locate the hardest hit areas and get this information to OEP officials for their use. OEP will use the information as a basis for sending out their own damage estimate teams and for setting up its own centers.

4. The offices should coordinate with each other to make sure the same information is being given out at each one. Each should have the previously prepared telephone list.

5. The offices should be closed only after OEP has set up its operations, but the regular district offices should remain available to answer questions and help solve the problems that arise.

6. The offices should maintain close contact with OEP officials in the area and provide a mutual exchange of up-dated information.

C. The Members should tour the stricken area as soon as physically possible so the people will know he is working on the problem. This will help ease the potential for panic which often accompanies such a disaster. A press conference should be called immediately after the tour to publicize the Member's presence in an effort to keep the situation calm.

D. All Members involved in the disaster area should make an effort to appraise each other of their activities and if possible coordinate any major efforts on behalf of the victims.

E. OEP should call a meeting at the White House for all Members and staff people involved in the disaster operations as soon as possible. The best opportunity is concurrent with the declaration and before the Member departs for a tour of the district.

F. Local OEP officials should be contacted immediately after each Member has set up his information centers and appraised of their locations, telephone numbers, and the staff people manning them.

G. OEP should contact these centers daily, or as the situation dictates, to appraise them of the situation and any changes that occur. The information centers should, in turn, relate pertinent information on a regular schedule to the OEP offices.

H. The utmost speed is necessary. Time estimates should be available and given out to victims who make requests for assistance and ask how long it will take. A definite time period should be given where possible because the worst thing you can say to a victim is "soon."

In essence the key words are advance preparation, coordination and speed. Speed is of the essence. The victims of any disaster deserve to be helped quickly and time is of the essence. Often the scope of the disaster will make travel difficult and communication impossible. In such a situation, it is imperative to make an extra effort to quell the possibility of panic. Ways must be found to get into these areas and calm the victims, assuring them that help is on the way.

The Federal Government, at the inception of this disaster, had an elaborate apparatus for assistance. Under the direction of OEP, more than 100 different services were available to communities and individuals to help with the rehabilitation of homes, businesses, public facilities and private property. But more was needed because of the scope and severity of the flooding.

We in Congress have now provided the victims some additional help in the form of H.R. 15692. Among other things, loans from the Small Business Administration and Farmers Home Administration are now available, retroactively, at a rate of 1 percent with a forgiveness feature of $5,000. It also provides much needed assistance in the form of grants to private, nonprofit education institutions which, until this measure was passed, were not eligible for Federal assistance. The ravages of Hurricane Agnes placed these schools in a position where they only alternative would have been to shut down if this assistance had not been provided.

But much more needs to be done if we are to get all of the flood victims back on their feet and prevent such occurrences in the future. More assistance is needed and more corrective and preventive measures must be taken and I call on my colleagues for their cooperation toward that end.

It is my sincere hope that out of this disaster two things will emerge. One, that measures will be taken to insure that such a thing will never again occur. And two, that this feeling of unity and cooperation will carry over into our everyday dealings with our neighbors.

In this hour of great need, my heart goes out to those who have lost so much in the devastating flooding. I have been to the area often and have seen the destruction first hand. We have still much, much more to do.

TULARE, CALIF., REACHES ITS GOAL

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring an interesting fact to the attention of all the Members of this House. That fact is that the city of Tulare, Calif., in my congressional district, raised $161,700 in a period of only 1 month for the purpose of assuring the development of an industrial park. This accomplishment by the people in Tulare is both remarkable and outstanding. They have demonstrated what a public-spirited people can do when they are determined to achieve a particular goal.

The citizens of Tulare have been concerned for some time about attracting new industry and broadening their economic base. And the industrial park was the way they decided to bring new industry into the city and create new job opportunities.

The money was actually raised through

the sale of $100 shares in the Tulare Industrial Site Development Foundation. The stocks were bought by individuals and businesses from every segment of Tulare. The sales began on July 5 and after only 2 weeks $100,000 had been raised. This was enough to get the project going. It was decided to continue with the sales and after 1 month a total of $161,700 in stock had been sold. And they plan to continue until they have reached $250,000 which is the amount needed to complete the job.

The Federal Government was able to play a part in this success story. The Economic Development Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency have each made contributions to the construction of the Laspina-Levin sewer line that will service the park area.

This is indeed a success story of a town concerned about its future and determined enough to do something about it.

Tulare has set an example for other towns throughout the country to follow.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the August 7 edition of the Tulare Advance-Register entitled "One Month—$161,700" be printed following my remarks:

ONE MONTH—$161,700—INDUSTRIAL PARK ASSURED AFTER WHIRLWIND CAMPAIGN

(By Tom R. Hennion)

Who said it couldn't done?

It could, and Tulare proved it—with flying colors!

Tulare's industrial park will be developed, and Tulare thus soon will make its re-entry into big league competition for new industry. All doubt of that was erased today by the jubilant officers of the Tulare Industrial Site Development Foundation.

They announced that the sale of stock in Tulare's proposed industrial park has reached the $161,700 mark.

That is $11,700 more than the $150,000 which the foundation, which will develop the park, said would be necessary to insure its establishment.

The sale of stock will go on, perhaps until the total has reached $250,000, but the essential amount to get the job started has now been raised.

And it was a true community-wide effort.

In fact, it might well be one of the speediest, most public-spirited sales of stock on record anywhere.

At the office of the Greater Tulare Chamber of Commerce, where the daily sales were tabulated, it was revealed that individual stock purchases ranged from $100 for a single share to $5,000 for 50. Also, sales records showed that purchasers came from all walks of life—from daily wage earners to large corporations.

It was their way of expressing their faith in the Tulare of the future, their way of making certain that Tulare is not handicapped in its quest for a broader economic foundation by lack of a proper place to put new industry.

It was also the serving of a community-wide notice on the world of industry that Tulare is a community that not only is ready to roll out the red carpet of welcome for new industry, but whose individual citizens are so enthusiastic over the idea that they have put up their own money to make it possible.

The actual campaign to raise the $150,000 necessary to get the industry park show on the road began just one month ago.

On July 5, the first offering of stock in the Tulare Industrial Site Development Foundation was made to the people of Tulare.

A community volunteer sales force of more than 20 businessmen, under the guidance of Frank Hulbert, immediate past president of the Chamber of Commerce, began calling on a list of prospects to tell them the industrial park story.

Acceptance of the proposal was even greater than had been anticipated. By July 19—two weeks after the sale started—$100,000 was in hand. That was the amount the foundation was required by the state corporation commissioner to impound in an untouchable bank account before any of the funds could be used.

The sales committee then set its sights on $150,000 as the essential minimum to insure the development.

This money will be used to make a down payment on the industrial park property, to pay for the cost of running a rail spur across So. K Street into the main body of the park, and for other necessary starting expenses.

"There is no intention of halting stock sales now," Dan T. Johns, executive vice president of the chamber, stressed today. "The more money we have the more we can do with the park. If we can reach our ultimate goal of $250,000, we can put together an ideal package to sell to industry."

The more than $150,000 now available to the foundation will, however, permit the group to begin its final planning, to construct the railroad spur, and to begin promoting the new park in nationwide industrial circles, Johns pointed out.

The industrial park, a Tulare dream for more than a decade, will be located on 163 acres of land to be purchased from Manuel and Mary Souza and Mrs. Allene Souza, as guardian for the estate of Gabriel Souza, Jr.

The site is bounded on the east by Blackstone Street, on the south by Paige Avenue, on the north by Levin Avenue, and on the west by So. K Street from Paige almost to Continental Avenue and by So. O Street from there to Levin.

Another 16 acre plot has been purchased on the west side of K Street to insure rail access to the principal park site east of K.

The site has ready and quick access to both Business Route 99 and U.S. 99 Freeway, and also to the Southern Pacific Railroad and Tulare Airpark.

The park will be developed by increments, with money obtained from the sale of the first parcels to industry to be used for the development of additional parcels.

Eventually, the total investment will exceed $1 million.

It will be served by the heavy industrial-type Laspina-Levin sewer line, now nearing completion, which surrounds the park on three sides. The city of Tulare has agreed to put in utilities and the necessary roads and to sink a new water well.

Weekend sales totaling $12,700 put the stock sale over the $150,000 top.

Purchasers included Southern California Gas Co., $2,000; Marion K. and Floy Morgan, $1,000; A. J. and Ruth Elliott, $1,000; Albers Manufacturing Co., an industry which itself is just now building a new plant in Tulare, $1,000; Al Holland, $500; Mary Enid Ledbetter, $500; Dr. Lee H. Smith, $500; Harry Krikorian, $500; and Mr. and Mrs. William Wolfe and Harold Williams. There also were anonymous purchases of $5,000 and $500.

NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION ON GREECE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the National Student Association, at its 25th congress held this week in Washington passed a forceful resolution on Greece. The NSA has been active, especially through its Center for Greek Studies, in calling attention to continued American support for a military dictatorship which illegally seized power over 5 years ago.

I include below the text of the resolution:

GREEK MANDATE

Whereas, it is now more than five years since a military junta seized power in Greece and destroyed all of that country's free institutions, and

Whereas, despite repeated assurances by both the Johnson and Nixon administrations that democracy was rapidly being restored in Greece, the only assurance that the Greek junta has given in regard to the long-awaited elections is that they will not take place this year either, and

Whereas, arbitrary arrest and torture remain the common experience of the Greek people, and many of the noblest Greeks remain in prison or exile under inhuman conditions, and the weight of the junta's oppression has fallen with especial severity on Greek students, and

Whereas, despite the declared opposition of the U.S. Congress to military aid for the Greek regime, the Administration is endeavoring to expand its aid, both open and concealed, to the junta,

DECLARATION

Therefore, the United States National Student Association demands the implementation of the expressed will of the U.S. Congress by the immediate cessation of all U.S. aid to the Greek junta, whether direct or indirect, open or concealed, and reiterates the condemnation of the Greek dictatorship adopted by the 23rd National Student Congress.

MANDATE

The U.S.N.S.A. is mandated to:

(1) Continue and expand the work of the U.S.N.S.A. Center for Greek Studies.

(2) Support and assist Greek students who are victims of the junta's oppression or actively engaged in resistance to it, both within and outside Greece,

(3) Take action in regard to repression in Greece nationally, by raising the issue with candidates for office, members of Congress and of the Administration, with the U.N. and other international bodies, with the churches and peace organizations, in the press, and in all possible ways.

(Approved by the National Student Congress, August 17, 1972.)

PROVIDING TREATMENT FOR EVERY NARCOTICS ADDICT WHO SEEK IT: THE FIRST PRIORITY

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on August 9, 1972 there appeared in the Review and Outlook section of the Wall Street Journal an article entitled "The First Step." It is an extremely important article and I am inserting it in the RECORD so that it may have as wide an audience as possible.

We have been hearing much in recent months, from the administration, regarding progress in its declared war against narcotics addiction. Almost every

week there is a press conference featuring Mr. Ambrose, Mr. Ingersoll, or Mr. Kleindienst announcing some spectacular achievement in intercepting the narcotics traffic. Yet, despite all of the press releases, the estimated number of narcotics addicts in the Nation continues to grow, and the number of addicts in treatment remains at a level of less than 20 percent of the total addict population.

My Judiciary Subcommittee recently held hearings on narcotics treatment and rehabilitation programs in Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Alameda Counties, Calif. We found that in each of these counties existing narcotics treatment and rehabilitation programs are reaching only a small percentage of the estimated population. In all three counties there are waiting lists of narcotics addicts who want treatment, but cannot obtain it. In Los Angeles County alone, for example, there is a waiting list of over 2,300 persons unable at present to enter the Los Angeles County methadone maintenance program. We were informed that unless supplementary funding is obtained to expand the county's methadone program, it will take about 3 years to serve all of the patients presently on the waiting list.

The problem faced by Los Angeles County exists throughout the country. In every city examined by my subcommittee we have found actual waiting lists of narcotics addicts seeking treatment but unable to receive it. Even in those areas where there are no formal waiting lists established, we have found that newly established treatment programs fill up to capacity within days of their opening.

There is obviously a tremendous need for the expansion of treatment opportunities for narcotics addicts. Dr. Leon Marder of the Los Angeles County General Hospital testified that the minimum national need was for the creation of between 150,000 and 175,000 narcotics treatment slots. He estimates that if sufficient opportunities for treatment were made available and publicized, fully half of the Nation's narcotic addict population would seek treatment voluntarily. At the present time, however, there are only an estimated 30,000 narcotics treatment slots available nationwide.

Thus we are faced with the situation described by the Wall Street Journal: More than 20,000 narcotics addicts on waiting lists unable to obtain treatment. These addicts are being left on the streets with the need to support their habits through criminal activity while the administration issues press releases describing its successes in its war against heroin trafficking. As important as law enforcement efforts against heroin pushers are, and as much as I personally support the intensification of our national law enforcement programs against the heroin traffic, I believe that the administration has misplaced its priorities in its emphasis of law enforcement to the neglect of treatment and rehabilitation programs. Our greatest priority must be the providing of treatment and rehabilitation opportunities to every addict who seeks them.

I urge my colleagues to read the Wall Street Journal article, which I include in its entirety below:

THE FIRST STEP

Since our business gives us more than a glimpse of mankind's foibles and calamities, very few facts shock us anymore. But one that does set us brooding is that nearly all of the nation's 450 methadone programs have waiting lists.

Imagine the scandal that would surround the discovery of waiting lists for treatment for cancer, or heart disease or broken limbs. Yet we have people asking to be treated for drug addiction, which is not only a personal tragedy but a severe social problem, and they end up on waiting lists.

We recognize, of course, that methadone treatment remains somewhat controversial and experimental, and by no means a complete remedy for the drug problems. We further recognize that the problems associated with the expansion of the programs are real, not matters of mere good intentions or even mere money. Still, if the drug problem is as serious as all the rhetoric about it suggests, those in charge of efforts to combat it ought to be doing whatever they can to help. And it seems to us methadone is one of the very few useful tools anyone has found.

In any event, we have trouble understanding many of the objections to methadone that have fueled the controversy. The treatment consists of switching addicts from heroin to methadone, itself an addictive drug. While this allows them to lead more-or-less normal lives, methadone detractors object that it does not cure their addiction. This objection would of course make sense if anyone knew any method of curing addiction on a large scale, but no one does. So we simply cannot understand logic that would deny what little help is available to addicts seeking it, and also deny what little chance society has to reduce somewhat the costs it pays in addiction-related crime.

Even harder to understand is the ignorant question, if you give them methadone, why not heroin? To insure anything like proper supervision, addicts must generally be made to visit clinics to obtain their maintenance drugs. Methadone is administered orally once a day, while heroin would have to be injected about four times a day. Even more important, methadone blocks the effect of heroin. An addict maintained on heroin would be continuously tempted to try additional illicit heroin for a better "high."

It is proving difficult enough to supervise the distribution of methadone, for that matter, without supervising the distribution of heroin. Here is the real problem of the methadone programs. Addicts have learned to inject the drug, apparently no little trick, and produce a high. Methadone, presumably somehow diverted from supplies intended for maintenance programs, has turned up on the street; people have turned up addicted to methadone without ever having been addicted to heroin.

While this certainly demonstrates the difficulties inherent in any attempt to deal with drug addicts, it seems to us a problem that can be reduced to manageable proportions. Regulations have already been tightened to insure better supervision. This means competent people must be found and a great deal of time expended in supervision. Building such administrative machinery is always slow and difficult work, and this of course goes far toward explaining those waiting lists.

Even so, it seems to us a greater sense of urgency would pay dividends. Estimates place the total waiting lists at about 20,000 addicts. Some 85,000 are receiving treatment, out of a guessed-at 500,000 addicts in the nation. Despite our current suspicions about the federal budget, we even approve of the Nixon administration's decision to ask $135 million extra for anti-drug efforts, including $60 million for local treatment programs that often rely on methadone. But we think cities where the drug problem is acute should not stand around waiting for federal funds, but should find ways to press ahead with their own resources.

No expansion of methadone treatment will end the drug problem, because it cannot help addicts who do not want to be helped. They will remain a large number, and there probably is no way to cope with them except to rely on greater coercion of one type or another. But it seems clear, at least to us, that the first step is to insure that properly supervised methadone programs are avaible to any addict who asks for help.

A FORKED-TONGUE ADMINISTRATION

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it amazes me how often the Nixon administration has one of its junior members spout bountifully about freedom of information and how open the administration is about its policies.

It just ain't so.

The feeling downtown appears to be, why do anything in the open when it is easier to do it in secret.

The most recent instance of this aversion to scrutiny involves a man who performed a supreme service for his country, A. Ernest Fitzgerald.

Ernie Fitzgerald is the guy who blew the whistle on the sweetheart relationship between the Air Force and the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. Ernie caught the Air Force fudging its books and hiding cost overruns on the C–5A giant transport plane. These overruns were costing the taxpayers millions.

The Air Force managed to fire Fitzgerald under questionable circumstances. Now they are trying to muzzle a public hearing on the dismissal.

Ernie deserves his day in court and with all of the openness and freedom which the law allows.

While I support the Pentagon's right to appeal the court's ruling for an open hearing, I think the more the administration fights this development, the more it destroys the faith of the people in our government and the hope of judicial relief.

I would like to introduce into the RECORD at this time an editorial from the New York Times discussing the Fitzgerald case.

The editorial follows:

SECRECY SHROUD

When Richard M. Nixon was a Senator with a penchant for investigations he strongly defended the right of Government officials to testify frankly before Congressional committees. Unless military men and civilian employes "have complete freedom from reprisal," he said in 1951, "the scheduled hearings will amount to no more than a parade of 'yes' men for Administration policies."

Yet the Nixon Administration now, for reasons difficult to understand, is backing up fact that the cost-overruns and Mr. Fitzgerald, the civilian analyst who in 1968 exposed to a Senate committee the $2-billion

cost-overrun by Lockheed on the giant C5A transport. The mystery is increased by the fact that the cost-overruns and Mr. Fitzgerald's testimony about them occurred in the Johnson Administration.

The Air Force discharged Mr. Fitzgerald through the subterfuge of abolishing his job, but rumors were spread that he had engaged in questionable activities involving a "conflict of interest." A White House investigation of these innuendos early in the Nixon Administration cleared the analyst and even brought a recommendation for his promotion, according to columnist Clark Mollenhoff, a former member of President Nixon's staff. Nevertheless, Defense Secretary Laird with White House backing has supported the Air Force in its efforts to make the firing stick and even to deny Mr. Fitzgerald public, not closed, hearings in his bid for reinstatement.

A Federal District Court ruled that the closed hearings before the Civil Service Commission were an unconstitutional denial of due process. But the Justice Department, on Air Force urging, is now appealing this decision, although there is no security reason for secret hearings. The Air Force argument that privacy in such hearings is needed for now to insure preservation of evidence was rejected by the District Court on the indisputable ground that the employe, Mr. Fitzgerald, wants an open hearing.

Mr. Fitzgerald's right to take depositions now to insure preservation of evidence was also upheld by the District Court in response to his plea that some of his key witnesses inside the Air Force already have left or are dead and that files may vanish with time. But even this ruling is being appealed by the Administration.

The Air Force clearly would be embarrassed by open hearings that exposed its mishandling of the C5A contract and its questionable tactics in the Fitzgerald case. But elementary justice and the need to discourage cost-overruns—which exceed $28 billion on current weapons development programs—both suggest that the public interest would be served by the prompt scheduling of open hearings that put the facts before the country.

TUSKEGEE STUDY

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, on July 26, the New York Times and the Washington Post reported on a study of the effect of syphilis, conducted by the Public Health Service, on 400 black men in Tuskegee, Ala. In the 3 weeks since that report was issued, the horror initially experienced has grown to the point of outrage. We witness continuing accounts of doctors who curiously watched the debilitating effects of syphilis proceed unchecked in 200 human beings. At least seven cases resulted in death.

Alleged statements by these physicians, in justification of this hideous experiment, have been incredibly complacent. They have expressed certainty that, with current knowledge of treatment of this disease and the change in approach to human experimentation, such a study would not be conducted today.

These statements are rather less than convincing however, when one considers the fact, acknowledged by these physicians themselves, that an effective treatment of syphilis with penicillin, had been in active use for at least 20 years. Yet the victims were never even offered this treatment. Just this morning, the Washington Post carried an article from a medical journal which quotes a report by the Public Health Service stating that even the use of the limited treatment available before the discovery of penicillin could have benefited most of the syphilis victims. Apparently the chance to watch the full, deadly effects of this disease proved too enticing to the physicians conducting this study.

This case is particularly abhorrent in view of the deep-seated racism existing in this country. That the lives of a group of poor black men could be deliberately destroyed, reflects the total disregard that whites have historically shown for the lives of black people. The oft-heard charges of genocide, which have been lightly discounted as wild-eyed rhetoric, seem agonizingly close to the truth in this instance.

In a recent article in the Philadelphia Daily News, Mr. Chuck Stone discusses the question of genocide, a question which is increasingly in the minds of a growing number of black Americans. In viewing the Tuskegee study, along with important other factors, such as the disproportionate number of black veterans dying in Southeast Asia, or the failure of the Government to cut off the flow of narcotics from these same Southeast Asian countries into the veins of our black children, even the most moderate must ponder some very ugly possibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this Congress to move quickly with determination to allay the fears of black Americans by taking immediate action to prosecute the figures responsible for this hideous study, and to insure a just reparation for the victims and their families. I include the Washington Post article, and the article by Mr. Stone, in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 8, 1972]

DOCTORS COULD AID SYPHILITICS IN 1936, MAGAZINE CLAIMS

(By Jean Heller)

NEW YORK, August 17.—U.S. Public Health Service doctors had the knowledge and the medication as early as 1936 to cure black men participating in a federal syphilis experiment in Alabama, but the doctors withheld the treatment, a national medical magazine has reported.

Quoting from PHS' reports on the progress of the experiment, known as the Tuskegee Study, Medical World News reported that only 25 per cent of the untreated syphilitics were normal after several years of study, while all syphilitics treated with the best remedy known at the time were free from the disease.

The Associated Press disclosed last month that doctors at the PHS Center for Disease Control in Atlanta deliberately had denied treatment to participants in the Tuskegee Study, even after the discovery of penicillin, so that autopsies could be performed on those who died.

The treatment of syphilis in the 1930s and early 1940s consisted of weekly doses of mercury and bismuth followed by doses of arsenic. The treatment lasted between 18 months and two years.

CDC doctors have said the doctors who ran the study in the early years chose not to treat some 400 syphilitics with the arsenicals because the treatment could be worse than the disease and sometimes was fatal.

However, Medical World News quoted the CDC report, which indicated that early treatment was better than no treatment at all.

"Adequate anti-syphilitic treatment prevented all forms of clinical relapse . . . whereas only one-fourth of the Negroes with untreated syphilis were normal," the report said.

After disclosure of the study, current CDC officials in Atlanta said their records showed that seven men had died as a direct result of untreated syphilis. They also said at the time that the figure could be higher, and apparently it is.

CDC reports written in 1955, 1961 and again in 1971 said that of 92 untreated syphilitics autopsied between 1935 and 1953, "28 (or 30.4 per cent) had cardiovascular or central nervous system syphilitic lesions as their primary cause of death."

In an earlier report, CDC doctors found untreated syphilis shortened life expectancy among Negroes.

"The fact that nearly twice as large a proportion of the syphilitic individuals as of the control group had died is a very striking one," the report said. "It can be said that the life expectancy of a Negro man between the ages of 25 and 50 who is infected and receives no treatment is, on the average, reduced by about 20 per cent."

Present and past CDC doctors say that Tuskegee and surrounding Macon County, Alabama, were picked for the experiment because the area had the highest syphilis rate in the nation in 1932, when the study was undertaken.

Dr. Donald R. Printz, CDC's chief of clinical research, had said that of the men tested in the area in 1932, 80 per cent had positive blood tests for syphilis.

When CDC was asked to recheck that figure, officials conceded they had misread the areas' population breakdown. "Instead of being 80 per cent syphilitic and 20 per cent uninfected, Macon County in the 1930s was 80 per cent black and 20 per cent white," the medical magazine reported.

[From the Philadelphia Daily News, Aug. 1, 1972]

SYPHILIS AND GENOCIDE

(By Chuck Stone)

It either takes a tough constitution or a rancid morality to sit quietly by and watch 200 men die without doing anything about it.

I call it genocide. Have you got a better name for it?

The act of genocide was even officially sanctioned by the United States Public Health Service.

The experiment began 40 years ago with about 600 black men. Of those 600, about one-third were free of the disease; two-thirds showed evidence of syphilis. Of the syphilitic group, half were treated, but the other half—about 200—received no treatment. And they received no treatment even after penicillin was developed during World War II.

At first blush, the charge of genocide may be considered extravagant rhetoric. But, those 400 black men were "systematically and deliberately destroyed" as a racial group and that's exactly what genocide is.

Even my reaction is a delayed one because I was so revulsed by this official slaughter, I shied away from a comment. What do you say about a group of sadists who wear the snow-white uniforms of medical researchers which permit them to play God with the lives of human beings?

The 13-member Congressional Black Caucus shocked me back into reality with its demand yesterday that "everyone responsible for these hideous acts of crime be brought to justice."

The Caucus also called for reparations to be paid to the families and victims of this 40-year-long experiment.

In its demand for reparations, the Caucus resurrected an idea that enjoyed a wide currency in the black community a few years ago. Former SNCC Director James Forman demanded that America's churches pay reparations to black people for supporting American racism. The idea was contemptuously dismissed as far-fetched, but the Caucus's demand of yesterday gives it a renewed respectability.

"The overall effects of this immoral revelation," continued the Caucus's statement, "extend far beyond the lifelong sufferings of myriad black families and their unborn offspring. It poignantly reflects the deflated value that white people have historically placed upon black lives."

That's an extremely barsh indictment for a group of distinguished elected officials to level against the citizens of their own country.

But its harshness in no way compares to the devaluation of human life that the United States government placed upon the lives of a group of its own citizens.

Sure, in the name of scientific advance, there have been medical experiments in which the victims were injected with a disease or a virus to test the effectiveness of a newly discovered cure. They knew the possibility of death, but they also knew that the medical researchers were hanging in there all the time trying to save their lives.

Not the U.S. Public Health Service this time.

And I think that's an essential difference—that doctors or researchers who usually dedicate themselves to trying to save human beings this time sat casually by for 40 years and watched them slowly die without making any effort to help them to hold on to life.

During the last few years, there has been a rising tide of opinion in the black community that there is a "secret" or "unofficial" plot to wipe out black people.

The continued existence of "detention centers" around the country and some of the cattle round-up methods used by some officials have in dealing with dissent have not diluted that charge.

Family planning or planned parenthood has been widely viewed by many responsible black professionals and leaders as a subtle, but effective effort to destroy the black family and limit its growth.

The high rate of black veterans' deaths in Vietnam (12.5%) compared to the percentage in the armed services (9.8%) worries a black community who see its manhood being systematically wiped out.

And now comes along a U.S.-government-stamped genocide program that takes on some of the coloration of Hitler's systematic destruction of 6 million Jews.

Sure, dismiss the analogy as ridiculous and tut-tut me with the admonition that I'm really being paranoid.

But when you live in a country that deliberately facilitates the deaths of 200 of its citizens of an ethnic group of which you are a part, that's not paranoia.

That's "real-a-noia" and a lot of black people, like the Congressional Black Caucus, are wondering just how much their American citizenship is worth these days.

STUDENTS LOANS

HON. JAMES D. (MIKE) McKEVITT

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, it was a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction that I learned that Senate Joint Resolution 260 as amended by the House has been sent to the President for his signature.

To me, this measure was essential. Because of the new Higher Education Act and the new formulas, the allocations of funds to the States are yet to be determined. But the important thing is that with this measure we are moving. According to the Office of Education, student loan officers in the various States will soon have an idea of how much money is available and they can plan accordingly. This measure should help alleviate the problem, in most cases.

The fall term is upon us and many students in need of student assistance cannot get their loan application processed. They do not know whether they will be able to pursue their education or not. However, this bill, which will soon be on the President's desk, will assure the loan program and I know that many university and college administrators and students all over the Nation are relieved.

THE NATIONAL NUTRITION, FOOD AND FIBER ACT OF 1972

HON. FRANK E. DENHOLM

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, the future consumer demand for food and fiber at home and around the world is unknown. The need for an abundant quantity of food and fiber—of the highest quality of nutritional value is imperative in America, in Asia, in Europe, and for all mankind. The availability of the essential quantity and quality of nutritional food and fiber at a fair and reasonable cost to consumers is most important in every family budget at home and around the world.

A price and production program based on manipulation of Government controls and vested interests at public expense is not in the interest of people—consumers or producers, of this country or those suffering the misery of famine and starvation elsewhere in the world.

The national nutrition, food and fiber legislation that I am introducing today for the consideration of the Congress emphasizes the importance of people, compensates performance and production as opposed to the concepts of the past that have attempted to influence upward the price of food commodities by programs of scarcity and the expenditure of public funds for nonperformance and nonproduction with no consideration for people—consumers or producers.

Mr. Speaker, I include the proposal that I have introduced today in the RECORD as follows:

H.R. 16485

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, an Act to assure maximum national nutrition with the highest quality and greatest quantity of food and fiber at the lowest possible cost to consumers with emphasis on people, performance and production; and

To achieve a balance in the national economic growth and social stability by reducing or tending to reduce the cost of living, by reversing the pressures of continued inflation and by providing alternatives to economic coercion of national population trends; and

To encourage maximum conservation in the preservation of ecological and environmental values in the optimum utilization of human and natural resources; and for other purposes.

SHORT TITLE

This Act shall be cited as "The National Nutrition, Food and Fiber Act of 1972."

TITLE II—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 101. (a) FARM FAMILY UNIT.—Any person as defined by law, including a spouse and issue, head of a household, widow or widower that derives one-half or more of his or her earned annual gross income from the actual production and sales of food and fiber, or

(b) Any person as defined by law, including a spouse and issue, that derives one-half or more of his or her annual gross income from the ownership of land used in the production of food and fiber under a leasehold, share-crop or tenancy agreement with a producer, but not to exceed an annual sum in the aggregate in excess of one-half of the computed annual aggregate total of a qualified Farm Family Unit, as a producer or producers as defined in subsection (a) of Section 101 and notwithstanding any number of such landlord-tenant relationships the owner or owners of any such land used in the production of food and fiber shall not participate in the aggregate benefits in excess of $20,000.00 per annum as provided for a separate Farm Family Unit producer defined in subsection (a) hereof.

SEC. 102. (a) GROSS ANNUAL SALES.—The combined gross cash receipts first received for food and fiber actually produced by a Farm Family Unit in any calendar year or for such other approved 12-month accounting period, including the gross cash receipts plus the compensatory differential payments, not to exceed in the aggregate a gross combined total in the sum of $20,000 per annum.

(b) The gross annual sales shall constitute the combined amount of gross receipts from sales of food and fiber actually produced plus the compensatory differential payments.

(c) DIFFERENTIAL PAYMENTS.—The computed difference between the average market price and parity as defined by law.

SEC. 103. (a) "CARRY BACK" OPTION.—The Farm Family Unit as defined in subsections (a) and (b) of Section 101 of this title may exercise the option of applying sales against the limits of Gross Annual Sales for any next preceding 24-month period that product cash receipts plus compensatory differential payments were less than the allowable annual aggregate total of $20,000 for any one calendar year or such other approved 12-month accounting period and such carry back shall be first applied to the oldest accounting period at the current computed rate or rates in determining the limits thereof.

(b) "CARRY FORWARD" OPTION.—The Farm Family Unit as defined in subsection (a) or (b) of Section 101 of this Title may exercise the option of applying sales against the limits of gross Annual Sales for any next succeeding 36 month period, provided that the computation of Gross Annual Sales is first applied to the next succeeding calendar year, or such other approved 12 month accounting period, and the then computed rate or rates of the Gross Annual Sales shall be computed at current prices received plus compensatory differential payments not to exceed in the aggregate a sum total of $20,000 per annum.

TITLE III—COST OF LIVING PRODUCTION PAYMENTS

SEC. 101. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any Farm Family Unit, that markets food and fiber other than berries, market-garden vegetables, melons or tree fruits and sugar beets or cane, shall receive compensatory payments directly from the Government as a differential computed value not less often than semiannually, equal to the difference between the national average farm market price for each product sold and 90 per centum of parity on the first $20,000 of Gross Annual sales marketed in any one 12 month accounting period when the average market price received on such commodity or commodities is less than the determined value of 90 percent of parity thereon.

(b) Gross Annual Sales in excess of $20,000,000 for any 12 months period by a Farm Family Unit shall not be eligible for the computed differential payment unless applied and computed as provided in subsections (a) and (b) of Section 102 of this Title.

SEC. 102. (a) Any Farm Family Unit may exercise the option of applying sales against the limits of Gross Annual Sales for any next preceding 24 month period that product cash receipts plus compensatory differential payments were less than the allowable annual aggregate total of $20,000.00 for any one calendar year or such other approved 12 month accounting period and such "carry-back" shall be first applied to the oldest accounting period at the current computed rate or rates in determining the limits thereof.

(b) Any Farm Family Unit may exercise the option of "carrying forward" product sales against the limits of Gross Annual Sales for any next succeeding 36 month period, provided that the computation of Gross Annual Sales is first applied to the next succeeding calendar year, or such other approved 12 month accounting period, and the then computed rate or rates of the Gross Annual Sales shall be computed at current prices received plus compensatory differential payments not to exceed in the aggregate the sum total of $20,000.00 per annum in such acceptable accounting period of time.

(c) The Gross Annual Sales limitation per Farm Family Unit shall be adjusted not less often than annually with the rate of decline or increase of inflation in the total national economy according to government standards of the recorded national cost of living index.

TITLE IV—ADJUSTMENT PROVISIONS IN TRANSITION

SEC. 101. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, during the first five years of this Act, if the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture finds that the production of wheat, corn, cotton, feed grains, or any other commodity of production in any calendar year is excessive in relation to available market outlets and desirable strategic reserves, he may require as a condition precedent to receiving food and fiber parity payments, that each qualified Farm Family Unit shall restrict the acreage of those crops in over production to not less than 75 per cent of the acreage planted or harvested in the immediate past three years. An acreage of cropland equal to that diverted from such production shall be set-aside and used only for approved conservation, grazing, recreational and wildlife purposes upon the condition of approved practices of husbandry as may be prescribed by the Secretary and for a compensatory payment equal to the net average income of all acres of production of the Farm Family Unit.

SEC. 102. In any year in which the Secretary informs producers that an increase in acreage planted to any crop is needed to maintain adequate market supplies and rebuild carryover stocks to more desirable levels, the minimum fiber and food subsidy payments shall be increased by not more than 25 per centum over the level specified in section 1901 of title III of this Act.

TITLE V—CONSERVATION, PRESERVATION, AND RECREATION

SEC. 101. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, each farm family unit shall be entitled to ecological and environmental improvement payments equal to a maximum of 90 per centum of the actual cost of approved practices for land and water conservation, abatement of pollution, preservation of wildlife habitat, and the development of recreational facilities, not in excess of a maximum of $3,000 per annum or in the alternative a direct payment computation equal to the immediate 3-year average per acre net income of the remaining unit acres of production, whichever is greater for actual performance of prescribed practices of ecological and environmental improvement programs.

(a) The intent and purpose of a national effort of ecological and environmental improvement shall be predicated upon the national interest with emphasis on each Farm Family Unit and community improvement.

(1) Farm Family Unit participation shall be compensated upon performance as prescribed by the Secretary but in no case at a rate less than a sum equal to the net average per acre income of the remaining acres of production of the Farm Family Unit.

(i) Farm Family Unit participation in preservation of wildlife habitat and the development of rural recreational facilities shall be premised upon controlled public access as prescribed by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

(ii) The Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in prescribing public access to private lands shall rely upon the recommendations of the local, county and state elected Committee members of the existing Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service or such other elected "peer" group thereof.

(2) Farm Family Unit participation shall be emphasized and encouraged for the improvement of the community and national ecological and environmental conditions with preference practices for the Farm Family Unit but including community and regional projects participation as may be approved by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

TITLE VI—REPEAL OF CERTAIN PAST PRICE-SUPPORT LEGISLATION

SEC. 101. All previous legislation relating to price supports and production controls for wheat, corn and feed grains, now in effect are hereby repealed.

SEC. 102. No regulations issued under existing Federal market orders shall be adversely affected by this Act unless deemed to be in direct conflict with the provisions hereof and in such case the provisos of ths Act shall control, prevail and supersede the provisions of such federal market order(s) that increase or tend to increase consumer costs of food and fiber.

TITLE VII—INVESTMENT IMPROVEMENT INCENTIVE

SEC. 101. Each Farm Family Unit possessed of a vested interest in improvements on land shall be entitled to a 7 per cent investment credit against federal income tax liability in a sum equal to the multiple factor of assessed valuations for improvements in the same manner as prescribed in the Internal Revenue Code for personal property used in the production of income.

SEC. 102. The Investment Improvement Incentive Tax credit shall be otherwise administered consistent with and pursuant to the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and Acts amendatory thereto.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION CREDIT FOR FOOD AND FIBER PRODUCTION

SEC. 101. (a) The Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture shall establish and provide a system of long term, low interest rate credit for Farm Family Units in need thereof.

(1) Acquisition credit policies shall not exceed a level rate of interest in excess of 4 per cent per annum to qualified borrowers nor exceed a term of 40 years, either or both.

(2) Policies of credit shall provide for maximum participation of the private banking and credit systems with emphasis on the local banking credit facilities of the community in cooperation with the Farm Credit Systems and existing agencies of the federal government.

(3) Participating loans with approved local banks to Farm Family Units shall be fully guaranteed by the government secured by "black acre" with recourse, and,

(i) Land bank notes shall be negotiable in the commercial money market of the private sector of the national economy fully guaranteed by the Federal Government to preserve liquidity of the participating bank and banking interests and such notes secured by mortgage(s) and guaranteed by the Government shall be interchanged and acceptable by the Farm Credit System or exchanged in the private commercial money market to fully monetize the credit capacity of the borrower in acquisition of real property essential to the production of food and fiber and for other purposes as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

(ii) The participating bank or banks shall be paid not less often than semiannually, the difference between the level rate of interest (4 per centum per annum) paid by the borrower on the land acquisition loan, and the current money market rate of interest from funds and authorization granted by the Secretary of the U.S. Treasury through the U.S. Department of Agriculture directly to the participating bank(s) for administration and supervision of the acquisition loans approved to the borrower as a qualified Farm Family Unit. The Government shall have full recourse on all secured real estate mortgages so guaranteed subject only to the priority of the participating bank(s) as mortgagee and the Secretary shall reserve all rights of periodic examinations to verify the security interest of the Government without notice.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture shall have the authority to prescribe criteria for eligibility, participation and qualifications of banks, borrowers and participants with the advice and counsel of a local "peer" committee, such as the ASCS committeemen or such other designated group acting therein.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is directed to issue such regulations as shall be deemed essential and necessary to administer all titles of this Act in a fair, just, objective and orderly manner.

TELEPHONE CONVERSATION—PART III

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, this is the last in a series of telephone conversations between Lev Lerner of Leningrad and S. J. Lotwin of Los Angeles. It is a followup to the two prior conversa-

tions which I inserted this week in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TELEPHONE CONVERSATION, JULY 9, 1972, BETWEEN LEV LERNER, LENINGRAD, U.S.S.R., AND S. J. LOTVIN, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

L.L. Hello.

S.L. This is Stuart Lotwin, Lev.

L.L. Yes.

S.L. How are you?

L.L. Bad!

S.L. Bad?

L.L. Yes.

S.L. Would you recap, speaking slowly, what the situation is with you.

L.L. Sometime, about two weeks ago I got the last refusal.

S.L. Yes, I know. Continue on, Lev.

L.L. What?

S.L. Continue, two weeks ago you got the refusal.

L.L. Yes. Exactly—the formula of refusal is that I have in my disposal information which represents the State secrets. But it does not correspond to reality.

S.L. Yes, I know.

L.L. I know that on my first work was the meeting of Technical Committees of which has decided that I have no secret information.

S.L. Very good.

L.L. Because of this meeting there is no reason for the refusal for my whole family. Do you understand?

S.L. Yes, I understand perfectly. Lev, let me say this to you. There was an article in the newspaper in the United States yesterday that said the Russian Authorities are doing this to everyone who is an engineer.

L.L. Yes.

S.L. So, you have not been singled out.

L.L. Yes.

S.L. You see what I mean? Lev, you are now working on textile machinery, is that correct?

L.L. Yes, this is correct.

S.L. Before, what type of product did you work on? Do you know what I mean by product? What type things were you designing for? Do you understand?

L.L. Repeat once more please, loudly.

S.L. What kind of products were you engineering for?

L.L. Before?

S.L. Yes.

L.L. Before I worked as engineer on radio techniques.

S.L. On what?

L.L. Radio techniques.

S.L. O.K. I got that. I understand and we're trying to do something about this and we will. You are still working now though, aren't you?

L.L. No, now my work is on the textile machines.

S.L. Yes, on textile machines; but you're working, yes?

L.L. Yes.

S.L. Yes, good. How is Zina? Is she working?

L.L. She is working but the situation for her work is very unsteady.

S.L. Unsteady. Yes, but she's working now.

L.L. Yes, she is working now.

S.L. Fine! How is everyone otherwise? Is everything well?

L.L. Yes, it is so hard.

S.L. It's what?

L.L. Not very well and not very bad.

S.L. I see, but everyone's O.K. Your parents well?

L.L. Yes.

S.L. That's good. Lev, there's some people here who would like to know why you would like to go to Israel. Could you tell us why?

L.L. Repeat once more, Mr. Lotwin.

S.L. Yes, would you say on the telephone now the reason why you want to go to Israel.

L.L. Yes, I understand. Because we are sure that Israel is our historical and spiritual homeland and it is our national homeland and we could live only in Israel. Do you understand?

S.L. Yes, O.K., fine, very good. Lev, how is Asia? Is she in school? Has she had any trouble in school because of your desire to go to Israel?

L.L. No, there are no troubles in the school.

S.L. Well that's good. So, she has not been affected.

L.L. Yes.

S.L. Lev, there are a couple of other things I wanted to tell you.

S.L. On July 18th, in other words a week from Tuesday, there is a ship arriving in Leningrad that's coming from Hamburg. Our Rabbi is on that ship and he would like to meet you.

L.L. Yes.

S.L. Now, he does not have your telephone number, but I thought if I could give you his name; could you find out what ships are arriving at the port of Leningrad and perhaps meet him at the ship?

L.L. Yes.

S.L. O.K., his last name is Lewis.

L.L. Give him the number of my phone.

S.L. I don't know if he has your telephone number.

L.L. Yes.

S.L. He knows about you. He tried to call you with me on one of the days when we couldn't get through—when President Nixon was there. He wants to meet you but I do not know if he has your telephone number. So, could you find out what ship is coming from Hamburg, Germany to Leningrad on July 18?

L.L. July 18th?

S.L. Yes. His first name is Albert.

L.L. Albert?

S.L. Yes, that's correct.

L.L. The second name?

S.L. Lewis.

L.L. Lewis?

S.L. Lewis, yes correct. He is my Rabbi from Los Angeles.

L.L. Yes, I understand.

S.L. Good, and he would like to meet you and talk to you.

L.L. Yes, we shall wait.

S.L. Then you will try to do that? To meet him?

L.L. Yes, if it will be possible.

S.L. Good, fine. I will try to send him a cable with your telephone number.

L.L. It will be more convenient if he calls to us.

S.L. If he calls you! O.K. Now, I spoke yesterday to Howard Goldenson. Do you remember him?

L.L. Yes.

S.L. Yes, he called me yesterday and we had a very pleasant conversation about you.

L.L. Yes, thank you very much.

S.L. He also gave me the name and address of your relatives in Cleveland, and I will reach them as well.

L.L. Yes, thank you very much.

S.L. Good. There is a man in Cleveland, if we can get to him he can be a big help in getting your visa approved. We're going to try that approach, too.

L.L. Yes.

S.L. O.K. Now, I am glad to hear that you're working and we clearly understand the situation with your visa.

L.L. Yes, yes.

S.L. And I want you to know there are many people here who have been working very hard and you're getting very well known. Yesterday, on Saturday, there was an article in the newspaper about you that has been read—this newspaper is the biggest newspaper in the Western part of the United States—and you are on the first page of it.

L.L. Yes, I understand.

S.L. And you've also been on the radio here.

L.L. Yes.

S.L. And there are newspaper men and radio people who are going to call me in about an hour to learn of our conversation and then to do more about it. So, there's a lot of people who are trying and your name is getting well known in the press and that's got to help.

L.L. Yes.

S.L. And you're trying and you're going to make it, Lev. You understand?

L.L. Yes.

S.L. So, keep your spirits up and your confidence and when it seems bad, don't think that they are only singling you out because it is happening to just about everyone with an engineering degree.

L.L. Yes.

S.L. O.K. So, keep your spirits up because you are going to make it. I am sure of that!

L.L. Yes.

S.L. And I hope it's soon but we're going to have it happen. Now is there anything else you would like to say, Lev, today.

L.L. I want to ask you to say to all our friends that our only one dream is to get the permission for going to Israel and to live with our people in Israeli boundaries.

S.L. Very good, we will and we will have this known by many people as well.

L.L. Yes, thank you very much.

S.L. Lev, would you write a letter to me and I will send you more letters. I think my two letters have not gone through to you.

L.L. Yes, I have sent to you the letter.

S.L. Oh, good, good.

L.L. But did you send me the letter?

S.L. I sent you some letters and I will send you more letters next week. I am going to send you a series of letters including things which you will find interestng to read.

L.L. Yes.

S.L. O.K. I'll send a series of them and I'll send our picture. So if you write; I think if we write to each other every week, whether we get a letter or not, do that because it is good to hear from you, and I think it will be helpful to have letters.

L.L. Yes.

S.L. O.K. Listen, tell Zina's mother that I will give her regards to her brother this week.

L.L. Yes, thank you very much.

S.L. Yes, and also if you will give our regards to your family.

L.L. Yes, and send our greetings to your family, too, and to all our friends.

S.L. I certainly will.

L.L. Yes, thank you very much.

S.L. And what I'll do is I will call you back—probably the beginning of August.

L.L. Yes, thank you but it will be more convenient if it will be on Sundays at the same time.

S.L. Sundays, at this time.

L.L. At the same time, yes.

S.L. The reason we called the other time was because of the people from the newspaper and radio who wanted to talk to you, but we will call you . . .

L.L. It was impossible, yes?

S.L. Yes.

L.L. You couldn't hear me.

S.L. Yes, it was impossible and, I think, deliberate.

L.L. Yes.

S.L. Do you understand?

L.L. Yes, I understand everything.

S.L. So, we'll talk to you the beginning of August this time.

L.L. Yes, thank you very much.

S.L. O.K., fine. So say . . .
L.L. On Sunday at the same time.
S.L. Yes, Sunday. O.K.
L.L. Thank you.
S.L. And Shalom, Lev.
L.L. Shalom to you and to your family.
S.L. Thank you, goodbye now.
L.L. Goodbye.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE RALPH TYLER SMITH

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I join with other members of the Illinois delegation in expressing a personal sense of loss in the passing of former Senator Ralph Tyler Smith, taken from his family and countless friends in the very prime of a productive and distinguished life.

Born in Granite City, Ill., on October 6, 1915, he was graduated in 1937 from Jacksonville's Illinois College and was awarded a law degree from Washington Law School in St. Louis, Mo., in 1940. He began the practice of his profession in Granite City where he joined the U.S. Naval Reserve immediately after Pearl Harbor. As a commissioned officer, he served for 5 years in both the Atlantic and Pacific combat theaters.

After release from active duty, he resumed the practice of law and then sought elective office in 1954. He served 15 years in the Illinois House where his qualities of leadership were recognized by his selection as majority whip and speaker. He was appointed to the Senate of the United States in September of 1970, and served until January of 1971.

Throughout his career he was known for the loyalty he deeply felt and convincingly demonstrated to his country, his State, his party, and his friends. His strongest public stands were taken on issues of fiscal responsibility. As speaker of the Illinois House, he evinced outstanding legislative leadership and sagacity in gaining enactment, by a closely divided body, of his Governor's programs, including the first income tax in the State of Illinois.

At the time of his death, he was devoting his entire energies to practicing law and to participation in church, fraternal, and community affairs. He had refused to abate his effort notwithstanding earlier heart attacks in the past 2 years. He was a past president of the Optimist Club, director of the Greater Alton Association of Commerce, president of Alton Shrine, elder of the College Avenue Presbyterian Church, and a valued member of many other fraternal and civic groups.

I extend my sincere sympathy to his wife, Mary, and to his daughter, Sharon Lynne. Among their cherished memories of their husband and father is their recollection of his role as a dedicated public servant.

YOUTH, DRUGS, AND MINIMUM WAGES

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, those who have advocated an increase in the minimum wage as a way in which to help the disadvantaged—the poor, the young, and the black—have produced a situation in which almost exactly the opposite effect is brought about.

Prof. James Tobin, a member of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Kennedy, pointed out that:

> People who lack the capacity to earn a decent living should be helped, but they will not be helped by minimum wage laws, trade union pressures, or other devices which seek to compel employers to pay more than their work is worth. The likely outcome of such regulations is that the intended beneficiaries are not employed at all.

A similar view has been expressed by Dr. Robert M. Reese, executive director of the Ohio Vocational Association. He noted that:

> For years, vocational educators and others have worked diligently to change work laws for youth so that they could obtain experience in employment.

He went on to say, in a letter to columnist Alice Widener, that the recent Senate proposal for a $2.20 minimum wage would "wipe out all the gains we have made in enabling lower-ability, disadvantaged youth to get the motivation of work to stay in school and become productive citizens."

Mrs. Widener, discussing the effect of joblessness among young people and the related rise in narcotics addiction, refers in her article to a question asked by the New York Daily News of an Indiana boy.

The question was:

> How much do you know about the danger of drug addiction?

The answer:

> A whole lot. It's a problem in my hometown . . . Why did these students use drugs? It gave them something to do. I worked every day after school, from 1 p.m. to 9 p.m., so I had plenty to do.

The steady increase in minimum wage laws has made it almost impossible for teenagers to find employment. Such increases, instituted by those who proclaim themselves to be the friends of the "underprivileged," have had an unfortunate result. They have, as with so many Government programs, hurt the very people who were meant to be helped.

I wish to share Alice Widener's column, "Youth, Drugs, and Minimum Wage," with my colleagues. It appears in Human Events of August 16, 1972.

The column follows:

YOUTH, DRUGS, AND MINIMUM WAGE

(By Alice Widener)

Dr. Robert M. Reese, executive director, Ohio Vocational Association, recently wrote in support of my column on youth, work, the minimum wage and child labor laws, "For years vocational educators and others have worked diligently to change work laws for youth so that they could obtain experience in employment."

Dr. Reese went on to say that the recent Senate proposal for a $2.20 minimum wage would "wipe out all the gains we have made in enabling lower-ability, disadvantaged youth to get the motivation of work to stay in school and become productive citizens."

Besides motivation to stay in school, jobs for teen-agers have another great advantage eloquently expressed, Aug. 2, 1972, by an Indiana boy in answer to the New York *Daily News* Inquiring Fotographer, who asked young people, "How much do you know about the danger of drug addiction?"

Larance E. Vinson, 18, a recent high school graduate, Elwood, Ind., replied: "A whole lot. It's a problem in my home town. We've had movies in high school and I know a few students who got sick from overdoses. Why did these students use drugs? It gave them something to do. I worked every day after school, from 1 p.m. to 9 p.m., so I had plenty to do."

That is a most cogent reply. Every member of Congress should read it. Larance obviously put in an eight-hour work day after each school day. Many parents and sociologists might describe such a schedule as cruel. A glance at Larance's handsome, happy, healthy face shining out from the *Daily News* gives the lie to such a judgment.

The young man is obviously the diametric opposite of the pathetic, apathetic or spoiled-rotten idle youth who turns to drugs because he desperately needs, and either consciously or unconsciously wants, "something to do" but isn't trained to do it or spurred on to do it.

Recently it was announced on the noon radio news that the number of teenagers in New York City has soared during the last decade and there are now 70,000 more than in 1960. That is about as many individuals as the entire population of Reno, Nev. With schools closed for three months and teen-age jobs lacking is it surprising there is a tragic increase in street crimes of all kinds, in youth gang warfare, youthful drug addiction, and juvenile delinquency?

When are we going to learn that idleness breeds mischief among teen-agers? When are we going to add up the youth-drugs-unemployment score and quit spoiling our young people by supporting them financially from 13 through 21? When are parents and teachers going to spend as much time in stressing money-jobs education as sex education? Winston Churchill said, "Everyone must work. . . . I do not understand those foolish people who waste their lives killing time till time kills them."

Killing time by young people is maiming and killing many of them through drug addiction arising from idleness. That's what 18-year-old Larance E. Vinson says and he is 100 per cent correct. He should be interviewed on TV nationwide.

HOW CHILDREN LEARN

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, at the recent early childhood conference I sponsored in Idaho, three panels were featured on the program. All did an excellent job of pinpointing some of the

issues that have come up in the early childhood field and in identifying some of the obstacles that we have to overcome and problems that we must solve as we move ahead to meet the needs of young children.

Dr. Wylla Barsness, assistant professor of psychology at Boise State College, chaired a panel on "How Children Learn." The group discussed some of the ways we can help children get the best possible start on their learning and let them live in the fullest way. Panelists include Margaret Arnold, teacher at St. Michael's Cooperative Preschool in Boise; Corrine Berg, teacher in the Boise Public School kindergartens; Judy Schrag, consultant, Idaho Department of Social and Rehabilitative Service; and Mary C. Smith, kindergarten supervisor, Boise Public Schools.

I would like to include an excerpt from the panel in the RECORD:

HOW CHILDREN LEARN

(By Margaret Arnold)

We are apt to make an artificial distinction between learning and living. We treat preschool and kindergarten programs as experiences to prepare children for the "real" thing to come. But children, and all of us, learn as we experience and every experience provides learning. The question we are asking is "What kind of experiences do we provide?" "How do we let learning happen?" "What are the optimal conditions for learning?"

It is necessary to provide for various elements in a child's early learning environment in order to provide for later development of the child. For example, nutrition of adequate quantity and quality is a necessary environmental element for early development of infants and children. Researchers such as Birch, Platt, and Cravioto have suggested that a critical period for good nutrition exists from 0–18 months and that once this critical period is over, nutrition rehabilitation introduced does not result in the return to normalcy of the affected central nervous system. Their research has shown that children who have experienced acute malnutrition and prolonged malnutrition during infancy and early childhood results in a reduced number of brain cells, reduced brain size and composition, and difficulties in intersensory integration necessary for later learning in school.

A second essential environmental element in early learning is the presence of a climate fostering adequate personality development. A child learns through his feelings as well as his thoughts. The cognitive function is seen as interactive, not independent of the affective function. A child's attitude toward himself as a competent person of worth or as an inept person of little worth will necessarily affect his ability to cope with his environment. It is not necessarily the amount of knowledge and skills which will insure school success, but rather his attitude toward himself as a capable and competent person who can effectively use those skills. An optimal environment fostering personality development stresses genuine relationships with adults who are understanding and supportive of a child's developmental thrusts toward trust, autonomy, and initiative.

Another dimension of an optimal environment for learning is early stimulation. Learning theorists such as Hebb and Piaget have stressed the importance of early sensory and perceptual experiences for problem solving and learning in subsequent periods of development. Researchers have suggested that where the environment rates high in stimulation value, a baby's DQ increases between the ages of 6–12 months—where that stimulation value is low, the baby's DQ is likely to drop. A stimulating environment for the preschool child includes access to many play materials and play experiences. A child learns through his own explorations and through rehearsing and reliving experiences through play. The child, in play, is master of the outcome and thereby develops an increasing ability to cope with the real world.

Other optimal conditions for learning include rich and varied cultural experiences, a social learning environment, and a positive emotional climate.

SUCCESSFUL FARMFEST, U.S.A., ANTICIPATED

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation to the Congress for its agreement to a joint resolution authorizing the President to invite foreign nations as well as the States of our Union to participate in Farmfest, U.S.A., to be held during September in my congressional district in Minnesota.

I was the original author of this resolution, introduced September 28, 1971, in behalf of our entire Minnesota delegation in the House of Representatives, and I am delighted that it has received favorable consideration.

It may be of interest to our Members to know that anywhere from 250,000 to 500,000 persons are expected to attend Farmfest, which its sponsors believe will be the largest agricultural exposition ever held. The weeklong event from September 11 to 17 on the Bert Hanson farm adjacent to Vernon Center, Minn., will feature world, national, and State plowing contests along with exhibits, demonstrations, and such top-flight entertainment as Bob Hope, Roy Rogers, and Dale Evans and country-western star Charlie Pride.

There is also a good possibility that one or both presidential candidates will appear at Farmfest.

At the present time, some 40 competitors from at least 20 countries around the world will be competing during the exposition for the title of world's best plowman. It will be only the second time that the United States has served as host country for the worldwide plowing matches.

Certainly, this agricultural exposition is an event that will boost worldwide friendship and international farm trade as well as serve as a great showcase for farmers, their products, implements, and agribusiness allies. We are grateful to all those in Minnesota who are working so diligently to make this enormous undertaking successful and memorable.

GOVERNOR REAGAN VETOES IMPORTANT FARM JOBLESS BILL

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, once again the legislature of my home State of California has pioneered much needed social legislation.

California already has a reputation for progressive legislation concerning education, welfare assistance, and medical aid to the indigent. The California Legislature recently reaffirmed this tradition with their approval of unemployment insurance for farm workers. Unfortunately. Governor Reagan has once again chosen to turn his back on the needs of the people by vetoing this important bill.

California is the breadbasket of the Nation. Its agricultural industry produces 40 percent of all the food and fiber grown in the Nation. The farmworkers are, in turn, the heart of this industry. For too long the farm laborer has been denied the social benefits uniformly granted to all other workers.

There is no reason why someone who works in the field should not be treated with the same dignity and respect that is accorded to white- and blue-collar workers. Farmworkers, after all, are the people responsible for placing the food on our dinner table.

Apparently Governor Reagan does not appreciate the important position of the farm laborer in our society. Moreover, he is apparently blind to other economic benefits to be gained from this legislation.

In the past, farmworkers have been forced to apply for welfare, particularly low wages of the agricultural industry and the seasonal nature of the work. This legislation would have guaranteed a steady income for farmworkers who live by following the harvest around the State. The veto of this bill is a blow to the taxpayers of the State.

At this point in the RECORD, I insert a column from the California AFL–CIO News of August 4, 1972, entitled "Labor Hails Passage of Farm Jobless Pay Bill." Apparently the hailing was too early:

LABOR HAILS PASSAGE OF FARM JOBLESS PAY BILL

Senate action Wednesday giving final legislative approval to a State AFL–CIO bill extending unemployment insurance to farm workers was praised by the Labor Federation this week as "one of the most significant steps the legislature has taken in recent years to help curb the growth of the state's welfare rolls."

That was the comment of John F. Henning, Executive Secretary-Treasurer of the California Labor Federation, AFL–CIO, after the Senate approved AB 205, a labor-backed bill introduced by Assemblyman Jack R. Fenton (D-Los Angeles) on a 21 to 12 vote Wednesday night.

"California's general taxpayer has been obliged for generations to pay the welfare costs of thousands of farm workers who are forced to apply for welfare, particularly

from November to March or April every year, largely because of the low wages that have haunted the industry and the seasonal nature of the work.

California agriculture is a $5 billion industry, producing more than 40 percent of all of the food and fiber grown in the nation. There is absolutely no just reason to continue to exclude farm workers from unemployment insurance coverage.

"On the contrary, as the leading agricultural state, California has an obligation to lead the way in bringing farm workers into the mainstream of American life and at the same time easing the welfare costs borne by the state's general taxpayers," Henning declared.

The Senate approved the bill after Senator Nicholas Petris (D-Oakland) urged support for it saying:

"The time has come to lift the mortgage off their backs."

Henning noted that unemployment insurance has long been available to cannery workers, building tradesmen and other workers in seasonal industries.

Voting for the State AFL-CIO-backed bill were:

Senators Alquist (D); Behr (R); Beilenson (D); Collier (D); Dills (D); Gregorio (D); Grunsky (R); Holmdahl (D); Kennick (D); Mills (D); Moscone (D); Nejedly (R); Petris (D); Roberti (D); Rodda (D); Short (D); Song (D); Stiern (D); Teale (D); Wedworth (D); and Zenovich (D).

Opposed were:

Senators Biddle (R); Bradley (R); Burgener (R); Carpenter (R); Coombs (R); Deukmejian (R); Harmer (R); Marler (R); Schrade (R); Stevens (R); Way (R); and Whetmore (R).

TRIBUTE TO J. HAROLD MOORE

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished businessman in my congressional district, Mr. J. Harold Moore, will retire on September 1, after serving with the Bell Telephone System for 42 years. He has spent his last 10 years in California as general manager of Western Electric's service operations on the west coast.

I have had the pleasure of touring the Western Electric facility in Sunnyvale with Mr. Moore and particularly noticed the atmosphere of dedication and congeniality among his employees. I am sure this was a direct result of the kind of leadership Mr. Moore has provided. His company and his employees are involved in many community affairs, all of which are designed to make their community a better place in which to live.

Of special note is Western Electric's drug abuse program and the booklet, "Parents Guide to Marijuana," prepared as a community service by the company. Over 5 million copies of this booklet have been published and distributed by Western Electric and other companies and service organizations.

Mr. Moore's personal involvement in community activities has been varied. This year he is general chairman of the U.S. Treasury Department's savings bond drive in commerce and industry. He is past chairman of the Santa Clara County Metro of the National Alliance of Businessmen; and he has served in many capacities with the Santa Clara County United Fund, the Sunnyvale Chamber of Commerce and with Junior Achievement.

There is much more that can be said about this fine gentleman. But in paying tribute to Mr. Moore on the occasion of his retirement, I would like to emphasize that his business successes throughout his entire career have always been turned to the betterment of mankind, a worthy characteristic we should all emulate for a better world.

TELEPHONE PRIVACY—XXXVIII

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 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 36th 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:

MENOMONEE FALLS, WIS.,
August 13, 1972.

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

DEAR SIR: I'd like to voice my support for the bill pending in Congress H.R. 14884! As a typically busy mother—nursery school registration chairman, United Fund, P.T.A., brownies, substitute teaching, channel 10 T.V., auction, sewing and mothering—I don't need any unsolicitated phone calls. Last week alone I had 3 calls within 2 days from the *same* carpet firm—needless to say I wasn't overjoyed! Anything you can do to get this bill passed will be greatly appreciated by many of us.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
August 9, 1972.

DEAR SIR: I would like to voice support for the bill pending in Congress, H.R. 14884, under which all you would need to do is to tell the telephone company that you don't want to be bothered by solicitors. The number of these calls is constantly increasing here and they are extremely annoying.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

ST. FRANCIS, WIS.,
August 15, 1972.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you and urging you to please help to have bill H.R. 14884 passed. It would be wonderful not to be bothered by all the telephone solicitors.

Thank you.

——— ———.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

MR. ASPIN: We are in full support of Bill H.R. 14884 pending in Congress to stop the use of the telephone as a selling media and will urge all our friends to voice their support of this bill.

——— ———.

CUDAHY, WIS.,
August 10, 1972.

REPRESENTATIVE LEE ASPIN: I am writing this note out of desperation, to voice my support for the bill pending in Congress, HR-14884.

I certainly do believe that the public should have some control over telephone solicitors. We pay our monthly telephone bills so we may have the convenience of such a service; not so people out to sell us something can use this service.

Not only are these ever increasing calls a nuisance but, I feel that in the privacy of my own home, I should not have to be subjected to such high pressure and irritating antagonisms.

However, there is another aspect to this issue I also find it awkward and embarrassing at times, when such philanthropic organizations as the veterans, all church groups, and all fund raising campaigners call to ask you to buy, give or canvass the neighborhood for contributions.

I feel guilty saying no to these people but in all practicality we are not financially able to contribute to all the groups that call upon us. We have enough coming to our door, to whom I find it too difficult to say no.

With our complete phone directory services and transportation so readily available, it is my opinion that the consumer can go to the supplier when in need of a service or product. At least my family can and wish to do it this way.

When we are in need, we will *go* get it, but in the meantime we don't want to be bothered by these telephoning agents, who incidently have selected you at random, to be the recipient of a special introducing offer, to receive many free gifts or to allow you to invest in some promising business adventure. How much this will all cost is anyone's guess, but it won't look as good on black and white as it sounds over the phone.

Mr. Aspin, I urge you to continue in your efforts concerning the passage of this bill and I hope your co-sponsors will all work diligently concerning this issue.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

EQUITABLE TREATMENT FOR FOREIGN SERVICE EMPLOYEES

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions in the past I have called the attention of the House to serious problems of denial of due process and democratic procedures to employees of the Foreign Service of the United States. Since early 1968, when I introduced legislation calling for an appeals mechanism outside the State Department for Foreign Service officers, I have observed with growing incredulity the ever-proliferating devices to which management can resort to deny due process and fair-play to employees. The case of John Hemenway, a former FSO who was selected out of the State Department, is one instance in which State abuses have received public attention. After a strenuous battle, Mr. Hemenway finally was accorded an appeals hearing on the merits of his case and, after over 2 years in process, a decision on his grievance may be shortly forthcoming.

Recently, Mr. Hemenway voiced opposition to amendments to the constitution of the American Foreign Service Association—AFSA—the group which includes many Foreign Service employees in its membership. As AFSA is involved in the affairs of the Foreign Service, Mr. Hemenway's differences with that organization, of which he is a member, could possibly play an important role in the present drive to secure equitable treatment for Foreign Service employees in their grievance recourses. I insert at this point Mr. Hemenway's letter of August 17 to the chairman of the board of AFSA:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 17, 1972.

AMERICAN FOREIGN SERVICE ASSOCIATION,
Chairman of the Board,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HARROP: In my letter to you of August 11, 1972, I recorded your personal involvement in attempts to censor materials I wish to send to the American Foreign Service Association (AFSA) membership under Article XI, Section 3 of the AFSA By-Laws. This letter records more fully your efforts at censorship, for the record.

In effect, by various devices, you and other members of the AFSA Board have placed obstacles in my way deliberately to make more difficult the exercise of rights of membership, in this case, my opposition to your proposed amendments to the Certificate of Incorporation (Constitution). I do not have to tell you that censorship can be exercised by a variety of means besides outright deletion or excision of material (which the Board also appears ready to do). In my view, the most insidious of your maneuvers are those calculated to delay my access to the members so long that my communications will become moot through tardiness.

Surrogates for censorship used by you and the Board have included: (a) demands for payment for the AFSA mailing list; (b) insistence that my mailing to the membership meet the Board's test of "germaneness"—even though I was opposing the Board's own amendments; (c) restrictions on the length of my statement of opposition circulated to the membership; (d) various artificial contrivances as the requirement that the address stickers I was required to pay for not be removed from the AFSA Club until attached to envelopes I had provided for the mailout.

Delay—one of the key motivations for all censorship—already has resulted from the Board's action.

The purpose of this letter is to set down as a matter of record various attempts by you and the AFSA Board to suppress information I wish to send to the AFSA membership at my own expense. You are obstructing my efforts to inform the membership that the wise course would be to reject the amendments to the AFSA certificate proposed by you and the AFSA Board.

1. *At the June 28, 1972 Annual Business Meeting,* I requested precise information concerning salaries the Board sought to "regularize" by amending the Certificate. No adequate explanation was ever offered at that meeting. To this day no one (outside the Board) knows what must be "regularized". The term "regularize" was used in the July and August *Foreign Service Journal* in transmitting official Board positions endorsing the amendments. The presumption therefore persists among many informed AFSA members in Washington that something is or was not regular with present Board financial arrangements concerning:

(a) Previous borrowing from the scholarship fund;

(b) Borrowing to cover borrowing from the scholarship fund, now presumably paid back;

(c) Payment of salaries to Board members in the approximate amount of the amounts which have been borrowed.

2. *Restriction by you of opposition statement to 600 words* was, in itself, hardly conducive to "openness". When eight amendments are involved, such restrictions are a blatant curtailment of open discussion. It is a dodge for censorship. Simply to cite the language used in the eight amendments and the changes made would have taken more than 600 words!

My protest to this limitation was met by a deadline of only three (3) hours to get a 600 word protest into the *Journal*. Yet, the *Journal* was not mailed for another three weeks, leaving one to wonder why more time could not have been given me. Twenty-four hours would have been a help.

3. *Denied the right of an adequate statement in the Journal, I decided to contact the membership by mail.* This is the right of any member, under Article XI, Section 3 of the By-Laws. Here I was confronted with a host of problems designed to defeat my decision, delay the mailout, or reduce its effectiveness as an oppostion statement. My suggestions that the ballots and arguments of both sides be sent by first class mail were rejected.

4. *Payment for the list* was required from me, personally, although the list seems to have been given to others for no payment on other occasions. It is a requirement of the By-Laws that the Association address the envelopes for such a mailing; the By-Laws make no reference to payment for this service.

5. An Amendment Committee, hand-picked by you personally and endorsed by the AFSA Board, which is pushing the amendments, did not contain a single opponent of the proposed amendments despite my specific suggestion that this would facilitate communication.

6. *The right you demanded to censor* my statement to the membership was expressed a number of times, but nowhere more clearly than the demand you had the Executive Director communicate to me on 11 August, 1972, which I made a matter of record in my letter to you of that date. You required that I make a statement as follows:

"I recognize the right of the AFSA Board to examine the contents of my mailing prior to my being allowed to remove the envelopes (bearing addresses) from the AFSA premises."

In my letter to you of 11 August, 1972, I told you this was a crass effort at censorship.

7. *Allegedly to "protect" the AFSA membership list* (in view of the upcoming elections under EO 11636, it was explained), but in reality in support of the censorship mentioned above, I was forced to affix address labels on the envelopes in the AFSA Club Building. My alternative to this arrangement—stated by the AFSA Board—was to pay an additional $84.00 (bringing the total to $184.00). Envelopes and postage extra, of course! There are a number of problems with this position of yours:

(a) It directly suggests that my opposition to the proposed constitutional amendments is somehow disloyal to AFSA—that I would work against AFSA's best interests.

(b) In fact, I am trying to defend the existing Constitution against what I consider improper usurpations by you and the present AFSA Board. Those of our colleagues who are in the field know little of past unauthorized actions of the AFSA Board and I am trying to inform them, against your opposition. You know very well that these amendments are only the first step to facilitate major revisions in the governing By-Laws of AFSA.

8. *When finally given me, the AFSA mailing list was unmanageable,* for it contained more than 10,000 names (AFSA membership is 7,252). Additional time and expense will be required to go through the names (which are jumbled and random) to find the 3,000 or so duplicate or improper names.

9. *Improper attitude of the AFSA Board* was demonstrated on many occasions, but at on time more appallingly than at the August 14, 1972 Board Meeting, which met to censor me, when Mr. Harris suggested that there was nothing to prevent me from using the US mails to contact anyone I cared to contact. His conclusion may have been that, therefore, the AFSA Board was not and could not "censor" me. That misses the point. To defeat the proposed amendments, I must contact AFSA members who are entitled to vote on the issue. To contact the Foreign Service generally through the Foreign Service list serves no purpose; it would greatly increase my costs. I must have contact with the membership; you, Mr. Harris, and the Board are inhibiting that contact and depriving the membership from having my views, which they can either accept or reject.

In sum, as I said in my *Journal* statement which was written on three hours notice, this matter has provided a very severe test for the much-proclaimed "openness" policy of the present AFSA Board. I think, Mr. Harrop, you and the Board have flunked the test. In that you share something in common with Mr. Macomber, whose policies you seem determined to promote—whether or not they are in the interests of the AFSA membership, the Foreign Service of the United States, or, for that matter, even larger interests.

I do not want to labor the point, but if you were really interested in protecting AFSA interests in the affairs of EO 11636, you would realize that possesion of the AFSA membership is irrelevant. The Foreign Service list is far better suited for someone grinding axes in that struggle. Practically all persons on the Foreign Service list (except CIA, DOD, Treasury and the like) can vote under EO 11636. Many people on the AFSA list can *not* vote under EO 11636. But they *can* vote against your proposed amendments to the AFSA Constitution. That is the vote that interests me and should interest the AFSA membership; no doubt that accounts, in part, for your obstructionist tactics in providing me with the AFSA list, as required by Article XI of the By-Laws.

Under your leadership, AFSA has failed to

meet your own test of "openness" when you upheld the decision in an undated letter, of Mr. Michael Gannett, who wrote me:

"It should be understood that your additional statement will have to be germaine (*sic*), as judged by the Committee, to the proposed amendmends (*sic*)." (mis-spelling in the original.)

On August 15, 1972, on instructions from the AFSA Board, AFSA Executive Director Gerald Bushnell wrote me the following:

"In reference to items (2) through (6) listed in paragraph six of your *Outline for AFSA Board Meeting 14 August 1972*, the Board was unable to determine the germaneness of the additional material you proposed. . . ."

My items (2) through (6) to which Mr. Bushnell referred, were the following:

(2) A record of my difficulties in attempting to oppose the AFSA Board in these amendments.

(I believe this germane to all of the amendments.)

(3) Extracts from financial reports showing payments that are to be "regularized."

(Pertinent and germane to amendment no. 4.)

(4) Extracts from recent Congressional Hearings showing attempts of AFSA Board members to attempt to influence legislation and to carry on propaganda.

(Germane to amendment no. 4)

(5) Commentary on the ballot as published with the two statements; what to do to recall your ballot if it is already sent before this mailing was received and therefore marked incorrectly through error or misinformation.

(Germane to all of the amendments.)

(6) A return card that acknowledges that the addressee has received this mailing.

(Germane to this opposition mailing.)

You and the Board stand condemned by your own actions and record in this effort to censor me. The membership of AFSA—your own colleagues in the Foreign Service in Washington and in the field—deserve competency from a leadership aggressively dedicated to their interests. In fact, you and the present Board have supported elements of special interest within management circles of the Department of State which is supervising the noticeable decay of all standards in the service—including tenure and security for competent employees. Unfortunately, I have had to conclude that your decisions, individually and collectively as the AFSA Board, have been colored by your own personal future career planning—not the best interests of AFSA and its membership.

You might wish to comment on the "germaneness" of this letter, for I intend to send it to the entire membership of AFSA and to anyone else who might be interested.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. HEMENWAY.

ELLEN FULLARD-LEO: GRANDE DAME OF HAWAII AMATEUR ATHLETICS

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, honored in Honolulu earlier this month, on the eve of the summer Olympic Games in Munich, was a lady who was saluted by several generations of amateur athletes, including former Olympians. Mrs. Ellen Fullard-Leo, now 88, devoted 64 amazing years to the advancement of amateur athletics not only in Hawaii but also elsewhere in the world.

Affectionately called the "grande dame of amateur athletics" in Hawaii, Mrs. Fullard-Leo at age 32 became the first woman on the AAU Board, and she still serves in that capacity. Recently, the AAU presented her a veteran's award and made her a life member. As a member of the U.S. Olympic Committee, she also served as an official at the first Pan-Am Games in 1951.

In order that others may derive enjoyment from reading about this delightful person in the world of amateur sports, I am submitting for inclusion in the RECORD an article entitled "She Has Built Her Life Around Amateur Athletics," which appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and Advertisers of August 6, 1972, and another, entitled "Mrs. Fullard-Leo, 88, Is Saluted Here," which appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of August 16, 1972:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and Advertiser, Aug. 6, 1972]

SHE HAS BUILT HER LIFE AROUND AMATEUR ATHLETES

(By Ben Kalb)

When Mrs. Ellen Fullard-Leo got into a taxi a few days ago, the husky Hawaiian driver stared at the 88-year-old lady and said, "You look familiar. I've seen you before." He told her his name and she answered, "Oh, you used to be a boxer for Palama Settlement." That stunned driver nearly jumped out of his seat.

It's not uncommon for Mrs. Fullard-Leo to remember amateur athletes from Hawaii. She's built her life around them. And she doesn't really stun too many people nowadays. They just think she's so amazing anyway, that nothing she could do would surpass anything she's done previously.

They call Mrs. Fullard-Leo the grand dame of amateur athletics. It's appropriate. She's done more to organize and support athletics in Hawaii than anybody else and that's not a public relations man talking, that's fact.

She still keeps an up-to-date record book, but you'd figure at this point in her life everything would just become a blur of numbers with no names attached. Wrong.

"I can entertain myself a whole night by looking at these names and remembering the night they broke the records," said Mrs. Fullard-Leo in her slight English accent. "I like to compare what happens from year to year."

Mrs. Fullard-Leo, the youngest and last survivor of 18 natural and 12 adopted children, became interested in sports because her husband was a champion athlete and her mother always told her, "It behooves a good wife to get interested in what her husband does."

She was the first woman on the AAU Board and now 56 years later she's still there. She has been on the U.S. Olympic Committee and was an official at the first Pan Am Games in 1951. She was recently given a veterans award by the AAU and made a life member.

In May she was named Hawaii Mother of the Year ("I think I'm the only mother that ever won on athletic steam.") And if it wasn't for her, there wouldn't be as many athletic clubs in Hawaii. She's had a hand in organizing and supporting every club from judo to swimming.

Mrs. Fullard-Leo feels the emphasis on sports today is in the wrong place. She believes professionalism has taken over.

"People don't get into athletics today for sport, only to go pro, to sell themselves to the highest bidder for promotion," said Mrs. Fullard-Leo. "I like professional sports because an athlete had to be good to get there. But he's not my idea of a sportsman. He's an entertainer."

She believes the trouble with amateur athletics today is the training schedule. She visited Russia a while back and thinks as far as athletics is concerned they have the right idea.

"The Russians get their physical development when they learn their ABCs. Then when you're 10 or 12 you choose what sport you like. In this country you don't get physical development until high school."

She then dismisses the philosophy that if athletes do start young they will burn themselves out and retire from competition at 20 or so—an age when they should just that enjoying it.

"Promoters and the universities put athletes in the limelight too much. They get away from the spirit of sportsmanship. Like all good things they overdo it. Very often mothers and fathers are to blame. They want to make a name for themselves so they push the kids. I blame the newspapers too. You never see anything amateur. It's always professionals. People just place too much value on competition," said Mrs. Fullard-Leo, herself a sports columnist for the Advertiser from 1950–60.

She stands in back of the Olympics and Avery Brundage "200 per cent" but feels that the purpose of the Games has changed a little.

"The Olympics has become an advertisement for the city that hosts it," said Mrs. Fullard-Leo. "The glamor of the Olympics is lost because we have world championships in every event every year. I don't think the Olympics has lost its original purpose, but a gold medal today isn't as important. People want to cash in on it."

The International Hawaiian Canoe Association is throwing a testimonial for Mrs. Fullard-Leo, Aug. 14. They've rented a banquet room in the Ala Moana Hotel. It's a good choice, but if all the people Mrs. Fullard-Leo has helped in Hawaii decided to attend, they wouldn't even fit into Honolulu Stadium.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Aug. 16, 1972]

MRS. FULLARD-LEO, 88, IS SALUTED HERE

Mrs. Leslie Fullard-Leo, 88, who has devoted some 64 years to the development and promotion of amateur athletics in Hawaii and around the world, was honored Monday at an Aha Aina Hoike held at the Ala Moana Hotel.

She was given award after award; was honored in speech and song and was saluted by former Olympians, officials of both government and athletic groups and was entertained by some of Hawaii's finest singers and dancers.

Mrs. Fullard-Leo was presented with replicas of Olympic medals, a life membership in the International Hawaiian Canoe Association, plaques, trophies, leis and carved canoes. She was honored as the "Grand Dame" of the Amateur Athletic Union, Nationally and Internationally.

Letters and citations were read from President Nixon, U.S. Sen. Hiram L. Fong, Rep. Spark M. Matsunaga, the AAU, the U.S. Olympic Committee, the U.S. Olympians, the Morning Music Club of Honolulu and several other organizations.

She also received letters from the mayors of Johannesburg, South Africa (where she was born) and Victoria, Canada, (where she helped organize amateur swimming.)

In response to all this recognition, the humble but fiesty sportswoman leveled criticism at the University of Hawaii for not having a rowing crew and the Hawaii Visitors Bureau for not cooperating with the local AAU. She stressed how the AAU gets no share of the annual "welfare drive" and even must pay rental for use of public school swimming pools, private tracks and the Honolulu International Center for indoor sports.

"My 64 years in athletics have convinced me that the best advertising medium extant for any community, is competition by its championship-caliber athletes," she said.

And she gave as examples, Chinese table tennis, South Africa's Gary Player in golf and "that chess game in Iceland."

"And didn't Duke (Kahanamoku) in 1912 swim Hawaii right out of the Sandwich Islands?"

Mrs. Fullard-Leo called for a continued promotion of canoe racing and suggested competition with England as part of Hawaii's celebration in 1978 of the discovery of Hawaii by Capt. James Cook.

"We would send an Hawaiian crew to challenge Oxford in orthodox shell boat racing on the Thames—to be followed by an outrigger canoe race across the English Channel," she suggested.

WHO IS DESTROYING OUR ARMED FORCES? (III)

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following is from a UPI dispatch of January 23, 1971:

The U.S. Army had built a wall around its installation at Cam Ranh Bay to keep out drug pushers and prostitutes. Now, however, the official policy is permitting ladies of the evening to be signed onto its bases officially in central Vietnam to meet American troops in their barracks. The key for admission to such bases is a Vietnamese identity card, a document that any undercover Viet Cong agent can obtain without difficulty. The Army admits that the girls are smuggling dope into the formerly walled installations, as well as posing serious security risks; but says the Army: the risks are worthwhile in the interests of keeping the peace within an increasingly disgruntled and demoralized Army.

That is an example of how Armed Forces policy, which should be building up the morale of our men in uniform, has been contributing to their demoralization in Vietnam. The origins of that policy can be traced to very high levels.

Until June 1970, for instance, two Navy lieutenants were giving morning intelligence briefings to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Their names were Gordon Kerr and James Pahura, and both were members of the Concerned Officers Movement, an organization which has shown itself to be not concerned about victory over communism, but preferring Communist victory in Southeast Asia.

Going down one step in the chain of command, we come to Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt, author of the famous Z-Grams. It was these Z-Grams that promulgated more sideburns, more liquor in the quarters, and similar changes in policy leading to what one source in San Diego would call "a dangerous undermining of Navy discipline and morale." It was in San Diego that 180 active and retired admirals voiced their vehement objections to the trend reflected in a New York Times report that:

San Diego and other Navy towns were filled with off-duty sailors in unpressed dungarees often spotted with grease stains and paint and sometimes ripped.

No wonder a Navy man would comment in the Navy Times for November 1970:

It is patently obvious Admiral Zumwalt intends to haul the U.S. Navy (willingly or not) into consonance with liberal America as it girds for the 21st century.

As this goes to press, Admiral Zumwalt has hauled the Navy still further in that direction by announcing his capitulation to the Women's Liberation Movement in the form of plans for young ladies to man battle stations aboard ship and perhaps even fly combat missions in Navy aircraft.

These trends were put in clearer perspective upon discovering that on June 2, 1965, Elmo R. Zumwalt became the youngest rear admiral in the Navy while serving as executive assistant and naval aide to Paul H. Nitze, then Secretary of the Navy, now negotiating for President Nixon's Disarmament Agency in Geneva. It was Paul Nitze who headed a five-man committee for the National Council of Churches in 1958 that called for—among other things— opposition to the development of U.S. military strength, except under United Nations control: opposed retaliation by the United States even if attacked; advocated turning over the Strategic Air Command to the United Nations; and urged that Quemoy and Matsu Islands be handed over to the Chinese Communists. Congressman WAGGONNER of Louisiana described this document as "a running theme of appeasement, coexistence, and surrender, the like of which probably cannot be found in any other document this side of the Iron Curtain."

At Fort Carson, Colo., once known as one of the toughest training areas in the United States, the Rocky Mountain News reported November 17, 1971:

Bikini-clad go-go girls dance nightly in the enlisted men's service clubs. The post has two coffee houses, operated with government funds, where the G.I.'s gather to rap with their commanders, practice arts and crafts and many to vent their anti-Army, anti-Vietnam war views.

This undermining of our military by "pressure from above and pressure from below" follows the classic pattern outlined in Jan Kozak's book "And Not a Shot Is Fired." In a future series I will explore the part that tax-exempt foundations have played and are playing in these developments. Every American would do well to think very deeply on these words of the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur in his annual report as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army in 1933:

The unfailing formula for production of morale is patriotism, self-respect, discipline, and self confidence within a military unit, joined with fair treatment and merited appreciation from without. It cannot be produced by pampering or coddling an army, and it is not necessarily destroyed by hardship, danger or even calamity. It will quickly wither and die if soldiers come to believe themselves the victims of indifference or injustice on the part of their government, or of ignorance, personal ambition, or ineptitude on the part of their leaders.

TRAINING AND EDUCATION IN EARLY CHILDHOOD

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, three panels at my recent early childhood conference in Idaho singled out some of the issues which are currently of importance in the early childhood field, and identified a number of the obstacles we have to overcome and problems we must solve as we move ahead to meet the needs of young children.

Chairing a panel on "Training and Education in the Area of Early Childhood" was Dr. Everett V. Samuelson, the very distinguished and highly respected dean of the college of education at the University of Idaho. In introducing his panel, Dr. Samuelson said:

I think that when we say training and education, the first thing is to keep it as broad as possible—the whole idea—so that we won't think only "well, this would be a nice major if you were in college," or that a person must be a professional with umpteen degrees and letters behind his name to deal with children.

The area of training and education should be a part of the long continuum of learning, so we need to think in terms of programs of junior high and high school level and we need to think in terms then of some college curriculums and in graduate work and everything else. By training people in early childhood we not only develop good teachers and good workers but also better parents, so that maybe you could say that there is a two-headed benefit to the area of early childhood.

Panelists were Carolyn Findlay, Idaho Office of Child Development; Dr. Harold Goff, director, education professions development, Idaho Department of Education; Lois C. Moss, home economics instructor, New Plymouth High School, Idaho; Peggy Pletcher, home economist, University of Idaho Extension Service; and Sarah Tracy, director of Child Care Studies, Boise State College.

I include excerpts from the panel in the RECORD:

TRAINING AND EDUCATION IN EARLY CHILDHOOD

(By Lois C. Moss)

Vocational Home Economics in the Idaho High Schools provides opportunities for training for potential parents. It consists of a semester course proceeded by a general introduction of the subject in Home Economics I. Mostly sophomores and juniors are enrolled in the course.

The over-all objections of the course is to learn how to build a feeling of trust and security in children by meeting and satisfying their basic needs. In trying to accomplish this objective students study the physical, emotional and social needs of children as they develop from infancy to adolescent. Ways of providing creative play are emphasized so the child has the opportunity to advance in sensory, artistic and muscular development.

In about one third of the vocational home economics schools in Idaho a play school is used as a media for teaching child development. This is a very appealing way for students to learn about the development of children. It reinforces learning and at the same time does a service to the community.

Following is an explanation of how New Plymouth's play school is operated.

Fortunately there is available space to set up a play school and storage to keep the equipment the part of the year it is not in use. Girls homemade easels, picture puzzles, play furniture, doll houses and furniture, etc. are used to equip the school. Cast off and extra chairs and desks are borrowed from the elementary school to help equip; plus inflated inner tubes, and parts of junk cars, appliance cartons, blocks salvaged from lumber yards, etc. are used.

The play school is set up in two sessions. The first has children from two and one-half years to five years in attendance for a period of one month. four out of the five school days. Students work with the children, keeping the play and art media within the ability of their age. One class period is set aside to correct wrong procedures, discuss children reactions and plan for the following week. At the end of the younger children's session, the play school is analyzed, and learning procedures and ways of handling children are reemphasized.

Behavioral objectives of children five to school age are then discussed. Additional techniques are taught for development of children. Kindergarten procedures are used with this age group. The play school is repeated with the older children with the follow-up discussion at the end of the session. A comparison of abilities of the two age groups are discussed.

It is felt by many Home Economics educators that the child development classes are the most beneficial to the students. Techniques normally taught only in college classes are learned. The students are much better equipped to raise their own children and many misconceptions are cleared up by this course.

It also benefits the community by allowing a means for pre-school children to be together, learn to play with each other and slightly prepares them for entering the first grade.

IDAHO EXTENSION HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAM

(By Peggy Pletcher)

The University of Idaho Extension Home Economics Program provides education in all aspects of family living. Home Economists are employed in almost every county of Idaho to improve:

Family stability
Consumer competence
Family housing
Family health
Community resource development

Among those being served are:

Young families
Youth
The disadvantaged
The elderly
Professionals in other agencies
The general public

For the purpose of this conference today, I will tell you how extension home economics educates in early childhood development. It is done mainly through three of our programs:

1. 4–H program
2. Young homemaker program
3. Expanded food-nutrition education program

First, the 4–H program:

Through project work in 4–H, girls can gain skills, knowledge and attitudes to enable them to care for young children as baby sitters now and to enable them to provide a satisfactory growth climate for their own children in the future. Many project areas contribute to the girl's education in child development.

In clothing, she learns about children's clothing; in home improvement, she learns how the appearance of the home can influence all family member's happiness; and in art, she can learn the value of creative expression.

But, it is mainly the Foods-Nutrition project and the Child Development project that I want to emphasize. The goal of the Foods-Nutrition project is to promote good eating habits in children that will provide them with good health throughout life. It attempts to help change the national trend in teenage girls' eating. Too frequently their diet of empty calories does not build the body required for the pregnancies of early marriage.

Promoting adequate teenage nutrition today may provide the very best basis for adequate childhood development tomorrow.

The Child Development project itself consists of three units of study of the infant and young child.

1. "Sitting Pretty" is the first project. It emphasizes safety, story-telling and game playing; and skills such as diapering and feeding babies. The project requires 30 hours of child care and the making of a magic bag containing 5 safe toys to entertain children of different age levels.

2. "Toys are Tools" is the second unit. The emphasis is on toys as learning experiences for children. 4–H members learn the value of creative play for children. Again 30 hours of child care are required.

3. "More About Children" is the third project. Activities include helping children to learn a useful skill, to understand nature, and to experience dramatic play. Skills learned are bathing a baby and arranging play areas in the home. In all of these projects the teenager must demonstrate a skill or give a talk. This education is provided to the 4–H member by volunteer adult and older teen leaders who organize and supervise 4–H clubs. The Extension Home Economist trains these leaders.

The young homemaker is another primary educational target in early childhood development. The extension home economist uses radio, television, newspaper, newsletters, workshops, classes, and leader training programs to teach the young mother food needs and clothing needs in young children; creative experiences for children; guidance techniques for children, and human relations skill for all family members.

Intensive training will be given Idaho extension home economists next fall. You can expect a program thrust through increased emphasis on education in child development in 1973.

The third program through which Extension Home Economics teaches is called the Expanded Food-Nutrition Education Program. This education program is relatively new to the United States and very new to Idaho. Three years ago federal money was appropriated for the extension service to promote better health through improved nutrition for low-income and disadvantaged families. This money was used to hire para-professionals in 19 counties in Idaho. The Extension Home Economist provided intensive training for three weeks to enable these nutrition aides to work in the homes on a one-to-one basis with homemakers. Further training is provided through a weekly meeting of the aides. Each aide works with about 20 families at one time. While nutrition is the primary emphasis, many contributing areas are covered—money management, referral services, and child development.

Some training materials used with the aides and written in a simple style for the less educated parent are "Talk with Baby," "Play Games With Baby" and "Babies Look and Learn."

When homemakers know how to provide nutritious food for her family, she graduates from the program into a group learning situation.

In summary, we teach the teenager, we teach the young mother, and we teach the para-professional aide. There is a time-worn adage "The nand that rocks the cradle rules the world." Those of us in Extension Home Economics are working to see that it is a loving and capable hand that rocks that cradle.

IS THE WAR IN VIETNAM A RACIST WAR?

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the administration's recent announcement of yet another increase in the bombing of North Vietnam, coupled with the withdrawal of the last U.S. ground combat forces from South Vietnam, makes it imperative for us to examine an aspect of the war which probably has received less than the attention it deserves.

Involved is a factor which will influence our policy in Asia for years to come, and which is already a source of great concern and embarrassment to some of our stanchest Asian allies.

Is the war in Vietnam a racist war?

Years from now, when the tumult and shouting surrounding Vietnam has subsided, history may record that the United States—a predominantly white nation commanding the greatest resources and the most advanced military technology ever known—systematically destroyed its foe—an Asian agricultural nation smaller than North Dakota—merely because its people wore yellow skins.

Would we pursue this policy of massive bombing and total destruction if the foe were a small, white Western nation? That is a crucial question which is being answered in the negative by some of our Asian allies who recall that a Caucasian nation was the first to use nuclear weapons against an Asian nation.

The total number of bombs dropped on North Vietnam exceeds the total dropped by the United States and its allies during World War II. Despite their numerous wars, the Western nations have stopped short of totally destroying their neighbors. However, Asian people on the other side of the world are different—or at least that is the way it must seem to our Asian allies.

I am submitting for inclusion in the RECORD a thought-provoking article by Honolulu Star-Bulletin Columnist William H. Ewing entitled "The Racist Factor in the War," and I strongly urge my colleagues to give more consideration to this important issue:

[From the Honolulu Star Bulletin, Aug. 16, 1972]

THE RACIST FACTOR IN THE WAR

(By William H. Ewing)

The racial factor seems to be an unmentionable aspect of our war with North Vietnam. Yet we all know the vast majority of white Americans regard any race other than Caucasian as inferior. The reason is that the only substantial contact they have had with another race is with black people. Blacks, they believe, are inferior; so, then, are all others except whites.

Here in Hawaii we know better. We Caucasians are aware that we ourselves are often, if not generally, looked down upon by Chinese and Japanese, and not without cause. We are acquainted with their natural and acquired abilities and we know these often exceed our own. But Hawaii is less than one-half of one per cent of the population of the United States, so we don't count for much as an example of national opinion.

Little by little, really at the pace of a microscopic snail, white Mainlanders are beginning to recognize the talents and latent abilities of black people. It may be true that the reason integration is proceeding faster in Mississippi than in Michigan is that Southern whites know blacks better. The Southern whites have stubbornly held off social integration as long as they could—it is a human failing to prefer to be on top—but there are too many black people who have distinguished themselves in too many fields to ignore them longer.

Mainland whites know very little about Asians, however.

The racial factor revealed itself in the Korean War two decades ago when American soldiers referred to Koreans, their allies as well as the enemy, as "gooks," "slopes" and other terms of denigration. Similar terms have become common in Vietnam.

Little is said about the courage of men who, fighting against the most lopsided odds in history, still are able to give a good account of themselves. No matter where you come from, regardless of the color of your skin, it takes a high order of valor to face and even invite death to accomplish a mission. The Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese have it. We have it, too, but that isn't the point. We assume our own men's courage because they are Americans. The point is that the enemy has it also.

From time to time someone has mulled over the question of whether, had Japan collapsed first in World War II, we would have dropped the atomic bomb on the Germans, a Western nation of Caucasian extraction. Nobody can say for certain, but it is my firm conviction that we would not.

To begin with, our allies would have objected. The Bomb was too fearsome an instrument to explode on a neighbor. The Europeans, despite their countless wars, would have shrunk from exterminating one another so ruthlessly. Asians on the other side of the world were different. In any event, history will record that a Caucasian nation was the first to use a nuclear weapon against an Asian.

History also will record that it was a Caucasian nation that, commanding the greatest resources ever known, and possessing a technology beyond even the imagination of its tiny enemy, methodically reduced that enemy—Asian—to the Stone Age.

Our leaders are not so outspoken as to say, as Gen. Curtis LeMay once said, that we are bombing them back to the Stone Age. But this is what is happening. When a nation loses its industry, its communications and its transport, not much is left except agricultural and animal life.

Would we do this to a Western nation? Would we do it to Cuba? Or Chile, or any other Latin American country? Or a European? Of course we would not. However insolent the enemy might be—a word President Nixon once used to describe the North Vietnamese—we would find a way to settle things without such wholesale destruction. The word "wholesale" is used advisedly. When a country smaller than North Dakota is plastered with the tons of explosive being unloaded on North Vietnam, any more limiting term would be inaccurate.

HOW WASHINGTON DECIDES WHAT MEDICINES YOU MAY TAKE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following paragraph is from a letter to me from one of my constituents, Mrs. Phil Hardwick of Santa Ana—quoted with her permission:

I was informed by my doctor's office that the drug Anergex has been taken off the market by the Food and Drug Administration, because they say they have found it ineffective. Both my son and I went through the series of shots for our allergies and found it very effective. . . . This is the one drug my doctor has used on me that really worked and believe me he has tried everything! . . . I hope that you (will) do whatever you can to get Anergex back on the market, to impress upon the Food and Drug Administration that it does work and we need the drug. . . . I really would appreciate it if there is anything you could possibly do."

The following correspondence ensued:

From my first letter to the Food and Drug Administration:

The enclosed letter from one of my constituents, objecting to your action removing the drug Anergex from the market, is sent to you for comment and further explanation of your action.

From my second letter to the Food and Drug Administration:

I have your letter of May 10 in response to my inquiry of April 13 following up a constituent's objection to the withdrawal of the drug Anergex from the market. Your letter is couched in very general terms explaining your authority to have such a drug withdrawn and the procedures required to obtain permission to reintroduce it. Your authority to take this action is not in doubt and my constituent is hardly in a position to undertake the procedures for reintroducing the drug to the market. What she needs to know is specifically *why* this drug was withdrawn.

Letter to me from the Food and Drug Administration, June 14, 1972.

DEAR MR. SCHMITZ: This is in reply to your May 16, 1972 letter further regarding withdrawal of Anergex from the market. Anergex . . . was reviewed by the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council and subsequently was the subject of an order withdrawing approval of the new drug application (NDA 10-491) published in the Federal Register of June 10, 1971. The Commissioner's finding is based on a lack of substantial evidence that the drug is effective . . . We cannot permit the continued marketing and human administration of Anergex.

Notice that in this correspondence, there is no reference to any findings or even any allegations that this particular drug is harmful to its users; furthermore, it was prescribed by a M.D. after extensive trials of other antiallergic drugs on this patient. The Food and Drug Administration, in its superior wisdom, simply refused to allow the drug to be bought or sold because they found it to be ineffective. Inquiries such as mine hit a solid bureaucratic stone wall. Many other Congressmen have had similar experiences. This is how Washington now decides what medicines you may take.

The same attitude and policies also extend to nutrition and dietary supplements. For several years the Food and Drug Administration has been developing regulations which, once they go into effect, will actually take vitamin pills off the market because of their alleged ineffectiveness. Congressman CRAIG HOSMER's Nutrition Protection Act, which would prevent this action, languishes untouched in committee.

It is bad enough that sufferers from alleregy and dietary problems are being or may be denied relief through actions like this. But it is still worse when people are abandoned to almost certain death by the same kind of bureaucratic arrogance, when a new treatment might save them. That is what is happening with the anticancer agent variously know as Laetrile, Amygdalin, nitriloside, or vitamin B–17, despite solid medical evidence showing that in a substantial number of otherwise terminal cancer cases it has greatly assisted the patient. For it happens that Laetrile does not fit the usual medical categories of anticancer agents; therefore, the Food and Drug Administration has prohibited even its testing by competent medical men. This scandalous situation will be further explained in a subsequent newsletter.

"MANNY" RIDGELL, THE MEMBERS' FRIEND

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 6, the House of Representatives lost a good friend. A. Emmanuel "Manny" Ridgell suddenly passed away. Manny had been the dedicated helper and friend for so many of us, and had been with the House of Representatives so long, that I guess we all assumed he would always be with us. The sudden and unexpected death of this friend of the House, is thus all the more distressing.

Manny had been Superintendent of the House Office Buildings almost as long as I have been in Congress, and he far outranked most Members in time of service to the Congress. Only Chairman CELLER and Chairman PATMAN have served the House longer.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues of the House in paying tribute to the career of this House veteran. He will be dearly missed. I also join my colleagues in expressing my profound sympathy to his wonderful family—a family that is a shining example of living the faith.

My words can bring them little consolation—far less consolation than their living faith brings to the friends Manny

left behind in the House of Representatives.

MINNESOTA FARMBOY LEADS ZESTFUL LIFE

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, much to my delight, the Washington Star carried a feature article concerning the healthiness and vigor of midwestern farm people, using as an illustration one of my constituents, Dick FitzSimmons of Good Thunder, Minn. I am pleased to insert this article by Andrew Malcolm of the New York Times News Service in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Young FitzSimmons' story serves as an example of the zestful life enjoyed by people in our State of Minnesota and as an example to the Nation:

FARMBOY TYPIFIES HEALTHY AMERICAN

(By Andrew Malcolm)

GOOD THUNDER, MINN.—The stark farmyard light stands nighttime vigil over by the tool shed where the farm's six tractors are resting.

Then, almost stealthily, a thin band of pink light eases up into the Eastern sky over the tasseled tops of the mile-long cornfield.

As if on signal, the crickets' chirping gives way to the birds' singing.

The stars start to fade, and soon the sun is out again, baking the corn and soybeans and anyone not in the shade.

But by then 16-year-old Dick FitzSimmons already has had his first breakfast and done over an hour of grueling calisthenics for the football season.

VERY VERY HEALTHY

A sturdy, 5-foot-10-inches tall, FitzSimmons has long, dark blond hair billowing over his forehead. His tanned hands are strong and toughened. And he is very, very, very healthy.

In fact, young FitzSimmons fits the American Medical Association's latest profile of the healthy American.

The medical group analyzed the nation's disability days, when a citizen's normal activity is restricted because of illness.

On average, it found farm folk healthier than city people, Midwesterners healthier than any other region's residents, men healthier than women, young healthier than old, affluent healthier than poor, whites healthier than blacks, those living with relatives healthier than those living alone and July through September the healthiest months.

Of course, no one person can be selected as the healthiest American. But Dick FitzSimmons, a soft-spoken farmboy here in Good Thunder (pop. 468), 1,100 miles west of Times Square, in the endless flatness that is southern Minnesota, wouldn't be a bad choice.

UP AT 5 A. M.

Dick awakens at 5 a.m., grabs a piece of toast and a pillowcase holding his clean athletic cloths and heads down the dirt road in his 7-year-old Chevelle, the deep-throated mufflers echoing off the towering corn at roadside.

Twelve miles and 15 minutes later he is in the locker room of the Amboy-Good Thunder High School. By 5:50 a.m. he and 50 other football hopefuls are on the field where the mosquitos rise in tribute from the dew-covered grass.

"It's a beautiful morning," barks Coach Rich Bullard "C'mon, FitzSimmons, move it." And he does "move it" for two hours until his once-white T-shirt is soaked with perspiration and dirt and grass stains.

OFF TO THE STATION

Then a shower and a quick drive to Larson's gas station and lunch counter where he downs 20 ounces of milk and a couple of his favorite caramel rolls.

At home young FitzSimmons, his father and some cousins bale straw, expertly stacking over 300 of the dusty 50-pound bales on wagon after wagon under a cloudless blue sky.

Mrs. FitzSimmons, who is finishing her four daily loads of wash, serves lunch at noon, over three pounds of hamburgers, two dozen ears of corn, a salad, cottage cheese, peaches and pitcher after pitcher of cold milk. In the summer Mrs. FitzSimmons buys at least 14 gallons of milk a week.

"But I've never bought any vitamin pills," she says, "We never seemed to need them. We just get lots of fresh air, exercise and work."

OUR NATION SALUTES THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PASSAIC VALLEY COUNCIL, BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA BY MERGER OF ALTAHA-AHEKA COUNCILS

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, with the ever-growing demand for the learning experiences and unlimited opportunities for self-development and responsible service to our communities and our Nation provided to our youth by the Boy Scouts of America personifying all of the noble traditions of the foundation of our American way of life, I am pleased to call your attention to the contemplated merger of two of our most distinguished councils in my congressional district and the State of New Jersey—the Aheka and Altaha Councils—which will be formally incorporated on September 1, 1972 as the Passaic Valley Council, Boy Scouts of America.

As a member of the National Council of Boy Scouts and having been affiliated for many years as an executive board member of the Boy Scouts of America, Altaha Council, and presently as a member of their advisory committee, I am indeed pleased and honored to participate in commemorating the inauguration of this outstanding coordinated program of these prestigious Boy Scout councils, joining together the exemplary leaders and resources of Scouting in my region and providing comprehensive broader opportunities for our young people. There are presently 10,000 young men being served by the Altaha-Aheka Councils, soon to be known as the Passaic Valley Council.

We are all familiar with the noble traditions of the Boy Scouts of America and their outstanding public service to the people of our Nation in helping our young men to achieve leadership qualities of self-reliance, character building, international friendships, kindness, courtesies and eagerness to serve others. Their highest standards of excellence in exercising measures to "Keep America Beautiful," attain greater communion and understanding among all mankind, and continually developing and serving, by example, in working toward freedom and justice for all people in our Nation and throughout the world are a significant investment in the enrichment and excellence of the quality of our way of life here in America.

The fulfillment of the purposes, goals and aims of these Boy Scouts of America could not be achieved without the strong team effort of volunteer and professional leaders of our communities who, themselves, have spent a lifetime of dedication and devotion to these same true American ideals and now participate unselfishly and willingly of their busy schedules in passing these sterling traditions along to our youth of America.

I wish to commend to you and ask you to join with me in heartiest congratulations and best wishes to the officers and trustees of the Altaha and Aheka Councils, Boys Scouts of America, who have been faithfully fulfilling these major leadership endeavors in the Altaha and Aheka Councils. Following is a list of officers and board members:

OFFICERS AND BOARD MEMBERS

ALTAHA COUNCIL

Officers

Sylvan Geismar, Honorary Chairman.
James L. Hamilton, President.

Vice Presidents

Roy R. Dean, Jr.
Andrew E. R. Frommelt.
Russell Graddy.
Robert E. Holloway.
Martin S. Mandon.
John M. Delaney, Treasurer.
William D. Kamp, Scout Commissioner.
Arthur W. Friedman, Exploring Chairman.
Dale L. Nolen, Scout Executive.

Executive board

Dr. E. Foster Arthur.
Alvin G. Blau.
Barnie Bragg.
Howard J. Breeman.
Murray L. Cole, Past President.
Syvert Dalane.
Robert J. Dalzell, Jr.
Eugene O. Davis.
Richard J. Dore.
Eugene H. DuVal.
Dr. R. J. Floody.
Louis Gilmore.
Joseph J. Glatzel.
Thomas L. Heward.
Ronald J. Hinchman.
Walter J. Hunziker, Jr., Past President.
Dr. Leonard Jackel.
LeRoy Kersting.
Paul LaBaissiere.
Frank C. Little.
Jack A. Maltby.
Nicholas R. Marcalus.
W. Fred Meyers.
William S. Mosca.
Nathaniel J. Ontell.
Morris W. Pechenik.
Donald Pierce.
Robert T. Ratcliffe.
Armando Salvini.
Jonas W. Saunders.
T. Norman Schwarz.
Jerome F. Scott.
Alvin H. Smalenback.
Charles F. Unger.
Stanley J. Usinowicz.
Lee A. Van Gorden.
Stephen J. Wolff, Jr.

AHEKA COUNCIL

Officers

Lawrence Gurtman, President.

Vice Presidents

Aldo Costantin.
William J. Bate.
Leo Kleinkopf.
David A. Doyle, Treasurer.
Dr. Samual M. Schlyen, Scout Commissioner.
Nelson L. Carter, Secretary-Scout Executive.
Dr. Carlisle Kramer, Exploring Chairman.

Executive Board

Cowles Andrus, Past President.
James D. Backman.
Joseph A. Banas, Jr.
Willam J. Bate.
Franklin T. Colcord.
Harold W. Compton.
Aldo V. Costantin.
Joseph M. Dauenhauer.
James DeBlaase.
David A. Doyle.
Richard Drukker.
Ralph F. Eastman.
Ellis W. Edge, Jr., Past President.
I. Lloyd Gang, Past President.
Joseph M. Gondola.
Bennett M. Goodman.
Lawrence Gurtman.
Dr. Wallace J. Haddon.
Edwin C. Jennings, Jr.
Robert Y. Johnson.
Sanford Kalb.
Maurice Kanter.
Louis I. Kievit.
Leo Kleinkopf.
Dr. Carlisle Kramer.
Harris N. Leroy.
Alvin Levitt.
Harold Martin.
Jerome S. Morici.
Everette B. Muh.
Herman B. Packer.
Dr. Bernard D. Pinck, Past President.
Daniel Rachles.
John F. Reynolds.
Joseph Ruddy.
Dr. Samuel M. Schlyen.
Martin Stern.
Robert Taylor.
Walter Tencza.
Albert Tiano.
Arthur L. Troast.
Harold M. Warshaw.
Clarence Whitworth.
Edward J. Wolak.
Edgar Y. Wurch.

May I also commend to you and seek, through this historic journal of Congress, national recognition of the outstanding public service to our youth that has been extended by Altaha Council Scout Executive Dale L. Nolen who has served more than 21 years in professional Scouting and the past 6½ years as our Scout executive. Dale's exemplary ability and sincerity of purpose have already been recognized by the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, and effective September 1 he will be assigned to their east central region where his specialized services will be devoted to Boy Scout Councils in the States of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and our colleagues will join with me in saluting all of these great Americans and their good works on behalf of the Boy Scouts of America. We do indeeed extend our best wishes to the officers and directors of the new Passaic Valley Council as they commence their merger of the Altaha and Aheka Councils on September 1, 1972.

EDITORIAL COMMENT FAVORS SPEEDY PASSAGE OF YEN CLAIM BILL

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, a sense of justice and fair play is something with which Americans, as a people, are richly endowed. This was movingly demonstrated today by the expeditious passage by this august body of the so-called yen claim bill, H.R. 8215, which I introduced, and by the unsolicited editorials, in some instances indignantly insistent in tone, calling for the quick enactment of the measure.

The legislation I introduced is directed toward erasing one of the last vestiges of what has been called "the blackest page in American history." I am referring, of course, to the World War II episode involving some 110,000 Americans of Japanese ancestry and their parents who were uprooted from their homes along the west coast and in Hawaii, deprived of most of their property, and imprisoned in what the Federal Government chose to call "relocation centers," but which were in fact concentration camps, complete with barbed wire fences and armed guards.

Many of these immigrant parents, barred by law until 1953 from becoming naturalized American citizens, held yen certificates of deposit in various U.S. branches of the Yokohama Specie Bank. At the outbreak of World War II, the assets in these branch banks were confiscated, or vested, under the authority of the Trading With the Enemy Act, so that such property would not be used to aid the enemy during the period of hostilities.

When Congress in 1946 enacted a comprehensive plan for allowing claims of legitimate creditors of enemy alien firms and entities whose assets had been vested, payment was expressly barred to creditors who were interned or paroled as "enemy aliens." Former internees who held Yokohama Specie Bank certificates of deposit were thus barred from recovering their hard-earned savings, and to this day they remain unrecompensed.

At least two subsequent acts of Congress served only to underscore and prolong the unfortunate plight of these people in their efforts to recover their Yokohama Specie Bank savings. In 1953, Japanese immigrants were permitted to become naturalized American citizens, and thousands, including these former internees, demonstrated their long-felt loyalty by becoming naturalized citizens of the United States. In 1956, Congress refused to discriminate against internees when it passed the Evacuation Claims Act, which compensated Japanese-Americans for certain property losses suffered during the period of wartime hysteria. Under that act, Congress expressly permitted recovery by those who have been interned and subsequently released.

H.R. 8215 would authorize these Japanese-Americans, some 2,000 in number, to recover from the remaining vested assets of the now-defunct Yokohama Specie Bank in the custody of the U.S. Attorney General.

Addressing itself to the situation of these Yokohama Specie Bank depositors, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin called it "Shocking."

The Evening Star-the Washington Daily News said that the money was "unconscionably—and unconstitutionally—taken from them."

The San Francisco Chronicle informed its readers that "It—H.R. 8215—should be promptly enacted."

The Philadelphia Inquirer said, referring to the bill's provision for flat-out repayment, but no interest—

After 30 years, it is hardly too soon.

Mr. Speaker, being confident that the Senate will now give speedy consideration to this legislation, I submit these editorial views on H.R. 8215 for inclusion in the RECORD merely as reassuring proof that Americans truly have not lost their traditional sense of justice and fair play. Early Senate passage of the measure, of course, will strengthen this conclusion immeasurably.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Aug. 7, 1972]

SHOCKING REPORT

It is shocking to read 27 years after the end of World War II that the U.S. is still holding bank savings belonging to 2,000 Japanese-Americans forced into internment camps in World War II.

The yen deposits confiscated from American branches of Japanese banks total $4.5 million.

Congressman Spark Matsunaga of Hawaii is sponsoring legislation to have the Justice Department give the money back. Many of the original depositors, of course, are dead.

The whole internment episode was a black chapter in U.S. history. Now we learn it is not yet closed.

[From the Evening Star and the Washington Daily News, Aug. 11, 1972]

BALM FOR A BAD CONSCIENCE

That old word "sleazy" is being greased up again and applied to Japanese imports by some groups of American workers who are beginning to feel the sting of competition. There is a special irony in this; first, because more and more Japanese products are remarkable for their good quality (they work, they last, the wheels stay on) and second, because sleazy is the way we have been treating our best import from Japan—Japanese people.

There are disturbing reports of increasing anti-Japanese feeling on the West Coast and elsewhere, along with the nastiness and small cruelties that invariably accompany a regrowth of racism. That young Japanese-Americans are beginning to meet this with a display of refined militancy—a show of cohesion and racial pride—is a normal if somewhat disturbing response.

Nothing can make up for the fact that tens of thousands of American citizens of Japanese descent and their parents were separated from their homes and possessions in the early panic after Pearl Harbor and penned up behind barbed wire in concentration camps while their fellow Americans picked over what they'd left behind. The $38.5 million in property claims which the federal

government paid to them in subsequent years is estimated to be less than 10 percent of what they actually lost.

Representative Spark Matsunaga, the Hawaii Democrat, has now won committee approval of a bill to return $4.5 million to one or two thousand Japanese-Americans whose savings were seized in the San Francisco and Seattle branches of the Yokohama Specie Bank. They're not asking for the 30 years of interest this money would have earned, or to get it back at today's conversion rate. Just the money that was unconscionably—and unconstitutionally— taken from them.

"If they could just get back a portion of their life savings," a spokesman for Representative Matsunaga said, "they would be satisfied." In the light of such good nature, anything less than speedy action would be sleazy indeed.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Aug. 13, 1972]

INJUSTICE UNDONE

Congress is moving to undo, in part at least, a grave injustice inflicted upon some 2000 Japanese Americans following the attack on Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941. A House subcommittee has unanimously approved legislation to restore to them—or their heirs—$4.5 million in bank accounts that were confiscated by the government upon their internment as "enemy aliens."

The funds had been deposited in branches of the Yokohama Specie Bank in San Francisco, Los Angeles and elsewhere and have since been held without interest by the Department of Justice.

It is now intended to return this money to its rightful owners—Japanese who, as noted by Representative Matsunaga of Hawaii, "committed no crime or act of sabotage against the country which they had learned to love and which they called their own." Legislation to effect that can be faulted only because of its tardiness. It should be promptly enacted.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Aug. 12, 1972]

LONG WAIT FOR THEIR MONEY

One of the more shameful episodes in American history was the herding of some 110,000 Japanese-Americans into detention centers shortly after Pearl Harbor.

Many of them were American citizens, born in this country. All of them had to abandon their homes, their farms, their businesses, their professions. None ever received full compensation for their economic losses, let alone their personal suffering, although Congress did, after World War II, pass legislation providing for the return of at least some of their assets.

Even then they had to fight their case through the courts, and it was not until 1968 that the issue was settled. But even then, not entirely.

For 30 years the Justice Department has been sitting on about $4.5 million which had been confiscated from bank accounts in U.S. branches of a Japanese bank. The money belongs to some 2,000 Japanese-American immigrants who, under the benighted immigration laws on the books at the time, could not become American citizens.

Congress had agreed to compensate only American citizens. "Enemy aliens" were specifically ruled out. Catch-22: Because these people had been forbidden to become American citizens, and even though most of them later did become citizens under a more enlightened immigration provision, they still couldn't get their own money back.

Rep. Spark Matsunaga who, like so many young Japanese-Americans in World War II, volunteered and fought bravely for America, has introduced legislation to return these savings to their rightful owners, many of whom are now in their 80s.

The Hawaii Democrat's bill follows the pattern of the 1968 federal court directive—flat-out repayment, but no interest. Rep. Matsunaga calls for prompt action to redress these grievances of Japanese-Americans. After 30 years, it is hardly too soon.

TELEPHONE PRIVACY—XXXVII

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 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 35th 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:

AUGUST 10, 1972.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ASPIN: My wife and I are 100% for the bill pending in Congress, H.R. 14884. We have had our fill of these nuisance telephone calls.

——— ———.

DEAR SIR: We are definitely in favor of your bill to stop salesmen from calling our home peddling real estate, cemetery lots, etc.

They usually interrupt meals, too.

——— ———.

AUGUST 4, 1972.

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

DEAR SIR: The telephone as defined by the United States Government is an instrument protected by law as a means of privacy to the individual and a luxury upon which a tax has been placed.

Unfortunately, for the last few years the telephone has not been an instrument of privacy as we have been plagued almost daily with telephone calls from private agencies soliciting for contributions and in particular by land companies that offer a myriad of techniques to entice the telephone subscriber into purchasing. It has been our experience to receive as many as three telephone calls from the same land company in one day! We have repeatedly expressed that we are not at all interested in their projects but this has been to no avail.

I understand that you are a sponsor of HR-14884 which may serve as a solution to this problem that we citizens are subjected to routinely. I further understand that HR-14884 has not been scheduled for action by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I, therefore, urge you to vehemently promote this bill for passage and assist the citizenry in acquiring some piece of mind.

——— ———.

AUGUST 10, 1972.

Hon. LEE ASPIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We would like to voice our support for Bill HR-14884, pending in Congress.

We don't like being bothered by telephone solicitors and would like to see this bill passed.

——— ———.

AUGUST 9, 1972.

DEAR MR. ASPIN: I would like to take this opportunity to add my voice in support of the bill pending in Congress, HR-14884. I am only one voice among thousands (at *least*) that cries out for relief from the telephone-pest-salesmen and women. My husband works nights and needs to sleep during the day. I work mornings. This means no one is able to "stand guard" at the phone. Consequently my poor husband is disturbed by countless (some, very RUDE) sales calls. Please, somehow, get this bill passed. It would be a godsend. God bless you for trying!!

——— ———.

AUGUST 8, 1972.

DEAR MR. ASPIN: I read about the bill you introduced in the House—the Telephone Privacy Act. Didn't know the possibility of help was at hand. I'm writing Senator Tower and Senator Bentsen, as well as Representatives Fisher, Gonzalez, Pickle and Kazen.

May I add that I have heard that the phone advertisers can, electronically, compute numbers using all possible combinations. If this be true, even "unlisted" numbers can be reached. This should be unlawful.

Also, the "long distance" call is being used a lot. I know. The last one I got, I was bathing when told I was wanted on long distance. That was the day that I was rude rude rude, as well as dripping wet!! Naturally, the phone company, "the only one in town, though they try not to act like it" is not anxious to stop long distance calls. In fact, the man I talked to (with phone co.) told me there is not much recourse. To do anything, one must take name of person calling, name of company, etc. and relay this to phone company, who will (I wonder!) tell the offender that R. Lilly is an old sorehead and doesn't want the privacy of her castle invaded. Or, one can, he suggested, "merely hang up." Ho, ho. The same company has called me 5 times within the last 2 months. I have said each time, "Take my name off your list!!"

Hope your bill passes. If not, do please try again and again!!

——— ———.

P.S.—One dear caller, from El Paso, Texas, informed me I would "now hear a recording! How can one vent his spleen on a recording??

THE AGENCIES' ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, at my recent early childhood conference in Idaho, which I sponsored to focus on the needs of the young children, three panels did an excellent job of pinpointing current issues in the early childhood field and in identifying some of the obstacles that we have to overcome and problems that still must be solved.

A panel on "The Agencies' Roles and Responsibilities to Young Children" was led by Dr. John R. Marks, director, Idaho Department of Public Assistance. In his opening remarks, Dr. Marks said:

I think that there are basically three components of programs that the agencies have and by agencies, we are talking about local, state and federal. They have the responsibility in direct service to children and families. They have a responsibility in the training and education of professional, or para-professional people. They have responsibility in educational and information services to parents-to-be.

I think that there are several components of a program that go within these three that I mentioned. An agency should have a program component involving primary prevention of handicapping and of the condition we call childhood disadvantage. This lies in the areas of health, social conditions, economic conditions, educational areas. All agencies that are involved have responsibilities in the area of early identification of the disadvantaged child and the handicapped child. It may not be appropriate to apply all of our resources to change behavior to many children who do not really have need of it. If we are going to be somewhat selective, then we are going to have to identify the various children who need the programs of the various agencies. There has to be, then, on the part of these agencies, if they are going to intercede, if they are going to discover, some means of intervening early.

I think that all of the agencies involved have a responsibility to have an education information program among the general public as to what the needs are as the agency sees them after filtering the input from the people themselves. I think that agencies too often decide "what is needed" and then proceed to go out and apply these programs to the unsuspecting public with very little input from the public themselves. What do the parents think they need?

Panelists with Dr. Marks were Dr. John Cambareri, director of comprehensive health planning, Idaho Department of Health; Robin McCurdy, education developer, Idaho Regional Training Office, Headstart; and Howard Schrag, director, Idaho Office of Child Development.

I would like to include excerpts from the panel in the RECORD:

AGENCIES' ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

(By Dr. John D. Cambarer)

Dr. Zeigler, as the keynote speaker for the Conference, did an exceptionally fine job of setting the broad and complex parameters for discussion of "early childhood development"—emphasizing as he did the importance of the effects of culture, economics, social status and other factors which relate to the current status of the family and the changing role of the parent.

It was unfortunate (though predictable) that the succeeding speakers have moved from the high plane established by Dr. Zeigler into increasingly pedestrian and parochial discussion of the problems of training teachers, teachers of teachers, teachers of teachers of "para-professional" child health care workers.

Like almost all of the other participants in this Conference, I, too, want to deliver a sermon:

We, at this Conference, are all sinners. We all commit the sin of hubris. The sin of "blinding" pride . . . in our professions, our disciplines, our vocations. We all interpret this enormously complex social crisis in terms of our limited and vested interest. We *cannot* approach solution to the problems of early childhood development only by training personnel to operate child care facilities!

There are *no educational requirements to be a parent!* Anyone who is biologically able can be a parent . . . not just those persons who have had high school, college, or other courses in child care . . . but *anyone* who is biologically able. There are no G.E.D. or equivalent requirements to be a parent and if we, who are participants in this conference, concern ourselves only with training (various levels of) personnel to staff child care facilities we are avoiding the real gut issue of the child development problem.

Moreover, federal legislation and/or federal subvention of training programs for child care personnel, or for establishment of child care facilities merely begs the question . . . it offers only partial amelioration of the symptoms; not a cure for the disease—the "disease" is: That the development of many a child is in the hands of rank amateurs who happen by accident to be parents, who did not want the child (for any of a number of social, cultural, economic or other reasons), and who do not know how to raise him.

I believe the more effective solution is to "train" parents. I believe the only real solution is to ensure that a child is born only to parents who are willing and able to love him, feed him, cherish him, and raise him so that the child develops well and, ultimately, he, too, will be a good parent.

If we are to really solve this problem, then we must "bite the bullet" and not restrict our thinking and talking to "training personnel for child care facilities," but also to thinking about some unpleasant problems such as: Family planning, sterilization, abortion laws, laws prohibiting advertisement and sale of contraceptives, etc. . . . those "nasty" issues which must be talked about and resolved before we can talk realistically about enjoying a society in which each child has the best insurance policy for developing into a mature, productive, and happy adult—namely, parents who want him.

Now, after criticizing previous speakers for their simple and single minded solution to this problem—and after also offering you my own simple, single solution, let me quote from someone who has *not* been quoted previously today: H. L. Mencken, who said (as best I can recall): "To every complex human problem there is a solution which is clean, and simple, and wrong!"

Thank you.

HOWARD SCHRAG

Because the Idaho Office of Child Development is relatively new, I will briefly renew its development up to this point.

It was brought into existence through an Executive Order issued by Governor Cecil Andrus on the 15th day of November 1971. The Office itself is a result of commitment from both the Region X Office of Child Development and the Idaho State Interdepartmental Committee on Children and Youth. The need for the office was largely noted when the Interdepartmental Committee on Children and Youth attempted to acquire information concerning children (ages 0–6) in the State. The Committee ultimately concluded that, although the needs could be somewhat defined, how well they are being met or what services were being provided to meet them were unknown.

As a result of this finding the major objectives of the Idaho Office of Child Development are to assess the needs of children 0–6 in the State of Idaho, assess the services being provided, finding existing gaps and duplications in programs, make an extensive fiscal evaluation of State and Federal program funds, and establish State priorities.

With these objectives in mind the Idaho Office of Child Development has become involved in five major activities. The first, now being completed, is an Agency Service Survey. This survey documents the services now being provided to children ages 0–6 in the State by both public and private agencies. It includes interviewing of day care operators, kindergarten teachers, various public and private agencies offering early screening and diagnosis, etc. The second major undertaking of the Idaho Office of Child Development will be a Clientele Survey. The Clientele Survey is to evaluate the services both needed and being received by children ages one through six. A sample of over a thousand children will be randomly drawn. Need areas such as housing, economics, safety, developmental-skill level, nutrition, child care arrangements, and health will be the major components of the survey. The third major survey will be conducted in conjunction with the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education and the University of Washington School of Medicine with Doctor Ralph J. Wedgewood, Chairman of the Department of Pediatrics. It will be a survey concerning itself both with consumer and vendor services in the prenatal, perinatal, and postnatal areas. Its compition is expected by September 1, 1972.

The fourth major undertaking is to obtain community input concerning their views and evaluation of needs for children as they see them in their community. This is being done under the auspices of the 4–C Grant received from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washintgon, D.C. The major vehicle for obtaining this information is the speak-out. Speak-outs are being held in the major planning areas throughout the State in order to provide adequate input from the various planning regions. In addition to this, the regions are anticipated to continue the organization of an advocate system for children. The fifth major undertaking is a review of the literature extending from preconception through six years of age. This review is vital in that it will form the rationale and basis for further planning and program development of children's services in the State of Idaho.

While the Office is relatively new we are now beginning to evaluate the results of the initial Agency Service Survey. Governor Andrus in his introductory remarks included some of our preliminary findings. In addition to what Governor Andrus covered in his remarks, we have noted two major overall areas of concern while completing the survey. The first area is that of program egocentrism—that is, each program or each agency delivering various programs tends to view their programs in operation as central to the needs and concerns of the community with all other programs being ancillary to virtually nonexistent. This observation correlates with the second finding that coordination between programs is virtually nonexistent. In the various communities quite frequently one program director does not know what another program director in the same community is doing. These problems

are not typical of Idaho alone. The authors of the recent publication *Day Care—Nightmare* found that the same problem existed in the Berkeley and Oakland, California area.

At this point our data is only preliminary and our research has just begun. We anticipate that information obtained by the various surveys on and relating to the overall needs and services being provided for children will be available by December of 1972.

TRADING IN DEATH

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the testimony of Antony C. Sutton, research fellow with the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, before the platform committee of the Republican National Convention August 16, 1972:

There is no such thing as Soviet technology. Almost all—perhaps 90 to 95 percent—came directly or indirectly from the United States and its allies. In effect the United States and the NATO countries have built the Soviet Union—its industrial and its military capabilities. The massive construction job has taken 50 years, since the Revolution in 1917. It has been carried out through trade and the sale of plants, equipment and technical assistance. Fifty years of dealings with the Soviets has been an economic success for the USSR and a political failure for the United States. It has not stopped war, it has not given us peace. The United States is spending $80 billion a year on defense against an enemy built by the United States and West Europe. Even stranger, the U.S. apparently wants to make sure this enemy remains in the business of being an enemy.

On that same date, August 16, I brought Mr. Sutton's evidence and conclusions to the attention of my colleagues in Congress and to the press throughout the country. Here are excerpts from my statement to the House of Representatives:

Mr. Speaker, the most despicable practice I have encountered in my lifetime is that of successive Republican and Democratic Administrations in carrying on aid and trade with the Communist nations which supply the weapons to kill our men in Vietnam. How any Member of this body, who supports such action, can go home and sleep with a clear conscience, is beyond my understanding. Many of them have sons, like mine, who some day will serve in our armed forces if they are not already doing so, and may well be a target for those weapons whose manufacture we make possible.

In Arlington Cemetery we keep a 24-hour watch over our honored dead, who made the supreme sacrifice to defend our country and freedom against its foes. Their loved ones mourn them still, and will never forget them. Many of these dead would be alive today if we had not done so much to build up and sustain the economy of the Soviet and satellite nations for the last half-century. But as long as the dollars roll in to fill the coffers of the "big money" men who in turn make many of the largest contributions to both Republican and Democrat Presidential candidates, those who profit from aid and trade with the enemy couldn't care less about the cost in blood paid in places like Korea and Vietnam. Business and hyprocrisy of the highest order must be carried on—as usual.

Referring to Mr. Sutton's evidence and conclusions, I said that:

It is imperative that every Member of this body read what he has to say—and act accordingly.

My statement concluded as follows:

Mr. Sutton says that "this information has been blacked out by successive Administrations." I intend to see that it is blacked out no longer. . . . For once, let us submerge our differences and unite on an issue on which every man of conscience and honor in this country ought to be able to agree. These facts must not be suppressed or ignored because of concern about face-saving or a desire to pretend that unpleasant truths do not exist. Those who fail to print and publicize Mr. Sutton's evidence do so at the peril of the life-blood of America.

Nor can it be hidden much longer in any case. This story will become too big to kill. You remember the old saying "murder will out." What Mr. Sutton reports is a very sophisticated kind of murder; the bodies involved are those of our own young men, crying out from their graves for justice. The truth about this murder through trade with the enemy is coming out, and it will be heard.

FACING THE REALITIES OF VIETNAM

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, once again this Congress has chosen not to make a statement in opposition to the war in Vietnam. The deletion of section 13 from the foreign assistance bill can only be regarded as a grevious error.

I supported the retention of the end-the-war provision in the bill because I think the people of this country do want out from Indochina. Nevertheless, we are only playing games with these end-the-war amendments. No amount of rhetoric will hide the simple fact that the war cannot be ended by provisions which pledge withdrawal of U.S. troops contingent upon the prior release of prisoners of war. President Nixon refuses to accept such a limitation, and so do the Communists.

I have had lengthy informal talks with the other side twice in the last year. There is no way that they are going to release our prisoners before we have completely removed all of our troops. In fact, I doubt whether they would even release our prisoners after we had removed all ground, sea, and air support of the Thieu regime.

Let us remember, we are dealing with people that are slightly paranoid. They want that government in the south, and they want us to hand it over to them on a silver platter. Mr. Nixon is not prepared to overtly destroy the South Vietnamese Government, and frankly I cannot blame him.

The NLF and the North Vietnamese feel badly burned by the 1954 Geneva accords. They had control of most of the country; they let that control be negotiated out of their hands. They are not going to allow that to happen again.

So President Nixon is really deceiving us when he intimates that there is serious negotiation going on. No matter how many secret trips Dr. Kissinger takes, until one side fundamentally alters its position, the killing will continue.

The North Vietnamese position is clear. They consider the Saigon government to be the colonial arm of the United States. Thus, they are not willing to exchange POW's for American troop withdrawal unless that withdrawal also includes the Saigon government and Saigon army.

I have discussed this so-called proportional repatriation plan with the other side. At one point they indicated that they would be receptive to such a plan. This was 2 years ago. Since that time they have become increasingly intranisgent.

The POW's are the other side's "ace in the hole." They will be released when we physically remove the Saigon infrastructure in total.

I have spoken against the Thieu regime on this floor a number of times in the past. It is a democary in name only. It suffers from widespread corruption, and engages in the massive violation of individual liberties. Nevertheless, I am not ready to hand this regime over to the Communists, even for the release of our POW's. Neither, however, am I willing to support the continued bankrupting of the United States in a conflict that is as much an economic disaster today as it was a decade ago when we began escalating in Indochina.

It was reported in the August 14, 1972, New York Times that President Thieu is now questioning the strength of the U.S. commitment to South Vietnam. Thieu argues that—

Six or seven months of heavy bombing would be enough to destroy North Vietnam's economy and war machine and force Hanoi to accept a cease-fire with international guarantees over all of Indochina.

Gentlemen, this argument would be humorous if it was not so deadly. We have been told since 1965 by a variety of "experts" that just a few more months of bombing will insure an allied victory. In each case the predictions turned out to be incorrect.

There is no light at the end of the tunnel, only the flickering hope of those who desire a continued American presence.

The North Vietnamese have been fighting this war for over two decades. A few more months of bombing will certainly not succeed in breaking their desire to fight. The North Vietnamese have demonstrated that they respond to heavy bombing in the same way as did the citizens of London and Berlin during World War II. Bombing does not make them give in; it makes them dig in and fight harder.

We have spent $200 billion in Vietnam and obligated ourselves for another $200 billion in veterans' benefits. By Secretary Laird's own estimates, the Soviet Union and China have only spent $10 billion in Indochina.

I say $200 billion dollars is enough aid. The South Vietnamese have a million

men under arms. If they cannot repulse a Communist attack with this kind of force, then I doubt whether they ever will be able to.

What we should seek in Vietnam, then, is not an escalation of the war nor the destruction of the Saigon regime. We should unilaterally deescalate our posture over the next 6 months such that in all of Southeast Asia we only provide an equal and reciprocal force vis-a-vis South Vietnam as the Soviets and Red China assume toward their Communist counterparts. If this means that the United States must deescalate several hundred percent so be it—it might even be President Nixon's secret solution.

Such a posture would neither be a military victory or a defeat. It would let the Southeast Asians themselves determine who among them in a fair contest is the fittest, and the POW's would be returned in due course. I see no other alternative.

Madame Binh of the NLF recently put in concrete the position of the Communist side which has not altered perceptibly in over a year. A portion of her statement and the statement by Xuan Thuy to the 151st plenary Paris Conference follows:

PLENARY SESSION

Following is English text of PRG opening statement by Madame Nguyen Thi Binh at 151st plenary session of Paris meetings, July 20, 1972, as released to press.

Ladies and gentlemen, at the last session of this conference, I pointed out: "Our position is that the South Viet Nam problem should be solved definitely and exhaustively, i.e. the military and political problems should be settled at the same time so that on the basis of the accords reached, the parties will sign a comprehensive agreement to end the war and restore peace" . . .

On the political field, the United States has installed in South Vietnam an administration devoted to it with a huge machine of coercion and repression, instruments to carry out the U.S. policy of war and neocolonialism and to perpetuate the partition of Vietnam . . .

The "U.S. participation in the war" manifests both militarily and politically, therefore, in order to put an end to such a "participation," these two aspects of the problems should be settled simultaneously. The U.S. side pretends to desire an end to its military "participation" without dealing with the political aspect. This simply means that the United States still wants to maintain in South Vietnam the administration it has set up to implement the policy of "Vietnamization" of the war. If so the United States will never be able to put an end to its military "participation"...

In order to put an end to the U.S. "participation" in the military field, we have advanced the proposal that the United States withdraws in safety from South Vietnam all troops, military advisers and personnel, weapons and war materials of the United States and those of the other foreign countries in the U.S. camp by a precise date, at the same time it dismantles all its military bases in South Vietnam and stops all the activities of its air and naval forces and other acts of war against the Vietnamese people. The U.S. government still refuses to set a precise date for its total troop withdrawal, therefore, until now, there is not a basis to discuss and solve this problem. In order to put an end to the U.S. political "participation," we have put forth the proposal that the U.S. stops supporting the bellicose group it has installed, Nguyen Van Thieu resigns and the Saigon administration renounces its policy of repression and coercion against the people.

[Unofficial translation]

STATEMENT BY MINISTER XUAN THUY, CHIEF OF THE DELEGATION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM AT THE 151ST PLENARY SESSION OF THE PARIS CONFERENCE ON VIETNAM (JULY 20, 1972)

Ladies and Gentlemen: It should be noted that war is only a means for the United States to materialize its political aims. The creation and maintenance of the Saigon administration by the United States constitute a brazen violation of the South Viet Nam people's right to self-determination. Therefore the United States has the responsibility to cease all support of that administration so as to let the South Viet Nam people exercise their right to self-determination. After the agreement on all military and political questions, a cease-fire will take place: Only such a cease-fire can last and really end the hostilities. Once the military and the political questions are agreed upon, all other questions, such as the release of militarymen captured during the war, can be easily settled.

DUE PROCESS AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on August 4 the News American of Baltimore, Md., called to the attention of its readers the current mess in the State Department and especially in the Foreign Service. As I have noted many times in the past, there is an urgent need for a fair appeals procedure for Foreign Service employees who, unlike those under Civil Service regulations, could not in the past get a fair hearing on their grievances.

Mr. Ned Young, the civil service editor, in his column, "The Federal Log," has done a service for the Hearst papers' many readers by reviewing several cases of State Department employees whose treatment at the hands of the ruling hierarchy was less than equitable.

I insert at this point the column, "Fired Diplomat Gets Hearing," by Mr. Ned Young in the August 4 issue of the News American:

[From the News American (Baltimore, Md.), Aug. 4, 1972]

THE FEDERAL LOG—FIRED DIPLOMAT GETS HEARING

(By Ned Young)

John D. Hemenway, an Annapolis graduate, had spent more than 25 years in the State Department's Foreign Service and was chief of the Berlin section when he was "selected out" (fired) Jan. 17, 1969.

There have been such occurrences in the past.

What makes Hemenway so special is that he has become the first such person in the history of the State Department to obtain under the old rules a grievance hearing before a three-member board of examiners.

He selects one of the examiners. Another is chosen by the State Department, and the third is agreed upon by both sides.

The examiners have conducted at least a dozen hearings to date and heard voluminous testimony, but no decision, at least official, has been reached as yet as to whether or not he should be reinstated.

His service was extended from January to Oct. 4, 1969, and a week before then on September 26, he petitioned Howard P. Mace, then the department's personnel director.

It is reported that the examiner chosen by Hemenway was later in danger of losing his job, due to pressure suddenly brought to bear.

Just recently, Hemenway testified before the Fulbright Committee in opposition to Mace becoming the American ambassador in Sierra Leone. Mace had been nominated for the job by President Nixon.

While Hemenway has gained stature during his period of ordeal in his attempts to prove, officially anyway, that he has been grossly wronged, he is by no means the first member of the Foreign Service to be "selected out" after a satisfactory, if not distinguished, career.

The first such member whose selection out made the headlines, as a result of efforts by himself and friends to become reinstated was Stephen Koczak who also was stationed in Berlin at the time.

Koczak, a cum laude graduate of Harvard who had devoted most of his professional life to the Foreign Service, was fired after he reported a fellow officer was going to East Berlin and telephoning his former mistress in Warsaw.

Despite the efforts of many people, he was never reinstated, and works today as the chief researcher for the American Federation of Government Employes (AFGE).

Perhaps the most famous such case was that of Otto F. Otepka, the State Department's security chief who was demoted from a GS-15 to a GS-14, but never technically fired or selected out.

He nevertheless was placed on leave, and when his leave time ran out, he was placed on leave without pay. This occurred in 1962. In 1967, he was finally granted a hearing, but Dean Rusk, then Secretary of State, upheld the demotion.

Otepka kept fighting, but never won. In 1969, President Nixon appointed him as a member of the President's Board on Subversive Activities.

Charles W. Thomas, a career Foreign Service officer who became an orphan at six years of age, was serving with the American Embassy in Mexico City when he received notice that he was being "selected out."

A diplomat for 18 years, with progressively successful service in West Africa, Central America, the United Nations and Washington, D. C., he was notified in January, 1969, that he was being fired in six months because he had spent an excessive amount of time in the same grade.

It is to be noted that any Foreign Service officer who spends too much time in the same grade is subject to dismissal.

Unable to get another job, Thomas committed suicide. His wife, who is still with the State Department, and who in the past had been rated as outstanding along with her husband when the two worked as a team, is waging a concerted effort along with friends to get her husband reinstated posthumously.

The cases of Hemenway, Otepka, Koczak and Thomas serve as evidence for the contention by many that in the Foreign Service, if not in other agencies, there is what is described as the "hidden government."

The term means that a clique, rather than the rules of government, rules the Foreign Service and determines who works and who doesn't work. In order to keep your job, belonging to the clique is a necessity.

Cliques, of course are nothing new. In fact it is said that the Foreign Service is the last of government agencies to have one—if it does have one.

ARMY'S RECORDS DISPUTE MY LAI FINDINGS

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, today I entered an article from the Daily Oklahoman describing the efforts of several of the paper's editors to secure release of Army reports dealing with the My Lai incident of 1968. The following story, also from the May 14, 1972, edition summarizes the information obtained from the reports and gives an interesting analysis of the findings. At this time, the editors are continuing their struggle for the release of the "Peers Report," which they believe will shed some additional light on the events surrounding the My Lai tragedy.

The article follows:

ARMY'S RECORDS DISPUTE MY LAI FINDINGS

(By Jack Taylor)

Official records of military units involved in the My Lai massacre, released to the Daily Oklahoman after a 2½-year struggle against censorship, reveal a wealth of new information disputing some findings of the Army's own investigation of the incident.

The records—morning reports kept by three infantry companies and a helicopter company—show there were numerous errors in previous reports of the composition, organization, chronological history and operations of the units during a three-month period encompassing the tragedy at My Lai four years ago.

The records show the Army apparently did not take advantage of official information it had at hand in impounded records when a panel was ordered to investigate a possible cover-up of the incident, raising questions about the findings and conclusions of that investigation.

Although the records were heavily censored when finally released, a detailed study of the documents led to these findings:

Lt. William L. Calley, the central figure at My Lai and the only one of 25 persons charged in connection with the incident to be convicted, apparently benefited from an entry designed to cover his being absent without leave shortly before My Lai.

Lt. Calley and a fellow platoon leader in his unit—Company C, 1st Battalion, 20th Infantry, 11th Light Infantry Brigade, 23rd Infantry (Americal) Division—apparently were sent to Vietnam illegally in the first place.

Reports that Calley's unit received no replacements in the weeks before My Lai are false.

Reports that Calley's unit was decimated by casualties and greatly under authorized strength at the time of the March 16, 1968, assault on My Lai are greatly exaggerated.

Characterization of Calley's unit as composed of up to 92 per cent draftees is disputed, with the ratio between volunteers and inductees actually at about the average of 60 per cent draftee and 40 per cent volunteer.

Calley's unit actually had an overall personnel turnover rate less than the other two companies, which experienced from twice to nearly three times as much turnover.

Findings and conclusions of the Army's investigative panel headed by Lt. Gen. William R. Peers contain numerous errors in unit strength, casualties and events during operations, when compared with the official records.

Neither the Peers panel nor Army prosecutors apparently ever obtained a complete list of personnel assigned to the units involved at the time of My Lai, although such information apparently was already compiled and readily available from at least two different documents in each unit.

The significance of these new disclosures is twofold.

First, they show that descriptions of Charlie Company as a revengeful, kill-crazy, combat-fatigued, ragtag bunch of GIs, stripped of most of their manpower and unable to get replacements, are largely without factual support.

To fix much of the blame on the unit's manpower problems and combat losses is an apparent oversimplification, for in many respects Charlie Company was better off than either of the two companion units in the same task force.

Second, the number of errors discovered in official proceedings—the Army's investigation, the courts-martial and a congressional inquiry—when compared with official records, raises questions about the objectivity and effectiveness of those proceedings, including the court-martial of Lt. Calley.

Such errors in the most basic data raise the possibility of more numerous and far more serious mistakes in the Army proceedings which could have affected the final findings, conclusions and recommendations.

The Peers panel, for example, wrote in its final report a full chapter dealing with "significant factors which contributed to the tragedy at Son My (the village in which the hamlet of My Lai was located)."

However, that entire chapter was censored from the report when released to the public, as were many other important parts of the report. The errors discovered in the Peers report are in the highly excised summary—primarily background information—that was made public.

John F. Lally, assistant counsel for the My Lai Incident Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Investigating Subcommittee, told The Daily Oklahoman many of the conclusions drawn in its final report were based on the testimony of witnesses—primarily Calley's commander, ex-Capt. Ernest L. Medina—rather than on official records.

Both the Peers panel and the House investigating group experienced considerable difficulty jogging the memories of witnesses who could not or would not recall pertinent facts. Yet more than one witness whose memory was previously fuzzy appeared to have a clearer recollection of events when interviewed by The Daily Oklahoman with the benefit of an accurate chronology based on the official records.

When Calley graduated from Officer Candidate School at Ft. Benning, Ga., on Sept. 7, 1967, he was immediately assigned to Charlie Company, then at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, and already alerted for deployment to Vietnam.

Calley and another lieutenant, Stephan Karl Brooks of Dade City, Fla., then in the battalion's headquarters company, went to Vietnam in December—apparently in clear violation of Army regulations directing that such green officers "will not be ordered to a hostile fire zone unless they have completed four months duty in leadership type positions . . ."

The Army has been asked under what authority they were sent to Vietnam, but so far has not responded. Lt. Brooks was killed in action with another unit in the same division during an extension of his tour in July, 1969.

After the 11th Brigade was assigned to the Americal Division, Company C and two other rifle companies—Company A, 3rd Battalion, 1st Infantry, and Company B, 4th Battalion, 3rd Infantry—were assigned to the special Task Force Barker, set up shortly before the Tet Offensive at the end of January, 1968.

The task force conducted two major operations in February. During the first, Charlie Company lost its first man—Spec. 4 William J. Weber, Calley's radio-telephone operator, who was killed on Feb. 12.

Three more members of the unit were killed when the company stumbled into a minefield on Feb. 25. A fifth man was killed by a booby trap two days before the My Lai assault, according to the morning reports.

This count of five killed is considerably less than the figures previously reported, which have been as high as 12. Actually, Company C experienced no more killed during the first three months of 1968, although Company B recorded 12 dead (nine before My Lai) and Company A had six killed (two before My Lai).

Even the Peers panel's report on the Feb. 13–15 and Feb. 23–24 task force operations contains faulty casualty figures when compared with the records, and possibly even more grave errors.

A comparison of the panel's reconstruction of events in its report with the record on the morning reports shows the Army investigators may even have been confused about which unit was doing what and suffering which casualties. The panel reported Company B suffered only one killed, when the morning reports show two. There is an inference Bravo Company's casualties were inflicted during the first day of the operation, when the two dead actually came on the third day. Company A, however, suffered one dead and a number wounded on the first day, according to the morning reports, raising the possibility the Peers group actually confused the two units.

The Peers panel wrote that the three infantry companies lost three killed and 28 wounded during the second operation. The morning reports do not reflect a single death for any one of those units during that period, and only 19 wounded seriously enough to warrant evacuation.

During the second operation, Lt. Calley, reportedly still shaken by the death of his RTO, was at Vung Tau, the in-country rest and relaxation center, although being permitted an R&R so soon after arriving in Vietnam was highly unusual.

Charlie Company's morning report of Feb. 19 shows Calley left on a three-day R&R at 6:30 a.m. the previous day. He recalled during his court-martial that he was still on R&R eight days later when his outfit stumbled into the minefield.

The morning report of Feb. 24 has an entry that Calley returned from R&R and was present for duty on Feb. 21—four days before the minefield incident. There is no reason to believe he actually was back in his platoon at the time, and an administrative error can be discounted since no correction was made on subsequent morning reports prepared over the next five weeks.

The entry appears designed to cover the fact Calley overstayed his R&R and was AWOL. When asked about it by The Daily Oklahoman, Medina, now a Menominee, Mich., businessman, refused to answer.

The Army has been asked about the discrepancy, but so far has not responded.

Gregory T. Olsen, a machinegunner in Calley's platoon and now a Portland, Ore., policeman, told The Daily Oklahoman he remembers "some talk about Calley overstaying R&R but that's all."

Previous reports about the minefield incident were among the most exaggerated accounts of any ever reported about Charlie Company, with casualties given in a range all the way from one killed and 15 wounded to six killed and 12 wounded, or, as one report lumped them together, 32 killed and wounded. One report described Charlie Company as no longer an effective fighting force after the minefield encounter. And even the Peers panel and House investigating group apparently didn't have the full picture.

The House group, in its report, quoted the task force's operations journal for that day as recording one killed and 15 wounded. The Peers panel, which worked with the same journal and apparently little else in the way of official records, concluded that two died, based on its findings on total casualties.

Actually, the morning report for Charlie Company on that day shows two men killed and at least 11 wounded, although one of the wounded actually was killed and entered under the wrong category on the report—a fact the Army could have ascertained had it checked its own casualty lists in Washington.

Since the Army censored explanations of such report entries, it is difficult to be certain about the extent of the wounded under the applicable category, "reassignment losses." One, for example, was lost to the unit as apparently wounded on that day, but was picked up three days later as back for duty.

There is no doubt, however, about the killed in action, despite the Army's censorship of those explanations: such entries can only be under the category "separations," which is used only when a soldier is dropped from the rolls.

Those entered under that category on the Feb. 25 morning report were Spec. 4 Bobby Wilson, a Bloomington, Ind., youth who was scheduled to go home early because a brother had just arrived in Vietnam; and Pfc. Gustavo Rotger, a New York City draftee. Actually one of those listed as wounded—Pfc. Donnell Bell, a volunteer assigned as a platoon leader's RTO—also was killed rather than wounded on that day, the casualty lists in Washington confirm.

At this juncture the unit strength and availability of replacements became a critical point in reports of contributing factors leading up to the tragedy at My Lai three weeks later. The bleaker the picture, the more it appeared to justify sympathetic attitudes toward the company's misfortune.

At one point during Calley's court-martial, Capt. George C. White, a lieutenant assigned as a platoon leader in Company A at the time of My Lai, testified as a defense witness that his unit had only 50 men on that day—only about one-third what the records actually show.

That is the most extreme understatement, but it is typical of descriptions of the manpower problem in Task Force Barker reported over and over in past months as significant weaknesses plaguing the infantry companies and contributing to a deterioration of morale.

Even the Peers panel's conclusion of Charlie Company's strength in mid-March was erroneous, reporting a total strength of 141 men with five officers, 125 enlisted men plus 11 men attached. There was never a strength report on any of the unit's morning reports in that period—or even stretching back to February—to justify that conclusion, indicating again either a cursory examination of records or the acceptance of witnesses' testimony at face value. The Army has been asked what records, if any besides the operations journal, were scrutinized by the Peers panel but so far has not responded.

Actually the morning reports show all three infantry companies assigned to Task Force Barker were much better off than has previously been indicated, and probably not in any worse shape than many infantry companies fighting in Vietnam in the wake of the Tet offensive. Only the Peers Report, ironically, overestimated the strength situation for Charlie Company in mid-March.

Each of the infantry companies in Task Force Barker was authorized six officers and 158 enlisted men under then existing criteria. Although the Peers report states the change was made in early March 1968 and the previous authorization was six officers and 175 enlisted men, the morning report for Charlie Company on Feb. 27 notes the change actually was effective on Jan. 15, according to U.S. Army Pacific General Order 16, and that the previous strength level was six officers and 164 enlisted men—a change two months earlier and a strength 11 men less than the Peers panel reported.

The records show that contrary to the popular assumption, Calley's unit actually was just barely under its authorized strength at the beginning of 1968 and that the other two companies were the ones sorely in need of replacements, each with about 40 fewer men than Charlie Company.

Except for a few days in mid-February when one of the other units surpassed Charlie Company, the latter remained at strength levels above the other units until its minefield encounter on Feb. 25, despite a heavy influx of replacement into the others. Charlie Company's strength remained on about a par with the other two companies until shortly before My Lai when it dropped slightly below both for the first time.

At the time of the My Lai assault, Company C had 130 men counting attachments, with three away on leave. Company A had 134 with one on temporary duty elsewhc e and Company B had 139 with two on leave or TDY. Even accounting for the 20 or so men always left behind to provide administration and logistic support at the base camp and the heavy weapons platoon usually deployed elsewhere, there were considerably more than the handful of men, sometimes reported as low as 70, involved in the assault on My Lai.

Calley's unit lost only one man wounded that day—Pfc. Herbert L. Carter, a Houston draftee who shot himself in the foot because he reportedly was horrified at what was taking place. On the other hand, each of the other companies lost a man killed and several wounded.

Contrary to many previous conclusions, the replacement picture for Task Force Barker was not at all bleak. In the three months encompassing My Lai the three infantry companies got 135 replacements—men straight from replacement depots, not men returning to their units after recovering from wounds, illnesses, leaves, etc. Company C got 20 of them, fewer than the other units because Charlie Company did not have the greatest need, based on its greater strength.

One report bemoaning Charlie Company's plight concluded: "The company had never received any replacements since it came to Vietnam and certainly none since the minefield disaster."

The morning reports show there were 10 replacements before My Lai and one was assigned after the minefield incident. Company A had 69 replacements before My Lai and 70 overall, while Company B had 55 replacements all before My Lai.

During the critical period of Task Force Barker's operations from late January until the My Lai assault, there was an overall gain of 134 men against a loss of 152—only 18 fewer than the number that started out. Company C gained 12 and lost 44 during the period to come up minus 32 overall, while Company A gained 67, lost 68 and was one down, and Company B gained 55, lost 40 and had 15 men more than at the outset.

The overall turnover was far greater in the other two companies than in Charlie Company for the three-month period. Calley's unit had a 97-man turnover, while Company A had a 212-man turnover and Company B had a 145-man turnover.

In addition, the officer turnover in Charlie Company was far less, giving the unit a stability of leadership not enjoyed by the other companies. Company C's officer turnover was five, while Company A's was 11—including four changes of command—and Company B's was nine.

Charlie Company had fewer noncommissioned officers (sergeants) assigned to the unit at the time of My Lai than did the other two infantry companies, with only 20 (the Peers Report said 23). Company A had 34 sergeants while Company B had 32. Part of the reason for that disparity may have been because far fewer promotions were meted out by Charlie Company.

During the three-month period encompassing My Lai, Calley's unit promoted only 27 men compared with 65 promotions in Company A and 83 promotions handed out in Company B. At the time of the My Lai assault, Charlie Company had 64 privates—about 20 per cent more than the other two companies.

During that same period, Company C sent five men on leave or R&R, while Company A sent only one on R&R and granted no leaves and Company B granted five leaves.

Disciplinary problems reflected in Company C's morning reports, despite the Army's efforts to censor any such indication, were less than in either of the other units. Charlie Company shows two men busted to private in January and February, while Company A's morning reports reflect six different indications of disciplinary problems ranging from reductions in rank to AWOLs and confinements, and Company B's reports show three reductions or confinements.

When attempting to determine an accurate accounting of everyone in Charlie Company at the time of the My Lai assault, one Pentagon authority thought at first there was a roster of Charlie Company personnel. After checking, he said apparently neither the Peers panel nor Army prosecutors ever compiled such a list, despite the apparent need to know who might be potential witnesses.

Asked why, he could only reply: "If you can find out why the Peers panel did about half what they did, let me know."

CONGRESS ENDORSES BUSING WHILE TRYING TO RESTRICT IT

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, on August 17 and 18, in a debate that dragged on to 1 o'clock in the morning, the House of Representatives passed the legislation which has been presented to the American people as the antibusing bill. The most important fact about this bill—virtually unmentioned in all that has been said about it in the news media—is that it contains the first explicit endorsement that Congress has ever given to busing itself; that is, compulsory transportation of students away from their own neighborhoods because of alleged racial imbalance in neighborhood living patterns.

Since this bill amounts to a Congressional endorsement of busing even though it attempts to limit the scope of the more sweeping Court decisions in this area, I could not vote for it on final passage.

Until now, Congress had consistently and in no uncertain terms rejected compulsory busing of schoolchildren for purposes of racial balance or of desegregation. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 explicitly prohibited such busing though the Federal courts subsequently refused to enforce that section of the act, claiming that their own fantastic interpretation of the Constitution on this point superseded it. From then on through the

antibusing amendments added by the House to the Higher Education Act last year, Congress had repeatedly rejected this method of desegregating on the simple and logical ground that every child, regardless of race, creed, or color, should be allowed to attend the public school nearest his home so long as he wished to do so.

The Federal courts defined Congress on this point—first, district court judges and finally, the Supreme Court in the *Swann* case from North Carolina, argued in the fall of 1970 and decided in the spring of 1971. These judges claimed that the 14th amendment's guarantee of equal protection of the laws might require an exchange of schoolchildren among widely separated neighborhoods on the basis of race. They never bothered to explain what then happened to equal protection of the laws for the children who had to be bused against their will and that of their parents, by comparison with others still allowed to attend their neighborhood school. In the fall of 1970, when hearing arguments on the *Swann* case, the Supreme Court refused to accept legal briefs from Members of Congress who had drafted and debated the Civil Rights Act of 1964, explaining just what it was intended to mean.

Faced with this kind of usurpation of power by the courts, Congress could and should have acted long ago—as I have repeatedly urged it to act—under the authority granted to it by article III, section 2 of the Constitution, to prescribe the jurisdiction of the Federal courts, by simply ruling out of Federal court jurisdiction all cases involving transportation of public school students because of their race, creed, or color. The Senate took exactly this action in February of this year, only to reverse itself less than a week later; and the House rejected an amendment to the busing bill just passed, which would have had this effect, by a vote of 174 in favor to 211 opposed.

The bill as finally passed did restrict busing of all public schoolchildren to either the nearest school or to the next nearest, and did reopen cases already decided by Federal judges to make the new restrictions apply to them also. Whether these restrictions will remain in the bill as approved by the Senate, if it is approved by the Senate, remains to be seen. But the bill as passed by the House still says that in formulating a remedy for a denial of the equal protection of the laws, which may involve directly or indirectly the transportation of students, a court, department, or agency of the United States shall consider a series of remedies ending with the construction or establishment of magnet schools or busing to the nearest or next nearest school.

"Magnet schools" is the new term now being surfaced to replace "educational parks"—another example of the familiar gambit of changing the name of an unpopular program without changing its substance. Whatever they are called, the concept of "magnet schools" and "educational parks" is essentially the same: a huge centralized school drawing children from long distances away. Such schools furnish an obvious means of complying with the requirement that court-ordered busing be limited to the nearest or next nearest school, while still forcing children to be transported far away from their neighborhoods. We may expect large urban school districts to begin moving in this direction, and those and other school districts also to take advantage of the clause in the recently passed House bill which specifically authorizes school districts to require busing on their own authority, if school board members and officials wish.

This bill would not stop busing. It is one more example of two steps forward, one step back.

A PARENT'S VOICE OF CONCERN: "WHAT OF THEIR VIEW OF OUR NATION?"

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the busing provisions of H.R. 13915, "The Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1972," are surely among the most important legislative provisions which will be considered by Congress this year.

In theory, the Equal Educational Opportunities Act seeks to guarantee every child in America an equal opportunity for a good education. In fact, however, the strict limitations on the use of busing will deny educational opportunity to thousands of children who live in segregated neighborhoods where schools are less than adequate. Moreover, the approval of stringent restrictions on busing would deny to a large segment of our population their right to share in the fruits of American democracy through education and hard work.

The effect of these provisions were well described by Dr. A. Jarrell Raper, a Richmond, Va., parent, in a letter written earlier this year to the Honorable Elliot L. Richardson, Chairman of the President's Committee on School Policy. Dr. Raper has made a copy of his letter available to me. With the thought that my colleagues will find Dr. Raper's letter of interest, I am submitting it for inclusion in the RECORD:

MARCH 6, 1972.

Hon. ELLIOT L. RICHARDSON,
President's Committee on School Policy,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RICHARDSON: My wife and I are white patrons of the City of Richmond's newly integrated and heavily black public school system. I am writing this letter to you in your capacity as a group preparing background material for President Nixon's forthcoming decision on his stance in regards to school integration.

I am deeply alarmed by the political reaction to racial integration in our schools. I use the word "integration" deliberately, because even a brief and cursory look at American residential patterns shows one that meaningful integration in the schools is impossible without transportation of pupils out of their segregated neighborhoods (busing).

My alarm is based on what I believe to be the practical results that would flow from a Constitutional Amendment forbidding assignment of pupils to schools by race. This prediction is based upon intensive personal experience in the Richmond area, upon studies done by competent experts in school integration and resegregation, and upon extensive local conversations with many people of good will engaged for years in matters and organizations furthering interracial contact and understanding.

A Constitutional Amendment would, for Richmond, cause immediate resegregation of most schools into black and white institutions. There would be a few "around the edges" that retained some integration at least for a few years. However, based on past experience in this community the majority of black schools would immediately resegregate, and the majority of white schools with a substantial black minority would do so within a few years. This would be accompanied by and result from rapid population movement (residential resegregation) as the citizens perceived this as the developing national pattern. Whites would never move into black areas, thus destroying a very healthy movement which is already in progress in Richmond at the present time. The pressure upon black families seeking to move into white areas in the face of a national policy of racial separation would be unbearable.

The effect upon the minority (black) self-image here in Richmond would be catastrophic. These people perceive themselves as having been systematically held down and exploited for generations and feel that the Nation and the South is just now beginning to approach an appropriate view of their citizenship. I frankly agree with their view. It is nothing more than the simple history of our nation. You are probably familiar with the educational aspects of such a self-view. Belief that one may, by striving, working hard, and learning, gain some benefits of life for oneself and one's family is the prime motivating force behind school achievement. This would be largely destroyed. It is probable that the black middle class would desert segregated ghetto schools en masse and find space in local private schools or build their own, worsening the racial isolation of the less fortunate students.

The effect on local race relations would be, and already is, very destructive. The blacks would see the larger white community as turning away from what had been previously a national commitment. Relations with local whites would deteriorate. This is already a process here. Recently black parents have told me that there is, State-wide, a black reaction against local "anti-busing" (anti-integration) sentiment in Richmond's suburbs as they interpret this as the whites' position. Thus feeling has been reinforced by recent events at the national level. This is, I believe, just the first corner of the disaster that we can expect if the nation at this point turns back. There are now in the South millions of interracial contacts and even friendships. These are quite real and very important. My own children participate in them, as do my wife and I on the parent level. Such an amendment would destroy these relationships. I've no fear for what I would tell my children as to what is right, and what is wrong, but what of their view of our nation?

It also appears that the image of our nation as being really sincere in its concern for minority groups and for equal opportunity would be badly damaged in the eyes of both races, if such an amendment were ratified. "Equal opportunity" and "democracy" are empty words in a context of segregated inferior schools. This changed pattern of what America's course is really to be would destroy in large measure the influence, now considerable, of moderates of both races, who in the last several years have been using in a positive way all of the Christian, ethical and democratic arguments

they can muster as foundations for the ultimate good to our nation of racial integration. A conspicuous movement nationally toward black and white separation would destroy their influence, as they would be seen as impractically idealistic dreamers who did not understand in realistic terms our nation's possibilities and intentions. Their influence would not be soon felt again in the Richmond area, if everything that has been said for the last several years is contradicted at the highest national level.

The effect on radicals of both races would be detrimental to democracy. Frank segregationists would be thoroughly vindicated in their oft repeated view that our nation is not really serious about this problem, that it is they who correctly predicted the future, as they have always said that the white majority was not serious about this matter. The hand of the Black Radicals, now quite weak in Richmond, would be greatly strengthened. Is this not what they have predicted all along? I believe that we could then look for much more racial belligerance and arrogance on both sides, racial bloc voting, further fragmentation of various segments of our society into racial components, and increased demands for local autonomy and community control along racial lines, as the "next best" maneuver in the presence of a national retreat on integration of our society.

Much of what has been described for the City of Richmond would also take place on a national scale, perhaps even more strongly. I regret to say that it is a widespread feeling among white and black middle class racial moderates that President Nixon bears a large degree of blame for inflaming this issue.

The needs of our society are plain for all to see. The educational needs of the black minority are also plain to see, are too long neglected, and can best be met by provision of predominantly middle class classroom environments in those areas where it is geographically possible. Almost all educators agree on this fact.

The real question that remains is the national commitment to justice and to the nation's future. Much is riding on the movements of our government in the next few months. If great care is not taken, trends may be set in motion which will become irreversible, despite later attempts to recover what was lost.

Please be strong enough to obtain for the American people what is best for our nation, not what they think they want. Informed people of both races are in great distress and uncertainty. Please think carefully and deeply.

Sincerely,

A. JARRELL RAPER, M.D.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD POFF

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Virginia deserves commendation on two counts.

First, the people of its Sixth District had the good sense 20 years ago to elect RICHARD POFF to the House of Representatives and, second, the Governor of their State has now appointed Congressman POFF to the Supreme Court of Virginia.

I have nothing but admiration for DICK POFF. He is a man of firm convictions about right and wrong, but also a man of kindly instincts. In Congress, he has been a valued member of the Judiciary Committee. On the bench, I predict he will be a gentleman, knowledgeable in the law and fair in his interpretation of it.

As he leaves this House to take over his judicial duties, I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in wishing him well and in congratulating him.

CONGRESS DID RECEIVE THE AMCHITKA ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS AND IN COPIOUS QUANTITIES

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I was seriously disturbed when I read in the speech given by our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Representative WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, to the International Platform Association, as printed in the August 14th CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 28818. Mr. MOORHEAD stated that the administration refused to give the Congress the environmental report on Amchitka nuclear test, thereby confirming the desire of the executive branch to conceal its actions from the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the first draft of the environmental report concerning the proposed Cannikin experiment on Amchitka Island was released in June of 1970. A redraft was issued in the fall of 1970 and the final environmental report was issued in June of 1971, almost 6 months before the experiment was conducted on November 6, 1971. I have obtained from the Atomic Energy Commission a list of those Members of Congress and others to whom the draft, the redraft, and the final report were sent. I am appending this list below.

Our distinguished Colleague was incorrect in his assertion that Congress was refused this document. Some of its Members and committees even got multiple copies. The referred to list of recipients follows:

CANNIKIN DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT WAS RELEASED ON JUNE 12, 1970

The following State and Federal agencies were provided copies on the dates indicated. Comments were returned from those State and Federal agencies as indicated:

State agencies

DATE SENT AND DATE OF COMMENT

Governor of Hawaii, 1; June 17, 1970; July 14, 1970.

Governor of Alaska, 1; June 17, 1970; none received.

Copies sent to:

Director, Department of Natural Resources, 1; June 17, 1970; none received.

Commissioner, Department of Natural Resources, 1; June 17, 1970; none received.

Commissioner, Department of Health and Welfare, 1; June 17, 1970; none received.

Commissioner, Department of Fish and Game, 1; June 17, 1970; none received.

Federal agencies

Council on Environmental Quality, 7; June 17, 1970; none received.

Department of State, 13; June 17, 1970; July 28, 1970.

HEW, 4; June 17, 1970; October 14, 1970.

DOD, 4; June 17, 1970; July 21, 1970.

Department of Interior, 13; June 17, 1970; July 16, 1970.

Department of Transportation, 2; June 17, 1970; July 22, 1970.

Department of Commerce, 3; June 17, 1970; none received.

Copies of the draft Cannikin statement were also provided to the following for their information:

ALASKA

Senator Ted Stevens, 1.
Senator Mike Gravel, 6.
Rep. Howard Pollock, 1.

HAWAII

Senator Hiram Fong, 1.
Senator Daniel Inouye, 1.
Rep. Patsy Mink, 1.
Rep. Spark Matsunaga, 1.

OTHER DISTRIBUTION

Senator Proxmire's Office, 1.
Robert L. Jones, Ca. Legislature, 1.
Western Interstate Nuclear Board, 1.
President, Aleut Indian League.
Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, 2.

INDIVIDUAL REQUESTORS—16

Rep. Dingell, Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.
House Appropriations Committee, 1.
Senate Appropriations Committee, 1.

DISTRIBUTION OF REDRAFT CANNIKIN STATEMENT

1971, UNDATED

April 29, 1971

House Appropriations Committee.
Senate Appropriations Committee.

May 4, 1971

Governor William Egan, Alaska.
Alaska Congressional Delegates.
Senator Mike Gravel.
Senator Ted Stevens.
Representative N. J. Begich.
Governor John Burns, Hawaii.
Senator Hiram L. Fong.
Senator Daniel K. Inouye.
Representative Spark M. Matsunaga.
Representative Patsy T. Mink.

(Redraft—Cannikin; Comments Environment Statement; Staff Report)

May 6, 1971

Senator Muskie.
Senator J. B. Allen, Alabama.
Senator Clifford P. Case, New Jersey.
Senator Hiram L. Fong, Hawaii.
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Minnesota.
Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Washington.
Senator Robert W. Packwood, Oregon.
Senator Birch Bayh, Indiana.
Senator Alan Cranston, California.
Senator Philip A. Hart, Michigan.
Senator Daniel K. Inouye, Hawaii.
Senator Frank E. Moss, Utah.
Senator Gaylord Nelson, Wisconsin.
Senator William Proxmire, Wisconsin.
Senator John V. Tunney, California.
Senator Henry M. Jackson, Washington.
Senator Stevens, Alaska.

May 6, 1971

Congressman Dingell.
Senator Mike Gravel.
Senator Ted Stevens.

DISTRIBUTION OF FINAL CANNIKIN STATEMENT

Russell E. Train, Chairman, CEQ, 10; with summary sheet; June 23, 1971.

Charles Fabrikant, EPA; 5; with summary sheet; June 23, 1971.

Caspar Weinberger, OMB; 5, with summary sheet; June 23, 1971.

John Quarles, Interior; 18; June 23, 1971.

Roger Egeberg, HEW; 4; June 23, 1971.

Sidney Galler, Commerce; 10; June 23, 1971.

Louis M. Rousselot, Defense; 5; June 23, 1971.

William C. Salmon, State; 12; June 23, 1971.

J. D. Braman, Transportation; 2; June 23, 1971.
Gov. Burns of Hawaii; 1; June 23, 1971.
Gov. Ronald Reagan of California; 1; June 23, 1971.
Governor Daniel J. Evans of Washington; 1; June 23, 1971.
Gov. Tom McCall of Oregon; 1; June 23, 1971.
Hon. Carl Moses Pres., Aleut Indian League; 1; June 23, 1971.
Dr. David, Dir., OST; 1; June 23, 1971.
Stan Robinson, SECY Public Document Room; 1; June 23, 1971.
Edward J. Bauser, JCAE; 20; June 23, 1971.
Gov. Egan of Alaska; 5; June 21, 1971.
Senator Birch Bayh; 1; June 23, 1971.
Senator Mike Gravel; 25; June 23, 1971.
Senator Ted Stevens, Alaska delegate, 1; June 23, 1971.
Representative Nick Begich; 1; June 23, 1971.
Senator Hiram Fong; 1; June 23, 1971.
Senator Daniel Inouye; 1; June 23, 1971.
Representative Spark Matsunaga, Hawaii delegation; 1; June 23, 1971.
Representative Patsy Mink; 17; June 23, 1971.
Senator Muskie; 1; June 23, 1971.
Senator James Allen; 1; June 23, 1971.
Senator Clifford Case; 1; June 23, 1971.
Senator Hubert Humphrey; 1; June 23, 1971.
Senator Warren Magnuson; 1; June 23, 1971.
Senator Robert Packwood; 1; June 23, 1971.
Senator Alan Cranston; 1; June 23, 1971.
Senator Philip Hart; 1; June 23, 1971.
Senator Frank Moss; 1; June 23, 1971.
Senator Gaylord Nelson; 1; June 23, 1971.
Senator William Proxmire; 1; June 23, 1971.
Senator John Tunney; 1; June 23, 1971.
Senator Henry M. Jackson; 1; June 23, 1971.
Representative John D. Dingell; 1; June 23, 1971.
Miss Suzanne Reed, Comm. on Interior & Insular Affairs, United States Senate (Put Room 3204, New Senate Office Building, on envelope only); 1; June 23, 1971.
Kevin O'Brien, Office of Congressman Lloyd Meeds; 1; June 23, 1971.
NTIS Input Section, Department of Commerce, Springfield, Va.; 10; July 7, 1971.

FATHER EICHNER

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to pay tribute to a man who is dedicating his life and his energies to the education of young men, many of whom reside within my congressional district. This year, Chaminade High School, at Mineola, has dedicated its yearbook to Father Philip K. Eichner S.M. Father Eichner, himself a graduate of Chaminade, returned to his alma mater in 1966 and in 1967 was named superior of the Marianist Community and president of the school.

Since that time, Chaminade, which was founded in 1930, has grown and flourished. Under his capable direction, a student aid fund was established, the school's finances were stabilized, a new school library created, a new wing added and many other improvements completed. All of this at a time when parochial schools are faced with a continuing financial crisis. His administrative abilities and complete dedication to others merits the appreciation of us all.

We are proud of Chaminade and of Father Eichner and of the young men who graduate from Chaminade each year to become upstanding members of our community.

LIMIT ON FEDERAL SPENDING NEEDED TO STOP BUDGET-BUSTING

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, in looking at the actions taken by Congress on authorization and spending bills it appears that any sense of fiscal responsibility has waned. I doubt whether anyone who has reviewed the budget-busting operations of this Congress can refute this conclusion

Regrettably it is the old political story of making a Christmas tree out of virtually every bill which has broad political sex appeal. In the process are not the budget-busters ignoring the simple fact that we are either obliged to go further into debt in a manner that will cause a new round of inflation or provide the increased taxes necessary to meet these obligations?

Speaking on the floor of the House recently, chairman of the House Appropriation Committee, GEORGE MAHON, of Texas, said:

> The House has busted the President's budget request for new spending authority in fiscal year 1973 that began only three weeks ago by the astronomical sum of $20,770,436,000 . . . Does that bring a chill or tear? Apparently not. Have we been dulled and made insensitive by some virus that is infecting the country?
>
> We must provide more revenue, or we must somehow try to do a little less by way of escalating spending. Do I want to go home—do you want to go home—and tell your constituents that you have supported thus far this session $20 billion in spending authority over the President's budget?
>
> Should the people of this country be expected to endure this sort of treatment at the hands of their elected officials?

Despite an original budget figure well above the previous year, the Congress voted $1.8 billion, or an increase of 23 percent, on the HEW bill. Paradoxically, many Members of Congress who voted against increasing the debt ceiling are the same Representatives who have consistently supported greater deficits through bloated appropriation bills. If we are ever going to get our fiscal house in order, the minority within the House who feel that we should balance our budget will need a great deal more help from some of our colleagues than we have been getting in the past.

I and a few of my Illinois colleagues recently cosponsored our own budget reform proposal which seeks to place an annual spending ceiling consistent with our ability to provide the revenue. If there is any way we can get the Congress to approve this resolution, appropriation measures would be handled in the customary fashion with one important exception. A two-thirds affirmative vote would be required for the House to approve any spending bill which exceeds the provisions of the budget resolution.

It is regrettable that there is not some means of informing the general public with regard to the detailed record of the votes cast by Members of the House of Representatives on appropriation bills. There are plenty of organizations around the country who have a peculiar interest in one area of legislation or another who publicize the votes of Members of Congress on the basis of whether or not they support their peculiar positions. In most instances the Members of this House who support an increase in any appropriation bill regardless of the merit of the subject of the legislation are regarded as friends and those who try to keep spending in line are automatically enemies of their cause. For example, if an amendment is offered to increase an already expanded expenditure for some environmental purpose, the Representative who votes to keep that expenditure within the budget figure is presumed to be in favor of dirty water and dirty air. Such an assumption is usually ludicrous.

Again when an education bill was brought to the floor that provided twice the funds of recent previous years and a Member voted to keep the increased figure within the budget request, he was promptly regarded by many as being indifferent to education. There is hardly a pressure group in the country who does not seek more for their particular program than is put in the budget regardless of how that figure may have already been increased, but that is the political nature of trying to make judgments within the realm of fiscal reason.

I am convinced that the average citizen wants Congress to recognize the basic needs of the people and its essential institutions, but I am not convinced sense of balancing the budget, the fiscal chaos as the means of meeting these needs. Perhaps if there were a method of informing the public which Members of this House do recognize the good fiscal sense of balancing the budget, the fiscal responsibility could be restored before it is too late.

In concurring completely with the remarks of Representative MAHON heretofore quoted, I do so as a Member of this body who has not once in 16 years voted to throw the Federal budget out of balance and if every Member of this House had voted as I have over the years, we would have had a balanced budget every year since 1957. I am proud of that record although I recognize that in some instances it has not been regarded as a political plus by individual groups and organizations who are never satisfied with the amount appropriated regardless of how much of an increase has been provided in the original budget.

I sincerely hope that more of our Members will join us in supporting the budget reform proposal with a spending ceiling consistent with our ability to provide the necessary tax revenues.

LAETRILE: THE CANCER FIGHTER WASHINGTON WILL NOT TEST

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following is from a letter to Congressman LOUIS FREY, JR., from Dr. Dean Burk, head of the Cytochemistry Section, National Cancer Institute, May 30, 1972:

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

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

In the case of other drugs and medicines removed from the market, as discussed in my newsletter of July 26, 1972, at least some medical tests were cited to show ineffectiveness. But in the case of the anticancer agent Laetrile, the Food and Drug Administration refuses even to make clinical tests. They have ruled Laetrile out because it does not fall within an arbitrary definition that any anticancer drug must be toxic—that is, to some extent poisonous to healthy cells as well as cancer cells.

Incredible as it may seem, some medical bureaucrats have simply decided that no nontoxic substance can ever help cancer patients, and therefore all such substances are to be automatically excluded from the market and no medical evidence in their favor is even to be considered.

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

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

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

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

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1972

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

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

How long?

SENATE—*Tuesday, September 5, 1972*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we thank Thee for Thy care over us in the days just gone, for Thy presence with us in every event and experience of life and for the opportunities awaiting us here. May we give our best in service to the Nation, knowing that in serving it well we also serve Thee. Make strong the heart and mind of the President and all our leaders. Guard the Nation and its citizens from all that is base or evil. God, mend our every flaw "And crown Thy good with brotherhood from sea to shining sea."

We pray in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 17, 1972, the Secretary of the Senate on August 31, 1972, received the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

As we approach the October date on which pay rates for Federal employees under the statutory pay systems would normally be adjusted, I wish to advise the Congress that I will recommend a pay increase for Federal employees effective January 1, 1973. I believe it is appropriate to point out that section 3 of Public Law 92–210, the Economic Stabilization Act Amendments of 1971, requires that this adjustment this year be delayed until January 1973.

The pay raise required by section 3 of the Economic Stabilization Act Amendments was limited by the terms of the law to the guideline that the Pay Board has established for pay increases throughout the economy, 5.5 percent a year. Clearly it was the intent of this law to see that Federal employees would be treated in a comparable manner with private enterprise employees under the Economic Stabilization Program. In recognition of this intent, on January 11, 1972, I directed that Federal wage employees should also have their pay increase limited by the Pay Board guidelines.

The necessary comparability studies have been completed and, under the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970, I will recommend that the increase necessary to achieve comparability, be paid, starting January 1, 1973, the first date our employees will be eligible to receive an increase under the Economic Stabilization Act. Our employees received their full 5.5 percent annual increase last January, and therefore their next increase cannot be effective until January 1, 1973. The provisions of Public Law 92–210 preclude submission of an alternative plan under section 5305(c)(1) of title 5, United States Code.

I believe it is important to express once again my strong personal support for the principle that our Nation's public servants should receive pay that is comparable with pay in private industry. For our Government to operate efficiently in these increasingly complex and demanding times, we must have a civil service of the highest caliber, and to recruit and retain these necessary employees, we must offer them a fair and just wage. Nevertheless, in our efforts to stabilize and revitalize our Nation's economy, it is also appropriate that they be treated the same as employees in the private sector, who are also able to receive such