

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself and Mr. QUOTE):

H. Res. 1124. Resolution to authorize additional investigative authority to the Committee on Education and Labor; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 16734. A bill for the relief of Kendall Gordon Parker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 16735. A bill for the relief of William Allen, and Marie Allen, his wife, Rock Springs, Wyo.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 16736. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Owings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 16737. A bill for the relief of Ramakrishna Rao Palepu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

284. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city council, Oak Park, Mich., relative to murder at the Olympic games; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has yet to face up to the challenge of our older Americans. Too many live out their later years in poverty—helpless and alone—feeling that they are a burden on their children and society. Surely a nation as great as ours can meet this challenge.

What are the basic needs of our senior citizens? Adequate income, adequate transportation, the best possible nursing home care, and expert medical attention.

Adequate income must be provided through both adequate employment opportunities for our senior citizens and through adequate social security and retirement benefits. Recently, I supported the 20 percent social security benefits increase, and during 8 years in the Congress, I have supported all of the measures which have come before the House of Representatives to increase social security benefits, as well as the proposal to adjust social security benefits automatically according to changes in the cost-of-living index. This proposal is part of H.R. 1, which passed the House of Representatives, and is presently awaiting action in the Senate. Additionally, I supported a 20-percent increase in railroad retirement benefits, effective September 1—the date that the newly enacted 20 percent social security boost became effective.

As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I have consistently supported urban mass transit subsidies which will help our local authorities improve our transportation services and make it feasible for them to authorize reduced fares for elderly individuals. Just last week in the Banking Committee I was successful in adding an amendment to the 1972 housing bill which provides that elderly and handicapped persons riding on a public transportation system, such as the Chicago Transit Authority, pay only half fare during nonpeak hours. The 1972 housing bill, with my half-fare amendment for senior citizens, is expected to pass the House this week.

As the general chairman for the Villa Scalabrini Development Fund, I was one of those in the Chicago community responsible for establishing Villa Scala-

brini, the old people's home in Melrose Park, Ill. I know firsthand what can be accomplished with a little thought, effort, and imagination in the area of nursing home care. Villa Scalabrini stands today as an outstanding example of a modern facility which provides compassionate care for its residents. It has provided not only physical care, but spiritual comfort and a refuge of peace and happiness for elderly persons. Last Sunday, I was at the old people's home in Melrose Park and participated in the 20th anniversary celebration of its establishment.

It was a moment of pride for me to see so many old people well cared for and happy in their surroundings. With the application of uniform standards, this can be accomplished in nursing homes across our Nation.

In 1954, there were only 6,539 nursing homes in the United States—today, that number has jumped to 24,000. Through medicare and medicaid programs, the Federal Government annually pays approximately 40 percent of the cost of operating this industry. Sadly enough, although the industry has grown, standards and regulations for nursing homes have not kept up with this growth. It is essential that we provide rewards to those nursing homes offering exemplary care, that we encourage better training and better pay for nursing home personnel, and that we provide Federal inspectors if State inspectors cannot adequately do the job.

Mr. Speaker, I have proposed establishment of a Select Committee on Aging which would provide the permanent, full-time, day-to-day compassionate interest and concern which more than 20 million older Americans—one-tenth of our population—fully deserve.

The Older Americans Act, which I sponsored and supported, established an Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to deal specifically with problems of the aged and aging.

I am also one of those who supported legislation to establish a National Institute of Aging within the National Institutes of Health. The National Institute of Aging will conduct and support research on the aging process and on the prevention, treatment, and cures for special health problems of the aged.

Medicare became a reality during the first year that I served in the Congress—1965—and I was one of the staunch supporters of this landmark program. It provided—for the first time in the history

of our country—health and medical care for our senior citizens.

During the 92d Congress, I introduced legislation to provide outpatient prescription drug coverage for certain specific illnesses under medicare. This proposal has already been approved by the House of Representatives and is now part of H.R. 1, which is receiving the consideration of the Senate.

All of this is not enough, however, as many of our senior citizens are still unable to provide adequate health care for themselves or to meet the high cost of prescription drugs on the meager incomes which they now receive.

Although H.R. 1 does include my proposal to provide outpatient prescription drug coverage under medicare for certain specific illnesses, such as arthritis, cancer, chronic cardiovascular disease, chronic respiratory disease, rheumatism, thyroid disease, diabetes, and tuberculosis, I do feel this should be supplemented by permitting medicare participants to purchase from the Public Health Service, Veterans' Administration, and Hill-Burton assisted hospitals and clinics, at wholesale prices, all prescription drugs not already covered by medicare, as well as hearing aids and eyeglasses.

I therefore introduce in the Congress a bill which will go a long way toward helping our senior citizens bear the financial cost of illness which so often accompanies advancing age. My bill provides that all prescription drugs not covered by medicare be made available at cost to persons on either part A or part B of medicare. In addition, it provides that hearing aids and eyeglasses be made available on the same wholesale basis by hospital dispensaries. Finally, the bill provides that drugs for medicare patients be prescribed on a generic rather than brand name basis. Making these drugs, hearing aids, and eyeglasses available to senior citizens at wholesale cost and at generic medicine cost rather than brand name medicine cost will help substantially to reduce the total cost of drugs for the elderly.

Mr. Speaker, the number of senior American citizens over age 65 is expected to exceed 25 million by 1985. In my own city of Chicago over the past decade the percentage of elderly persons in the 60-and-over category has grown from 15 percent in 1960 to 15.3 percent in 1970. Today almost 10 percent of our population is elderly, and there are 20 million Americans in the senior citizen category. Of these, 17 million have no private pro-

tection whatsoever as far as prescription drugs are concerned.

Our senior citizens now spend 20 cents of their health care dollar on prescription medications. This amounts to about \$1 billion a year or 25 percent of our Nation's total outlay for prescription drugs. When we consider that many of our older people are living on minimal fixed incomes and that fully 25 percent of them are living at or below the poverty level, then we cannot help but realize the terrible strain which high cost drugs, hearing aids and eyeglasses must place on their limited financial resources.

In my judgment, there is no question about the need for making high cost drugs, hearing aids and eyeglasses available at wholesale cost to our senior citizens. I am hopeful that the Congress will take early action on my bill in order that it may supplement the provision already contained in H.R. 1. Truly, our senior citizens are among our most forgotten Americans and we cannot ask them to wait any longer for solutions to their special problems. This legislation would help to solve one of these special problems.

THE AMERICAN FLAG—SACRED SYMBOL OF OUR NATION

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for almost two centuries, the American flag has served as the sacred emblem of our great Nation. In the words of the brilliant Henry Ward Beecher:

A thoughtful mind when it sees a nation's flag sees not the flag, but the nation itself. And whatever may be its symbol, its insignia, he reads chiefly in the flag, the government, the principles, the truths, the history that belongs to the nation that sets it forth.

With our great American heritage in mind, it is very shocking for me to view the utter disregard which some Americans have recently displayed for the flag of their Nation. In demonstration after demonstration protesters have shown a flagrant disdain for the flag.

During the infamous May Day demonstrations which seized Washington last spring, I witnessed many disturbing acts committed against our country. Some of the most alarming of these were young revolutionaries climbing flagpoles and tearing down the American flag, stomping on it and then replacing it with the flags of enemy countries, countries which are holding American prisoners of war.

In Miami at the Republican National Convention last month, demonstrators were actually wearing pieces of the American flag as parts of their clothing. There were also many incidents of flag burning and desecration as a further act of protest.

I personally view actions of this nature with disbelief. It is shocking to see such overt acts taking place openly. Do we as a Nation lack the will to stop this vicious onslaught? Our apathetic nature has

caused this small group of revolutionaries who actively advocate the overthrow of our country, to believe we are an easy target for their acts aimed at demoralizing the American people.

I do not feel that our Government or our citizens should have to put up with this display of disdain for our Nation, the principles it stands for, and the men who have sacrificed their lives defending it.

For these reasons I am introducing two bills today: one which will make it a Federal offense for anyone to display the flag of any country which holds American prisoners of war, or any revolutionary group which advocates the overthrow of our Government; the second will expand the criminal sanctions for the desecration of the flag. I feel that passage of these bills is essential if we are to preserve the respect which the vast majority of Americans have for the flag of their Nation. For, in the words of Woodrow Wilson:

The flag has no other character than that which we give it from generation to generation. The choices are ours.

THE TRAGIC PROBLEMS OF OUR NATION'S SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter which I feel should be read by every Member of the House. It is a compelling letter which eloquently addresses itself to the tragic problems of our Nation's senior citizens. It is a forceful letter, but it is also a typical letter. Typical in that it expresses the same concern which I find in the hundreds of other letters which I receive on this subject each month. The problems cited here are not the problems of one man, but of millions of our elderly citizens throughout the country. I hope that every Member will give this letter careful and serious consideration.

STOUGHTON, MASS.,
August 14, 1972.

HON. JAMES A. BURKE,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your letter of July 20, it was welcome and appreciated. Its contents and the accompanying material were very informative; which I enjoyed reading very much.

Your reference to our past communications about social security, verified our intense interest, which for you is to vote for improvements and for me that will be the recipient of such.

Therefore I concur with you very strongly about the inadequacy of social security, and I wish you success in educating your colleagues to work hand in hand with you to improve social security.

I am tormented by cynicism to have discovered that in this advanced day and age, that "civic and religious leaders; who from the 8th to the 11th century, learned how often difficulties resolve themselves by the intervention of human mortality," that such an ironical act of fate is that of history repeating itself so forcefully in this 20th century.

I am also apprehensive about the mood of hesitancy and obstinacy by Congress to treat social security realistically, on the premise, that it took thirteen years to awaken and nullify the shame and sham of prohibition; "So now I ask, how many more years must pass before our law makers awaken to the need to nullify the oppressive and irresponsible segments of social security?"

I also feel unjustly imposed upon, not only by the curtailment of my working and earning capabilities but my being denied a mortgage insurance plan on my new home, because of my being seventy-one years old. I do hope something can and will be done about this added pre-posthumous punishment. I hope and pray that the day is not too far distant when the elderly will be given more of what is needed than that they are denied.

You may if you wish read all or any part of this letter to your colleagues. You have my permission and blessing to do so.

I should appreciate your informing me if anything is being considered by Congress to improve social security at the present time.

Also what if any features of social security are embodied in the Democratic Platform in this years' Presidential campaign.

Thanking you for whatever courtesy you might extend to me; with every good wish to you as always, I am

Sincerely,

MATTHEW RUGGIERO.

SEEDS OF JOBLESSNESS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, television watchers have been subjected in recent weeks to the sight of performer Steve Allen or nature photographer Ansel Adams emerging from a woodland scene to urge auto purchase prospects to "test drive a Datsun" and by doing so enable the U.S. Forest Service to plant a tree.

Promising as may be this campaign to the betterment of the national environment in the future, the fact remains that, in far too many instances, our Government is continuing to play the patsy role to foreign competitors. Rather than planting a tree, the TV pitch could have us planting the seeds of further American joblessness.

Datsun cars are the product of Japan's Nissan Motor Co. Ltd. Each one sold in this country, therefore, adds to our international trade deficit and represents one less American car produced and sold. Of special significance to western Pennsylvanians, each Datsun sale here means almost a ton of U.S. steel production lost.

That the U.S. Forest Service is lending itself to a program of promoting Japanese sales in our markets is something which needs the attention of administration officials. The agency is part of a government which professes to be concerned about the trade deficit, the rising tide of import products, and the urgent need of more American jobs. Could not U.S. firms be enlisted in the promotion of tree planting? If the Forest Service is so desperate for funds, why does it not come to Congress?

Representative MARTHA GRIFFITHS, of Michigan, is quoted by the Wall Street Journal as saying:

Whatever the benefits to America, we can't afford to have any of our agencies helping send money out of the country.

Representative GRIFFITHS is well aware of the effect of this kind of arrangement on Michigan's auto industry. We are equally aware of its effects on the steel industry of our district, a chief supplier of automobile steel and steel bodies. It is another of those situations in which the American manufacturer and worker have been maneuvered into an unfavorable position by the supertolerance of our Government in its trade relations with other nations, many of which maintain severe restrictions on their imports of U.S. products.

Imagine Japan permitting General Motors, Ford, or Chrysler to use one of its government agencies to promote the sale of their automobiles in the Japanese domestic market. Booming Japan does not play the trade game that way. Only we do.

INTRODUCTION OF AMENDMENT TO THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the National School Lunch Act, as amended by Public Law 90-302, defines "service institutions"—section 13(a)—to mean "private, nonprofit institutions or public institutions such as day care or other child care centers, settlement houses or recreation centers which provide day care or other child care when children are not maintained in residence for children from areas in which poor economic conditions exist, and from areas in which there are high concentrations of working mothers, and including public and private nonprofit institution providing day care service for handicapped children."

The problem with this section is that it excludes resident camps. The legislative history on how the provision excluding resident institutions came into the bill is somewhat unclear. Representative CHARLES VANIK introduced the bill, and it was not in his original version. However, it was a part of the bill when it came to the floor.

In dealing with the Camping Services of Community Council of Greater New York, I have learned that a tremendous need exists to extend these funds to nonprofit residential camps. The vast majority of the children who are served by these nonprofit camps are urban children from lower income groups. Most of them would be eligible for the lunches were they attending a day camp rather than a residential camp.

To extend the school lunch program to nonprofit resident camps would give more children the opportunity to attend camp by lowering the costs to the camps. Camp is an invaluable experience for

children, especially urban children who have had little chance to leave the city, and I believe that the program should be extended to resident camps.

For this reason, I am today introducing a bill which would amend the School Lunch Act to include "resident camps" under the definition of "service institutions." I include a copy of the bill at the conclusion of my remarks:

H.R. 16721

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that section 13(a) (1) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1761(a)(1)), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence, to read as follows: "The term 'service institution' shall also include nonprofit residential camps for children."

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS STATE- MENT ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today the House considers the Labor-HEW appropriations bill. Thus, I feel it is an appropriate time to share with my colleagues excerpts of the testimony of Mr. Carl A. Beck, chairman, Legislative Action and Policy Committee of the National Small Business Association before the Senate Labor Subcommittee. It is one of the finest examples of constructive approaches to the concerns of the small businessman as he tries to comply with the Occupational Safety and Health Act that I have seen yet.

In the testimony he sets forth the results of an investigation undertaken by the Small Business Association of the actual inspections and reports by OSHA by region III in Philadelphia. Their independent investigation concludes that:

... the business community has fallen victim to a great many rumors and scare-stories which appear to have little foundation in fact.

The recommendations of his statement are constructive and worthy of consideration by the House at this time.

The statement follows:

TESTIMONY OF CARL A. BECK

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, my name is Carl A. Beck. I am Chairman of National Small Business Association's Legislative Action and Policy Committee and President of the Charles Beck Machine Corporation of King of Prussia, Pennsylvania. This statement is presented on behalf of National Small Business Association representing 40,000 firms doing business in over five hundred different industry categories. We appreciate the Committee's giving us an opportunity to comment on the effect of the Occupational Safety and Health Act.

Our statement is based on almost five years of exposure through legislative consideration of OSHA, forms review on the Business Advisory Council on Federal Reports, and personal exposure to compliance in my own small machinery manufacturing business.

In order that our statement today not be circumscribed by only personal experience and judgment, we have broadened our investigation into the business impact of OSHA by studying a representative sample of actual Inspection Reports. In addition to the usual "horror stories" we have all heard, we have also heard many complaints from our members, and from the business community in general, about OSHA, that factories are being shut down, small firms are being fined into bankruptcy, etc.

In order to check the validity of these fears and reports, we went to the Philadelphia Area and Regional offices of OSHA and conducted our own investigation into how the OSHA laws were being administered.

This study focussed only on correspondence files and inspection reports of Region 3, which are kept at the Philadelphia offices. (There is no centralization of information from the 50 OSHA offices.)

We talked with OSHA inspectors and administrators, reviewed a random selection of cases handled by the Philadelphia office during the last six months, and examined various procedures employed by OSHA. Throughout our investigation, Department of Labor employees were informative and co-operative, giving us whatever information we requested, except that prohibited by regulations. It appears that the results of this study generally reflect the situation across the country.

We believe our study shows that the business community has fallen victim to a great many rumors and scare-stories which appear to have little foundation in fact. A businessman is probably unduly terrorized by the prospect of an OSHA inspection because he does not understand the OSHA laws, and is being preyed upon by hordes of people who hope to profit from his lack of information.

We could not find any substantiation for any of the many stories circulating about firms being forced out of business as a result of OSHA inspections. What we did find out was that the small businessman is confronted by an unmanageable mass of regulations with which he is told he must comply, or suffer being fined. After taking a look at all the rules, standards, guidelines, etc., it is no wonder that he will believe almost anything.

Out of the roughly 3,000 cases that were indexed in the Philadelphia files, we found only two firms that had received fines totalling over \$1,000 (\$1,070 and \$1,200), and in both cases there had been an employee fatality. Similarly, the largest fine for a single violation was \$600, and in every case this fine was levied it was related to a fatality. Fines for all violations cited against a company generally ranged in the \$150-\$250 bracket, with fines totalling over \$350 being rather uncommon. An examination of the 18 small firms in our random sampling shows that these firms averaged total fines of roughly \$100, with \$210 being the highest, excluding one firm that was inspected and fined because of a fatal accident.

The real expense to these small firms, as expected, comes not from fines but from the cost of modifying or replacing equipment in order to comply with OSHA regulations. An additional expense is incurred when the small businessman must bring in consultants to advise him on compliance.

Every businessman we spoke to told us that he was able to understand the basic language as set forth in the *Federal Register*. However, they all noted that most points didn't apply to them anyway, and that the complexity of working their way through the entire body of referenced standards was a Herculean task.

The biggest problem, we found, is with the "referenced in" standards that are included as part of the OSHA law. To procure all these would cost over \$300. They must be obtained from a number of different sources, and combine to form a stack of paper several feet

high. Both investigators and legal personnel in the Philadelphia office readily conceded that some of these standards were written in specialized fields, and are not readily intelligible to the layman.

The basic document itself, the *Federal Register*, went out of stock several times during the past year because of demand. When this basic document is not available from OSHA field offices, it must be ordered from the Government Printing Office, and we all know how long that can take.

The various referenced standards also are frequently sold out when ordered. We know of delays of up to three months in obtaining some of these.

The Philadelphia office of OSHA seemed to be very co-operative in replying to questions received. In January of this year, however, a businessman faced a month's delay before his question was answered, and today the average reply period is six to eight weeks.

After a delay in receiving the *Federal Register*, a small businessman wades through it and finds some referenced standards that he suspects may apply to his firm. After another delay of some months these standards arrive, at different times from different sources. He writes to OSHA with a question about a technical aspect of one of the standards, and waits two months for a reply. As much as six months may have elapsed from the time he first sought information to the time his specific question was answered. And during this time that he is diligently trying to effect compliance with the law, an inspector may show up and fine him for non-compliance.

A major problem, however, is the fact that an OSHA inspector cannot enter a businessman's property except to conduct an official inspection. A common problem is illustrated by the case of the small construction firm owner in Pennsylvania who wrote to OSHA, asking if an inspector could come look over his site "and tell me what must be done to insure that I comply with all facets of this law". In accordance with the law, the Regional Administrator had to reply: "I must inform you that you may receive a monetary penalty for any or all of the violations noted on such an inspection".

Many firms are turning to the use of consultants, out of desperation. They are being forced to pay to find out what the law requires of them. And there appear to be plenty of people who are anxious to give him advice—for a price. Self-styled "OSHA consultants" have sprung up during the last year like mushrooms after the rain. And they are not cheap, by any means.

A businessman who doesn't want to wait six months to be certain that he is in complete compliance with all federal laws concerning his employees' safety and health is constantly being subjected to high-pressure, scare tactics sales pitches from people who are taking advantage of his plight. The owners of one construction firm in West Virginia with whom we spoke told us that they currently receive about six letters a month from consulting firms telling them how badly their services are needed in order to be sure they will not be hurt by an OSHA inspection. The owners tell us this is just a trickle compared to the flood of solicitations they received a year ago. Each letter, of course, pointed out how serious the threat of an OSHA inspection was, and how severe could be the penalties for not being in total compliance.

Businessmen are also bombarded with high-pressure sales efforts for "Code Conversion Kits" and other devices that their manufacturers claim are essential for compliance with federal laws. Other firms have been observed advertising products as being "OSHA approved" or "meets all OSHA standards". Since OSHA steadfastly refuses to endorse any product and says that no item can be deemed to be in full compliance until it is

considered in reference to the specific place and conditions in which it will be used, many of these ads seem to be using objectionable sales methods. More importantly, they are adding to businessmen's fears about complying with OSHA.

Another question we looked at was that of how many investigations actually turned up violations. We had seen figures issued by the Department of Labor, indicating that 23% of the OSHA investigations turned up no violations whatsoever. This figure was cited as proof that their regulations are easily understood and implemented by many employers.

This claim was not borne out by our study! The evidence in the Philadelphia office indicates that less than 1% of all initial investigations reported no violations. Less than 5% of the investigations resulted in no fines being levied.

The only way a figure anywhere close to 23% could be obtained would be by including figures for follow-up visits, where inspectors check to see if previously cited violations have been corrected. This kind of number-juggling strikes us as being less than desirable!

As a result of our study of operations and reports of the Philadelphia Area and Region 3 offices, as well as interviews, discussions, and personal experiences from the small business community, we would like to offer three specific recommendations:

1. There needs to be an organization of regulations and standards into a format where they can be indexed and subdivided so that applicable sections for a business or industry can be assimilated.

2. Consultative, non-punitive visits should be permitted and encouraged, to enhance compliance, rather than encourage avoidance. The development of a "self-inspection manual", keyed to industries or SIC groups, would ameliorate the man-hour needs of OSHA inspectors, and make their visits more productive.

3. OSHA personnel have done much to "spread the word" about OSHA to the business community, but the time has come where business, particularly the small businessman, needs industry-oriented advice and consultation, not lectures. Other federal departments and administrations should be utilized also for such a program of education. There is a great need for simple yet specific educational pamphlets and materials, which could be made available to trade associations and industry groups as well as through government channels.

A reorganization of the regulations, an opportunity to encourage their use and adoption, and an educational campaign directed to specific needs—these three aspects of implementation will go a long way toward solving small business' problems of compliance with OSHA regulations.

We appreciate this opportunity to present our views and recommendations.

FREELY TRAVELING ABROAD

HON. LAWRENCE G. WILLIAMS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the ugly spectre of human bondage has again been raised by one of the world's supposedly civilized nations. One of the rights we take for granted—that of freely traveling abroad, or leaving our country, has routinely been denied the citizens of totalitarian states.

We freely accept the concept that an

individual who does not like our system, or feels that he can do better elsewhere, is free to leave. The Soviet Union does not grant that right to their citizens, as we all know. The Iron Curtain has always served better to keep their people in, than to keep other people out.

In the past weeks, however, the Soviets have risen to new heights in their attempts to hold Soviet Jews against their will. The Soviet Government has announced a new "tax" required of all emigrants educated in the Soviet Union. This tactic is, of course, aimed primarily at the Soviet Jews who desire to leave Russia for Israel.

This so-called "tax" is, in truth, no more than a ransom which must be paid to free human beings who are being held against their will.

The Soviets publicly indicated that this tax is designed to repay the Soviet state for the educational expenditures that emigrants had benefited from the tax ranges all the way up to \$24,000 for a person holding a doctorate. The Soviets have clearly indicated the fact that this is a ransom, however, by passing a 35-percent surcharge on all funds sent to the Soviet Union to pay this "tax." If all the Soviets were doing was attempting to recoup the educational expense there would be no reason for this surcharge. In fact, the Soviets have established what they consider to be a market value on human beings.

The Soviets were already charging an exit fee of nearly \$1,000. Now, on top of that, a Soviet Jew holding a doctorate whose "tax" is paid by funds from outside the Soviet Union would be required to pay a total of nearly \$35,000 for the so-called privilege of leaving the "workers paradise."

Mr. Speaker, this is the type of action that separates the decent and indecent governments of this world. At a time when the Soviet Union is hoping for new trade agreements with the United States, I hope all Members of the Congress keep this flagrant violation of human rights in mind when we are asked to vote to approve those trade agreements. Mr. Speaker, I find dealing in commodities with the country which also deals in human lives to be unconscionable and I urge my colleagues to join me in condemning the current practice of the Soviet Union.

RETURN TO RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT SPENDING POLICY

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, over the last few decades and particularly in the last 4 years, the U.S. Government has been committed to the idea of increased taxation and increased spending. Unfortunately during several periods this has resulted in massive deficit spending as Government spending continued at high levels during periods of low Government revenue production. Just a few short years ago the already overburdened American taxpayer was appalled

by the \$10 billion annual interest rate on the national debt. He is no doubt mortified by the present \$22 billion annual price tag for interest on the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that the Congress adopted a responsible Government spending plan. I have introduced legislation which is supported by the President that would place a \$250 billion spending ceiling on Federal expenditures during fiscal year 1973. At this point I would like to insert in the RECORD an article by Harvey A. Call of the Fort Lauderdale News which takes an interesting look at the whole issue of Government spending. The article follows:

SOUND FINANCIAL COURSE WILL BE MOST IMPORTANT IN NEXT ADMINISTRATION

We are embarked upon an election campaign that can, and should, be more important to the United States than any held in its nearly two centuries of being.

While a great deal of attention will be focused on the more emotional issues, the greater meaning of the November election will be the direction the nation takes in meeting its financial problems.

Foremost, of course, will be whether our course is to pursue the path of taxing and taxing and spending and spending—a route that has been followed for most of the past four decades.

Then, too, the nation continues to run up monthly deficits in trade and balance of payments. These must be stabilized to maintain a healthy economy. That is important not only to employment and business in this country, but it is equally important to all major nations of the world which, in a measure, ride on the coattails of America. It is a case of what hurts America hurts them.

In a large measure, the next President may not be able to determine these issues so much as Congress.

Mr. Nixon has had his problems over the past three and a half years as Congress expanded upon his programs and added to their costs. This has been due largely to the fact he has not had a Congress responsive to his leadership.

That is not to deny that he has had the support of many opposition party members who choose to break away from their leadership and pursue policies they considered more vital to the nation's interest.

However, as a second term President, in the event he is re-elected, Mr. Nixon would normally face greater difficulties. This is so because members of Congress would be aware of the fact that his political power comes to an end in January, 1977 and that his favor is not as important to them as the favor of a President who is still in his first term.

Some time ago, Mr. Nixon urged that a ceiling be placed upon federal spending. He proposed \$250 billion, a figure that seemingly embraces ample expansion above the present levels.

Certainly a ceiling on annual spending makes sense. It makes sense if we are to continue the current fiction of a ceiling of the national debt.

Congressman Paul G. Rogers, although not a member of the President's party, is in accord with the spending limit.

This is not a Johnny-come-lately stance for Mr. Rogers. Years ago he was fighting to implement the economies in government recommended by the earlier Hoover Commissions.

And, at other times, he fought unsuccessfully to force upon the government a program of paying off, in good times, a proportion of the federal debt.

Deficit spending has become a way of life

for the government. It might be said to be an easy way of life.

It is fairly evident that deficits at times, when the economy is lagging, help to pick up the slack and keep workers in jobs.

However, the constant accumulation of debt means ever higher annual interest payments.

It was just a few years ago that taxpayers were appalled at paying \$9 or \$10 billion annually as interest on the national debt. Today, the price tag for borrowing is up around \$22 billion.

This is a fixed expense. It is money which has to be extracted from the taxpayers before anything else in the way of governmental operations can be considered.

The Democratic nominee, Sen. George S. McGovern, has proposed programs which have been estimated as adding \$144 billion to federal spending.

Mr. Nixon, in last week's acceptance speech, said this would add 50 per cent to what our taxpayers are now pouring into the federal treasury.

The fact is that combined federal, state and local taxes currently amount to more than one-third of the personal income of our people.

Further drastic increases in taxes can have only one of two effects. The people would be severely strapped and unable to enjoy the way of life we now know, or the government would face bankruptcy while the world faced chaos.

It is imperative that a ceiling be placed on governmental spending. It is imperative, too, that in prosperous years we turn some of our affluence toward reducing the national debt and thereby reducing the built-in requirements for massive interest payments.

To do that, we are going to have to seek out this fall candidates who are concerned about taxing and spending.

If we don't, it is no one's fault but our own.

U.S. DYNAMICS—NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN COLOR MICROFICHE

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, small business and industrial organizations today are being inundated by the growing mounds of paperwork brought about by necessary and mandatory recordkeeping. Many small offices are finding out that paper files and the storage of records are literally forcing them out of house and home.

This problem of massive paper files and records even confronts many of our governmental agencies.

The awesome challenge of reducing such files into pertinent processed information was undertaken by U.S. Dynamics, Inc., in 1968. Their subsidiary organization, Milli File, Inc., is devoted to the development of microfilm information retention systems. This company, based in Elmsford, N.Y., has developed microfilm and microfiche systems which today enable businessmen, small offices, even our governmental agencies, to store information more efficiently and at a lower cost than in maintaining numerous and voluminous paper files.

Such companies as American Cynamid and Olin Co., medical institutions like the Long Beach, N.Y., Memorial Hos-

pital, law firms and others have already acquired the Milli File system which U.S. Dynamics has developed and have converted their paper records into "milli fiche."

U.S. Dynamics, Inc. now reports that Milli File has developed a unique color microfiche system which is available at a "penny an image" and is completely compatible with the standard black-and-white Milli File microfiche system used in offices and other locations where low-cost business machines are utilized.

The cost for this Milli File microfilm and microfiche system is very low.

U.S. Dynamics, Inc., and the men and women of Milli File merit the highest praise for bringing to bear their imagination, resourcefulness, skill, and determination in creating a system which I believe is an important asset to small business and industry.

WHICH CANDIDATE IS RIGHT ON THE JEWISH PROBLEM?

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, in past years, the Jewish vote in the big cities has been pretty much Democratic. But this is not a usual year.

The Herald Tribune, published with the New York Times and Washington Post, has not been exactly a backer of President Nixon. In fact, all three publications have taken some rather nifty jabs at the President all of the way around.

It was a pleasant surprise that the Herald Tribune on Friday, September 1, found them in the President's corner on our relations with Israel. I do not think it is any revelation on the part of the Tribune, Times, and Post that Nixon has been doing a good job in handling Israeli-American relations.

As the Herald Tribune finds in its editorial, titled, "The Opening Campaign" McGovern has repeatedly overcommitted himself because of votes he has made in the Senate which indicate that he was only tepid in his support of Israel. As the editorial so well points out, McGovern's sincerity is not being disputed, they are just questioning his "statesmanship." The editorial also states that "the President has worked for a reasonable settlement in the Middle East" and further "that policy is the sane and sound one for the United States, for Israel, for the whole Middle East." As the editorial further suggests, "Mr. McGovern's efforts are wholly unrealistic in the context of the world as it exists today." I insert the article from the Herald Tribune which I am sure many of my colleagues will want to read.

The article follows:

Since both Sen. McGovern and President Nixon have been campaigning in their own ways for a long time, it is hardly correct to refer to current developments as the opening of the presidential contest. Yet for Mr. McGovern, at least, it is the beginning of a

serious effort to attract the numerous following he must win if he is not to be simply only the top man in Democratic primaries at a Democratic convention.

For one thing, the South Dakota senator has disposed of the suggestion he once put forward of an annual gratuity of \$1,000 to every American, a naive notion that had a strong resemblance to Caesar Augustus handing out four gold pieces each to the Roman citizenry at large. He has put forward to a skeptical group of security analysts a program for tax changes that is certainly open to question, but which cannot simply be laughed away.

And Mr. McGovern has turned to what he has called his "Jewish problem." This has been in part created by President Nixon's friendly relations with Israel, and by such indiscretions as Gov. Nelson Rockefeller's remarks to the effect that Mr. Nixon was responsible for the release of Soviet Jews to emigrate to Israel. It also stems from the inevitable confusions arising from the McGovern slogan: "Come Home, America." The senator is very anxious to explain that this does not mean come home from everywhere, under all circumstances, but only from Southeast Asia and other areas of which the senator disapproves. He was especially interested in explaining to New York City Jews that he was more concerned with Israel than the President: that his concern stemmed from a moral commitment, not power politics, and that as President, he would have been public and forceful in his denunciation of Soviet restrictions on Jewish immigration.

One need not dispute the senator's sincerity in all of this. But it is possible to question his statesmanship. He was, to be sure, not wholly incautious in his commitment to Israel. He just said he had not done such things as delay the dispatch of American planes to Israel and vote against that state in the Security Council. But the inescapable conclusion from his negatives was that he would have given Israel all the planes it wanted, when it wanted them, and backed it to the hilt before the United Nations.

This is one point of view about Israeli-American relations: the Arab states would argue that is just what Mr. Nixon has done. But the fact is that the President has worked for a reasonable settlement in the Middle East; he has urged concessions on Israel and he has not opened American aircraft factories for the Israelis to purchase planes to the limit of their wishes and capabilities. And that policy is the sane and sound one for the United States, for Israel, for the whole Middle East. Mr. McGovern's efforts may be regarded as political realism in the narrow sense; they are wholly unrealistic in the context of the world as it exists today.

HONORING OUR CONSTITUTION

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, this week, September 17 through 23, is a most meaningful one for our Nation. It is the week that has been set aside for us to pay special tribute to our beloved Constitution.

This document written by our ancestors has crossed many generations to remain today our best protection as individuals in a free land. It is most fitting that we should set aside this time when all Americans can pay special attention to our Constitution.

I was delighted recently to hear from a wonderful friend of mine, Mrs. Gladys Peck Johnson. Mrs. Johnson and I were classmates years ago in Perth Amboy, N.J., where I still reside. Mrs. Johnson is now of High Point, N.C. Knowing of my activities as a Member of the House of Representatives, she wanted to share with me her joy at being the chairman for Constitution Week for her chapter of the DAR. One article that Mrs. Johnson sent me states my own feelings particularly well. Our Constitution must truly remain alive for every American to be protected by it. Each generation in our Nation must embrace it anew if we are to continue to enjoy our freedom and independence.

The article has been used in the past by the DAR to convey to its members the meaning behind Constitution Week. I would like to take this opportunity to insert it in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues who might not have seen it. The article is as follows:

CONSTITUTION WEEK, SEPTEMBER 17-23

This week commemorates the signing of the Constitution of the United States of America—the oldest constitution still in active use, and the greatest document for human liberty in two thousand years of recorded history. It was so designated by Congress and signed into public law August 2, 1956. By proclamation, President Nixon has once more set aside this week, Sept. 17-23, in order that all citizens may honor that document which preserves their freedoms as well as outlines their responsibilities.

The Constitution was devised after the American Revolution had ended. By this time, near chaos existed. Each state had its own laws and tariffs. There was no common monetary system. It was not believed possible in Europe that America could create a democracy in such a large area for thirteen states each so different in size, ideas and way of life.

The Constitution became the compromise, each state giving up something dear to it for the common good. It has been called by William Gladstone, a British prime minister, "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man".

The Constitution together with its 26 amendments, is the protector and guide of every citizen of the United States. But each generation, in time, must work for and claim it, otherwise through carelessness or indifference, the rights and liberties we have enjoyed may vanish. The price of keeping them is eternal vigilance.

The Daughters of the American Revolution urge all citizens to fly the American flag this week and read again that document by whose laws their lives and homes are protected.

ALEC KERR

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened last week at the passing of a very good friend, Alec Kerr, editor of the Star-Tribune publications serving Harvey, South Holland, and Markham. Alec was not only a great newspaperman, but also a great, great individual, and his many friends will long remember him.

I insert into the RECORD at this point the editorial eulogy for Alec carried in the September 14 Star-Tribune, a publication he had developed and served with for so many years. Alec was a dedicated newspaperman but, more important, he was dedicated to the communities he served and to its residents. He was also a compassionate man. This was reflected in the stories and policies of the publication. The editorial, however, speaks for itself:

ALEC C. KERR GUIDED PAPER TO EXCELLENCE

Alec C. Kerr died Tuesday and an entire profession mourns his death. Alec was a pioneer editor of a new style of journalism long before anyone realized that suburban community newspapers were the wave of the future. He knew, years before anyone else noticed, that residents of the suburbs required the same information services as those living in big cities and he knew, perhaps better than anyone else, just how this new media should be directed.

There is no one single monument to his leadership in this community; but literally thousands. A YMCA that serves thousands of young people and adults from the south suburban area got the backing it needed to exist from Alec Kerr. Grade schools, high schools and other public buildings were championed by him in editorial campaigns that stirred public support. Countless public servants will testify that Alec Kerr encouraged them to seek election and few ever betrayed the trust he gave to them.

Months and years before the Chicago media became interested in water pollution, the Harvey Tribune was running series of articles on the condition of Lake Michigan and the streams in south Cook county.

Other causes through the years found the Harvey Tribune and Alec C. Kerr, editor, at the front; always presenting an objective viewpoint with strong editorial campaigns as well. Under his leadership, the Tribune was recognized on the state and national levels as one of the best community newspapers published today.

His leadership and excellence in his profession was recognized by his peers when he was selected "Illinois Editor of the Year" in 1967. His newspaper finally received the acclaim he felt it deserved every year when the Illinois Press association selected the Harvey Tribune as the "outstanding weekly or semi-weekly newspaper" in Illinois in 1971.

To those close friends and associates who knew Alec, they knew that the top newspaper award was the one he cherished most above all of the personal awards he received in his 38 years as a journalist and there were many personal awards. Alec Kerr lived almost all of his life to make the Harvey Tribune the best newspaper in Illinois. He succeeded.

It is the best newspaper in Illinois because it had the best editor in the state. All of us will miss him, because he was more than an editor—he was a father to this newspaper and to all of us.

We share his loss with his devoted family and his legion of friends and re-dedicate ourselves to continuing in his tradition—a tradition of excellence.

PLAYING POLITICS WITH PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, perhaps nothing on our current political scene is

more heartless than the playing of politics with the lives of American prisoners of war.

These brave men accepted their duty and responsibility to defend freedom and to combat aggression when their country called upon them. They have suffered greatly, and all Americans who value their own freedom should be grateful that young Americans recognize that sacrifices are continually necessary if that freedom is to be preserved for future generations.

How ironic that men and women who condemn our commitment in Vietnam, men and women who have urged draft evasion and avoidance, who have called for amnesty for deserters, now proclaim their own interest and concern for the plight of these prisoners.

The most extreme example of such political game-playing with the fate of American prisoners has come from former Attorney General Ramsey Clark, a man who was an official in the very administration which initially sent those young men to Vietnam.

Mr. Clark declared that American prisoners of war were well treated in North Vietnam. This pronouncement is in accordance with the statements of the North Vietnamese themselves, but not with the real evidence.

Douglas Hegdahl, who was released by the North Vietnamese in 1969 after more than 2 years in captivity, declared that:

I have to smile at his gullibility. He obviously was given the typical 25-cent tour.

Mr. Hegdahl, a former Navy seaman, has personal experience with showcase prisoners of war tours. Writing in the Chicago Tribune, Stephen Crews notes that:

For a number of months he lived in a showcase prison building that was specially equipped by the North Vietnamese for visits by foreigners. While staying in this building, Hegdahl was visited by such anti-war leaders as David Dellinger, Rennie Davis, Tom Hayden . . .

Prisoners, Hegdahl pointed out, were always brought to that single building. He stated that:

Every delegation was shown the same model prisoners and although they've changed the cast since I left, I imagine the same is going on now.

Why did Ramsey Clark not ask why the North Vietnamese have refused to release the names of the prisoners they hold? Mr. Hegdahl notes that:

I knew people who are not on their official list, and since that's true, I believe there are probably many, many more.

In his important article, Mr. Crews has interviewed a number of relatives of men held captive in North Vietnam. The father of one prisoner, Dr. Gordon Perisho, declared that:

He (Clark) has no business doing what he did . . . The prisoners he talked to were the same group shown to others . . . No one was permitted to see all the POW camps, or to permit the International Red Cross to inspect the camps as provided by the Geneva Convention.

It is time that politicians stop seeking partisan gains at the expense of these brave and long-suffering young Americans.

I wish to share with my colleagues the article by Stephen Crews which appeared in the Chicago Tribune of August 17, 1972, entitled "Clark Given Phony Viet Tour." The article follows:

TELLS OF SHOWCASE JAIL—CLARK GIVEN PHONY VIET TOUR: EX-POW

(By Stephen Crews)

Former U.S. Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark's pronouncement that American prisoners of war are well treated in North Viet Nam was contradicted last night by a man who had been a prisoner there.

"I have to smile at his gullibility," said Douglas Hegdahl, 27, who was released by the North Vietnamese in 1969 after more than two years in captivity. "He obviously was given the typical 25-cent tour."

Hegdahl, a former Navy seaman who was captured in April, 1967, after falling off a ship in the Gulf of Tonkin, has personal experience with showcase POW tours. For a number of months he lived in a showcase prison building that was specially equipped by the North Vietnamese for visits by foreigners.

While staying in this building, Hegdahl was visited by such antiwar leaders as David Dellinger, Rennie Davis, Tom Hayden, members of the Woman's Strike for Peace, and foreign film crews.

"They always brought them to this one building, and most prisoners were never even seen," Hegdahl said.

Hegdahl, who now works as an instructor in the Navy Survival School near San Diego, was one of many former POWs and relatives of present POWs interviewed for their reactions to Clark's recent statements about his visit to North Viet Nam.

"Every delegation was shown the same model prisoners and although they've changed the cast since I left, I imagine the same thing is going on now," Hegdahl said, in a telephone interview.

He said that before he was placed in the showcase building, he spent 13 months in a solitary cell that lacked even a window.

PUNISHED FOR TALKING

Altho never tortured, Hegdahl said he was often punished, "most often for trying to talk to other prisoners."

The typical punishment, he said, was being forced to assume "stress positions" such as "kneeling with your hands over your head."

When visitors were coming, the guards would bring in new grass mats, along with a table and even a magazine or two, Hegdahl said. When the delegation passed on, these luxuries were removed.

"They even took us outside sometimes so we'd be suntanned," he said.

Hegdahl said he prays that the controversy over treatment of prisoners is forcing the North Vietnamese to improve conditions. "All I know is that everything they ever did for me had propaganda behind it," he said. "Why, one time, just before being released, they brought me 18 bananas to eat so I'd put on some weight. It was a regular fattening up process."

Hegdahl said he does not question Clark's right to say what he believes, "but I do question why he allows himself to be so used."

"North Viet Nam never lets anyone in who does not already feel favorably towards them—unbiased teams are not allowed."

"Clark should have asked why the North Vietnamese have refused to release the names of all the prisoners they hold. I knew people

who are not on their official list, and since that's true, I believe there are probably many, many more," he said.

CANNOT ACCEPT WITHDRAWAL

Hegdahl said he cannot accept any method of ending the war which smacks of mere unilateral withdrawal.

"When the prisoners finally come back, they're going to want to know why they spent all that time in prison. It wouldn't do much for their recovery if they discover it was all for nothing."

The parents of POWs still in North Vietnamese prisons also had some things to say about Clark's visit and his comments.

In the Mississippi River community of Quincy, Dr. Gordon Perisho listened to Clark's statements and thought about his son, Gordon Samuel, 31, who has been missing in action since New Year's Eve, 1967.

"I think he (Clark) has absolutely no business falling into the propaganda boil of North Viet Nam," Dr. Perisho said. "They (The North Vietnamese) no doubt showed him around where they wanted to show. They showed him some fattened up prisoners, but he didn't see the rest."

RED CROSS BARRED

"He has no business doing what he did. I didn't see any thing new in what Ramsey Clark said. The prisoners he talked to were the same group shown to others who visited North Viet Nam. No one was permitted to see all the POW camps, or to permit the International Red Cross to inspect the camps as provided by the Geneva Convention."

Summing up his feelings, the physician said, "I think the analysis of [John] Mitchell and [Melvin] Laird that he was duped was the correct one."

POW FOR 6 YEARS

In South suburban Riverdale, Mrs. Myrna Borling, wife of John Borling an Air Force pilot who has been in a North Vietnamese POW camp for six years said she has paid little attention to Clark's statements.

"I try to put things like that out of my mind," she explained. "After so many times of building up hopes and then having them dashed, I no longer allow myself to build up my hopes."

However, she also added she feels her husband will be coming home "sometime soon."

PILOT SHOT DOWN

In Appleton, Wis., Virginia Flom, 30, the wife of Fred Flom, a pilot shot down over North Viet Nam Aug. 8, 1966, is like other relatives of missing soldiers in her reluctance to allow herself to build up hopes.

"I sort of steel myself against forming any opinion," she said. "Over the last six years it's just gone up and down so many times that I can't put my faith in anything. I feel that we should be out of there and that the bombing should be stopped regardless of what happens to the men. The bombing is only prolonging the war."

Another Wisconsin resident, Mrs. Myrtle Metzger of Wisconsin Rapids, said her son, William Metzger, Jr., has been a POW for five years and that she had mixed feelings about Clark's mission.

"I don't approve of bombing and I agree that it should stop. But, perhaps some of Mr. Clark's statements were a little severe in criticism of the bombing."

Mrs. Metzger's daughter-in-law, Bonnie Metzger, 29, is assistant national coordinator of the National League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia. Speaking from her home in Annendale, Va., Bonnie Metzger said she thought Clark's remarks have been taken out of context. She added, "I think that anyone who has the opportunity to go to Hanoi should definitely go."

PICO RIVERA, CALIF., AND SAN LUIS
POTOSI, MEXICO, SISTER CITY

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, over the years this body has voted millions of dollars and many programs to assure our friendship with other countries. I would like to call your attention to the efforts of one of the cities in my district, Pico Rivera, and the remarkable results they have achieved in furthering the goal of close friendship with our neighboring state of Mexico.

In the interest of international good will and for the purpose of fostering and implementing a sister city program for the people of Pico Rivera, a Sister City Committee was organized and incorporated in November of 1965. The Sister City Committee has 15 board members and several subcommittees. Each of the subcommittees acting in a particular area develops programs and projects for the furtherance of understanding toward Pico Rivera's sister city, San Luis Potosi, Mexico. As an example, the Student Exchange Subcommittee cosponsored a visit for a group of 30 university students from San Luis' mayor in the purchase of educational and training toys for deprived children in Mexico. Throughout the 7 year relationship there have been many visits both official and unofficial, by citizens of both cities to each others' city. In 1971 delegates from San Luis Potosi visited Pico Rivera with the purpose of obtaining technological and managerial knowledge with which to improve the industries in San Luis.

Perhaps the most innovative program to be initiated by the Sister City Committee is that of Project Firetruck. In 1970 a formal request was made by the city of San Luis Potosi; that Pico Rivera keep a watchful eye out for the purchase of a good firetruck.

Upon receipt of this request the Sister City Committee asked if they would be allowed to donate a firetruck to San Luis. After receiving confirmation from San Luis Potosi the Pico Rivera Committee started Project Firetruck. The project evolved into a communitywide involvement program with additional help from outside the community. Contributions were taken up and the Sister City Committee purchased a surplus firetruck from Los Angeles County—then the real work began.

In a heartwarming show of cooperation the following people, and industries worked together in refurbishing the firetruck:

Ford Motor Co., supplied power train; Hadley Equipment, equipment usage; Mechanical Finishing Co., paint job; Norwalk Radiator Co., radiator; A-1 Louis Rental, welder; off-duty firemen, mechanical work; Engs Motor, paint job; Los Angeles County Fire Department Station 103, complete set of fire clothes; and over 750 hours of labor in refurbishing the firetruck were donated by off-duty firemen working in Pico Rivera.

The Charro Association of Pico Rivera held a Mexican Rodeo on June 18, 1972, and on April 23, the Optimist Club drove the fire truck to surrounding shopping centers. Both groups donated their time and energy to raising funds to defray the cost of transporting the firetruck to San Luis Potosi.

Last June, I had the opportunity to inspect the firetruck while it was awaiting transportation to Mexico. It was stored at station 103 in the city of Pico Rivera and I was given a guided tour of the firetruck by the station personnel. It was a wonderful sight to behold. In gleaming red and chrome it appeared as if it had just rolled out of the factory. Even the firefighting tools had been chrome plated and shined. The foresight of the committee was noted in the details of the work that they did. Over each of the labels which identified the controls was written the name of the control in Spanish.

In mid-August this year the firetruck was driven to San Luis Potosi by Joe Proo, the vice chairman of the Sister City Committee, and Howard Schroyer, the city manager of Pico Rivera. Other members of the city council and the committee flew to San Luis Potosi to be on hand for the arrival of the firetruck. Upon their arrival the town secretary of San Luis Potosi issued the following declaration:

SISTER CITY GREETINGS

To the Mayor of Pico Rivera, City Council Members and Members of the Sister City Committee.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Since its inception, this interesting and constructive international Program of Sister Cities has attained perfect response in the cordial relations between the City of Pico Rivera, Calif. and its sister city San Luis Potosi.

On this day, we greet you with open arms and upon declaring you honored guests, the town of San Luis Potosi, presided over by Don Antonio Acebo Delgado, does affirm the permanent wish of all its citizens that this interchange of such positive results, due to your labor which is neither lucrative nor compensated but signifies efforts toward the benefit of the community and country.

We share your ideals as we know that you serve with loyalty and devotion in the union of our cities to bring about peace and friendship between your fellow men.

Welcome, Our home is your home

Lic. Marun KURY GARZA,

Town Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, this effort on the part of the citizens of Pico Rivera has been a valuable aid to our foreign policy. I commend their activities to the rest of our citizens and congratulate them. If all peoples would do as much to establish good relations throughout the world, we would soon see the advent of the age of the brotherhood of man.

HALT THE FLOW OF NARCOTICS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the

remarks of my colleague from New York and to commend him for the efforts which he has made to focus the attention of the Congress and the American people on the increased traffic in drugs which reach our shores from Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, several congressional study missions have returned to the Congress with reports that Thailand serves as the major conduit for drug traffic in the Far East. Even an NBC camera crew was able to photograph an opium caravan several months ago.

While seizures and arrests have increased in Thailand, much more needs to be done to halt the continuing flow of narcotics. Therefore, I was pleased to join with the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) back in March when he first introduced a suspension of aid resolution and I supported the amendment to suspend aid to Thailand both in the Foreign Affairs Committee and on the floor.

I share the belief that we can no longer merely threaten to cut off aid; the time has come to suspend all economical and military assistance now and resume it when some significant, effective action to interdict the heroin flow is taken. We cannot permit the President to speak one way and act another.

GUY KITE NAMED OUTSTANDING POLICEMAN OF THE YEAR FOR THE U.S. CAPITOL

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is always a great honor to be selected for an award by your contemporaries and peers. Guy Kite was recently selected by the U.S. House of Representatives Doormen's Society as the Policeman of the Year. Guy joined the U.S. Capitol Police Force in June 1968. Guy's energetic enthusiasm and devotion toward his job has won him the respect of his associates.

Aside from his police duties, Guy is very active in civic affairs.

SOCIAL ACTIVITIES

1. Member of Washington Street Methodist Church and served on the official board 1963 through 1965 (3,000 members).
2. Member of Alexandria Washington Masonic Lodge No. 22.
3. Member of Mt. Vernon Royal Arch Chapter No. 14.
4. Member of Old Dominion Commandery No. 11 Knights Templar.
5. Member of Kena Temple Shrine and former Captain of the Provost Unit.
6. Past Guardian Treasurer of the Jobs Daughters Bethel No. 4 (1966 through 1967).
7. Past President of the Lambskin Masonic Club Year 1966.
8. Has participated in about 20 parades with the Shrine and 5 half time shows at football games. Have served as Chairman on 3 different dance committees which have drawn over 1,000 people.

Help maintain Provost headquarters at Shrine conventions and work with police on any trouble and emergencies that might occur.

9. Member of Northern Virginia Dog Training Association. Train own dog to become a champion in both breed and obedience.

10. Capitol Hill Shrine Club.

I take pride in reporting to my colleagues on the accomplishments of Guy Kite. And I congratulate Guy on his outstanding work in the House of Representatives and on the Capitol Police Force.

UNSUBSIDIZED HOUSING PROGRAMS

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, on September 6, I raised the question of the future of our national housing program and the possibility of separating the unsubsidized housing programs from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The jury is still out on this question, and I am convinced that this is one of the most important questions for Members of the House to consider. I am, therefore, including in the RECORD an editorial comment from the August, 1972, issue of the Mortgage Banker:

CAN FHA BE REPLACED?

(By Oliver H. Jones)

During the first five months of this year, applications for FHA insurance on home mortgages have declined steadily, falling nearly 30 percent below the same period in 1971. FHA lenders indicate that the decline in FHA activity has not stopped with the latest published statistics.

Contrasting these conditions with increases in housing starts, permits, and conventional lending by savings and loan associations, some market watchers are ready to conclude that the Federal Housing Administration is in the final throes of its death agony. Some feel that FHA has done its job and it is time it retired from the field; that private mortgage insurers and the 95 percent conventional loan can take over. Still others compare the expansive tactics of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board with the restrictive tactics of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and speculate on the Administration's objectives. They wonder whether the decline in FHA's market-oriented program is by design or by random error.

It is not unusual for market observers to hold different views, or to jump recklessly to conclusions about the future course of events. One's memory does not have to be very long to recall the forecasts of pending doom for thrift institutions during the credit crises of the second half of the sixties. But look at the savings growth at thrift institutions now!

Admittedly, FHA's withering share of the market in a period of record growth is not directly analogous to the predicament of thrift institutions faced in 1966. It is not the result of economic derangement as much as overloading FHA with welfare-oriented programs and management's reaction to the problems these programs created.

No one can deny that the failure to recognize and then to deal with the problem-creating potential of the welfare programs created in the 1968 legislation cries out for correction, or that the corrective actions taken have unnecessarily and unduly hampered FHA's market-oriented programs.

This observer finds it difficult to make the jump from these operational failures to the conclusion that FHA is no longer needed. FHA's demise would be a great loss, perhaps mourned less in passing than in its absence.

The nation's social objectives demand welfare-oriented programs that work. The nation's economic objectives demand market-oriented programs that keep the nationwide market viable. To these ends the Mortgage Bankers Association of America has (1) exhorted HUD and Congress to provide adequate counseling for low-income families, (2) supported consideration of other means of housing the poor, including the housing allowance program, (3) made recommendations to speed up processing, reduce paperwork, and place the control where it is needed, and (4) aggressively investigated the pros and cons of the thesis that the welfare—and—market-oriented programs mix as poorly as oil and water and must, therefore, be separated.

Why all this effort, when others have already discounted FHA's future? Is it because mortgage bankers have originated more than 60 percent of all outstanding FHA loans? Yes, self-interest is involved; but so is the broader interest of maintaining the nationwide market and its contribution to housing as well as the economy. After all, mortgage bankers originated conventional home loans long before FHA was created. Many continued to originate conventional home loans in the forties and fifties. When there are active buyers of conventional mortgages, mortgage bankers are active originators. Today, many mortgage bankers are meeting the changed condition of the market by originating conventional home loans and selling them to savings and loan associations and to the Federal National Mortgage Association. The adjustment will be difficult, but it is being made, and it is evidence that the mortgage banker's interest in revitalizing FHA is not solely a matter of self-interest.

Nor is the mortgage banker's continued loyalty to the market-oriented FHA program a blind failure to recognize that the conventional market and the savings and loan associations have been the major source of home mortgage loans for decades, or that private insurance has contributed materially to the successful development of the low-downpayment, conventional loan. The mortgage banker also realizes that FNMA's new authority can provide a needed backstop for originating conventional mortgages for sale to private investors, if it is used as aggressively as the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation uses its new authority.

This Association (MBA) firmly and sincerely believes that those who would throw in the towel have not read their economic history carefully. Consider the view that the savings and loan industry can satisfy all market-oriented demands for home mortgages at all times in the future. Of course, the continued heavy volume of savings flowing into these institutions now encourages this view. One can even make the case that the saver's disenchantment with the stock market as a certain hedge against inflation will support continued deposit growth for some time. Even so, can anyone assure us that yield spreads between interest rates paid depositors and short- and intermediate-term Treasury and federal agency issues will never again reach the point where these equally safe havens for funds become more attractive to savers than insured deposits? Can anyone assure us that monetary policy will never reach the point where tight credit is again a plague on the economic landscape? Can anyone assure us that conventional lenders will never again find their ability to maintain savings rates limited by yesterday's mortgage loans and today's usury ceilings? We doubt it.

We realize that FHA mortgages suffer some of the same agonies as conventional mort-

gages when monetary policy is restrictive. On the other hand, we know that FHA mortgages have provided an important source of mortgage credit in tight as well as easy money periods. It has been, and can again be, the mainstay of middle-income families. It has been, and can again be, the principal vehicle for moving funds from surplus to deficit areas. We insist, therefore, that FHA cannot be replaced by conventional lenders.

Consider also the view that private mortgage insurance can replace FHA. Private insurance has widened local markets by providing short-distance lenders a means of reducing the risk of low-downpayment conventional loans. With all of its contributions, it has not provided the assurances required by long-distance lenders. Moreover, many long-distance lenders (i.e., mutual savings banks and life insurance companies) are not permitted to invest in low-downpayment conventional home mortgages, nor are they permitted to invest in conventional mortgages out-of-state, with or without private insurance. We see no evidence that private insurance can maintain the nationwide market.

Yet, the nation needs the involvement of long-distance lenders, made possible since 1934 by FHA insurance and later by the VA guarantee. These vehicles make it possible for financial institutions in capital surplus areas to pay interest rates and encourage savings in those areas because they can reach beyond their local areas for higher yielding mortgages. The saver benefits, as does the economy.

At the same time, by sending their funds to distant areas where savings are in short supply, the long-distance lender competes with local lenders for mortgage investments, thereby reducing mortgage interest rates in those distant localities. The borrower benefits, as does the economy. The borrower benefits whether he uses a conventional or an FHA mortgage because it is the average interest rate that is affected by the influx of out-of-state funds.

In short, if FHA's market programs are permitted to disappear or are driven into retirement, the greatest loss will be to the nation's savers and home buyers.

Those who would encourage FHA's early retirement from the market for economically sound mortgages should also consider the impact of such a change on FNMA. Can FNMA be expected to fill its portfolio with welfare-oriented mortgages and still maintain its private status and its ability to borrow on the capital markets? At best, it would pay more for funds to house low-income families than the Treasury would pay if it borrowed directly. At worst, FNMA would again become a government-owned and government-financed agency, again subject to budget restrictions and unable to play a significant role in helping the market over periods of tight credit. Surely, this huge financial institution should continue to serve the market it has served so well for over three decades—the market-oriented FHA programs.

Some will claim that FNMA can overcome these objections by holding conventional home loans. FNMA can, and should, do its best to moderate the effect of credit cycles on the conventional market as well as on the FHA and VA markets. On the other hand, a predominance of conventional mortgages in its portfolio will surely raise its borrowing costs, reduce the leverage the security buyer will accept, and limit its ability to perform its backstop function.

Finally, those who would turn over the entire home mortgage market solely to savings and loan associations should ask the S&Ls if they really want it. The Hunt Commission's recommendation that thrift institutions be granted wider lending powers is being given serious consideration and has long been a major legislative objective of

these institutions. Much widening of these lending powers has already taken place, particularly through the growing service corporation. These developments hardly describe financial institutions that want to remain restricted to mortgage lending.

This is not the time to throw in the towel. It is a time to roll up our sleeves and go to work on revitalizing FHA's market-oriented role. It is a time to rededicate ourselves to the market system.

HAWTHORNE CABALLEROS REGAIN WORLD CHAMPIONSHIP, AGAIN BRINGING HONOR TO THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY AND AMERICA

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, in competition with the finest drum and bugle corps throughout the world, the Hawthorne Caballeros Senior Drum and Bugle Corps, with their musical excellence, marching proficiency, and sparkling exemplary performance, restored the most coveted world championship title to the borough of Hawthorne, my Eighth Congressional District, the State of New Jersey, and the United States of America.

The world champion Hawthorne Caballeros were officially organized on March 20, 1946, with 22 former members of the St. George Cadets of Paterson, N.J., and displayed their first organized effort at a parade in Bayonne, N.J., in the annual celebration of Memorial Day 1946, as representatives of American Legion Post 199 of Hawthorne, N.J. Their many years of preparation, training, personal effort, teamwork, and quality of excellence have achieved a measure of greatness unattained by any other drum and bugle corps, for which we can, indeed, be most proud.

They first won the world championship title in 1970 in Rochester, N.Y., and are the only senior unit in the United States and Canada whose record has been unmatched in the two countries. They have won nearly three times as many American Legion national championships as any other corps in history. They have traveled over a half-million miles and won over 300 first-place victories.

Their professionalism and sportsmanship have served as a shining example for others to follow and the excellence of their musicianship and showmanship has won the sport new followers each year. Approximately 10,000 cheering, enthusiastic drum corps fans unanimously applauded their world championship winning performance at the Roosevelt Stadium, Jersey City, in the 1972 senior world championship competition on Sunday, September 3, 1972.

Mr. Speaker, all of us know that this first place worldwide goal could not have been achieved without the strong team effort of every member of this corps throughout its history but we also know that it sometimes takes the inspiration, sterling character, and quality of leadership of one man to serve as a motivating force behind this team effort. For the

lifetime of dedication and devotion to the true American ideals of sportsmanship and fairplay and the fulfillment of the American dream leading to this pinnacle of international fame, I ask you to join with me in applauding Jim Costello, the director and drill instructor of the Caballeros, and one of the founders of the corps, who, incidentally, inherited his love of drums and bugles from his father, James Costello, Sr., who was a drummer with three area corps before his retirement. It is interesting to note that his brother, Bob Costello, and brother-in-law, John McAuliffe, were also among the original founders of the Hawthorne Caballeros.

May I ask my colleagues to join with me in national recognition and the heartiest congratulations to the members of the world champion Hawthorne Caballeros for their untiring efforts in achieving superiority and perfection as an American Legion drum and bugle corps. Following is a list of the current members of the corps:

Justo Aleman, Frank Amalino, Doug Axman, Lou Axman.

Charles Baldwin, Erwin Barre, Victor Benfatti, Frank Bentivenga, John Bolland, Arthur Boovier, Edward G. Bullock, Richard A. Bullock.

James Campbell, Joseph Campos, Charles Caruso, Blaise Castaldo, Bob Collins, Henry Conklin, Charles Cook, James Costello, Joseph Cowin, Bernie Crogan.

Roger A. Day, Dan Dayman, Tom DeMarco, Donald R. De Poto, James Dockery, Phil Dumond, Gene Dunne, William Durborow, Mike Durning, Paul F. Durning, Jr.

Martin Ericson, Raymond Facundo, Anthony Famello, Tom Fantry, Tony Ferrazano, Tim Fogg, James Ford, Paul N. Fostvedt.

Ronald Gamella, Ed Gasparich, John Grada, James R. Graham, Charles Guess.

Bob Hayes, Denis Hayes, Ted Heumann, Jay Hogan, Al Hopper, Mike Hull, John Hughes.

Bill Iwanyk, Fabian Izsa, Frank T. Jankech, Eddie Jankowski, Edward Januszki.

Tony Kaplon, Dennis Karol, William Kennedy, Larry Kirchner, Robert Knapp, Frank Koch, Steve Kriskewic, Frank Kubinak, John Kunie.

Robert Lehmann, Mike Lia, Paul W. Lott, George Lucas.

James Mallen, Silvano Matera, Fred Matthews, Mike Melvin, Robert M. McCarthy, Jerry McCrea, Joe Montenegro, Richard Muehen, Tom Munier, Robert Murray, Nick Muscara.

Tom Nagle, Cipriano Newball, Allan Nichols.

Robert O'Brien, Joe Oliveri, John Panico, Wayne Paulson, Charles Phillips, Frank Pisillo, Bob Pivinski, Kevin Paulsen, Jack Pratt.

Steve Raclofski, John Rattina, Larry Rudesyle, James Russo.

Dave Saccente, Dennis Saccente, Natal Scangorella, Bob Schultz, Henry Shull, Chris Sortino, Alan Specia, Gary A. Stooke, Lou Storck.

Peter Tateo, Doug Taylor, Jerry Tennenberg, Dave Tintie, George Tuthill.

Ralph Venezia, Gregory Verheek, Roger Vreeland.

John Wagner, Robert Wagner, Bill Warwick, Bob Wilkes, Steve Williams.

Robert Zutterman.

The Caballeros have engendered deep admiration and respect from all of the residents of my congressional district and the State of New Jersey and are a

continuing source of pride and honor to the members of the Hawthorne community having among their most staunch supporters, the mayor of Hawthorne, Hon. Louis Bay II, and all of the members of the governing body of the borough of Hawthorne.

Deepest appreciation is also extended to the families, supporters, and friends of the Caballeros for their encouragement and confidence over these many years.

May I also take this opportunity to express to the American Legion Post Commander Lasalle Olsen our grateful appreciation to all of the members of the American Legion Memorial Post 199 of Hawthorne for their many years of undaunted devotion and wholehearted support of the Caballeros whose outstanding contribution to our cultural enrichment is applauded by all of us.

GATEWAY NATIONAL RECREATION BILL

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1121, the gateway national recreation bill, is of great interest to the people of New Jersey and the surrounding metropolitan area.

Recreational areas are always in demand, particularly in geographical regions of large and concentrated population. The Atlantic shoreline is a popular vacation spot, and certainly the development of this area would enhance the natural assets of the Jersey shore.

I am sure that the editor of the Home News in my congressional district will be pleased to know that H.R. 1121 has been reported to the House, pending action on this floor. I include an editorial published in the Home News on this very subject:

GATEWAY BILL NEEDS SUPPORT

Almost everybody is in favor of the Gateway National Recreation Bill which would provide for a national recreation area in New York Bay, including parts of Brooklyn, Staten Island and Sandy Hook.

But the fact that the legislation is widely favored does not mean that it is sure to pass.

The House Interior Committee hasn't decided on its plans to bring the bill to the floor for a vote. It may take the bill to the Rules Committee and have it scheduled for a vote, or it may move directly to the floor for a vote if suspension of the rules can be obtained by a two-thirds vote.

Supporters of Gateway, including the prestigious Regional Plan Association, do not care which method is used, but they warn that Congress is thinking about a pre-election recess beginning as early as Oct. 6. House passage will not settle the matter, for a Senate-House conference committee will have to iron out differences, and take the bill back to both houses.

Meanwhile the Congress is busy with a host of important issues, and members are also looking towards election day in November.

Members of Congress from New Jersey and New York should push for prompt passage of this legislation.

YOUNGSTERS SUFFER MOST

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are still some isolated but persistent strikes affecting our public schools across the country and indications are that, in the years to come, schools will be beset by further problems stemming from teacher strikes.

A very timely and, I believe, absolutely sound commentary was made in an editorial by the editor of the Star-Sentinel Newspapers, Paul D. Coffman, in the September 14 issue. The point that is so effectively made in this column is that it is the youngsters in school who suffer the most when a strike closes down any school.

The editorial follows:

STUDENTS ARE THE LOSERS

(By Paul D. Coffman)

It has always been my understanding that the prime purpose of our public school system is to give the youngsters who attend these institutions the best opportunity possible to get a good education.

We elect school board members to supervise the affairs of the schools, we hire superintendents and related personnel to administer the affairs of the school and we attempt to get the best teaching personnel available to offer instruction to our youngsters.

The parents of the students and the taxpayers are the ones who must supply the money, through taxes, to carry on the school program and the program can only be as good as the school finances, supervisors and personnel make it.

During the past few years, the teachers, through their unions, have taken the strike vote as a means to get that to which they feel they are entitled and many of the parents who are not satisfied with the actions of the school board or supervisory personnel have used the boycott as a means of showing their disdain for the actions of such individuals.

I cannot see why any citizen would want to be a member of a school board since the board member who is donating so much of his or her time must, in many communities, undergo a constant attack from the citizenry no matter how good or how poor the individual's performance might be. Since many do accept these responsibilities, they must like what they are doing; otherwise there wouldn't be any candidates available at election time.

I do not wish to take sides in the hiring, firing or demotion of teaching or supervisory personnel, such as has recently happened at the Washington School in Maywood, but I do feel that the superintendent of schools and the school board should be the best judges of what type of personnel they feel will best carry out their wishes in the education of our youngsters.

If parents become disenchanted with members of a school board or the superintendent of a school system, they have one recourse that we all share under our American system. They can vote the school board members out of office at the next election and put men or women into office who will hire a superintendent more to their liking.

In my opinion there is no place for strikes and boycotts in our public school systems since the ones that really suffer under such conditions are the youngsters who are deprived of the educational opportunities to which they are entitled.

ROADS AND RAILS FOR THE CITIES

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, since 1967, the United States has been a petroleum-deficit nation and this gap between domestic supply and demand continues to widen. Even with domestic oil production running at close to capacity, we now import over one-fourth of our total oil needs.

How do we meet the threatening energy crisis which confronts us?

Today, between 80 and 90 percent of the air pollution in our urban areas is caused by automobile emissions.

How do we solve this national problem?

Traffic congestion in our cities is unbearable, and even our freeways are becoming the world's longest parking lots during rush hour.

How do we eliminate this vexing problem?

An answer to these three problems is rapid mass transportation.

By allowing our State and local officials the flexibility to meet their local transportation needs, we can provide a partial solution to the waste of energy resources, the waste of time, and the waste of our environment.

Mr. Speaker, we must provide our State and local officials with the means to establish a safe, efficient, and convenient method of getting people to their job, to school, to hospitals, and to Aunt Mable's. This could mean added highways, or it could mean bus or rail public transportation, or it could be a combination of both highways and mass transit.

For these reasons, I am supporting amendments to the Federal Highway Act.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD an article that appeared in the Washington Post on September 17:

ROADS AND RAILS FOR THE CITIES

The Senate this week has an excellent opportunity to get the highway trust fund on the right track in the cities. The two-year, 14-billion federal-aid highway bill reported by the Public Works Committee already contains significant provisions granting state and local officials some flexibility to cancel controversial urban freeway plans and redirect federal highway funds to less disruptive roads or to bus systems. The bill would also expand the present urban transportation fund eightfold, to \$800 million per year, and authorize direct federal grants to metropolitan transportation agencies.

Following such efforts to shelve old, seemingly endless freeway fights and to lure people from private cars into buses, the next logical move would be to get more people off the roads entirely and onto rail transit systems, thus relieving both the congestion on existing arteries and the pressures for still more lanes. The most feasible legislative vehicle for such a policy shift is the Cooper-Muskie amendment, which would grant cities the option to use their shares of that \$800-million urban transportation fund for rail transit as well as buses, bus lands, fringe parking areas and roads.

The amendment, to be offered on the Senate floor this week, enjoys impressively broad,

bipartisan support. Senators Cooper and Muskie in fact missed gaining a majority within the Public Works Committee only by one vacillating vote: the amendment was first adopted by that panel, 8-7, then rejected 8-7 the next day when Sen. Robert T. Stafford (R-Vt.) changed his mind with the explanation that "I come from a rural state." The Senate Banking Committee, which handles mass transit bills, endorsed the Cooper-Muskie measure, 10-0, as a supplement to the present program of aid for urban transit systems. The amendment is also blessed with administration backing, primarily as a result of Transportation Secretary John A. Volpe's vigorous—and undaunted—advocacy of unified transportation planning and funding for metropolitan areas. With a flexibility which is refreshing, compared with the our-bill-or-nothing approach taken too often by administration officials, Secretary Volpe has recognized that his "single urban fund" approach has not won congressional favor, and has swung his enthusiasm behind the Cooper-Muskie move.

Measured against the massive transportation snarls of urban areas and the mammoth pro-highway bias of past federal policies, the Cooper-Muskie amendment is a very modest advance. Permitting cities to use the highway trust fund to build rails as well as roads is not an improper diversion of that fund, much less a perversion of any sacred trust. To the contrary, truly balanced transportation systems benefit highway users as much as bus riders and subway strap-hangers. Indeed, those who must use the roads—those who, for instance, have no other way to transport goods—have an especially direct interest in curbing highway congestion by offering people other ways to get from place to place. Ideally, each metropolitan region should be able to design and fund whatever mix of roads and rails—and bike paths and pedestrian ways—will meet its particular needs in the most efficient, healthy and humane way. The Cooper-Muskie amendment, while limited, is an important and attainable beginning toward that end.

KIRKWOOD COMMUNITY COLLEGE—LEADERSHIP IN ENVIRONMENTAL DECISIONMAKING

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, Kirkwood Community College in Cedar Rapids has been making an outstanding record in the environmental education field. Kirkwood's latest effort in this vital area was the organization and management of a "decisionmakers" wastewater treatment workshop.

The workshop, held in Annapolis, Md., during August 29 to September 1 of this year, was attended by representatives from all 50 States. They included mayors, city managers, State attorneys general, and others involved in the decisionmaking needed to clean up America's waters and keep them clean.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud of Kirkwood's record and national reputation in the environmental education field. I think that Project Director Daryle Holbrook, his staff, and everyone from Kirkwood involved in this impor-

tant national conference deserve our sincere appreciation.

Through this workshop, they have brought clearly to State and local jurisdictions throughout the Nation that the nearly \$20 billion in water pollution funds the Congress plans to expend over the next 4 years is not the only ingredient necessary to clean up our waters. More money will be almost meaningless, without the necessary local planning and leadership to make America's water-pollution programs a continuing success—a success that will see our lakes, rivers, and streams running clear and clean.

Mr. Speaker, I insert immediately following my remarks the public news release concerning the Kirkwood workshop.

Kirkwood Community college helped put itself on the national map and boosted the cause of better water pollution control recently at Annapolis, Md.

Kirkwood used a grant from the Federal Environmental Protection Agency to conduct a workshop at the U.S. Naval Academy, August 29-September 1.

Invited participants from all 50 states attended. The list included mayors, city managers, state attorneys general and others with decisionmaking powers in the field of wastewater treatment.

Mike Crawford, director of Grants and Services at Kirkwood, said that about 15 of the states represented at Annapolis agreed to sponsor their own workshops during the coming year to promote better wastewater treatment.

Federal wastewater officials view the future with an attitude paralleling the good news-bad news genre of jokes.

The good news is that massive amounts of federal funds probably will become available soon to municipalities needing to improve their treatment plants. The minority counsel to the Senate Public Works Committee, Richard Hellman, told a Kirkwood workshop banquet audience that pending federal legislation will provide \$18.1 billion for such uses in the 1973-76 period.

The bad news is that many state and local governments do not appear prepared for all that money.

Many states do not yet require certification of treatment plant operators to assure proper plant operation. Iowa, is among the states with mandatory operator certification.

Speakers at the Kirkwood workshop were also chided about poor planning practices. They said that many multi-million dollar facilities are being designed without regard for future budget needs for trained personnel.

Workshop participants viewed a new EPA multi-media program which pictured badly deteriorated sewage treatment facilities less than 10 years old. The government says some of these incidents are due to poor maintenance and operating practices.

Project Director for the workshop was Daryle Holbrook of Kirkwood. Holbrook will complete his task by encouraging state and local workshops dealing with federal laws, regulations and funding sources for wastewater treatment projects.

THE MCGOVERN CREDIBILITY GAP

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, in a recent appearance before the Associated Press New York Broadcasters Association, Mr.

Herbert G. Klein, director of communications for the executive branch, mentioned a few of the credibility gaps which are now surfacing in the McGovern presidential campaign. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call Mr. Klein's remarks to the attention of my colleagues.

It is obvious that Mr. Klein could have mentioned many other credibility gaps attributed to Senator McGovern. He could have mentioned the fact that Senator McGovern is one of the alltime big spenders in Congress. That his spending philosophy helped bring on the inflation that President Nixon has been trying to bring under control for the past 4 years.

Mr. Klein was being kind to Senator McGovern when he didn't mention the Senator's proposal to lop off \$32 billion from the present national defense budget, no matter how many people it would throw out of work; to say nothing of reducing our country's ability to defend itself.

In his long list of credibility gaps, Mr. Klein was being generous when he didn't mention Senator McGovern's far-out income redistribution plan where he proposed to give every man, woman, and child in America \$1,000.

Mr. Speaker, promises are an important part of any presidential campaign. They tell the voters what the candidate plans to do if elected; they are a yardstick for measuring his performance in office. I firmly believe that President Nixon has fulfilled the great majority of the campaign promises he made in 1968. He would have fulfilled many more with a Republican Congress. I believe that with the help of millions of Americans who place country before party, he will be reelected overwhelmingly for another 4 years.

Mr. Klein's comments follow:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY HERBERT G. KLEIN

We are witnessing in this campaign year an event of historical significance . . . a candidate for the presidency has established a credibility gap months before Election Day. Never in modern history has a presidential candidate's credibility diminished so rapidly.

A one-thousand percent stand has become a national joke.

The biggest question of the campaign is where does McGovern stand.

One can only conclude that Senator McGovern doesn't know where he is going, or that he believes the average voter is incredibly naive. The lack of McGovern credibility is showing up strongest among the young people who grow more disillusioned by the day. On the other side, the youth movement toward President Nixon is growing like a landslide. Credibility for the President and the lack of credibility for Senator McGovern is the key factor.

You veteran observers of national politics must be as surprised as I am at the extent to which Senator George McGovern dally stretches his credibility and our incredulity.

I believe I know how the voters will answer this McGovern desire to dance around the process of decision; to take a verbal step forward to two back on most of what he says. I think, in fact, that you newsmen could legitimately call his waffling "the McGovern waltz."

During a period in our nation's life in which a president must take dozens of hard decisions daily, and then have the courage to stand behind them, the McGovern waltz is more of a hesitation step. For the man who must occupy the Oval Office of the White House, a waltz of this kind is out of step

in any age when there is no time for such nonsense.

With another two months before election, we can no doubt anticipate seeing Senator McGovern change steps and direction by the day. But just to refresh your memory, let me review some of the waffling that he has already appeared on the McGovern dance program:

1. Senator McGovern sent a personal emissary, Pierre Salinger, (who spoke to you earlier) to North Vietnam to bargain for the release of American prisoners of war. When confronted with the action, he strongly denied that he knew anything about it and then later made a full acknowledgement. Mr. Salinger is loyal, but for him and the public that incident had to be incredible.

2. In regard to Rick Stearns, a staff member known to have signed an anti-Zionist tract as a student, Senator McGovern informed some disgruntled Democrats that the staffer would definitely be out of the California campaign. At the same point in time, he told others on his staff that the matter would be left strictly to the conscience of the Western States Coordinator himself. He is on the McGovern staff.

3. In announcing to the American Federation of Teachers that "teachers belong in school—or on a picket line" George McGovern publicly endorsed illegal strikes. It is also interesting to note that shortly thereafter, his campaign received a "donation" of a quarter-million dollars from the AFT. New Yorkers have seen the disastrous effects of teacher-strikes. Such a stand must be incredulous.

4. George McGovern made another incredible remark by claiming that Former President Lyndon Johnson "inherited" the Vietnam war and could do very little or nothing about it. In 1967, Senator McGovern was quoted as saying "The President is a tortured and confused man literally tortured by the mess he has gotten into in Vietnam . . .", whereas this August, McGovern stated ". . . he (LBJ) inherited that (the war), he didn't start it." What does the Senator really believe?

5. In May Senator McGovern said that he has "supported every legislative effort to give military and economic assistance to Israel since coming to the Congress some 14 years ago." In truth, George McGovern has often been part of a small minority in the U.S. Senate which usually votes against Iran, Turkey, Greece, and above all, Israel. In 1957, McGovern was one of only 61 members of Congress to vote against a military/economic program to help counteract communism in the Mideast. Three times in the crucial year of 1967, he voted to make it much harder for Israel to buy arms on credit. On the final roll call, a pro-Israel vote from the Senator would have changed the outcome. In 1970, he said, "Israel can't be given a 'blank check' on the U.S. Treasury." No one is offering a blank check, but it is credible to keep a balance of power in the Middle East.

6. George McGovern's condoning of the "South Carolina lie", in which TV and news reporters at the Democratic convention were actually lied to so that the McGovern cause would be furthered, is additional evidence of a looming credibility gap. That represents the politics of the machine-dominated past. The fact that this team approves of prevarication if it will serve its purposes can only lead one to believe such occurrences will happen regularly, whenever this group feels it would benefit them not to let the public know the truth. That's called the right to lie. I don't agree with this and I suspect neither would Pierre Salinger today. In explaining the official and unofficial reason behind the South Carolina sell-out, press secretary Dick Dougherty quipped, "you can just say we lied."

7. Senator McGovern's bobbing and bowing on capital gains cause more reason for doubt. In a full page ad of the *Wall Street Journal* on May 22 of this year, George McGovern said, "I have not suggested the elimination

of capital gain limitations existing in the present code." On August 29, he waveringly said, "We must phase out the tax preference or loophole for capital gains . . ."

8. And, of course, the first and foremost gap that George McGovern began with, but will certainly not finish with, was his statement that he was 1000% behind his vice presidential candidate—right up to the point at which the grand caller cried, "Change partners!"

George McGovern says he has changed his position on issues probably less than any presidential candidate in recent times (AP-Aug. 31). That, alone, is incredible. His fancy footwork speaks for itself. Even as we watch Senator McGovern maneuver some quick turns to avoid head-on collisions among staff advisors, or do double-time steps to keep up with his own welfare and tax programs, it is apparent that no choreographer—no matter how talented—could budge George McGovern from his basic one step forward and two steps back.

CLOSING SCHOOLS WHICH EDUCATE THE POOR

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, periodically, society poses a question to its members which none of them seem to be able to find an answer for. One such question involves the closing of a growing number of private or parochial schools.

Everyone in the country reading the papers is at least vaguely aware that across the land such schools, both elementary and secondary, are closing down with steady regularity. To many Americans, this is a peripheral problem. Some even seem to be pleased that this phenomenon is gathering force.

A time has come for all of us to realize just what is happening and why it will inevitably affect almost every American.

These schools educate millions of youngsters who otherwise would be clogging our already grievously overburdened public school systems. Their parents pay double school taxes in the form of support for public schools and tuition payments for private education.

That burden has become too much for hundreds of thousands of families. As a result, one after another of these schools is closing its doors, and dumping its enrollment into the lap of various public school systems across the Nation.

But who, in all truth, are these students? Are they children of suburban families? Are they offspring of the comfortable and well-to-do? Hardly.

Rather, they are almost always inner city youngsters. Children of the poor vastly predominate among ranks of those whose parochial schools close their doors. It is the parents of such young people who simply cannot afford to bear the burden imposed by double taxation. These will continue to be the schools which will close. For no matter how hard a given family may work to afford their children a decent education, it may be in vain if the diocese simply cannot afford to subsidize that private school in their neighborhood.

More often than not, public schools in these neighborhoods are educationally far below minimum standards. We all at least are aware of the scandal of America's inner city school facilities. Of course, there are a few show schools, where an inordinate quantity of funds has been poured in and special task forces of teachers have been mobilized. These are very much the ghetto exception rather than the rule. Parents in such neighborhoods making a decision to send children to parochial schools do so at enormous personal sacrifice. They willingly take on double burdens, often working extra jobs in order to pay tuition. Think of the hardship worked upon them when a diocese must close such facilities because of the larger financial picture confronting it as a whole.

Children of this type are forced to attend slum schools which destroy much of what their parents have labored so desperately and so hard to create and preserve. In many cases, where such instances occur, and a child is levered into a public facility, it is a virtual death sentence to any hope which may have been carefully nurtured for a better life and a higher education.

We must come to grips with this worsening situation. If we continue to refuse some sort of basic aid to these facilities, we are compounding what everyone admits is the Nation's worst problems. How hypocritical for us to bewail the fate of those in our slums and ghettos, and then to sanctimoniously refuse a smidgin of assistance to these people and schools their youngsters attend.

"The wall of separation between church and state" is a very fine phrase. It smacks of the Constitution, our Founding Fathers, and the colonial era. But is it fair to utilize it as a weapon in this situation? Is it fair to interpose it as a barrier between ghetto children and a chance to attend a decent school?

I believe there is a need and place for both public and parochial schools in America. Each serves a purpose. One does not need or seek to supplant the other. America must recognize and adapt to the truth of this statement.

A solution is available which would avoid any direct aid to private schools of the Nation. It is, like all such solutions, relatively simple. A tax credit for the amount of tuition paid by parents is a legitimate, constitutionally valid alternative. Such tax relief would be made available under terms of a measure I have joined in sponsoring with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY).

Parents would still have both choice and chance to educate their children as they see fit. Schools in question would have a fighting chance to survive, rather than close one after the other, as is the case today, and their fate in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I realize this subject rouses significant passions on both sides of the aisle and on all levels of society. Nevertheless, we cannot evade responsibility any longer. A new school season is again upon us. It is inevitable that without some form of alleviation, cumulative pressures will result in the closing of many more such private educational facilities. It is estimated now that they

are closing their doors at the rate of one a day across the United States.

If we do not act, then we surely throw these poor children to the wolves. It is an act of simple self-preservation as well as of compassion to allow some form of tax relief.

NAM COMMENTS ON "TAX REFORM"

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues in this year's political campaign is the state of the economy. We are all concerned about and interested in the economic reforms advocated by the presidential candidates. President Nixon's record is clear and evident on this matter. Senator McGovern has presented a variety of proposals, including his recent tax reform plan to a Wall Street audience.

George Hagedorn, chief economist for the National Association of Manufacturers, has written a succinct commentary on what is wrong with the McGovern proposal. His main objection is the heavy-handed manner in which McGovern would tax capital gains, the lifeblood of investment and economic growth. There is no quicker way to promote economic stagnation than to discourage economic investment which is exactly what the McGovern proposal would do. Mr. Hagedorn's article follows:

ECONOMIC ANEMIA

(By George Hagedorn)

Senator McGovern, in his appearance before the New York Security Analysts, has at last presented the economic analyst with something he can begin to analyze, although many details are still missing.

It turns out that Senator McGovern's tax reform program is intended, not primarily to correct alleged inequities, but to raise substantial additional revenues—\$22 billion a year. Practically no one would pay less in taxes but would pay a great deal more. And the heart of the program is a proposed new treatment for capital gains, which will be depended on for \$12 billion—more than half of the total. Without that \$12 billion of new revenue, the whole fiscal program fell apart.

Realized capital gains are to be taxed as ordinary income. This is justified on the ground that "Money made by money should be taxed at the same rate as money made by man."

Unrealized capital gains are to be taxed at the death of the asset holder. This is explained on the principle that: "... the inevitability of death should not assure the avoidability of taxes."

It is not at all clear how Senator McGovern arrives at his figure of \$12 billion as the revenue gain from these two proposals. Revenues from capital gains taxation depend not only on the way they are taxed but also on the amount of capital gains the economy generates. High rates of taxation on zero capital gains yield zero revenues.

Inflation, of course, tends to create nominal capital gains. If the general price level trends upward, the price of at least some investment assets may trend upward with it. But to regard capital gains resulting from inflation as income, in the same sense as current compensation for current services, is

to mistake a fiction for a fact. By receiving a larger sum of dollars for an asset than he had previously paid for it, the investor simply gets back his real purchasing power. If he doesn't get more than he paid, in an inflationary period, he has suffered a loss. Capital gains reflecting inflation are not truly a gain to their recipients, and to tax them as such is a form of confiscation.

Capital gains do not necessarily arise from inflation. There can be genuine capital gains, resulting from the dynamic growth of the economy and a healthy state of capital markets. It is questionable whether these conditions could be met under the fiscal program of Senator McGovern, which would impose harsh penalties on business operations, business expansion, and the flow of funds for investment.

Where does that leave us? We must conclude that, if the expected revenue increase is to be derived from a tax on genuine (non-inflationary) capital gains, the \$12 billion is a grossly overstated estimate. It is questionable whether there would be any genuine capital gains to be taxed. If the revenue increase is to come from capital gains that merely reflect inflation, it would be taxing a purely fictitious element of income.

Shifting the focus of attention from the affected taxpayer to the economy at large, we reach even more disturbing conclusions. The simplistic idea that capital gains can be regarded the same as "any other kind of income" is a fundamental mistake in economic interpretation. Capital gains are not income at all in any general economic sense. In compiling the national income accounts, the Department of Commerce does not include capital gains as part of the total. Scholars universally agree with that procedure. National income is created by the production of new goods and services, not by the transfer of existing properties.

Consider the case where A sells to B an existing asset for \$100,000. No new item of national wealth has come into existence—the asset is the same as it was before. There has been no net addition to funds available for new capital formation—the same \$100,000 previously in B's hands is now in A's. All this is true regardless of whether A made a capital gain on the transaction.

But suppose some part of the \$100,000 is taxed away as a capital gain. In that case there has been a net reduction in funds that can be used to provide capital for expansion. The \$12 billion that Senator McGovern wants to raise annually by additional taxes on capital gains would be a direct drain, dollar for dollar, of the capital supply—the very life blood of any nation's economy.

It is inescapable that any form of taxation will reduce resources available for other purposes. But capital gains taxation is a direct rap on the artery that supplies capital for growth.

Twelve billion a year is a lot of blood-letting. Senator McGovern has hit on the quickest way imaginable of producing economic anemia.

FACTORY WORKERS TURNING TO NIXON

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, first-time voters—perhaps 25 million of them—may make the difference in this year's presidential election. A series of articles is being written by the Washington Star-News staff writer, Duncan Spencer, about the "new voter."

Many of my colleagues are wondering what this new voter has in mind.

According to Mr. Spencer's report from Hamtramck, Mich., where the production line of Dodge Main is located, he indicates that the factory workers at this time favor the President over Mr. McGovern. There are many reasons for the great shift of new laborites who ordinarily vote the straight Democratic ticket—and especially is this true of the new voter. The new voter who works on the assembly line is not exactly the happiest person in the world. I speak from experience because I worked on the assembly line of the Buick Motor Co., in Flint, Mich., in the summer of 1929. Working on the assembly line is not the most interesting job in the world and in some ways it is a rather strenuous job because on the assembly line you have to keep up with production. In addition, you are doing the same routine thing day after day which is not exactly attractive to young people. Mr. Spencer finds that "whatever you want to call the young men of Dodge Main, ethnics, anti-intellectuals, or bigots, their anger and frustration is turning into votes for Richard Nixon."

I attach herewith the article by Mr. Spencer which I am sure many of my colleagues will want to read:

FACTORY WORKERS TURNING TO NIXON

(By Duncan Spencer)

HAMTRAMCK, MICH.—The men from the production line at Dodge Main start to skip out a little before the lunch break really begins at 11:30 a.m. and it's usually the younger ones first, because they hate the place the most.

There are at least 2,000 workers of the 9,000 men and women who assemble cars at Dodge Main who have never voted before. This is their year, but their conversation would bring tears to the eyes of either presidential candidate, or to anyone who thinks blue collar youth is ripe for the plucking Nov. 7.

The plant has tried, in its own way, to change things. The walls were painted in psychedelic colors recently, there are experiments with groups of workers on the line to make the jobs less boring and mechanical. But when the men talk about themselves, they talk about "factory rats," and it's not a term of endearment, not to the 20-year-old who said "you're walking into hell when you go into that body shop."

Whatever you want to call the young men of Dodge Main, ethnics, anti-intellectuals, or bigots, their anger and frustration is turning into votes for Richard Nixon. In their world, you drink as many beers as you can at 11:30 to kill the afternoon, and in politics, you look for someone to blame. The other day in Hamtramck, George McGovern was filling the bill.

"That goddam \$1,000," said Jim Nils, 23, of Port Huron, Mich. "Everybody is fed up with giving their money to other people." It was easy to find agreement with the comment in the noisy bar across from the plant where many men come for lunch. The older men sit in silence, eating slabs of bread and sausage from their paper bags, and the young are often inarticulate. "McGovern," said Ron Aettrino, a 30-year-old parts inspector, doesn't show them nothing. I think he's too much for the freaky college jerks."

But Nils didn't elaborate his complaint. The subject seemed settled—he went back to Hamtramck's eternal verity, the life of the plant and the line, where the shiny new Dodge Demons, Dusters and Darts roll off at a rate of over 1,000 per day. "There was

\$800 in the check pool today," he said, "and I was 10 numbers off."

The check pool is a weekly numbers game that ends on payday, and the winner is the worker whose computer-printed paycheck number is closest to the numbers on scraps of paper pulled from a hat.

"I don't play that," said Aettrino, his large hand elegantly wrapped around a glass. "We still got some scruples—which sounds pretty bad for a Dago at Dodge Main."

It seems easy for a man to put himself down in Hamtramck—the grimy city-suburb of Detroit dominated by two buildings: St. Florian's Catholic Church and Dodge Main, where thousands of Poles, blacks and Armenian-Americans work in an atmosphere not much given to hope or optimism.

You can hardly tell what season it is from looking. Railroad cars creep across the overpass to the plant which cannot disguise the fact it is one of the oldest in Detroit. Cars parked by the workers cover every bit of space near Joseph Campau Avenue. On the side streets, though, the frame houses are freshly painted, the gardens kept like golf greens.

Hamtramck is pure ethnic country where every other block has a Polish bar, or a sausage shop, where it is an article of faith to paint and paint again in futile defiance of the soot and dust falling from the skies.

But it's also located within a prime battleground for both parties: The state of Michigan, where there are 21 electoral votes to be won.

In Detroit, the Republicans are making a strong effort to register voters in areas which have historically had a high percentage of ticket-splitting. But their computer list, which is based on past voter performance in Michigan, does not include Hamtramck. It is considered to be too strongly Democratic to be worth the time and money. Over 600,000 telephone calls are planned before the October registration deadline, but none of them will go to the area around Dodge Main.

The Detroit metropolitan area represents 47 percent of the state's population. In Detroit, as one McGovern worker put it last week, the United Auto Workers in many ways is the ballgame for Michigan politics. A block and a half down the avenue from Dodge Main at UAW Local 3, John Smith, local president and a black man (65 percent of the local is black), was explaining a few things.

"This plant is the oldest in the city," he said. "But it's a young plant. There are over 1,000 18-year-olds in our membership and about 2,000 are in their early 20s. In a plant like that, we have a lot of absentees."

The main problem facing the union is that young men don't like to work. They don't like this work because it is repetitious, boring, hard, dirty and long. The men drink to pass the time. They are frustrated and angry, but not angry enough, Smith pointed out, to want to quit or to feel the whole system needs an overhaul.

"I put it this way," he said. "If you got \$100 and I got nothing, you're not worried about me, you're worried about how to hang onto your 100 bucks."

Smith says the union is registered 75-85 percent Democratic but the younger men say that doesn't mean they will vote that way.

It was noon and men all over the restaurant got up as if by signal to join the stream of workers moving back toward the link fence and the factory gate after the half-hour lunch break. The day was not as cheerful as usual last week because production was up. That meant the line would run all day Saturday and even at time-and-a-half, the extra pay wasn't enough to make the young ones like the compulsory work.

The hands at Dodge Main leave the plant in the afternoon with blank faces. The city they live in is depressed and worn out, pol-

luted and dirty. Many of their friends were sent to Vietnam. Some were killed. Unemployment in Detroit is almost 10 percent and further automation in the plant will cut some men out of jobs almost certainly in the next five years.

The neighborhoods around the plant are plain and segregated into small blocks of blacks and whites. And there is the line staring them in the face until they are 58 years old.

But for all these things, they feel neither party has anything to offer this November. In interviews, the young workers repeat that whenever programs are started by the federal government, they are aimed at someone else in the case of Detroit—at the blacks, or the unemployed. For them, they say, there are no scholarships at Harvard.

Yet in spite of that and the fact that their union—the union of Walter Reuther and the bloody battle of the overpass, now the union of Leonard Woodcock—has straight-forwardly endorsed George McGovern, they say they are going to vote for Richard Nixon and they say that many of their friends, white and black, will do the same.

The workers at McGovern headquarters, stationed in a former interior decorator's shop near the center of the spread-out city, are fully aware of the problem.

The blue collar areas, normally heavily Democratic, are one of McGovern's main problems, said Mike Barone, the Detroit "issues specialist" for McGovern.

"The way we hope to win is in three areas," he said. "A good Democratic vote in the upstate areas where busing is not such a big issue, a big vote among the blacks and students in Detroit (there are between 150,000 and 200,000 college students state-wide, Barone estimates), and a turnaround in the Detroit suburbs on the issues of economics, the war and the credibility of the candidate."

But one of the disappointments with the campaign so far, as Barone sees it, has been a failure by McGovern to really fight hard on the more mundane issues like the Watergate break-in.

"It's an old theory of mine," Barone said sadly, "for a scandal issue to click, people have to be pretty well against someone anyway. The liberals seem to just want to play by the rules."

"We talked to the young people in the plants," said Sandy McClure, another McGovern worker, "and it was a case of a pox on everybody's house."

That was pretty much what Nils and his fellow "factory rat" Ken Jurewicz were saying at Jax Bar the other night. They were among a group of about half a dozen young men from Dodge Main, watching the Detroit Tigers get whacked on television, not really paying attention.

They talked about their jobs and about the coming election in the same tone, as if things would go on the same way whatever they did; there was agreement on that. As one of them put it, talking about the Watergate investigation: "People don't think the Watergate thing is too scandalous. It's just a part of politics. People don't trust the government anyway."

And Nils said the same thing about the union. "We laugh at the union," he said. "A bunch of old guys. But you've got no choice; if it was optional, that union would be broke."

Jurewicz, a tall and muscular young man of 27, the third generation of a Polish Hamtramck family, was more voluble than the others. He expressed many of the views of the first-time-voters, but put them in the perspective of one who had voted for President before. A Democrat, he voted for Humphrey in 1968, but he is for Nixon this year.

"Look," he said, "I would say people have gotten kind of comfortable with Nixon. They're working steady. There's plenty of overtime and he's made some moves to stop inflation."

"But with McGovern, I just say no, he's an opportunist, ambitious you know, and as far as I can see, not really capable. I don't really know what he's done in the Senate. But I do know he jumps on all these things, what I'd call fads. When he started campaigning about a year and a half ago, the war was the big issue. Now it's not. The war is dead. Marijuana is dead, too."

"McGovern talks about jobs for blacks. Well, around here, it's easier to get a job if you're black. If you want a job at Dodge Main, just don't fill in the box that says Caucasian. Fill the box that says black or other."

Jurewicz also made clear the hostility many working youths, black and white, feel to their college-educated peers. Because there is so much absenteeism on Mondays and Fridays, the company has hired part-time workers to fill-in on the line. They are usually college students.

The young workers inevitably link the college students in the plant with McGovern. The college kids stick by themselves. They've got a kind of a clique, Jurewicz said. "They're better than you and you're nobody, that's pretty plain. But these guys go to college because they don't know what to do with themselves or their father pays their way. They don't know what to do. What do they do? Nothing. The young college kids are on a fad thing and McGovern is their fad."

Another theme in the conversation in the bar was the gulf between the younger workers and the men in their 50's and 60's, some of whom refused to retire when their time came, even with a pension of \$500 per month.

"It's pathetic, that's what," one of the men said. "Do you know how much I make? \$125 take home. They could retire with that. I tell them they're working free, but they won't quit, they say they'd lose their pay."

The work ethic, he indicated, didn't make much sense to him. "To get through the day's work you either have to be high or dead. You see cars on the line coming through with bottles in them. It didn't make sense to try to do a good job because you do the same thing over and over."

The big question is whether the "factory rats" will vote at all. And that, according to Penn Kemble, 30, chairman of Frontlash, the union-backed organization which is trying to register the new non-college voter, can be a matter of habit.

"Remember this," he said in a recent interview. "There are more elections in unions than there are in any university or any church; the young guys in the auto plants are pi-ed off at the liberals; the first-time voters in Michigan will be reflective of what's happening."

Young factory workers, he said, "Don't know where their place is, or who is for them. There was a real social class thing in that damn convention and they're aware of it. They are the kids stuck between the country club and the board room, and the more affluent and educated new class of kids. The new politics thing, that doesn't seem to appeal to them either."

"Why in the world would 48 percent of them say they're going to vote for Nixon?" he asked, quoting a poll of non-college youth. "How is it Humphrey wins in Pennsylvania and Wallace wins in Michigan? These guys are today's forgotten men."

matched by equal attention from the news media when the wholesale cost of cattle declined. The true facts of the situation, which has so far received only one-sided treatment by the press, are plainly set forth in the following column by C. W. McManamy. Mr. McManamy, writing here for the August 21 issue of the Council Bluffs, Iowa, Nonpareil, speaks from direct practical knowledge of the beef industry. His observations are well worth the attention of my colleagues and all who would understand the fluctuations of the meat market.

The article follows:

MARKETS GO UP—GO DOWN

(By C. W. McManamy)

On Wednesday, July 5, of this year a shipper had fed steers on the Omaha market. They sold for \$38.65 per hundredweight.

The previous week fed steer prices in Omaha hit a \$40 top. That top and the upturn in cattle prices which had brought it about made news.

Press, TV and radio, mostly in the East, made considerable moment of the advance in cattle prices and the impact on the price of meat in the counters.

On Tuesday, Aug. 14, just this past week, that same shipper had another shipment of cattle on the market. This second load came from the same string of feeders, they were fed in the same lot with the first load. They received the same ration as the first. Except for the extra 40 days feed, they were as near identical with the first load as cattle can be.

That load last Tuesday brought \$35.65 per hundredweight. Market top in Omaha that day was \$37.

It is easy to see that this man received \$3 per hundredweight less for his second load than he did for his first. It is also easy to see that his experience was shared generally by cattle feeders since there was \$3 per hundredweight decline in the general market.

This \$3 decline in cattle prices in a little over a month carries some rather important connotations.

In spite of this I have not seen, or heard, as of this writing, any stories or comments relative to this sharp decline.

Why is this? When cattle prices go up three bucks, for instance, does it set up a clamour that can be heard from coast to coast. Those same prices can go down by three bucks yet it causes scarcely a ripple of public interest anywhere.

What about a \$3 decline in fat cattle prices? This means, first of all, that the feeders profit margin has shriveled up by that amount. A \$3 per hundredweight decline means that a 1,000 pound steer will return \$30 less to the producer.

So it would be that if the owners profit on that steer in July had been \$30 then his August shipment was merely breakeven operation. Should his July profit have been only \$25 then his August transaction would have resulted in a \$5 loss per head.

I have no idea what the profit margin per head might have been on that July sale, but it is quite obvious that the \$30 decline on the August sale will wipe out a goodly portion of the July gain.

This is one of the reasons it is so ill-advised to stir up a fuss when livestock prices go up. The producer long ago discovered that it will take all his expanded profits from the higher times, and more to offset the diminished returns of the low times.

There might be some who would say that this is a problem for the feeder.—And so it is. There is more to it than that, however, and people in this neck of the woods had jolly well better realize this.

A \$30 per head decline in the value of 300 steers a feeder has ready for market means \$9,000 less profit he will have to spend. Mul-

MARKETS GO UP—GO DOWN

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the hue and cry raised over the short-lived increase in beef prices predictably was not

tively this by 10 feeders, just to keep the picture small and in focus: \$90,000 less to be spent.

It should be readily apparent to many folks, removed from the feeder's lot but involved in associated or related businesses, that their own welfare is subject to change without notice when cattle or hog prices suffer these sharp drops.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE LEGISLATION—PAST AND FUTURE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, during this Congress it has been my pleasure to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits, of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

During these busy months I have often had the distinct honor of addressing meetings of Federal employees during which I have had the opportunity to report on legislative matters of vital interest to them.

Because of the profound interest of these employees in these issues, I now insert in the RECORD a short resume of legislation pending bills and a prognosis of how Federal employee legislation may fare in the near future.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that most of the successes of our subcommittee have occurred over the objections and opposition of both the Civil Service and the administration.

In too few instances has the President or his appointees to the Civil Service Commission indicated any real or concrete desire to better the plight of the Federal worker.

I cite, for example, the extraordinary occurrence of August 1971, in which the President singled out the Federal employee for special "sacrifice" as a part of his "phase I" program of wage and price control.

Mr. Speaker, as you may recall, immediately after the President's announcement that he was postponing the pay raises for Federal employees, I introduced a resolution prohibiting this punitive action.

And I was delighted when the Congress saw fit to uphold the Federal employee and prevailed upon the President to give those workers a 5.5 percent increase they did in fact deserve and need.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, the President again is seeking to penalize the Federal employee by postponing the regular October increase 3 months. I wholeheartedly agree with Chairman THADDEUS DULSKI of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee that the President does not have the authority to postpone the pay raises which are designed to bring the Federal employee pay up to a level comparable with the private sector.

HEALTH BENEFITS

My subcommittee has, during the past 2 years, held extensive hearings on the

Federal employees health benefits program.

As a result of these hearings, I am convinced that the Civil Service Commission is not diligently representing the employee's interests in negotiating contracts with such insurance industry giants as Blue Cross/Blue Shield and Aetna.

The mammoth error by the Blues and by the Commission in overestimating the premiums for 1972 has already cost every policyholder dollars that he can ill-afford to lose.

The Blue Cross/Blue Shield associations have also deliberately circumvented the policyholder in cutting back on previously approved benefits without notifying the enrollee of these cutbacks and without notifying the Civil Service Commission of such action.

The Blues, our subcommittee found out, have been spending expense money on a lavish scale without worrying in the least about the auditors from the Civil Service Commission.

Why? Because the Commission has been woefully deficient in overseeing the performance of the insurance companies.

I think the subcommittee's hard questions and continuing surveillance of the performance of the Commission and the insurance industry will in the long run have additional cash benefits for all Federal employees and retirees.

For example, I fully expect the Commission to hold fast and not allow any sizable premium increases for Blue Cross/Blue Shield or Aetna. As these are the carriers that cover more than 80 percent of all Federal employees, this would be a major step in the right direction.

Our subcommittee has also worked diligently on legislation increasing the Federal Government's share of premiums for the Federal employees health program.

The bill reported out by the House, H.R. 12202, which would increase the Government's share of health insurance premiums to 75 percent, has been momentarily blocked by the Senate which wants to cut the percentage down to 50 percent and exclude postal workers from sharing in the increased benefits.

It is my firm belief that the Congress intended by enactment of the postal reorganization bill to have the postal workers bargain from the same base as other Federal workers. I believe the testimony of those who negotiated with the Postal Service that that belief was shared by the administration. Now the Postal Service is saying that they never shared that understanding—I do not concur with the Postal Service manager's statement.

If, however, we do not prevail in our efforts to keep the postal workers within the coverage of H.R. 12202, I will make every effort to see that the Postal Service keeps their word and bargains fairly with their workers and gives them at least the same health benefits as those given to other Federal workers.

RETIREMENT

At the time of this writing, the Rules Committee of the House is deliberating as to when my bill, H.R. 11255, the 80-point retirement bill, will be considered.

The Post Office and Civil Service Com-

mittee reported the bill out by a wide margin and I am hopeful that the Rules Committee will soon clear the bill for action on the floor of the House of Representatives.

There is no question but that this is one of the most significant retirement bills to come before the Congress in many years and I am eager to debate the issue of fair and equitable retirement for Federal employees on the floor of the House.

The debate will be bitter, I am sure, because of the administration's strong opposition to the 80-percent retirement proposal.

Our subcommittee is also actively at work in attempting to secure passage of meaningful legislation granting increases in annuities to Federal retirees and their survivors.

We have held extensive hearings on annuity increase bills including my bill, H.R. 7805.

I believe that the fairness of a retirement annuity increase has been amply demonstrated—especially in light of the President's approval of a 20-percent across-the-board increase for social security recipients.

In closing, I want to assure all Federal employees that the subcommittee will continue to work hard to implement those progressive bills and to investigate the programs that appear to be working against his best interest.

Mr. Speaker, too rarely do we in the Congress hear from our Federal employees, a large group of hard-working Americans whose political activities are curtailed by the Hatch Act and whose pay and working conditions directly depend upon those they vote in office. If that seems to be paradoxical, Mr. Speaker, it is.

I am hopeful that those who read these remarks will respond by telling me of their specific problems and of the type of legislation they need to better perform their jobs and serve their country.

IS IT TRUE WHAT THEY SAY ABOUT THE NEW YORK TIMES?

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of all Members substantial excerpts from an article which appeared in the National Review entitled "Is It True What They Say About the New York Times?" by John C. Ottinger and Patrick D. Maines.

This piece is a thoughtful analysis of New York Times news coverage on five major case histories. These cover the senatorial race of JAMES BUCKLEY in 1970, the 1969 debate on the ABM in the Senate, the Haynsworth case of 1969, Vice President AGNEW and the networks in 1969, and the President's recent decision to mine the ports of North Vietnam.

The analysis by Mr. Ottinger and Mr. Maines carefully notes the placement of stories on page 1 or on other pages, the

number of words in the several stories, and the balance in the headlines. The article on the whole shows a sensitivity for news standards on the one hand and news importance on the other.

In summation the piece points out that:

The Times' news performance in terms of balance between right and left may not be flawless but it must be rated very high.

While the New York Times, like other newspapers, strives for fairness, none of the top New York Times executives would deny that they sometimes err, the article reports. The National Review concludes by noting:

That the Times discharges its stewardship with the degree of fairness which this study suggests is a challenge to all media that aspire to responsible journalism. Conservatives—and all other Americans—could be far more confident if other major media measured up to the same standard.

The article follows:

IS IT TRUE WHAT THEY SAY ABOUT THE NEW YORK TIMES?

(By John C. Ottinger and Patrick D. Maines)

Conservatives have long dismissed the *New York Times* as a hopeless hotbed of liberalism, biased beyond redemption and therefore not to be taken too seriously. The Vice President, of course, has classified it as only slightly less left-leaning than the television networks. Late in 1969, he charged it with blatant news bias because its early edition—the one he reads in Washington—didn't consider "fit to print" an account of a letter endorsing the Nixon Vietnam policy signed by no less than 59 senators and three hundred representatives. (The *Times* did cover the story in its Late City Edition, as it later informed the Vice President. But the impression was there, and he had relayed it to the country.)

Other conservative leaders have been equally vocal in *The Conscience of a Majority*. Barry Goldwater accused the *Times* of publishing a "100 per cent false" story during the 1964 campaign, springing from a famed but discredited CBS telecast imputing connections between Goldwater and neo-Nazi groups in Germany. In a speech early this year, L. Patrick Gray III, now Acting FBI Director, suggested that "subtle bias may have been at work" when the *Times* ran a photo of then Assistant Attorney General Robert C. Mardian, shown conferring with Attorney General John Mitchell, and identified Mardian as ITT's Washington vice president, William R. Merriam. This "made it appear that the Justice Department and ITT were in cahoots with each other." As recently as May, Kenneth W. Clawson, Deputy Director of Communications for the White House, attacked the *Times* as "a conduit of enemy propaganda to the American people," in connection with the later-contradicted report that the North Vietnamese had swept Haiphong harbor clean of American mines.

National Review itself has raised a questioning eyebrow at the *Times* "objectivity" at least three times in the past two and a half years. In May 1970, *NR* pointed out, the *Times* described Kent State University, pre-shootings, as a relative enclave of tranquility—disregarding enough SDS-inspired riots and breakings and enterings in 1969 to fill 167 pages of a House Internal Security Committee report. In October 1971, *NR* reported, a *Times* head showed that "A Survey of Youth Puts Lindsay in Front of Nixon," relegating to the body of the story the figures which put Senators Muskie and Kennedy far ahead of Lindsay. And in February

of this year, *NR* caught the *Times* "managing the news" by suppressing a wire from the North Vietnamese government again refusing to negotiate the release of American prisoners until it learned of the CIA's release of the text of what the *Times* had received but not printed. Managing Editor A. M. Rosenthal later explained the omission to *NR*'s satisfaction; but again the impression of *Times* bias had been created—and spread.

To what extent is this negative impression soundly based? If it isn't true that the *Times* leans to the left, why are so many presumably perceptive people certain that it does? It is not in the conservative interest to perpetuate that assumption if it is false, because however freely one may question various aspects of the *Times* performance, its power is undeniable.

The *Times*, however, wields its power in various ways. In some cultural fields, it approaches near-omnipotence. A blast from the *Times*' theater critic, especially since the end of the *Herald Tribune*, can doom a Broadway play. It was written of Orville Prescott, the weekday book critic until 1965, that he was "the terror of the book industry, an arbiter whose every approving nod could sell a thousand books," and there is no indication that his successors are any less potent. And the Sunday *New York Times Book Review*, with its far greater space and much larger circulation, is probably even more influential.

The editorial page and the Op Ed output of the columnist—Messrs. Reston, Wicker, Lewis, Sulzberger et al.—are influential but it is an influence that political activists often exaggerate. Politicians, even Presidents, pay far more attention to editorials than do average readers, millions of whom simply don't read them. The *Times*' own advertising director, according to Gay Talese, once soothed an angry advertiser by assuring him that, after all, nobody reads the editorials.

The real power of the *Times* comes from its editors' command of the most massive flow of news generated by any single medium, print or electronic, in the world. As Frederick T. Birchall, long-time managing editor, said nearly sixty years ago, "Let me control the headlines and I shall not care who controls the editorials." It is in this area—the administration of the news—that our analysis is concerned, for this is the real power center.

BUCKLEY FOR SENATOR, 1970

(Oct. 1-Nov. 2)

	Featuring Buckley	Featuring Goodell	Featuring Ottinger	Featuring 2 or 3
Number of news- stories.....	39	30	21	35
Approximate words.....	23,800	25,750	11,600	34,950
Newsstories— p. 1.....	5	6	1	4
Approximate words.....	6,500	8,300	650	5,250
Pictures.....	16	13	12	-----
Pictures on p. 1..	3	3	3	-----

Though the *Times* prints some seventy million words a year, selectivity is the sine qua non of its news editors' function. Events not rated newsworthy may not be covered or, if covered, not published. Qualitatively, there is position: A top head or three-column picture on page one is light-years ahead of similar space on page 45 in terms of readership and impact. There are the rhetorical subtleties: A turn of phrase can make a difference; an intriguing head v. a bland or negative one can make even more of a difference.

In this study we have picked five developing news stories in which there was a distinct right-left line: Buckley for Senator, 1970; the ABM debate and vote, 1969; the Haynsworth nomination, 1969; Agnew and the media, 1969; and the President's decision to

resume the bombing of North Vietnam and to mine Haiphong harbor in May of 1972.

I: BUCKLEY FOR SENATOR, 1970

Five years after William F. Buckley Jr.'s race for mayor of New York, the dramatic personae were different, but the *Times*' editorial stance was strictly déjà vu—violently negative. How then did Senator-to-be James L. Buckley fare with the arbiters of the news?

From the start the *Times* editorially backed the incumbent liberal Republican, Charles E. Goodell, but the formal endorsement indicated that the *Times* thought so much of Democratic Representative Richard L. Ottinger that it wished it could somehow support him too. The best it could accord James Buckley was that "the Conservative candidate has many engaging qualities, but . . ."

As the campaign peaked, most of the pejorative editorial fire was concentrated on Vice President Agnew's alleged perfidy in reading Goodell out of the party, but there was plenty left for Buckley. On election eve came the final editorial bomb, "An Appeal to Fear": . . . for Mr. Buckley, until a week ago a temperate and engaging candidate, has at no time produced anything that could be described even charitably as a program.

Our conviction remains strong that New Yorkers recognize both the emptiness of the Buckley programs and the regressive nature of the policies he symbolizes.

But in news coverage, it was not Buckley who received short shrift; but Ottinger. This the quantitative scoreboard dramatically shows. For reasons which newsmen could not ignore, Buckley and Goodell simply generated bigger volumes of news: Goodell because he was the target of the Agnew "purge" and Buckley, at least in part, because he was its beneficiary. As an early October story head put it, "One of Goodell's Opponents Is Named Agnew"—and the involvement of both Washington and Albany in the Goodell-Buckley competition spawned much more copy than the Ottinger campaign did.

The newsmen—in contrast to the editorial writers—were positively cordial to Buckley. On October 1, the only campaign picture printed was a three-column one of Buckley on a walking tour, with a story politely reporting his "sharp but restrained attack on his Democratic opponent and gentle though qualified praise for his Republican opponent." Two days later, they found Buckley "at home amid cabdrivers," later stories were equally free of the dire negatives in the editorials: "Buckley Shopping for Votes on Long Island," "Buckley Stresses a U.S. Drug Role," "Buckley Focuses on Domestic Ills," "Rent Stamps for Poor Proposed by Buckley," "Long Island Gives Buckley Exuberant Greeting." When the Sierra Club and Friends of the Earth joined to accuse him of connection with an oil company said to be imperiling the Florida environment, no scare head captioned it; merely a one-line "shirt-tail" following another election story deep inside the paper, with no more than four hundred words on a subject that didn't surface again.

In stories covering a day's activities for all three, Buckley more than once got the most prominent mention.

There followed three more Buckley paragraphs, including the report of a "tumultuous ovation from more than three thousand supporters" at a rally, before any further mention of his two rivals.

An early October "Week in Review" roundup observed that "Mr. Buckley . . . has run a professional campaign that is winning him friends and voters all over the state." At mid-month, his campaign apparatus won a news accolade unequalled by either other camp: "Conservative Campaigners Demonstrate a Polished Expertise," ran a six-column streamer over a column-and-a-half story, with five photos of campaign manager F. Clifton White and his chief aides.

As election day neared, *Times* headlines helped notably to reflect and enhance the rising Conservative optimism: "Buckley Predicts a Triumph for Silent Majority," "Buckley Is Optimistic," "Buckley Supported by . . . Principals and Others in City Schools," "Buckley Buoyed by Westchester." And on the morning of election day, the *Times*' lead story declared that Buckley might win by a 300,000 to 400,000 vote margin over Ottinger, with Goodell a weak third.

Our comparative analysis ends there. Clearly, in the 1970 campaign, *Times*' news coverage did no visible disservice to the Conservative cause.

II. ABM AND THE SENATE, 1969

When it comes to appraising news treatment of issues rather than candidates, analysis becomes more complex. Fewer stories, as a rule, can be clearly put on one side or the other, and the nuances are sometimes difficult to pinpoint. But this was not the case when we analyzed coverage of the final fifteen days of the battle in the Senate over the Administration's plan for the Safeguard antiballistic missile system in mid-summer of 1969. The *Times*' editorial position was strongly in opposition. Such, in this case, was the thrust of the news too.

ABM AND THE SENATE, 1969

[July 24 to Aug. 6]

	Emphasis anti-ABM	Emphasis pro-ABM	Emphasis approximately even
Number of news stories	7	0	6
Approximate words	8,650	0	4,600
News stories—page 1	4	0	2
Approximate words	5,450	0	2,050
Pictures	4	0	2
Pictures on page 1	2	0	0

On July 24, page one headlined, impartially enough, "ABM Fight Taken to Senate Floor," but from then on through the crucial two weeks, the opposition dominated the news, despite the fact that the sides could hardly have been more evenly matched. On July 30 a three-column photo of Senator Jacob K. Javits and Representatives Ogden Reid and Jonathan Bingham, opponents all. Next day, a long story recounted the Foreign Relations Committee's sympathetic viewing of a "top-secret" General Electric film reportedly confirming the "ineffectiveness" of the proposed system.

On August 6, the opposition got bigger headlines than ever with "A Complete Ban on ABM Sought by Senator [Margaret Chase] Smith," with a four-column photo of three more senatorial ABM foes.

On that day came the Senate vote, duly reported next morning: "Nixon Missile Plan Wins in Senate by a 51 to 50 Vote," ending that phase of the battle. The news editors this time show themselves to be sharply one-sided, even making due allowance for the fact that the offensive in any situation generally makes more noise and generates more news than the defensive.

III: THE HAYNSWORTH CASE, 1969

Another case in which the opposition had a built-in newsmaking advantage was the Senate fight over the confirmation for the Supreme Court of Judge Clement F. Haynsworth. For this analysis, we covered the five weeks leading up to the final vote in November, as reasonably representative of the *Times*' coverage of the whole affair.

On October 19, the Sunday "Week in Review" summed up the case with relative evenhandedness:

"What was not anticipated was the steadily unfolding list of discoveries that Mr. Haynsworth, as a judge of the United States Court of Appeals, had heard and ruled on several cases in which he appeared to have a personal financial interest."

"Some of the charges hastily leveled . . . by headstrong Democrats turned out to be shoddy, unsubstantial or just plain wrong . . . but not all of them did."

Two days later, a page one story, followed inside by his news conference transcript ("Nixon Vows Help for Haynsworth till Senate Vote"), relayed the President's defense of his beleaguered appointee. But inside, under a six-column head came "The Case against Judge Haynsworth," maintaining that "almost all the senators with these objections are focusing their statements on the ethical matters, side-stepping the troublesome question of whether the Senate has a right to disapprove a presidential nominee just because it disagrees with his political philosophy."

On October 25 came a rare news break in Haynsworth's favor albeit back on page twenty, as he won an endorsement from sixteen past presidents of the American Bar Association, and was endorsed the second time by the ABA's Committee on the Federal Judiciary (but, the *Times* noted, this time not unanimously).

From then on, almost every Haynsworth headline signaled more ammunition for the opposition. November 1 brought a forecast of a losing battle, as page one displayed a *Times* poll of prospective Senate votes (only 34 for Haynsworth). The story of the debate, when it finally opened, was more in balance.

But for the most part, the negatives continued: "Idahoan [Senator Len B. Jordan] Opposes Haynsworth," "Two Senators Split on Haynsworth," "Harvard Law Professors Oppose Haynsworth in Poll," "Three More Senators Oppose Haynsworth."

So it went up to the day of the final losing decision. Seemingly, one side of the issue was deemed substantially more newsworthy. But allowance must be made for the fact that the opposition, in the nature of things, was creating a substantially larger number of news breaks.

IV: AGNEW AND THE NETWORKS, 1969

With the Haynsworth drama still on stage, November 1969 brought another and sterner test of journalistic balance: Vice President Agnew's indictment of the television networks and the storm that followed. As the Vice President well knew, he was invading sensitive territory: No one, not even a politician, is more thin-skinned in the face of criticism than a journalist. The *Times* editorial was quite predictable:

"In his far-reaching attack on the national television networks, Vice President Agnew has exacerbated the division among the people of this country over the Administration's Vietnam policies and at the same time has undermined the basic principle of freedom of speech on the airwaves. . . ."

But in the news columns, as the argument with the networks was joined, the picture was by no means as one-sided. The day after the Agnew text was printed, there was more *Times* news emphasis in its favor than against it. Elements of concurrence were reported from even Walter Cronkite "I have found myself in agreement with Vice President Agnew on some points. First is the tremendous power concentration in a few media hands in New York . . ." and Howard K. Smith ("I think Mr. Agnew had some good points, but I disagree with him about intent"). Cronkite and Smith, of course, both denied that the networks were irresponsible.

On the second day, the page one emphasis still inclined toward Agnew. Clark Mollenhoff affirmed that the Vice President had reflected the President's views, though both Herbert Klein and Ronald Ziegler said the speech itself was entirely Agnew's. That day's negatives were all in an inside-page story which itself carried many pros.

The following Sunday's "Week in Review" took the editorial-page line. But Jack Gould, the *Times*' eminent television critic, put the argument into calmer perspective by pointing out that, irrespective of the current brou-

haha, "rules for covering news" do "differ from radio and TV" and that because of their federally licensed status, broadcasters cannot enjoy the same degree of freedom guaranteed to the print media by the First Amendment. And columnist Reston helped to contribute a respite:

"... he ought to be included in the catalog of good news. He isn't going to intimidate the press; even Lyndon Johnson couldn't do that, and he was an expert. At least the Vice President says something and gives the commentators something to write about. Maybe the networks should relax and be grateful."

Next day's front page expanded the Agnew theme as it quoted Herbert Klein's call (on CBS' *Face the Nation*) to all media to re-examine both "format" and "approaches to the news."

THE HAYNSWORTH CASE, 1969

[Oct. 21 to Nov. 21]

	Emphasis pro-Haynsworth	Emphasis anti-Haynsworth	Emphasis neutral or mixed
Number of news stories	6	11	7
Approximate words	8,650	10,050	6,600
News stories—page 1	2	2	1
Approximate words	2,750	2,850	1,300
Pictures	2	4	0

The day after, Ziegler made page one with a disavowal that the Administration had any "desire to censor the news." So did FCC Commissioner Nicholas Johnson, who simultaneously castigated Agnew for having "frightened network executives and newsmen in ways that may cause serious harm to independent journalism" and praised him for bringing the tactics of TV news coverage to the public's attention.

The anti-Agnew viewpoint got another airing ("Editor Says Nixon Seeks To Muzzle News Media") in an outburst from the *Louisville Courier-Journal's* Norman Isaacs, President of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. But Isaacs also conceded a "germ of truth" in the charge that Washington and New York dominate the news and that there are "arrogant" publishers who "shrug away protests about errors and misstatements."

Herb Klein stayed in the news as the *Times* gave full treatment to his New York speech to the International Radio and Television Society, expressing hope that when "the passion" died down, the questions would be "looked at coolly."

Clearly, whatever the stated biases of the editorial page during the first wordy week of Agnew v. the Networks, they were by no means echoed in the emphasis of the *Times*' news columns. In fact, in purely quantitative terms they seem to have favored the Vice President's point of view by more than three to one.

V: THE MINING OF THE PORTS, 1972

There are few more striking opportunities to compare *Times* editorial opinion and *Times* news coverage than that provided by the President's decision on May 8 to mine the ports and bomb the railroads of North Vietnam.

The editorial page reached high frenzy, assailing "Mr. Nixon's Brinkmanship" as "rash and precipitate action" which "only the gravest threat to the security of the United States could justify," and calling on Congress for immediate counteraction to "save the President from himself and the nation from disaster." But on the Op Ed page, James Reston took the calmer view:

Maybe, at this solemn hour, it may be more useful to concentrate on his peace terms rather than on his war plans. He has been more specific this time than ever before.

President Nixon . . . tough as he sounded, gave Hanoi, Moscow and Peking a more realistic basis for compromise than ever before, and at least his new peace proposals

should be tested before his risky military maneuvers create a world crisis.

Except for the rarely used eight-column, three-line banner the first day and the gargantuan quantity of copy given the story, the *Times*' news editors faced the crisis with even more equanimity. At no time in the first week, even in the initial excitement, did they fall into the technical error of calling the action a blockade, except in quotation marks. The instant reflexes from the Democratic presidential hopefuls and other liberals were balanced with approval from such senators as Griffin, Goldwater, Buckley and even Democrat Gale McGee ("under the conditions there was no alternative").

The second day's main head struck an upbeat "Nixon Hopes His Vietnam Move Won't Prevent Trip to Moscow," captioning three stories: Kissinger's elaboration of the President's stand, the day's military action in North Vietnam, and the playback from the Hanoi delegation in Paris. The outcries from the Senate Democratic caucus were relayed at length, too—but back on page nineteen. The story reported "cries for the impeachment of the President" from New York Representatives Bella Abzug and William F. Ryan—but in the 25th paragraph of a 26-paragraph item. Farther back still was the roundup of European criticism, but tempered by the British Foreign Office statement that "countermeasures by the United States were, in the circumstances, inevitable."

In his "news analysis" of the day, Max Frankel even voiced guarded optimism:

"Mr. Nixon is switching attention from a war he was losing to a confrontation in which he feels himself more evenly matched. And, thus far at least, he hopes to manage that confrontation by indirect means, with a relatively low level of military risk, so as to gain time for diplomatic maneuver."

"While the United States implants its delayed-action mines in Haiphong harbor and while the Russians try to circumvent or even to disarm the mines, there will be ample time for Soviet-American consultation. . . ."

AGNEW AND THE NETWORKS, 1969

[Nov. 14 to 20]

	Emphasis pro- Agnew	Emphasis anti- Agnew	Emphasis approx- imately even
Number of news stories	10	5	8
Approximate words	15,150	4,450	10,450
News stories—page 1	5	1	0
Approximate words	7,300	900	0

But Frankel realistically warned—much as did *NATIONAL REVIEW* in its next issue (May 26)—that "neither the American carrot nor the Soviet stick seems likely to suffice to persuade Hanoi to entrust its fate to the major powers. Having felt betrayed by the Russians and Chinese, as well as Americans, after the 1954 partition of Vietnam, the survivors of that experience will not lightly agree to a new partition along altered lines."

Next day, Thursday, was the only day that week when the antiwar protests made page one. But with no sensationalism: a low-key story and picture tucked in the lower left corner. The main stories were on Secretary Laird's laconic elaboration ("We will take those actions that are necessary to stop the supplies . . ."), and on the Vietcong's rejection of the peace proposal. The news from all the protests combined occupied less than two columns, most of the space on inside pages.

On Friday, the main page one head flashed the ritual Soviet demand that the "blockade" (carefully in quotes) be lifted, along with Trade Minister Patolichev's display of bonhomie at the White House. Protests were spreading from coast to coast, and the *Times* published a layout of four pictures and two column-long stories. But all this again was downplayed—on page twenty-one.

The weekend found the big multi-column heads—and indeed the issue itself—gone from page one, except for a small story from Paris: "The Spurs Nixon Plan, But Would Resume Talks." The rest of the related front-page news was spot material on air raids northeast of Hanoi, on the evacuation of civilians from the capital, and on the continuing deadlock at Anloc Protest news worth printing boiled down to a single short item from Wisconsin: "Madison Mood: Calm and Fear Mixed."

By Tuesday, the issue had disappeared entirely from page one, and back inside the news of Secretary Rogers' counterattack on "Democrats who had criticized the mine-laying as an act of brinkmanship" got twice the space given an account of five antiwar demonstrations.

But on Thursday, the story was back on page one. "Communists Report Mines at Haiphong Swept, Ships Sailing," said the head. The byline was that of Anthony Lewis, doubler-in-brass as both columnist and London bureau chief, who had been filing from Hanoi since Monday. True—the story began: "The North Vietnamese say that . . ." and the dateline was Haiphong. But the second paragraph noted that "independent sources [never identified] give support to that claim." And the Pentagon's flat and unequivocal denial that anything of the kind had happened was confined to a bracketed third-paragraph insert and an inconspicuous short-tail at the end of Lewis' column-long dispatch.

The White House reaction was predictable. Kenneth Clawson, Deputy Director of Communications, as mentioned above, accused the *Times* of "being a conduit of enemy propaganda to the American people"—leading Management Editor Abe Rosenthal to retort that the Administration was "challenging the right of the American public to be informed about what the North Vietnamese are saying." Clawson's contention that the story should have been withheld for "a day or so" while "they did some more investigating on their own" obviously flew in the face of every news medium's compulsion to get hot news to the public as fast as possible. But the *Times*' position was questionable. The Pentagon's version might well have been given comparable prominence, for example, in a companion story adjacent to the Haiphong dispatch. Or two stories might have been combined under a head saying something like "Hanoi Says Mines Swept, Ships Sailing; Pentagon Denies It."

In this one case, to a degree at least, the *Times* had been a "conduit of enemy propaganda," but it is hardly credible that its lack of evenhandedness was deliberate. The likelihood is rather that it occurred under the exigencies of deadline pressure, and that the news desk was influenced by the prestigious Lewis byline coming from hitherto almost unreachable Hanoi. No confirmation of the Lewis story followed, nor did identification of his "independent sources." Clearly, Haiphong harbor had not been swept nor had ships been sailing, as a later page one story from Hanoi was to concede.

MINING OF THE PORTS, 1972

[May 9 to 22]

	Emphasis—			
	Pro-policy	Anti-policy in United States	Anti-policy abroad	Neutral or mixed
Number of news stories	34	32	30	23
Approximate words	40,600	23,500	24,550	22,450
News stories—page 1	11	4	9	9
Approximate words	13,800	2,950	9,150	9,500

With this one major exception, once again the news editors of the *Times* had performed with singular balance and almost to-

tal freedom from the towering bias registered by the editorial page in its jeremiad on "Mr. Nixon's Brinkmanship."

On the evidence of our five case histories, the *Times*' news performance in terms of balance between Right and Left may not be flawless, but it must be rated very high. Neither Abe Rosenthal nor any other responsible *Times* news executive would think of claiming infallibility. They clearly strive for fairness, and do not deny that they sometimes err.

In the case of Agnew and the networks, where every journalist's natural reflex tended toward strong anti-Agnew bias, the news coverage of the issue was as evenhanded as the Vice President himself could have asked.

In the ABM case the news did appear to be weighted in favor of the opposition, as it did to a slightly lesser degree in the reporting of the Haynsworth fight in the Senate. Much of the apparent weighting, however, should be attributed to the fact that attackers always can—and almost always do—generate more news than defenders, whatever the issue. Almost every switch of a senator away from Haynsworth produced another story, and there were many more of these than shifts to him.

In the Buckley campaign for the Senate, the Conservative side can hardly fault the *Times*' in the news, despite the editorial page's opposition.

Finally, in the most recent and perhaps most controversial story of the five, the decision on the mining of the ports, the *Times*' news administration was so evenhanded that it must have been deeply dismaying to the liberal opposition.

It is important indeed that conservatives recognize the true role of the *Times* in conveying their viewpoint with relative freedom from bias, not only to its two million-plus readers, but to the news media of the world. For the *Times* represents a standard of news coverage with which the press of the U.S. and the world constantly compares itself, and to which the electronic media also turn, admittedly or not, for much of their news content and many of their judgments on news emphasis. Editors from coast to coast check the *Times* front page every day as a reference-point. If not as a guide, for their own news judgments. The *New York Times Index* stands alone in the world's libraries as a guide to history itself. And rare is the member of Congress, the ambassador or the head of government anywhere who is not a *Times* reader.

That the *Times* discharges its stewardship with the degree of fairness which this study suggests is a challenge to all media that aspire to responsible journalism. Conservatives—and all other Americans—could be far more confident if other major media measured up to the same standard. Yet, to date, the news magazines are regrettably far short of it, and the networks, their legal obligations notwithstanding, do not even approach it. Were the news standard of the *Times* more broadly emulated, the nation would be far better informed and more honorably served.

JETS FOR RED CHINA—BUT NO ENGINES FOR FRANCE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the new alignment of world powers creates unusual results.

On one day 10 707 jet airliners are sold to Red China. On another day General Electric is denied an export license to

sell engines to France for a new B-1 bomber.

It appears that our decisionmakers are turning their backs on our oldtime European allies and, instead, are courting new Communist friends.

I include several newsclippings:

[From the Star and News, Sept. 18, 1972]

UNITED STATES SET TO BLOCK GE, FRENCH DEAL ON ENGINE FOR B-1

(By Carole Foryst)

General Electric Corp., which has been trying to put through a joint venture with the French for more than a year, is about to be told by the government there can be no deal.

GE will be given word any day its request to export to France the technology used in the engine for the B1 bomber has been denied by President Nixon after nearly four months of consideration by various levels and departments of government, reliable sources say.

The decision to deny the export license threatens to topple the deal between GE and France's government-owned aircraft engine manufacturer Societe Nationale d'Etude et de construction de Moteurs d'Aviation.

WIDE USE EXPECTED

The French were willing to put up about \$220 million and get another \$100 million or so from other European companies to develop a new aircraft engine of a type the aviation industry says will be the dominant engine for the next 15 years.

GE's end of the agreement was to supply some money and the compressor from the B1 engine—this country's highest piece of compression technology developed for the yet-to-be-built B1 bomber.

The decision to tell GE "no" was a long time in coming out of the White House. Normally, an export license request of this type is handled by the Office of Munitions Control in the State Department. In July 1971, the office turned GE down and GE began a campaign around various government departments to get the decision reversed on a higher level. With the exception of the Transportation Department, every department and agency involved came out against granting the export license.

ECONOMIC FACTOR

Among the reasons for this near unanimity, it was recognized that by giving France this technology we would be handing her possibly half a market estimated in the billions. Without it, at best, she would come into the market late. (Pratt & Whitney and Allison division of General Motors are proposing to develop such an engine for the Air Force.)

Furthermore, in a year when the United States continues to face serious trade problems, the prospect of exporting the engine for the upcoming air buses and short take-off and landing planes is a prime consideration. This is to say nothing of jobs and the precedent a green light would set for other high technology companies to export their knowhow for scarce research and development funds.

Finally, sophisticated defense technology would leave the country before it went on the B1 bomber for which it was developed for \$389 million.

While the departments were coming up with vetoes on economic and security grounds, President Georges Pompidou sent a letter to President Nixon suggesting the French had tentatively approved the project. He urged, in effect, "Let's get on with it."

Other French government officials in the United States offered trade-offs, cajoled U.S. officials with a "Let's cooperate and be friends" approach and finally threatened to leave GE in the lurch and join up with another company or consortium.

Evidently, to President Nixon, the eco-

nomie considerations far outweighed any political benefits.

OTHERS WOULD FOLLOW BOEING CHINA DEAL

(By Stephen M. Aug)

Months of patient effort and weeks of hard negotiating have won the Boeing Co. not only an unusual cash purchase for \$125 million worth of its planes, but a stretch-out of its 707 production, continued employment for hundreds of workers and more than a foot in the door to greater trade with the Peoples Republic of China.

The deal, completed Saturday, is the largest transaction to date since trade barriers have been eased between the United States and mainland China.

An examination of records at the Commerce Department, however, indicates that a number of other companies—some of them unidentified—are looking toward further deals with the Chinese.

Among them:

Pratt & Whitney Division of United Aircraft Corp. received last Thursday a Commerce Department license to export \$12,112,000 worth of aircraft engines and parts for installation on U.S. planes. These would be replacements for the engines to be placed on the 10 Boeing 707s the Chinese have ordered. A Pratt & Whitney spokesman said a company delegation leaves for China today to negotiate the deal.

An export license was issued Aug. 2 to an unidentified company to demonstrate and resell \$6,713 worth of outboard motors.

On July 25 the department issued a temporary license for a demonstration of \$6,000 worth of data processing equipment. This, however, is not to be sold, but is to be returned to the United States. The department did not identify who received the license.

The department's quarterly report for the three months ended June 30 says export licenses for sales of more than \$150 million were approved for the Peoples Republic of China. Commercial aircraft for civil airline operations accounted for all but a few thousand dollars.

Virtually all of this was accounted for by the Boeing license which was granted June 30. In mid-July, the government granted McDonnell-Douglas Corp. a \$21 million temporary license authorizing a demonstration flight of an airplane to China.

But Douglas officials never went to China, nor did their plane. They weren't invited, and business with the Chinese at this point is by invitation only.

LOCKHEED LESSON

Sometimes, of course, even invitations haven't resulted in sales, as Lockheed Aircraft Corp. learned.

A five-member team headed by Lockheed International vice president Robert I. Mitchell visited China from May 28 to June 14 in an effort to sell airplanes—the jumbo L1011 Tristar, L100 Hercules and the Jetstar, an executive jet plane. Although there has been a continuing exchange of correspondence since the visit, no sales have resulted.

Commerce Department records indicate a number of sales to the Chinese of photographic film—some direct, and some of it U.S. products re-shipped from Hong Kong.

The only significant export to China since the trade barriers began coming down last year—and prior to Boeing—was the sale of about \$6.6 million worth of communications satellite equipment by RCA Corp. The company's first sale was made in connection with President Nixon's February visit to China.

STEADY IMPORT FLOW

There continues, however, to be a steady flow of imports from China. During the first seven months of this year, \$16.8 million worth of Chinese goods have been imported.

George Driscoll of the China desk at the Commerce Department, said the first direct transactions between U.S. and Chinese firms after the RCA deal were made in connection

with the Chinese Export Commodities Fair at Kwangchow from April 15 to May 15. After \$6 million worth of business was transacted—although none of it was export business from American firms.

Among the importers is Seabrook Foods Inc. of Great Neck, N.Y. Murray P. Berger, president, was among those who attended the fair. His company has ordered about \$200,000 worth of frozen vegetables—including some 9-inch green beans—and frozen shrimp. Compared with the \$75 million in sales Seabrook Corp., Leviant International, Boeing, RCA, May Lee Import-Export Corp., Bloomingdale's Sobin Chemicals, Envirotech Corp., and Alexander's Department Store. Trade associations also appeared from Minneapolis, Chicago, San Francisco and Hawaii. The China Trade Association of Washington also was represented.

The Chinese, these businessmen must have found out, are tough negotiators. Boeing's chief negotiator on the 707 transaction, Byron H. Miller, international sales director, said his sales team had "a quite arduous time . . . it was by far the most rigorous negotiations I've ever been involved in."

"VERY ARDUOUS"

At a news conference yesterday, Miller said they were "very, very protracted and detailed negotiations." The result, he said, was a 125-page contract, and "we went through that thing 10 times . . . it was very arduous."

Although most sessions began at 9 a.m. and ended at 5 or 6 p.m. with a two or three-hour mid-day recess, loggerheads that developed resulted in no meetings at all for two or three days at a time.

Miller traced the progress of the deal starting perhaps two years ago when Boeing received several "always somewhat mysterious" inquiries about its aircraft. The source was eventually traced to mainland China, but several indirect attempts by Boeing to obtain authorization to send a delegation to China were unsuccessful.

SIGNING SEPTEMBER 9

Then, last March 7, the company applied directly to the China National Machinery Import & Export Corp., which negotiates such deals. A cable to Boeing three weeks later invited a delegation to the April-May trade fair. Negotiations began April 15 and trade documents were signed Sept. 9. Nine different Boeing officials took part at one time or another.

Miller said the Chinese want details of the contract kept confidential. But he said the deal is for cash—almost unheard of in airplane sales—with a 30 percent down payment and full payment in U.S. dollars through the Bank of China and an unidentified bank in an unidentified country when the planes are delivered.

The contract includes training for Chinese pilots on the ground and in simulators at Boeing headquarters in Seattle, plus flight training in China. The planes will have Pratt & Whitney engines, and these account for about 15 percent of the \$125 million price for the 10 aircraft.

The planes will be used on both domestic and international routes, Miller said, speculating that they would likely reach such Western nations as Japan, Canada and France.

INDIANA MARKS "CECIL M. HARDEN DAY"

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, by proclamation of Hon. Edgar Whitcomb, Governor of the State of Indiana, August 23, 1972,

was proclaimed "Cecil M. Harden Day" in honor and tribute to a beloved, respected, and honored public servant.

I know many Members in the House will remember her with affection and feel a deep sense of regret that she is no longer among us.

I knew Cecil Harden years before either of us came to the Congress. I have always valued her as a longtime friend, and have benefited greatly over the years from her wise advice and counsel.

It is with great pleasure I insert the Governor's proclamation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time:

STATE OF INDIANA—PROCLAMATION

To all to whom these presents may come, greeting:

Whereas, Mrs. Cecil Murray Harden is in fact one of the greatest Republican women that our country has witnessed; and

Whereas, through her tireless devotion and loyalty, Mrs. Harden has risen through the political ranks from precinct committee-woman to the distinct honor of being Indiana's national committeewoman; and

Whereas, Mrs. Harden seconded the nomination for President Richard M. Nixon when he ran successfully as Vice-President in 1952; and

Whereas, the description of dedication, integrity, sincerity and love vividly portray the fine character of Indiana's most famous national committeewoman:

Now, therefore, I, Edgar D. Whitcomb, Governor of the State of Indiana, do hereby proclaim August 23, 1972, as

CECIL M. HARDEN DAY

and urge fellow Hoosiers to join with me in paying a special tribute to a very special person who has served her country and the great State of Indiana with highest sense of duty.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Indiana, at the Capitol, in the city of Indianapolis, this 23rd day of August, 1972.

EDGAR D. WHITCOMB,
Governor of Indiana.

THE NATIONAL LAND POLICY,
PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT
ACT OF 1972

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about H.R. 7211 the National Land Policy, Planning and Management Act of 1972. If passed, this act could have devastating effects on attempts to achieve an ecologically sound environment. It is vital, therefore, to realize the full implications of H.R. 7211. Although the bill seems designed to preserve ecological balance, it has several serious defects. Well-known environmental groups such as the Sierra Club, National Audubon Society, Wilderness Society, and Friends of the Earth, have spoken against this bill because its faults far outweigh its redeeming qualities.

The Land Policy, Planning, and Management Act is a poor compromise between two badly needed proposals, a National Land Use Policy Act and a Natural Resources Land Management Act. Through combination and compromise,

the bill, as currently written, is unacceptable.

I commend the National Wildlife Federation's conservation report of June 30, 1972, to your attention:

CONSERVATION REPORT OF THE NATIONAL
WILDLIFE FEDERATION

Loss of Protection: H.R. 7211 is seriously deficient in that it leaves public lands unprotected from mining and logging. By repealing the authority to create national monuments contained in the Antiquities Act of 1906 and other withdrawal authority, executive agency heads could not preserve scenic, historic, and archaeological areas (Sec. 502(e)).

Mining: H.R. 7211 is seriously deficient in that it leaves the antiquated Mining Act of 1872 intact. In short, mining companies or individuals can locate mining claims and carry them to patent, getting title, while executive agencies could protect lands with high public values only by going to the Congress!

Interior Committee Veto of Classification: The bill provides that certain land classification involving more than 25,000 acres may be subject to "veto" by either the Senate or House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Thus, a Committee could defeat a proposal developed with full public participation and intergovernmental coordination.

Advisory Groups: Title III sets up a bewildering system of advisory boards and councils which will constitute special-interest pressure groups. Views of the public can be obtained better through public hearings!

Resource Giveaways: Sec. 401(a)(8) says that the U.S. shall receive fair market value for the use of public lands (including forests, parks and refuges as well as public domain) and their resources "except that monetary payment need not represent fair market value where Congress has identified public benefits . . . that offset the need to return fair market value" . . . This opens the door to widespread giveaways of grazing privileges, lumber, mineral resources, etc. Further, if a use is terminated or interrupted (Sec. 401(a)(9)), the user would be compensated, thereby expanding what now is a privilege into a vested right in public lands!

Land Disposals: Public lands (defined as almost all lands owned by the U.S. Government, including units of the National Park, National Forest, and National Wildlife Refuge Systems as well as Public Domain) could be disposed of if, as a result of land use planning procedures, it is determined that disposal "will achieve a greater benefit for the general public than the retention thereof" (Sec. 401(a)(1)). Lands not previously designated for a specific use and land classifications then would be reviewed for the type of use that would provide the maximum public benefit (Sec. 401(a)(2)). Thus, an agency head could designate lands for disposal under a land use plan if he determines it "is best suited for the use or the production of resources under non-Federal ownership" (Sec. 403(d)(1)(C)). This process could result in widespread disposals of lands, perhaps open parks to mining or other activities if an administrator decided the general public benefit would result. Local advisory councils could exert great pressures for land use plans which include disposal (Sec. 307(f))!

In short, passage of this bill could lead to disposal of valuable public domain; expose more public lands to mining, logging and grazing; stimulate giveaway of lumber, mineral, and other resources; and create many superfluous and costly committees. I urge you to defeat this legislation when it comes to a vote.

In addition to the National Land Policy, Planning and Management Act there

is other proposed legislation which pose serious threats to environmental preservation.

The National Forest Wild Areas Act of 1972 proposes to create a system whereby eastern areas of the United States could be preserved under the designation of "wild areas." Theoretically this sounds ideal. In actuality, the concept of "wild areas" would allow the U.S. Forest Service to skirt the Wilderness Act of 1964 as it applies to the "wilderness" classification east of the Rocky Mountains. The two designating systems, "wilderness" and "wild areas," would compete and be confused with one another. Inevitably, no lands in the East would ever be designated as "wilderness."

The Forest Service currently maintains that there are no areas in the eastern national forests that qualify as wilderness. In light of the fact that the eastern and southern regions of the Forest Service include 50 national forests covering an area of 22.9 million acres, it seems incredulous to me that no wilderness exists.

It seems particularly unlikely when one considers the fact that over one-third of the 193,000 acres in Shenandoah, a national park, have been proposed for wilderness under park wilderness classification. Yet supposedly the 1.7 million acres of George Washington and Jefferson National Forests, only a short distance away, have no areas which would qualify as wilderness. The Forest Service claims that no eastern area can qualify as wilderness and concomitantly it has never proposed any area to Congress for such consideration.

It is recognized that a tremendous need does exist for alternative land classification to create areas for research and recreation. Such areas certainly should be established in national forests. But with the Forest Service already unwilling to use the wilderness classification mechanism, available to it, now is not the time to discuss creation of an alternative categorization system. This alternative to wilderness proposal would certainly threaten the authority of the Wilderness Act of 1964, a major step in preserving our environment.

CINCINNATI ATHLETES' CONTRIBUTION
TO U.S. OLYMPICS SUCCESS

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, there were streaks of sunshine, gold, pride, and happiness coming out of the recently completed 20th Olympiad which was clouded by terrible tragedy, international politics, and suspicious judgments. I am extremely proud to report that five Cincinnati athletes participating in the Olympics contributed to the light instead of the gloom.

America won 33 gold medals in all. Certainly, no athlete did more for his country's prestige than Mark Spitz, the Californian who won seven. His performance alone shattered all records and was

a grand consolation for the sorry happenings in other sectors of the Munich arena.

Perhaps no future athlete will surpass Mark Spitz' marks but we in Cincinnati are no less proud of the Cincinnati athletes who participated and those who won two gold medals, more than 6 percent of America's total. Jenny Kemp of Regina High School and daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Clifford Kemp, was a member of the golden, 400-meter, free-style relay swim team and she has already returned to the training lanes to better her collection of medals in 1976 at Montreal.

Deena Deardurff is only 15 and has an equally good opportunity to return to the next Olympics. She is a student at Wyoming High School and the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Deardurff. She won a gold medal swimming the butterfly leg for the 400-meter medley relay team.

Roland Muhlen of Cheviot, Ohio, did himself and his countrymen proud by coming in sixth in the two-man canoe event. This contest is typically won by the European and Communist-bloc countries where contestants are trained and coached full time the year around. Cheviot friends and neighbors contributed money to a fund so Roland's wife, Kip, could accompany him.

Marine Sgt. Ray Russell is 32 and probably participated for the last time as a light heavyweight boxer in the Olympics but he was in contention down to the finals and was praised as a veteran athlete, setting a good example for youthful participants who can come back to compete another day. The sergeant's mother, Mrs. Beoda Savage, lives at Winton Terrace in Cincinnati.

Maureen Bechdolt of Loveland has become a reputable archer at 20 years of age and has remained in Europe to take part in the international field archery trials at Venice, Italy. She finished 28th in women's archery, and, with her husband Robert's encouragement, can be expected to return for another shot at Olympic targets.

In all, these fine Cincinnati area athletes gave a grand accounting of themselves. Greater Cincinnati, the State of Ohio, and America are proud of them for their accomplishments, poise, and behavior in an atmosphere of supreme tension.

MEDICAL UNIT IN LAKES AREA PROVIDES POST-AGNES AID

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the story still is being told of the devastation, the suffering, and the heroism associated with tropical storm Agnes last June.

History likely will record Agnes as our Nation's greatest catastrophe.

Fortunately, my own district escaped major damage and inconvenience. But our people, our technicians, our businesses, and our organizations mustered

manpower, supplies, and services for the widespread stricken area.

One example which I feel merits recognition is the work of the Lakes Area Regional Medical Program, Inc., headquartered in Buffalo, N.Y.

This organization has a telephone communications system extending throughout the western part of New York State and in two counties of Pennsylvania on which it conducts administrative business and provides education in health care. In particular, it provides professional assistance.

This communication network is a closed system, independent of the normal domestic telephone systems serving this large area.

LECTURE NETWORK UTILIZED

When the normal domestic service began deteriorating on Wednesday, June 21, as a result of the heavy rains and flooding that accompanied tropical storm Agnes, the Lakes Area Regional Medical Program Telephone Lecture Network was pressed into special service.

During the first 24 hours of the disaster, when all of the lines were out, the lecture network remained in service between hospitals in Wellsville, Hornell, Bath, and Corning, mainly through the persistent efforts of the Long Lines Division of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. with headquarters in Buffalo. Finally, even this service was interrupted to the Wellsville and Corning hospitals as the waters continued to rise.

Following the flooding in the Bath area, only three lines were available to serve the entire community. Use was restricted to emergency calls. This situation lasted until Thursday, June 29, when the Federal Telephone System (FTS) was restored to operation.

This communication limitation seriously hampered recovery operations at the Veterans' Administration hospital in Bath. Once again, the Lakes Area Regional Medical Program Telephone Lecture Network was pressed into service and was virtually the only line of communication to the outside world for the Bath VA Hospital.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL IS AIDED

Messages from the Bath VA Hospital were relayed over the network through the special conferencing arrangement at the Lakes Area Regional Medical Program headquarters for connection to other VA locations as far away as Washington, D.C.

The VA hospital in Canandaigua, N.Y., was assigned the task of handling certain administrative functions for the Bath hospital, and frequently was conferred on matters including damage reports, ordering of drugs and supplies, transfer of patients, notification of next of kin, and so forth.

The lecture network has proven it is a valuable tool in expanding medical service throughout western New York. Regular conferences are conducted and consultations are held on unusual medical problems. But the role of the network during the crisis resulting from Agnes was a new function.

Since communications have been restored to most of the area, the network

has resumed its normal operation. Recently it was utilized and is credited with having saved one life. The drug information service, provided through the network, obtained the rare and necessary medication for a moribund patient in this area.

EXAMPLE OF COOPERATION

Mr. Speaker, this is but one example of the cooperation which developed among peoples throughout a wide geographic area as a result of tropical storm Agnes.

It permits me an opportunity, at the same time, to cite and commend the continuing work of the lakes area regional medical program, a federally funded and community controlled activity which is providing urgently needed medical help and guidance.

The program has as its motto: Communications, cooperation, and scientific service. It would seem that all elements of this motto were integral in the program's role in the aftermath of the visit of Agnes.

Studies show that the Federal contribution to this program represents only 30 percent. The bulk of the contribution comes through the very essential time and effort provided at the local level.

CONCERN FOR BASIC HEALTH CARE

Coronary and respiratory care are two of the principal concerns. There is planning for basic health care throughout seven counties of western New York State and two adjacent counties in Pennsylvania.

The aim is to encourage better utilization of available physicians, nurses, and other medical personnel and to cooperate in locating and tending to patients in real need of assistance.

This summer, the organization obtained a mobile health-care unit which is specially designed to aid in educating volunteers in sparsely populated Allegheny County. This function ties in with better utilization of professionals by encouraging volunteers to learn health care basics. The unit is operated by Alfred University's School of Nursing in cooperation with the Allegheny County Public Health Nursing Service.

LEE HAMILTON'S WASHINGTON REPORT TO INDIANA'S NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include my recent Washington Report to Indiana's Ninth Congressional District concerning the issues facing America's public schools:

CONGRESSMAN LEE HAMILTON'S WASHINGTON REPORT

(EDITOR'S NOTE: This is the first of a series of Washington Reports of the issues facing our public schools)

One of the most difficult problems facing government of all levels—federal, state and

local—is to ensure equal access to education for all our children. Concern about equal educational opportunity has arisen for two principal reasons: (1) the existence of gross inequities in the system of funding public schools, and (2) the need to upgrade the quality of education, especially for the minority groups and the disadvantaged.

Public dissatisfaction is growing as education costs increase, as disparities grow in school funding methods and as courts are ordering mandatory changes in the funding system.

Inequities in School Funding. The costs of education vary greatly in different parts of the country and within individual states, because of cost-of-living differentials, the size and composition of the student body, transportation needs, and many other factors. While more money does not necessarily mean better education, the disparities in financial resources are so great there can be no doubt that students in poorer districts are at an educational disadvantage.

These disparities show up in a variety of statistical indicators: (1) the school district's financial ability (usually measured in terms of property valuation per pupil), (2) school revenue per pupil, and (3) school expenditures per pupil. In a single state, the range between the wealthiest and poorest school district is as high as 85-to-1 in financial ability, 3.9-to-1 in revenue per pupil, and 24-to-1 in expenditures per pupil. The ratios between the wealthiest and poorest districts in Indiana are 17-to-1 in financial ability, 3.8-to-1 in revenue per pupil, and 2.2-to-1 in expenditures per pupil.

The principal cause of these differences is our reliance on the local property tax as the major source of school revenue. In 1971-72, 52 percent of all school revenues across the country came from local sources, and 80 percent of all local school revenues came from the property tax.

Since property wealth bears no relationship to school population or educational need from school district to school district, there are great inequities in the amount of revenue that districts can raise, and in tax burdens in district residents. A \$20,000 home in a wealthy school district would not be taxed nearly so severely as the same home in a poor school district in order to support the school system in each area.

Increased Educational Costs. Total educational expenditures have grown faster than the gross national product (GNP) in recent years. The average annual rate of growth of school expenditures since 1962 has been 10.5 percent, while the average rise in the GNP has been 7.3 percent. Expenditures will continue to increase, mainly because of increased salaries, and despite an expected decline in enrollment after 1975. A Presidential study commission recently estimated the country's education costs at \$86 billion for 1980-81, nearly double the amount spent in 1970-71.

The influx of low-income residents in the inner city and the demand for quality education has brought higher educational costs and tax rates. As costs increase, taxpayers revolt. To add to the discontent, the property tax is regressive and falls heavily on the poor and elderly. The impact is felt particularly in the rural areas and in the inner cities, which have been caught between increasing educational costs and declining tax bases.

Court Decisions. A California Supreme Court ruling last August set the precedent for several state and district federal courts by ruling that school financing based on the wealth of individual school districts violates the individual citizen's right to equal protection of the laws under the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. While these cases have not gone beyond the federal level, the U.S. Supreme Court has agreed to review a Texas school financing case, and its decision could establish a rule affecting all states.

The courts, however, have not prescribed

remedies, or even invalidated any kind of tax, including the property tax. The courts have indicated that state legislatures should reform financial systems to insure that revenues are not a function of local wealth.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to be present when the House voted on several matters last week. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

"No" on rollcall No. 357, motion to recommit H.R. 15550, a bill to transfer waterfront property to the city of Alexandria.

"No" on rollcall No. 359, motion to recommit H.R. 16118, amending the Immigration and Naturalization Act.

"No" on rollcall No. 360, adoption of the rule waiving points of order on the conference report accompanying H.R. 15495, military procurement authorization bill.

"No" on rollcall No. 361, adoption of the conference report accompanying H.R. 15495, military procurement authorization bill.

"Yes" on rollcall No. 362, adoption of conference report accompanying H.R. 14896, child nutrition bill.

"No" on rollcall No. 363, adoption of a rule waiving points of order on H.R. 16593, Department of Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1973.

"Yes" on rollcall No. 365, adoption of an amendment to the defense appropriations bill restoring funds for the civilianization of KP.

"Yes" on rollcall No. 366, adoption of an amendment to the defense appropriations bill cutting off all funds for the war in Southeast Asia in 4 months, conditioned on release of POW's and accounting for MIA's.

"Yes" on rollcall No. 367, adoption of an amendment to the defense appropriations bill cutting overall appropriations by 5 percent.

In connection with the conference report on the military procurement authorization bill, I join with those of my colleagues who have denounced the cynical effort of promilitary forces to use the legitimate defense needs of the State of Israel as a hostage to coerce antiwar Congressmen into voting for the bloated Pentagon budget authorized by the bill. The bill which came out of conference was a distinct improvement over the bill I voted against on June 17 when H.R. 15495 was passed by the House. The conferees deleted funding for an anti-ballistic-missile site in the Washington area and eliminated a \$20 million authorization for the Air Force ABRES program for improved reentry vehicle. Furthermore, the conferees added a provision extending the President's authorization to give military assistance to Israel from September 30, 1972, to December 31, 1973. This provision does not belong in this

bill, and it would unquestionably be passed in separate legislation if Congress were to refuse to approve this oversized authorization bill.

My vote against this bill can in no way be considered a retreat from support from the legitimate defense needs of Israel. Rather, it is a protest against continued funding for the war in Southeast Asia and against military waste in programs funded by the bill such as the B-1 bomber, the Trident submarine, and the submarine-launched cruise missile system.

ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of September 18, 1972, carried three editorial articles that should be considered together. All three dealt, in different ways, with the ethics of the present administration.

The American people have been appraised of the facts about ITT, milk price supports, Watergate, and campaign fund disclosures. It is true that the waters are muddied by charges and countercharges, but a pattern has emerged nonetheless. The pattern is built around the fact that money means something to this administration. The people who govern the most powerful country in the world are impressed by the flash of a few dollar bills.

It is a tragic phenomenon, and one which is bound to have severe repercussions. After all, while ITT can pay out about \$200,000 to prevent the dissolution of its empire, there are more than 25 million Americans who cannot pay the rent and who are unable to feed their families.

That means that those 25 million American people do not have anything to offer the President in return for services and good government. In fact, there are very few Americans who can afford the big payoff.

That is what William Raspberry was saying in his column, "Nixon Ignores Blacks." Poverty does not impress Mr. Nixon; in fact, one is forced to concede that he does not seem to know it exists. Mr. Raspberry looks around and sees growing hopelessness among minority, poor, and disadvantaged Americans. Government for the rich—whose only ethic is the phony "work ethic," whose model citizen is Horatio Alger—cuts 99 percent of the American people out of the system. It is no wonder that Mr. Raspberry sees hope dimming. But President Nixon and his immoral and insensitive Cabinet are too isolated to notice—or to care.

That was the feeling I got when reading Garry Wills' excellent article, "Nixon Deserves Watergate Affair." He paints a convincing picture of a bunch of shady gangsters who never quite make it. As Wills sees it:

There is something cheap and mean in Mr. Nixon that attracts to him ideological hoodlums and sharpies. Even now that he is po-

diomed behind the presidential seal, he looks no more than a very competent chiseler, the kind who hangs out with not-so-competent sharpies and con men.

It is a convincing portrait of mediocrity in Government.

Columnist Nicholas von Hoffman went a step beyond Wills. He moves from talking about the immoral people with whom the administration has actually been linked, to envisioning a Cabinet made up not of gangsters who cannot hack it, but of ones who can. Like all good satire, von Hoffman's Poster has the ring of probability.

I bring these three articles to my colleagues' attention for a reason. The American people have seen scandal in Government since before Aaron Burr became involved in an illegal land deal in the western territories. We have always survived scandals in Government by ousting the offenders. But if the American people go to the polls in November and consciously opt for unethical Government—for 4 more years of Government for the rich—then I despair for our future. I really do.

The three articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 18, 1972]

NIXON IGNORES BLACKS

(By William Raspberry)

It is a happy time for black folk, the young man was explaining, and he had the logic to prove it.

"Nazism was the forerunner of Zionism," he said. "Without Hitler, the Jews would never have gotten themselves together into a cohesive unit. Well, in just that same way, Nixonism could be the forerunner of pan-Africanism."

"He isn't the ideal catalyst for the purpose, of course. We hoped for Wallace. We prayed for Agnew. The best we could do was Nixon."

It's an interesting notion. It may also be of some interest to note that the young man whose notion it is won't be around to deal with the Great Catalyst. He's living in East Africa, having given up on America.

But, brother, is he into revolution! He can keep you spellbound for hours with his biting irony, his hilarious impersonations and his supertight logic on just how the revolution will go down. You smile, nod your head and maybe even clap your hands after a particularly telling point. Boy, is that Nixon in for a surprise. If only he knew how he's bringing us together.

Then you go home and you realize that there's not going to be any revolution, if by that you mean the overthrow of the American government. There won't even be anything worthy of being called rebellion, a revolution that falls. What you'll get is some outraged, frustrated, dehumanized people lashing out and getting knocked off.

You'll understand what makes them do it, even though you'll know it won't do any good.

All the beautiful brother's beautiful logic on the revolution is just about as meaningful as the old exhortations to unleash Chiang Kai-shek.

A real Nazi-like move on the part of Richard Nixon could force black Americans to coalesce, although by then, as was the case in Nazi Europe, it would be too late to matter.

But Nixon won't move that way. He isn't about the business of eliminating black people. He's about the business of ignoring them, leaving them to their natural enemies.

No genocide, just the end of another hopeful era in the history of the American black. It happened in the post-Reconstruction days and in the period after both world wars. It seems to happen every time there's reason

to believe that things are getting permanently better.

In spite of the statistics that show black people to be better educated, better housed and better paid than ever before, I believe that it's happening again. And I believe that it's happening as a direct result of Richard Nixon's appeal to the baser instincts of people who see black progress as inimical to their own interests.

I don't pretend to foresee a quick return to the days of night riders and lynchings. Those days may be gone for good. But, then, lynching never did threaten the decimation of black folk; it merely symbolized the hopelessness and helplessness of their plight.

The hopeful periods—including the most recent one that reached its zenith on the Monument Grounds in August, 1963—were marked not so much by concrete attainment but by the feeling even among the jobless poor, that things were getting better and the government cared.

That feeling is growing dim, and another four years of Richard Nixon may eradicate it completely.

That's very hard to say without leaving the impression of pro-Democrat partisanship. But I honestly believe it's gone beyond considerations of party.

But I'm not waiting for revolution. For every black who is seriously talking revolution, there is another who is urging his people to vote Republican for the salvation of Sammy Davis Jr. and the two-party system.

And there is a third who may be more dangerous than either of the others. He's the one whose litany is: "Don't bother, man. It don't make no difference."

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 18, 1972]

NIXON DESERVES WATERGATE AFFAIR

(By Garry Wills)

Untangling the Watergate raid will require time and patience. Unless Larry O'Brien is being very tough on his evidence, he has taken some chancy steps to help out his own desperate candidate.

But let's say the misdoings go no higher than those caught in the raid itself, or some other adventures murkily motivated. Grant, that is, there will be no legal guilt provable in Mr. Nixon's immediate vicinity. Then, even granting all this, the Watergate will still be an appropriate symbol of this administration.

This is granting a lot. If the Nixon people were all clean, why did they resist an independent and bipartisan investigation? Justice Department spokesmen have claimed this is the most thorough probe since the Kennedy assassination. Well, that figures. But are they investigating only what they can find out, or also trying to decide what others might find out, given the chance? The Warren Commission was both extra-political (in part), and bipartisan. Not only its findings but its processes were opened to the public. The findings of this Justice Department, whatever they turn out to be, will be forever tainted.

That is the first reason why this administration so richly deserves the Watergate affair. It is an administration that came in on a special promise to shake up justice and get tough on the evaders of the law. It put this shaking up in the hands of men like Will Wilson and John Mitchell. It raised up a Kleindienst, the apologist for unconstitutional proceedings during May Day, and then rewarded Kleindienst's lawyer with the vacated post dishonored by J. Edgar Hoover.

In the name of law, this Justice Department twisted the grand jury process, grumbled that the courts kept calling their illegal wiretaps illegal, revived the spying sectors of the department, and humored the last cruel whims of the FBI's fading despot.

While themselves crying out about the right of privacy against investigators like Jack Anderson and Dan Ellsberg, the admin-

istration used bishops to help spy on priests and intimate nuns.

Why, then, should even free-lance adventures doubt that shabby tricks would be acceptable to our present rulers? Even if the authorities did not think up the tricks themselves, their whole style and record would encourage shady dealers to expect a welcome in any campaign run by John Mitchell.

Bobby Kennedy at least had the grace to entertain misgivings about the department's bugging and wiretapping. Who can picture John Mitchell as anything but gleeful over it? Imagine the difficulty you would have trying to introduce Mr. Mitchell into the presence of anything so unaccustomed as a Misgiving. If Agnew, serene amid imagined persecutions, ever had a Misgiving, it would cripple him the rest of his smug life.

There is something cheap and mean in Mr. Nixon that attracts to him ideological hoodlums and sharpies. Even now that he is podiomed behind the presidential seal, he looks no more than a very competent chisler, the kind who hangs out with not-so-competent sharpies and con men. Behind that podium, down in the shadows, swarm the Will Wilsons, the Murray Chotiners, the Charles Colsons. And now, perhaps, the Maurice Stanses.

It is all too apt, not only the bugging, but also the bungling. Trying to do it on the cheap. Slick operators in frayed cuffs and collars who will "Tell ya what I'm goin' ta do." It is like an old 40s movie of the bookish slum kid who wanted to have a big white-walled DeSoto and wide-shouldered new suit like the neighborhood "operators," and then in later years couldn't keep these questionable characters from popping up to embarrass him.

Too apt, that those who could not make their wild charges of guilt stick to others, cannot establish their own innocence in this case, even if they are, indeed, innocent. Mr. Nixon and the Watergate Gang, whatever their other connection, will always be linked by this fact, that they serve each other.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 18, 1972]

FIRST ALL-OUT FELONY CABINET

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

They write about McGovern's staff problems, but what about Nixon's. It's true the McGovern people spend an undignified amount of time elbowing each other over who's going to get what job if their boy makes it, but they don't have anybody in their entourage who can begin to compare with Steve King.

Mr. King is Mr. Nixon's campaign security director, the very same thuggish fellow who, Martha Mitchell says, ripped the phone off the wall while she was talking to Helen Thomas of the UPI, threw her down, kicked her and, the next day, held her down while a doctor injected a sedative.

Nice guy to have on your staff, that Mr. King. He fits in well at the White House where Charles Colson, special counsel to the President, sends out memos to his staff saying that to get Nixon re-elected, "I'd walk over my grandmother if necessary." When you see what happened to Martha, you know that's no figure of speech, and they wonder why so many old ladies swear to God they're Republicans.

You don't have to be a plug-ugly to gain entree to the White House. A bribery conviction will do just as well. That's all William L. Taub, Jimmy Hoffa's representative had going for him to get an appointment to see Dr. Kissinger. It was Mr. Taub, who has frequently been accused, although never convicted, of trying to sell things that didn't belong to him, who arranged for all the high clearances necessary for Mr. Hoffa's mission to Hanoi where he was to do a diplomatic loaves and fishes act and free our POWs.

We shouldn't be too hard on Mr. Nixon about this. He did promise us that he would

leave no stone unturned in his efforts to seek the release of our airmen. So he turned over one stone and there was Jimmy Hoffa wiggling and white from five years of jail for jury-tampering and mail fraud. Once in the sunlight, sending over one of our better known felons as an unofficial ambassador plenipotentiary didn't look so good. Whereupon Kissinger, Kleindienst and Rogers all expressed horror and said they had nothing to do with it. Well somebody at a high level had something to do with this most unusual of diplomatic initiatives, otherwise how did Mr. Hoffa get all those signed and sealed documents permitting him to go? And they talk about lies in the McGovern campaign.

The Hoffa episode could represent a change in Nixon's law and order policies, a switch from punishment to rehabilitation. Give an ex-con a break, make him an ambassador.

There does seem to be grounds for believing the White House has developed a new sensitivity toward the lawbreaker's feelings. It may be that the staff has been reading an interview given out by one Bernard L. Barker, the ex-CIA agent, who apparently was on Nixon's campaign payroll the night he was so unlucky to be arrested in the offices of the Democratic National Committee. Mr. Barker, in a glorious melange of old-fashioned Republicanism and new-fashion felony is quoted as saying: "I was caught in the National Democratic Headquarters at 2:30 in the morning, I can't deny that . . . nobody owes nobody nothing . . . you go out and work for it . . . I never looked at myself as a burglar . . . it is very repulsive to me when I read (about myself) as the 'alleged burglar' this gripes me. I think more as a cop and not as a burglar."

A Nixon administration cop, perhaps, but that should give all kinds of interesting people renewed hope. Take Meyer Lansky, the figure with the worldwide gangster reputation, who the United States has been trying to extradite from Israel where he has been nesting. We thought the Justice Department wanted him back to go before a grand jury, but the truth may be they want him to come home so they can make him Secretary of the Treasury. He's supposed to know a great deal more about finance than John Connally.

And speaking of Connally, since he's at work bringing his old Democratic gang over to Nixon, maybe he'll bring over all the old gang, including Bobby Baker. Baker's a clever boy for numbers and he could help the slightly pathetic Maurice Stans, Nixon's campaign finance chairman. Stans keeps losing sight of large blocks of campaign money and being at a loss when it's rediscovered in the bank accounts of some of our better known second-story men. Bobby always knew where the money was.

Bobby may find his role as a Nixon campaign staffer a little unsettling at first. Under the Democrats he operated in the deepest and darkest background so he may discover the open, brassiness of the Nixon campaign a bit of a change, but the high noon, broad daylight policy, while perhaps a trifle arrogant, does have the virtue of candor if not honesty.

It's anybody's guess as to who else may find a place in either the campaign or the Cabinet. Earl Butz, the Secretary of Agriculture, who screams libel like a Pavlovian dog when asked why his former subordinates are cleaning up on the Russian grain deal, could make use of the services of Billy Sol Estes. Billy Sol could teach Earl how to do it and be smooth. Melvin Laird could be replaced by Charlie Manson. There's a boy who knows how to wind down a war for you. And to complete the first all-out felony cabinet, James Earl Ray should be put in somewhere to deal with anybody caught paying quotas.

But the Nixon campaign staff needs help now. They're having the deuce of a time getting all that money across the Mexican border quietly. For that they don't need help

from Chuck Colson's grandmother—if she's still alive. What they need are experienced dope smugglers. Put them on the payroll and call it penal reform. If they get caught and there's a big public outcry, why just say it was unauthorized and keep on truckin' down to election day.

PART III—CONGRESSIONAL ACTION FUND DEFENSE REPORT

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced an analysis by the congressional action fund of three major defense budget proposals. Table 2, which appeared on page E7887 of the September 13 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, indicated that Senator McGovern would terminate the Poseidon submarine and Minuteman II procurement programs and would slow development of the Trident submarine. In the first two cases, it should be made clear that weapons and submarines already in production would be completed and put into service. In the last instance, Senator McGovern would investigate alternatives to the controversial Trident design while slowing its development.

I am introducing into the RECORD today an additional section which examines the problem of excessive military spending:

DEFENSE SPENDING FACT SHEET

THE GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE

1. More than half the world's military budget is expended by the United States. Estimates by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute for 1969 showed that of the \$159.3 billion spent for military purposes by the world's industrialized countries, the U.S. spent \$79.3 billion, the Soviet Union \$39.9 billion and Communist China (very approximately) \$7 billion.

2. The American-Russian arms race continued apace over the past year as the U.S. increased its number of nuclear warheads by 24% and Russia by 25%. Today America has an arsenal of 5,700 one-megaton warheads compared with Russia's 2,500 warheads. (Source: Official estimates by the Secretary of Defense.)

3. In 1968, Secretary of Defense McNamara estimated that a force of from 200 to 400 one-megaton nuclear warheads would be "an adequate nuclear deterrent for the United States." Such a nuclear force would be capable of destroying from 52 to 74 million Soviet people (21% to 30% of the population) and from 72% to 76% of Soviet industrial capacity. The U.S. can today destroy the Soviet Union at least fourteen times over.

DEFENSE BUDGET OVERVIEW

1. The U.S. has spent over \$1 trillion—one thousand billion dollars—on the military since World War II. Over the past ten years, America has spent \$662 billion on defense. During the same period total income taxes collected by the federal government was \$662 billion.

2. The fiscal year 1973 defense budget represents 42% of the total federal budget. If the cost of past wars is added in (6% of the federal budget which goes to veterans' benefits and 12% devoted to interest on the national debt, most of which is war-incurred), military-related expenditures add up to 60% of the total federal budget. (Source: Office of Management and Budget official figures as re-

calculated by the Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service).

3. In other words, the federal government in this fiscal year will spend \$1,301 on military affairs for every man, woman, and child in the U.S. The federal government will, by contrast, spend \$130 per capita for education, and nonpower programs, \$65 per capita for community development and housing, and \$22 per capita for natural resources and environmental programs.

4. In the past two years, non-Vietnam obligations have risen from \$63.3 billion (in fiscal year 1971) to an estimated \$80 billion in the current budget. That is an increase of 25% or about \$17 billion over two years. This increase averages out to \$90 per capita; that is, the rise in the defense budget will cost every man, woman and child in the U.S. \$90 this year.

FAT IN THE MILITARY

1. The United States requires 18,000 men to field 324 tanks while Russia utilizes only 9,000 men to field 300 tanks. The U.S. Air Force maintains 132 men per aircraft while the Israeli Air Force, with similar equipment and a fine combat record, has only 23. (The New York Times Magazine, July 30, 1972.)

2. Comparing today's military establishment with the one maintained by the U.S. at the end of World War II (June 30, 1945) we find that it now takes 36% more high ranking officers (190 generals and admirals of three, four, and five star rank) to command almost 80% fewer men—some 2.7 million in mid-1971. (Selected Manpower Statistics, Department of Defense.)

3. Between mid-1968 and mid-1971 the nation's total military manpower declined 23% while the number of three, four, and five star officers increased by 7%. (Idem.)

4. According to Congressman Otis G. Pike (D-N.Y.), chairman of the special subcommittee on manpower utilization, the top-heavy arrangement of manpower is costing the U.S. \$2.7 billion per year. In other words, if we took today's military personnel and spread them according to the grade structure which existed in 1946, it would cost the government \$2.7 billion less per year, using today's pay scales.

5. Twenty-five years ago (mid-1946), the Army had seven recruits for every Sergeant E-5. Today the Army has eight recruits for every ten Sergeant E-5's. In other words, it takes five Sergeants to command four buck privates in today's Army.

6. In the Navy the ratio between E-5 petty officers and E-1 seamen recruits has changed from 1 to 1 in 1946 to 8 to 1 today. In the Marine Corps, the ratio between E-5 Sergeants and E-1 privates has changed from 1 to 8 in 1946 to 1 to 1 today.

7. During the year ending June 30, 1972, the Army employed nine men in uniform to sustain every combat soldier. Eight years ago the ratio was eight to one. This additional one support troop per combat troop costs the Army \$1 billion per year.

8. The Army currently spends \$240,000 for every combat soldier it maintains and about \$1.8 million per active Army division. Compared with 1964, this represents an increase of 125% over eight years in the cost per combat troop and an increase of 140% per division (now somewhat larger).

COST OVERRUNS

1. In 1971, the General Accounting Office reported that 61 major weapons systems then under development experienced, on average, an increase of 26% or \$24 billion in their expected total cost. In 1972 the comparable figure for 77 major weapons systems then under development was 19% or \$21 billion.

2. According to Senator William Proxmire, cost overruns on 45 selected major weapons systems increased by \$1.3 billion between June 30, 1971 and March 31, 1972. Today those systems are costing the government \$36.5 billion over the original planning estimates.

3. The following chart was inserted in the *Congressional Record* August 3, 1972, by Senator Proxmire. It appears in full on page 26674. Figures are in millions of dollars.

	Number of systems	Planning estimate	Current estimate
Army.....	8	\$10,892.7	\$16,067.3
Navy.....	20	29,731.3	42,195.0
Air Force.....	10	33,273.6	47,179.4
Total.....	38	73,897.6	105,441.7

Army (8):			
Cheyenne ¹	125.9	331.2	
Safeguard ²	4,185.0	7,975.0	
Dragon.....	382.2	485.1	
Sam-D ³	4,916.8	5,240.5	
Lance.....	586.7	774.2	
Tow.....	410.4	651.9	
M-60A2.....	162.1	403.5	
Tachire.....	123.6	205.9	
Total.....	10,892.7	16,067.3	

Navy (20):			
SSN-688.....	1,658.0	7,075.1	
DLGN-38 ⁴	769.2	820.4	
S-3A.....	1,763.8	3,151.8	
F-14.....	6,166.0	5,271.6	
EA-6B.....	689.7	1,219.2	
P-3C.....	1,294.2	2,289.5	
A-7E.....	1,465.6	2,150.4	
Vast 247.....	241.1	443.6	
Phoenix.....	370.8	1,251.4	
Condor.....	356.3	380.5	
Poseidon ⁵	4,568.7	4,751.0	
Sparrow F ⁶	1,215.8	331.6	
Sparrow F ⁷	151.5	1,226.3	
Mark 48 ⁸	720.5	1,933.0	
LHA.....	1,380.3	970.0	
CVAN-68/69.....	946.5	1,316.2	
DE-1052.....	1,285.1	1,430.6	
SSN-637 ⁹	2,515.8	2,944.0	
DD-963.....	1,784.4	2,754.5	
Aegis.....	388.0	484.3	
Total.....	29,731.3	42,195.0	

	Number of systems	Planning estimate	Current estimate
Air Force (10):			
B-1.....		\$8,954.5	\$11,112.6
F-15.....		6,039.1	7,810.7
C-5A.....		3,423.0	4,526.4
F-111.....		4,686.6	6,994.6
AWACS.....		1,379.1	1,348.7
Maverick.....		2,656.7	2,661.3
SRAM.....		257.9	385.3
Minuteman II.....		167.1	1,331.9
Minuteman III.....		3,014.1	4,906.4
Total.....	33,273.6	47,179.4	

¹ The Cheyenne costs represent research and development costs only. These estimates do not include termination costs related to the canceled production contract.

² For the programs where the SAR's have shown only a development or a planning estimate, we have made both estimates the same to prevent distortion between the totals of these columns.

³ The development estimate of \$4,031,000,000 formerly reported, dated March 1967, was changed to \$5,240,500,000 in March 1972 to reflect the entry into engineering development.

⁴ Although no development estimate was shown on the June 30, 1971, SAR, our last report included the same cost for the planning and development estimates in order to prevent distortion between the totals of these 2 estimates. With the award of the production contract, the Navy established a development estimate in the Dec. 31, 1971, SAR and is reflected in this schedule.

⁵ Cost estimates for the Air Force portion of this program were deleted from the SAR in December 1971.

⁶ Cost estimates include Air Force estimates for its portion of the Sparrow F program.

⁷ The development estimate was revised based on the award of the production contract in July 1971.

4. According to Forbes Mann, President of LTV Aerospace Corporation, "Every time a new A-7 attack aircraft flies over the fence at the end of LTV's facility in Grand Prairie, Texas, 23% of its cost is in the paper that goes along with it." Based on current cost figures, this means that the Department of Defense has spent \$750 million on paper work alone for the A-7 attack aircraft. That is

more than the federal government spent to assist state and local governments in fighting crime over the past three years.

THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

1. Recent studies of military bases and similar activities show that for every 100 civilians employed on a military base, there are about 258 persons outside the base dependent on those jobs. There are some 3 million persons employed in this capacity; thus, almost 7.75 million people depend on these civilian workers.

2. The armed forces itself employs 2.7 million persons in uniform and 1.2 million civilians. Estimates of defense-related employment in the private sector run around 7 or 8 million. Defense related employment can be found in every state in the U.S. in 5,200 communities where the plants of 22,000 major contractors and 100,000 subcontractors are located.

3. Between 1971 and 1968, when the defense cut-backs began, some 380,000 workers lost their jobs in the aerospace industry alone. 60,000 of these workers were engineers with advanced degrees.

4. A survey conducted in 1970 by the Senate subcommittee on executive reorganization concluded that "private industry is not interested in initiating any major attempts at meeting critical public needs (i.e. converting from defense activities to housing, pollution, mass transit, and other domestic needs)." The survey respondents—executives from 69 industrial firms, five mayors, and two union leaders—"all indicated an unwillingness to initiate such actions without a firm commitment from the Government that their efforts will quickly reap the financial rewards to which they are accustomed."

DEFENSE SPENDING AND NATIONAL PRIORITIES

1. The following list of alternative defense and non-defense expenditures was prepared by Citizens' Organization for a SANE World:

Defense item	Cost	Nondefense item	Defense item	Cost	Nondefense item
Nuclear aircraft carrier with support equipment.	\$2,980,000,000	Construction of District of Columbia Metro System.	B-1 bomber fleet (construction).....	\$11,400,000,000	Cost of bringing the 25,500,000 people in United States out of poverty.
1 Huey helicopter—type used in Vietnam.	\$1,000,000,000	66 2-bedroom houses (low cost).	C-5A program (including cost overruns).	\$4,000,000,000 to \$5,000,000,000.	Cost of eliminating hunger in the United States.
Cost overruns for 45 selected weapons systems (see above).	\$36,500,000,000	Estimated cost of water pollution abatement, 1970-75.	5 Air Force F-15's.....	\$42,000,000	Gary, Ind., school budget for 1971-72.
1 destroyer.....	\$90,000,000	5 high schools of type found in Midwest.	105 helicopters: the number destroyed in 1971 Laos campaign.	\$52,500,000	Health facilities for treatment of 700,000 patients per year.
1 main battle tank.....	\$600,000	Full-time therapy for 171 drug addicts for a year in New York City.			

2. Between 1946 and 1967 the United States spent over \$1.58 trillion on federal programs. Of this amount, over \$904 billion or 57.3% of the total, has gone for military power. By contrast, less than \$96 billion, or 6.08%, was spent on social functions including education, health, labor and welfare programs, housing and community development.

CONSERVATIONIST'S NEW ASSIGNMENT

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, since March 1969, Mr. Charles G. Carothers III, one of my constituents from Duxbury, Mass., nationally recognized in the field of waterfowl conservation, has been serving the environmental field in the Department of the Interior. Now he is leaving Federal service for a new challenge in

the nongovernmental area of conservation of natural resources. He is joining the promotional and publishing division of Ducks Unlimited, Inc. DU is the nonprofit, nonpolitical membership corporation organized to perpetuate wild waterfowl in North America.

Under two Secretaries of the Interior in President Nixon's administration, Mr. Carothers has been Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks. Before he was persuaded to join the Interior Department, he had been a business executive and active in my State as an officer of Massachusetts Conservation, Inc., and its predecessor organization since 1953, a former director of the Massachusetts Wildlife Federation, Inc., and for years as a member or officer of DU.

Private citizens willing to contribute their special expertise and do a tour of duty in public agencies make a badly needed contribution to Government. But of course the nongovernmental environ-

mental organizations are indispensable in the unending campaign to preserve our precious natural resources. Good campaigners are needed inside and outside of Government and Mr. Carothers' efforts will continue to benefit the public at large.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 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 gen-

ocide on over 1,757 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

CONGRESS FIDDLES WHILE PUBLIC BURNS

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, 1971, I introduced the Nonsmokers Relief Act (H.R. 4776), a bill aimed at protecting the rights of millions of nonsmoking Americans by providing separate seating for smokers and nonsmokers aboard planes, trains, and buses.

The response was overwhelming. Mail from throughout the Nation, and even abroad, flooded into my office in support of this legislation. Health groups and passenger associations were enthusiastic, and since then many of the Nation's major air carriers voluntarily adopted the provisions of the Nonsmokers Relief Act on their own.

Just about everyone has responded, it seems, except the Congress. Despite the overwhelming evidence of support and need for this bill, the Congress has failed to act. Since the Nonsmokers Relief Act was introduced nearly 19 months ago, the Congress has done nothing: The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, to which it was assigned, has not even begun to consider it, and no hearings are planned at this time.

While the Congress does nothing, millions of nonsmoking travelers must continue to undergo the distress of being forced to inhale the noxious fumes from cigars, pipes, and cigarettes smoked by others.

Nonsmokers now outnumber those who do, yet this majority is being forced to accept discomfort and risk to health when traveling in interstate commerce. The U.S. Surgeon General has reported that the health of a nonsmoker could be adversely affected if he is forced to inhale tobacco fumes, particularly in a confined area. H.R. 4776 would protect the rights and health of the nonsmoker—without placing any burden on those who chose to smoke.

The Nonsmokers Relief Act would not infringe on the rights of the smoker; it would, however, serve to protect the rights of the nonsmoker.

Last year, after my bill was introduced, California adopted a law requiring land and air passenger carriers with trips originating in the State to set aside space for nonsmoking passengers. Amtrak, the national rail passenger network, has instituted smoking and nonsmoking sections as a courtesy to its passengers.

The Interstate Commerce Commission last November ruled that "secondhand smoke is an extreme irritant to humans within its range" and ordered separate seating on buses in interstate commerce. The ruling, however, has been held up in the courts.

While the airlines who have chosen to provide seating sections for nonsmokers

are to be commended, there are still many passenger carriers who are not doing so.

A hopeful sign that this may change comes with a story in the Washington Post today that the Civil Aeronautics Board is considering a requirement that all airlines separate smokers from other passengers. This proposal deserves the unqualified support of the Members of Congress. The article follows:

CAB WOULD SEPARATE SMOKERS ON AIRLINERS
(By Vern Haugland)

The Civil Aeronautics Board yesterday proposed requiring all the airlines to segregate smokers from other passengers.

The CAB said that this could be done by designating a smoking area in the rear of each compartment of an airliner and prohibiting smoking in other areas.

The board noted that most of the trunk airlines already segregate smokers. In general, however, the supplemental airlines and the local-service lines do not, the board said.

The board said it would accept comment on the proposed rule until Nov. 3, before making a final rule.

In December, 1969, consumer advocate Ralph Nader asked the Federal Aviation Administration to ban smoking on planes as a fire hazard. Another petition asked the FAA to require segregation of smokers to protect the health of other passengers.

In March, 1970, the FAA ruled that smoking did not represent a flight safety hazard. The FAA referred the health issues to a joint study with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to measure tobacco smoke contaminants in transport aircraft.

The CAB said the completed joint study shows, in general, that the low levels of contaminants in a passenger plane do not represent a health hazard to nonsmokers. But, the study found that more than 60 per cent of the nonsmokers were bothered by tobacco smoke.

The CAB said an outright ban on smoking on commercial flights would be a drastic remedy and inconvenience travelers who wish to smoke.

TAX-FREE FOREIGN AID TO
NORTH VIETNAM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, while our international grain dealers and administration sell the historic foreign-aid deals to Russia and Red China, India announces she is ready to ship to North Vietnam seeds from the so-called "miracle rice" which was developed and research-financed by American tax-free foundations.

It pays to be anti-American?

I include a related news clipping:

[From the Evening Star, July 21, 1972]

HANOI TO GET RICE SEEDS FROM INDIA

NEW DELHI.—India is ready to ship to North Vietnam high-yield rice seeds—so-called "miracle rice"—developed from seedlings and research financed by American philanthropic foundations.

A spokesman for the Foreign Trade Ministry said yesterday the project, which would include Indian scientists to advise the North Vietnamese, had gone no further than ob-

taining necessary clearances from the Foreign Ministry.

"Even if we wanted to send the seeds now, how are we to send them?" the spokesman asked, saying the shipment would be kept out by American mines in North Vietnamese harbors.

No decision has been made as to the amount of seeds to be supplied, he said.

A Foreign Ministry official said a request for the rice came to New Delhi through the Indian diplomatic mission in Hanoi. It was followed by a note from Hanoi's mission in New Delhi.

"We have responded," he said.

If the shipment is made, the varieties supplied will have been developed in India by government scientists.

FREE THE FORT WORTH FIVE

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, as I noted in a lengthy statement a few days ago—and it appears at page 30554 of the September 13 RECORD—the Fort Worth Five are a group of Irish-surnamed American citizens who have been dragged 1,400 miles from their homes and families to the hostile and unfamiliar atmosphere of Fort Worth, Tex., to face a grand jury investigation. Despite the fact that they are accused of no crime, and have only tried to find out their rights and assert those rights, they have been held in prison, without bail, for several months.

The eighth amendment to the Constitution provides that—

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Under this amendment, which constitutes an integral part of our great Bill of Rights, even an individual accused of the most heinous crime is entitled to be admitted to a reasonable bail.

After a long and difficult court battle—not for their ultimate vindication, but merely for the right to remain free men while their rights in this matter are determined by the courts—Justice William O. Douglas ordered last weekend that the five be admitted to bail. When the case was remanded to the district court for the actual setting of the bail amount, the district judge ordered bail of \$100,000 for each of the men.

It is most revealing to note that in these days of law and order, a Federal judge has seen fit to flout the law, as duly determined by his judicial superior, by setting a bail which is so steep that it is in effect no bail at all. Supposedly, we have a coequal and independent judiciary, but the district judge who acted in this case seems to be more of an appendage of the Justice Department than an independent giver of the law.

The Fort Worth Five must be set free on a reasonable amount of bail or on their own recognizance until the complex and novel legal issues in their case are finally decided by the courts. They are family men with strong ties to their

local communities, and not one shred of evidence has been produced to indicate that any of them is likely to fail to appear in court when required. In addition, legislation such as my bill H.R. 16056, providing for change of venue in grand jury proceedings where the interests of justice so require, should be enacted as soon as possible.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, consumer protection and consumer product safety are certainly not recent concerns of this membership. During the past years the principle of protecting the consumer from advertising deception and harmful products has been a major legislative interest of this body.

We have made inroads in the area of consumerism including "truth in lending" and "truth in advertising" laws. However, the battle is certainly not yet won. Too many people are still falling victim to hazardous products. The people of this country are not kept fully informed on new products and their effectiveness, as well as their drawbacks.

There exist hundreds of consumer-interest organizations across the country which have worked to educate the consumer. These groups attempt to stimulate intelligent selection of products, and an awareness of what legal channels are available to them in bringing action against violators of consumer laws. These consumer-interest groups are doing a commendable job; however, they are widely dispersed over the country, and this tends to limit their general effectiveness.

H.R. 15003, the Consumer Product Safety Act, if approved and enacted, will finally make available to the people of this Nation a consolidated organization—an independent regulatory commission—to protect consumers "against unreasonable product hazards." This regulatory commission will have the authority to set safety standards and even remove dangerous products from the market. As a result, the products would not be available to the unsuspecting customer, and thus, possibly avoiding the threat of personal injury.

Most importantly, we would be able to protect the thousands of consumers from minor and serious injury, and even death, that too often occurs from use of a faulty and hazardous product.

Too many people have needlessly suffered injury.

We have witnessed the need for such controls and for the education of the consumer. Children's toys have already been screened to a large extent; and, as in the period prior to Christmas of 1970 when the FDA removed 39 different toys from the market, such toys could have made that holiday season an unhappy one.

We, as representatives of the people, must guarantee the consumer safe products in the marketplace.

ATTICA AND REALITY

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, The McKay Commission report on the Attica prison uprising, with the recommendations that the blue ribbon panel makes must receive the widest possible dissemination. It states what the public needs to know about prison conditions and prison reform.

Prison bars hold men and women for so many months and years. Rehabilitation and innovative work release programs which reintroduce a convicted prisoner to society hold promise of reducing the 75-percent rate of return to our large institutions. This will cost money, but it will be money well spent.

The Select Committee on Crime will study the McKay report, and soon will release a report of our own based upon our observations and examinations of Attica and other prisons which led to our hearings last year. We hope we can move the Federal Government to make available the necessary funds to carry out the recommendations of the McKay Commission and our own.

An excellent column written by Tom Wicker of the New York Times, entitled "Attica and Reality" appeared September 14. I submit it for review of those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ATTICA AND REALITY

(By Tom Wicker)

The McKay Commission has concluded that Governor Nelson Rockefeller should have gone to Attica before permitting the armed assault that recaptured the prison last September. But the commission also observed that this question "has tended to overshadow all other issues as a subject of public debate," and that is both true and too bad.

Had the Governor gone to Attica, the deaths of 39 persons killed in the assault might, or might not, have been avoided; no one will ever know. As the commission stated, at least Mr. Rockefeller's presence might have acted as a restraint on the attackers; as some of the special observers' committee believed at the time, personal exposure to the lethal atmosphere of tension and hatred prevailing at Attica just before the attack might have altered his view on how to proceed.

All that is speculation. What is certain is that the failure at Attica was not a failure of Nelson Rockefeller alone. It was not a failure of Commissioner Russell Oswald alone, or of the miserably misnamed "corrections" department he heads, or of the observer committee, or of the prisoner leaders—not even of the state troopers and corrections officers who made the clumsy attack, and the officials who were supposed to restrain and discipline them. They all failed in one way or another to prevent the prisoner uprising and its bloody aftermath; but the essential failure was more general, even national—an inhumane and ineffective penal system as part of an inhumane and ineffective criminal justice system that springs from a society indifferent to the inhumanity and ignorant of the ineffectiveness.

This is not said as a retreat into meaningless generality, for which no blame can be fixed. Those troopers who fired wantonly and indiscriminately into the mass of prisoners should not be granted by inaction the amnesty the state refused to extend to the prisoners. Neither should those who failed to

stop such violence, or the corrections officers who violated orders by firing their own weapons, or those who later carried out brutal reprisals. The prisoners who slashed three others to death and participated in the beating of a guard who later died, if they can be identified, should be held responsible for their acts. So should anyone else, prisoner or observer or official, from the Governor on down, who can be shown to have specific responsibility for a specific crime.

On the other hand, the assertion of a general public culpability is not intended as a sort of fatuous do-goodism, a view that there are no criminals or that social conditions excuse every hostile act. It is not merely what Spiro Agnew has called "agoniz[ing] over the root causes of conditions that are constantly used as an excuse for some people to commit crime."

But it would be all too easy for some to conclude that had Governor Rockefeller only gone to Attica, all would have been well. It would be just as easy for others to conclude that had Mr. Oswald ordered the prison recaptured by force on the first day of the uprising, there would have been no problem. It would be all too easy to conclude that nothing was really wrong at Attica but a few individual failures, and to ignore the real problems that came to bloody fruition there.

One of these real problems is the practice of incarcerating men like animals in their cages, in fortress-like prisons closed to the public eye and located for the most part far off the beaten path, with these prisons manned by untrained, underpaid, often frightened civil servants, mostly whites, placed in total control (so long as they can maintain it) of prisoners, mostly blacks and other minorities, separated abruptly from home, community, jobs, sex, amenity and hope.

Another real problem is that many of these prisoners know themselves to have been unfairly or capriciously or callously treated by police anxious for arrests, prosecutors hungry for convictions, defense counsel of inadequate skills and preparation, courts too often incapable of speedy trial and reasonably certain justice, arbitrary parole boards, and bureaucratic and inflexible procedures throughout a criminal justice system that can neither protect the innocent adequately, punish the guilty surely, nor effectively distinguish between the two.

The real problem, finally, is that prisoners, by and large, do come from the lowest and most hopeless economic classes and the worst social conditions, do suffer dehumanizing and degrading conditions that offer little physical security, less comfort, the most limited legal rights, virtually no training—much less motivation—for the future, and few opportunities for self-improvement.

For all these reasons, prisons make men worse rather than better, cause crime rather than prevent it, endanger society rather than serve it. For all these reasons, and whatever the specific guilt of individuals, those who administer criminal justice in America, as well as the public and the politicians who tolerate its inhumanity and ineffectiveness, are stained with the blood of Attica.

LIBRARY DEDICATION

HON. LAWRENCE G. WILLIAMS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, last night I was privileged to attend the dedication of a new \$600,000 library at the Holy Cross R.C. Church which is located in my district. This was a most important event to me because it was the culmina-

tion of a great number of important achievements by Msgr. Louis J. Meyer during his priesthood.

It was only 2 or 3 months after I was sworn in to my first elected position as Springfield Township Commissioner that Father Meyer approached the board with the original plans for the Holy Cross School to be built on what was formerly farmland at Springfield and Bishop Roads. After the school was constructed, the combination auditorium and gymnasium was used for church service.

The school was then enlarged and the construction of the church was started. Through the efforts of Monsignor Meyer and his parish, Holy Cross has developed into one of the most beautiful churches in the world.

The church, itself, contains an upper and a lower sanctuary with a combined seating capacity of almost 2,300. Mass can be conducted simultaneously at each of the sanctuaries, and each sanctuary has a ground-level entrance. The lower sanctuary has an entrance at the front while the upper sanctuary has a ground level entrance in the rear.

The Holy Cross Church is a tribute to the outstanding dedication, drive, and initiative of Monsignor Meyer. It is difficult for me to realize that he has accomplished all of this in only 20 years.

The great impact which Holy Cross School has had on the tens of thousands of children is readily apparent.

The efforts of Monsignor Meyer will never be forgotten by his parishioners and the people of Delaware County who know of his efforts.

THE RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT REGARDING TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, since 1967 there has been an escalating number of American citizens traveling to restricted countries and engaging in activities in those countries which undercut the foreign policy objectives of the United States. The most recent and perhaps most flagrant episode involved the visits of Jane Fonda and Ramsey Clark to North Vietnam.

It was assumed prior to 1969 that the Department of State had authority to refuse to issue or to revoke U.S. passports because of unauthorized travel to restricted countries or areas and to require assurances from the traveler that he would not use his passport for travel to the area and would not travel to the area. However, the Court of Appeals held in *Lynd versus Rusk* (1967) that although the Department could restrict the validity and use of a U.S. passport for travel to certain foreign countries or areas, it was without statutory authority to restrict the travel of U.S. citizens to such countries or areas.

Shortly thereafter, Stokely Carmichael took advantage of this decision

and traveled to Cuba and North Vietnam to condemn U.S. aggression against North Vietnam and call for total revolution against the imperialist, capitalist, and racist structure of the United States.

In August 1969, an American delegation comprised of SDS leaders, black antiwar leaders, and other militants toured North Vietnam and held a mass rally on August 4, 1969, during which they condemned the United States, praised the North Vietnamese, and called for solidarity between the antiwar factions in the United States and North Vietnam. In September 1969, Eldridge Cleaver and a delegation of Black Panthers appeared at the World Conference of Journalists Against U.S. Imperialism in Pyongyang, North Korea, and said in part:

U.S. imperialism seeks to turn the entire world into a huge prison under its bloody thumb and under the boots of the troops and puppets. The people of the world must unite and stage a massive, universal prison break against U.S. imperialism.

Perhaps the largest contingent to leave our shores to assist our adversaries occurred in early 1970—600 young radicals joined the "Venceremos Brigade" to cut cane for Castro at the very time when our embargo on trade with Cuba was beginning to have its desired effect. Actually, the real purpose of this SDS-sponsored expedition was not to cut cane, but to make Cuban propaganda hay. It furnished considerable propaganda ammunition to Cuba and Latin American Communists.

The recent activities of Jane Fonda and Ramsey Clark in North Vietnam further illustrates the need to control such unauthorized trips.

Jane Fonda made several broadcasts over Radio Hanoi in which she attempted to demoralize American servicemen and get them to disobey orders. Similarly, Ramsey Clark representing an organization called the International Commission for Inquiries into the U.S. war crimes in Indochina over Hanoi Radio referred to the "cruel and terrible slaughter in North Vietnam."

Both Miss Fonda and Mr. Clark condemn our action against North Vietnam, yet ignore the fact that it was the North Vietnamese who entered into South Vietnam as the aggressors. Moreover, who can recall Miss Fonda or Mr. Clark ever condemning the North Vietnamese aggressors for the vicious atrocities, deaths and casualties they have caused the people of South Vietnam over a 10 year period, and for their refusal to comply with the Geneva Convention on POW's?

The effect of the many unauthorized trips by American citizens to restricted countries since 1967 has been to: first, misrepresent American opinion to our adversaries; second, provide misinformation to the American public; third, provide propaganda ammunition and actual economic assistance to our adversaries; and fourth, to make the attainment of peace more difficult by interfering with private negotiations and other foreign policy activities.

I am of the opinion that one of the most important reasons for the intransigence of the North Vietnamese in the

Paris negotiations is the blurred picture of the American electorate which has been painted by the fringe minority who have traveled to Hanoi in deliberate violation of the restrictions imposed by the Secretary of State.

A case in point is the recent trip of Ramsey Clark. Clark, while in Hanoi, stated that he expected a big McGovern victory and if McGovern were elected, the war would end on the day he came into office. He also inferred that McGovern would accept Hanoi's "seven points," and Nixon would not.

H.R. 16488 which I introduced on August 8 of this year would control such flagrant intervention in the conduct of American foreign policy. This bill would give the Secretary of State the satisfactory authority, which the Court of Appeals said he presently does not have to impose and enforce area restrictions on travel. In other words, it formally gives the Secretary the authority which he exercised prior to the court decision in 1967.

Under this legislation, the Secretary could restrict travel to a country that we are at war with, where armed hostilities are underway, or when such travel would seriously impair the conduct of U.S. foreign policy. After reviewing an application to travel to a country classified as restricted, the Secretary could, however, grant permission to visit that country. Minimal penalties are provided for travel to designated countries or areas without specific authorization by the Secretary.

The Department of State and Department of Justice support this legislation and I am hopeful that the House Judiciary Committee will act on it soon to prevent future unauthorized trips by the Jane Fonda's and Ramsey Clark's. Our country must speak with one voice. We can no longer tolerate interference by private American citizens with our diplomatic negotiations and the rise of American citizens as propaganda conduits.

RESULTS OF 17TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I wish to insert in the RECORD the results of a questionnaire which I recently sent to all the residents of Michigan's new 17th Congressional District. At completion of this tally, I have received a total of 8,989 returns out of approximately 138,000 questionnaires mailed. My special thanks are extended to the individuals who responded with interest, many with detailed and thoughtful comments on these major issues facing Congress and the Nation. The results of the questionnaire follow for everyone to read:

RESULTS OF 17TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you support President Nixon's policies in Vietnam?
Yes, 66.6%.
No, 33.4%.

2. Which do you think is the best solution to the Vietnam war:

(a) Continue military operations at present level while pursuing further negotiations?, 28.6%.

(b) Immediate withdrawal?, 14.5%.

(c) Withdrawal contingent upon release of POW's?, 34.7%.

(d) Phased withdrawal of U.S. troops?, 22.2%.

3. Should unconditional amnesty be granted those individuals who have avoided meeting their military obligation by leaving the country or deserting from the armed services?

Yes, 18.3%.

No, 81.7%.

4. Do you favor the busing of school children to achieve racial balance?

Yes, 8.6%.

No, 91.4%.

5. Do you favor federal regulation of private pension plans to protect pension rights of employees?

Yes, 79.2%.

No, 20.8%.

6. Do you feel any of these can be effective in controlling crime:

(a) Increasing federal aid to states and localities for crime control programs?

Yes, 67.4%.

No, 32.6%.

(b) Enactment of stronger gun control laws?

Yes, 72.1%.

No, 27.9%.

(c) Building more correctional institutions and improving rehabilitation?

Yes, 77.9%.

No, 22.1%.

7. Do you support efforts to widen diplomatic and trade relations with China?

Yes, 82.0%.

No, 18.0%.

8. Do you feel the present wage-price-rent control program has been successful in combating inflation?

Yes, 34.2%.

No, 65.8%.

9. With the constitutionality of the property tax questioned as a means of financing public education, would you favor:

(a) Greater federal expenditures for schools?

Yes, 53.4%.

No, 46.6%.

(b) State assumption of responsibility for public education with a new system of financing?

Yes, 72.4%.

No, 27.6%.

(c) A national sales tax (value-added tax) for school revenues?

Yes, 47.7%.

No, 52.3%.

10. Health care costs are placing medical care out of the reach of millions of Americans. Would you favor:

(a) National health insurance for everyone financed by employer-employee contributions matched by the federal government under social security?

Yes, 67.2%.

No, 32.8%.

(b) Tax credits to purchase private insurance?

Yes, 46.8%.

No, 53.2%.

(c) Expansion of medicare and medicaid?

Yes, 61.6%.

No, 38.4%.

(d) A federal program to help pay catastrophic medical costs only?

Yes, 55.0%.

No, 45.0%.

11. Do you feel that greater federal efforts are necessary to reduce unemployment?

Yes, 67.6%.

No, 32.4%.

12. What do you believe are the principal problems facing our nation today? (The following are the problems most frequently cited and the percentage of response.)

Crime, 20.6%.

Vietnam, 11.9%.

Inflation, 10.4%.

Busing, 9.8%.

Unemployment, 8.8%.

Drugs, 7.0%.

Taxes, 6.2%.

Welfare, 5.5%.

Pollution, 2.7%.

MODERN MOMS ARE INDEPENDENT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Suburban Life Newspaper has a very interesting editorial page in which individual staff members give their viewpoints on any subject of special interest to them. Mrs. Sharon Windle, writing in the Suburban Life of September 14, discusses the attitude of a modern mother in what I believe is a very practical and sound fashion.

The editorial follows:

MODERN MOMS ARE INDEPENDENT

(By Sharon Windle)

Kids are like a pair of shoes. They're much more comfortable to have around after they've put on a little mileage.

I suppose after a preface like the above I needn't add that I'm not what you would call a Dr. Spock version of motherhood. To the impenetrable eye of the old-fashioned mother or the super-sensitive grandma, I, and others of my pattern, may appear at times, unconcerned, immobile, impatient and too strict. It is only because we are all of the above.

We are also honest. Many of us did a very inadequate job of role playing with our dollies as kids. Many of us as adults washed diapers only out of sanitary necessity; made formula because our offspring weren't born with a super set of molars to chop up a steak and walked through the park with a baby carriage because it was good for mommy and an ailing for baby was an advantage too.

The biggest difference of opinion in the old way of child rearing and the new appears to be that the modern method places more value on the child himself as a human being with an individual personality. The old method treats kids as a possession to be disciplined and molded into a junior model of mom or dad.

The old method popularizes parental ego-expansion or ego-enforcement by using the child as a vehicle. How often have we heard, "She'll have all the opportunity I never had, or he'll get all the material things I could never afford as a kid." Wish for these unfilled childhood dreams of parents often cause them to demand regimented behavior from their offspring which is based on biases and misconceptions. Sadly, the end result is often alienation of the child.

It seems to me, and others who share my thinking, that the biggest responsibility of a parent is to recognize his or her shortcomings, prejudices and limitations and teach the child from that basic understanding.

It is necessary to realize that being a parent does not make you "right" and parenthood has less value when wielded as a bayonet than as a gesture of goodwill.

Too often the old-fashioned mommy is more concerned with the physical duties of mothering by which she judges herself and her peers judging the success of her role fulfillment than she is with the object of those efforts, the child himself.

Modern mothers don't seem to be so concerned with what others think of them as they are of the effects of their actions and the end results on the child himself.

There are among my peers some of the most powdered, pampered, fed-on-time, bedded-by-8 p.m.-promptly kids in the world, with the hungriest egos and weariest personalities.

I am less concerned with being a "good" mother than I am with mothering a "good" child. A child who will grow up into a world which, as I see it, could use some good kids to help straighten it out.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, September 20, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Thus saith the Lord God; in returning and rest shall you be saved; in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength.—Isaiah 30: 15.

O God, who art the Creator and Sustainer of life, whose spirit keeps the planets in their courses and yet whose ear is ever attentive to the quiet whispers of our human hearts, we pause in silence before Thee praying for wisdom, strength, and patience as we endeavor to meet the needs of our beloved America and to lead our Nation in right and good paths.

O Lord, guide our people in choosing

wisely her leaders. May our citizens grow in mature responsibility and together join hands with kindred spirits across the seas in daring to be pioneers in brotherhood, sustaining the principles of those who seek to end strife, and to usher in a new day of enduring peace to the glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

RECOMMITTAL OF S. 1316, AMENDING FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION ACT, TO COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 1316) to amend section 301 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended, and section 5 of the Poultry Products Inspection Act, as amended, so as to increase from 50 to 80 percent the amount that may be paid as the Federal Government's share of the costs of any cooperative meat or poultry inspection program carried out by any State under such sections, be re-committed to the Committee on Agriculture.