

York, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. SCHWEN-
GEL):

H.R. 16774. A bill to establish a national adoption information exchange system; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 16775. A bill to expand the Youth Conservation Corps pilot program, to authorize assistance for similar State programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 16776. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to make certain that recipients of aid or assistance under the various Federal-State public assistance and medical programs (and recipients of assistance under the veterans pension and compensation programs or any other Federal or federally assisted program) will not have the amount of such aid or assistance reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 16777. A bill to provide for disclosures designed to inform the Congress with respect to legislative measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

H.R. 16778. A bill to provide for disclosures designed to inform Congress with respect to legislative measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

By Mr. McKEVITT (for himself, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. PIKE, Mr. RANDALL, and Mr. WARE):

H.R. 16779. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to prohibit the payment of aid or assistance under approved State public assistance plans to aliens who are illegally within the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 16780. A bill to change the formula for calculating the value of wheat marketing certificates and feed grain price support payments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REID:

H.R. 16781. A bill to prohibit tax deductions for expenses incurred in the production or publishing of false advertising; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. NELSEN, and Mr. CARTER):

H.R. 16782. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance and encouragement for the establishment and expansion of health maintenance organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 16783. A bill to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, as amended, to create the bicentennial film program; to the Committee on Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 16784. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to the financing of the cost of mailing certain matter free of postage or at reduced rates of postage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FREY (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. THONE, Mr. VEYSEY, and Mr. WARE):

H. Con. Res. 708. Concurrent resolution to require a court impact statement in each report of legislation from a committee of either House of Congress to that House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H. Res. 1125. Resolution in support of the U.S. veto of the United Nations resolution on terrorism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Res. 1126. Resolution to prohibit any notice of an increase in social security payments from referring to any individual who is a candidate for public elective office; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (for herself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, and Mrs. MINK):

H. Res. 1127. Resolution to authorize additional investigative authority to the Committee on Education and Labor; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VANIK, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. WYATT, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. CONABLE, and Mr. HALPERN):

H. Res. 1128. Resolution in support of U.S. veto of U.N. resolution on terrorism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. REES, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHWENGLER, Mr. SISK, Mr. STEIGER of

Wisconsin, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia):

H. Res. 1129. Resolution in support of U.S. veto of U.N. resolution on terrorism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself, Mrs. COUGHLIN, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DOW, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. ERLINBORN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FISH, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, and Mr. LENT):

H. Res. 1130. Resolution in support of U.S. veto of U.N. resolution on terrorism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BELL, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRADENAS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BUKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONOVER, Mr. CORDOVA, and Mr. COTTER):

H. Res. 1131. Resolution in support of U.S. veto of U.N. resolution on terrorism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 16785. A bill for the relief of Thomas A. Lucid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.R. 16786. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Greco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 16787. A bill for the relief of Martin Tarnowsky and John Tarnowsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 16788. A bill for the relief of James E. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 16789. A bill for the relief of Rito E. Judilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16790. A bill for the relief of Virna J. Pasicaran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 16791. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clare McManigal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONVOCATION ADDRESS BY VICE ADM. STANSFIELD TURNER, PRES- IDENT, U.S. NAVAL WAR COLLEGE

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, we in Rhode Island are very proud of our naval installation. There is an impressive naval tradition relationship between our State, its people, and the Navy. Our new president of the U.S. Naval War College is

Vice Adm. Stansfield Turner, and at a recent convocation he made a very impressive and, I think, provocative talk.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the Extension of Remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONVOCATION ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT OF NAVAL WAR COLLEGE

Good morning.

Welcome to distinguished guests and families.

I extend a warm welcome to the students of the 89th session of the Naval War College.

You are now the newest matriculants in the oldest Naval War College in the world.

In the Naval Warfare Course, you are 188 strong at the CDR/CAPT level. Fifty percent of you are U.S. Naval Officers. The rest are Army, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, State Department, CIA, naval and defense civilians.

In the Command and Staff Course, you are 232 strong at the LT/LCDR level. Two thirds are Navy.

In our two International courses you are 46 strong representing 35 different Navies.

Our total student body is 467.

Our 89th session will have a number of unique characteristics:

1. This is the first year that we have had an academic convocation.

2. This is the first year that we have had United States student participation in the two courses designed for international students. This is a direct reflection of the increasing importance of cooperation with allies under the Nixon Doctrine.

3. This is the first year of our new Naval Staff Course for younger international officers.

4. This is the first year five countries have been represented in our international courses. We welcome Cambodia, Lebanon, Malaysia, Nigeria and Singapore.

5. This is the first time in over 30 years that we have completed a new academic building expressly for the War College. Just behind historic Luce Hall here, our new Spruance Hall is nearing completion.

6. This will be the first time in over 20 years that we have built new family housing for War College students. I am proud, thanks to the efforts of one of my predecessors, Admiral Richard Colbert, that this housing has been specially designed to harmonize with the historic architecture of Newport.

7. This is the first year that we will teach an academic program exclusively for the staff side.

8. This is the first year that we have provided a text book allowance to our students.

9. This is potentially the finest student body that we have had in many years. At the express direction of the Chief of Naval Operations, the Naval officers in your classes were rigorously screened. Because of this emphasis on quality we have less than our authorized students. You in this new student body are to be congratulated on having been chosen to attend the Naval War College.

10. Finally, and most significantly, this will be a year of major changes in the College's academic program.

Why are we changing our curriculum? First because every academic institution must periodically review whether it is fulfilling its mission. I think that the changes in the issues and problems which the Navy faces today call for changes in what we teach here. The problems we face are increasingly complex. More is demanded of us as officers than ever before. This College in turn must demand more of its students.

Beyond that, I believe that there has been a creeping intellectual devitalization in all of our War Colleges since World War II. I have never met a graduate of any War College who said that he had been intellectually taxed by a War College course of instruction. I am not saying that these men did not find their courses stimulating, time consuming, and worth their year of effort. I am saying that few were challenged to anywhere near the limits of their intellectual capabilities.

Further evidence of our intellectual weakness is the ineffectiveness of our military establishment in answering the questions, criticism and doubts raised against it in recent years. You can be certain that your morning newspaper contains several attacks on the performance or motives of military men. The fact that these questions are growing in crescendo indicates that we are providing convincing responses or taking positions that are credible to others not in uniform. Admittedly, some of the criticism is neither genuine nor constructive and cannot be satisfied.

However, most of it is legitimate and deserves satisfaction. And I would urge that we not fool ourselves into thinking that these voices will be stilled simply by the ending of the conflict in Viet Nam.

Why have we eroded our credibility? One cause is that higher military education has come to substitute prolonged briefings for rigorous intellectual development. This is because almost every aspect of our society today has some impact on national security. Our War Colleges have succumbed to the temptation to add piecemeal to their curricula in a fruitless quest to cover every-

thing of relevance.

Another sample of the ineffectiveness of our military educational system is our increasing reliance on civilians and on "Think Tanks" to do our thinking for us. Do not misunderstand me. These people have done outstanding work for us. We very much need their help and stimulation into the future. We must, however, be able to produce military men who are a match for the best of the civilian strategists or we will abdicate control of our profession. Moreover, I am persuaded that we can be a profession only as long as we ourselves are pushing the frontiers of knowledge in our field.

There are many other symptoms of our professional decline. The War Colleges' reputations have regressed to the point that many officers believe that assignment to any one of them is primarily a year of release from the pressures of set or field duties, a year to "recharge batteries," as the saying goes. As far as I can find, no student in recent years has ever flunked out of this College for academic indifference or incompetence. I consider that either an amazing record, or a false concept of gentlemanly treatment that can only foster intellectual laziness. As of this moment, I can assure you that those who do not perform have no guarantee of a full year at the Naval War College.

Let me now talk directly to this year's student body about the improvements we intend in the College's courses of instruction. Any improvement must support the objective of the Naval War College, which is to enhance the capability of naval officers to make sound decisions in both command and management positions. This means developing your intellect, encouraging you to reason, to innovate, and to expand your capacity to solve complex military problems. To do this the College will emphasize intellectual development and academic excellence.

Now for the specifics. First, we will start by increasing the academic content of our courses and at the same time placing greater emphasis on what you the students do rather than what is done for you. We will expect lots of individual effort in research, in reading, in writing, and in solving case problems.

The first semester, for instance, those of you in the Naval Warfare Course will be assigned about 100 pages of carefully selected reading each week. We will temper this with seminar discussions led by our recently expanded and strengthened faculty. That faculty's purpose is to expose you to areas of knowledge, to make you aware of what you need to probe into on your own, and to help you do so. It is not here to spoon feed anyone.

To the best of my knowledge examinations have never been used here. As far as I can determine this is because our War Colleges hold a false concept that a senior officer is above that sort of thing. Not so in my view. You must prove yourself even more as you move upward. The importance of our knowing all that we can about the men we are going to promote to be Colonels or Captains or Admirals or Generals is much more vital than down at the bottom rung. Thus, we will institute exams this year. We will not employ the usual precise military grading system down to two decimal points. Superior, pass and fail will suffice. We are not interested in establishing a class standing or writing fitness reports based on exams. Additionally, the type of exams we will employ are not subject to precise grading. We will be attempting to uncover ideas and original thinking, not standard solutions or factual answers. We will do so as much to focus your study efforts as to grade you.

We will de-emphasize lectures which are

a passive learning experience, and have a low pay-off. We will want you to hear a number of distinguished senior officials but most of our lecturing will be done with our own faculty. Part of creating a more academic atmosphere on this campus will be to involve our own faculty more deeply.

The Naval Warfare Course will also eliminate the associated Master's Degree program with George Washington University. This was a good program academically. Ironically, it was probably one of the most intellectually demanding parts of the curricula of all of our War Colleges. I am not willing, however, to compromise my control of your academic efforts. Surely, we have more than enough to teach you in the time allotted and we must jealously guard our prerogative to do it in the way that our professional needs dictate. I have no concern that this change can really affect any of you in your prospects for promotion. I assure you that fitness reports signed on Naval Warfare students will explain that as a group you were not permitted to participate in a Master's Degree program.

In addition I intend three shifts of emphasis or direction in our curriculum this year, which are at variance with the International Relations degree offered by George Washington University.

First, we will approach the study of strategy through historical cases rather than through international relations or political science. Our courses of instruction have hitherto concentrated too exclusively on the brief period of military strategy since the close of World War II. The domination of this period by only two world powers will likely prove to have been a temporary aberration. The current trend toward a multipolar world would seem to confirm this. Studying historical examples should enable us to view current issues and trends through the broader perspective of the basic elements of strategy. Approaching today's problems through a study of the past is one way to ensure that we do not become trapped within the limits of our own experience. We will not be concerned with history as chronology, but with its relevancy and application to today and tomorrow. We will start with Thucydides' History of the Peloponnesian War. What could be more related to today than a war in which a democratic nation sent an expedition overseas to fight on foreign soil and then found that there was little support for this at home? or a war in which a sea power was in opposition to a nation that was basically a land power. Are there not lessons still to be learned here?

The second shift in emphasis will be away from the broad issues of strategy and international relations into areas of more exclusive concern to the United States Naval officer. In the last 25 years we in uniform have been very aware of the importance of understanding our relationship to the economic, diplomatic and other factors of national strategy. I believe that in the process we have lost some of our ability to offer pure military advice. Few of us in uniform will ever be required to deal in the creation of national strategy. All of us here, however, will influence our military and national strategies. We will do so through the recommendations we will offer and the decisions we will make on how to allocate those scarce national resources that will be entrusted to the military establishment in the years ahead. You and I will formulate the strategy of tomorrow by the way we spend and manage our Defense budget today.

Loosely speaking I refer to this second area as Management. The focus of all of the four courses here will shift in this direction. We are in danger of pricing the United States out of a military capability that is sufficient to be a deterrent. Therefore, under Management we will study cases of choice: choices of weapons characteristics; choices

between weapons; choices between weapons and other necessary elements of military power such as personnel; and choices of how to procure and manage military forces. We will deal in only a few representative cases and we will not attempt to cover the full range of military managerial problems.

Rather the cases used will illustrate how to select and weigh the factors relevant to a decision and how to understand the organizational and managerial functions of translating a decision into action. Hopefully, working on a few representative cases will make you better prepared to handle whatever particular decisions or choices you subsequently encounter.

Thirdly, we will also shift emphasis toward the study of the employment of the forces that we procure and manage. I call this section of the curriculum Tactics. Again, we will look at specific tactical cases but, perforce, we will not attempt to cover all types of naval tactics. The emphasis will be on how to solve problems using reasoning that can be applied to whatever cases you encounter after leaving the War College.

Each section of the curriculum, Strategy, Management and Tactics, has a common thread, that of allocating resources. Strategy is the art of allocating total national resources: economic, diplomatic, psychological, military and others to serve our national purposes. Management is the art of allocating scarce financial resources to procure and manage a military force that will support our strategy. Tactics is the allocation of available resources or forces when the action starts. We badly need officers who are capable of handling the trade-offs in each of these fields. The skills of doing this are infinitely more demanding than the allocation of assets in the business world of profit and loss. That makes our job here wonderfully demanding.

This year's shift of emphasis towards a deeper study of strategy on the one hand and towards more attention to management and tactics on the other is really not something new at the Naval War College. They represent a return to our great traditions—to the strategic and historical contribution of men like Mahan; to the tactical and operational studies of men like William Sims, Raymond Spruance, Kelly Turner who were the experts in naval warfare in their day. The idea of hard work is by no means new either. One of our researchers recently dug out the complete course materials for the 1926-27 curriculum. He said that it was a whale of a workload, for students and faculty alike, and that the marginal comments indicated that lots of midnight oil had been consumed back then. I trust that it will be again.

The balance between Strategy, Management and Tactics will vary between the four courses we teach. Our senior courses, the College of Naval Warfare, and the international Naval Command College, will spend more time on strategy. The College of Command and Staff and the international Naval Staff Course will look more toward tactics.

They will all four share common ground in management and I am intent that there be more interchange between all four student bodies. Each can stimulate the others. This is one campus and one basic curriculum with different shades of emphasis.

Speaking of togetherness, I want to amplify my earlier mention of a wives' course. We all know the importance of our wives interest in and support to our careers. Military wives usually become familiar with their husband's areas of professional specialty, if only in self-defense against the foreign language he speaks in acronyms such as ASW, TACAIR, FYDP, and other unintelligible mumbo jumbo. I suspect that it will be more difficult for wives to feel a part of Thucydides' Peloponnesian Wars, case studies of the F-14 or warfare tactics new to her husband. As a pilot project this

autumn we are going to offer an exclusively distaff course on strategy and another on anthropology. If they work well and meet a need we will look at expansion in the next term.

Now those of you in the entering classes may well ask, "What is in all of this for me?" This is not the relaxing sabbatical I had hoped for!

My response is that if you are inclined to shy away from a challenge, you are not the kind of officer we want here. All of you here are too capable to afford a year away from the intensity of professional development or from the heat of competition.

Now let's look also at the rewards that you can achieve under the new curriculum. They are considerable. First, I intend to identify those who have the capability to contribute to our profession's intellectual growth. I will make this known as best I can, and particularly to urge your assignment to appropriate responsibilities after you leave this College. If we are to redress the balance of unfavorable public opinion, we must be able to place the intellectual square pegs in the square holes, and those otherwise qualified into holes shaped for them; and many of those are equally important and challenging I would add. We don't all want to be squares (Forgive me).

Second, and far more important, you can have the reward of becoming a more capable and productive officer, but not because you learned a lot of new facts here. If you attempt to make this a prep school for your next duty assignment, you will have missed the purpose of being here. If we trained you for a particular assignment or type of duty, the value of this College would be short lived. We want to educate you to be capable of doing well in a multitude of future duties.

The common ingredient to them will be the ability to make good decisions. Now the essence of decision making is not finding facts—a plebeian chore. Rather it is considering all of the key factors which bear on a decision—and weighing them in a manner that will assist in making the final judgment. Your objective here should be to improve your reasoning, logic and analysis, not to memorize data that will soon be outmoded. Don't look for answers on how to conduct anti-submarine warfare or whatever. Search instead for methods of approaching anti-submarine warfare problems. Learn to discern which facts are trivia and which drive the results.

The new curriculum should leave you with abundant free time without the distractions of musters, coffee-breaks, committee meetings, and lectures. You can run the risk of abusing your freedom, or you can use it for self-development. You are on your own to get your higher education in military decision making during these next ten months. My basic premise is that if we point you in a reasonable direction and just turn you loose, you will conquer every height ahead of you on your own. Always keep in mind that the product which the country desperately needs is military men with the capability of solving complex problems and of executing their decisions. Scholarship for scholarship's sake is of no importance to us. You must keep your sights on decision making or problem solving as your objective. Problems are not solved by standard or pat solutions, especially not in times of such rapid change as we are experiencing.

Here is an academic atmosphere, free of real world responsibilities, you have a particularly valuable opportunity to express thoughts freely and let your imagination roam. We want this year to be built around an uninhibited exchange of ideas, and rank has no monopoly on those. Note that student and faculty name badges emphasize first names and purposely omit rank. From today

on also everyone will be wearing civilian clothes to blur rank distinctions.

Mainly, though, I adjure you to take advantage of this opportunity. If you find yourself taxed hard, over-taxed in cases, do not let that discourage you. If we tailored a course to the average student, we would fail to tax those who are most ready to proceed. Remember the related point that course content is secondary. It is the development of habits of thinking that counts. If you cannot cover everything that is assigned, do what you do accomplish well, so that you think creatively. Ploughing through a wealth of material just to absorb it is not what we want or what you need. A modicum of excellence and understanding will far outbalance a plethora of mediocrity and superficiality.

There is, of course, also a danger that we may not challenge some of you to capacity in the standard programs here. If so, it will be up to you to seek out academic opportunity equal to your talents. You can undertake additional independent research projects under the guidance of one of about thirty well qualified tutors we have on campus. Or you may audit the academic program of one of the other courses, no matter which course you are in. Or if you believe that you have exceptional talent and conceive of a particularly demanding project, you can apply to be a Research Associate under our new Research Department and do independent work at the doctoral level. I hope that many of you will take some of these directions.

We in the military establishment have the intellect and the capability to provide the answers demanded of us today. We can tap those capabilities only through hard intellectual endeavor such as you are about to undertake. We are a profession, not a trade. You are going to help us continue to be professionals. You have a unique opportunity for these next ten months. It will be only as productive as you make it for yourselves. Cherish this one golden opportunity and give it all you have.

Your first meeting on Thucydides commences at 1:30. Between now and then all of our facilities are open for you and your families and our guests to visit.

Again, welcome—and good studying.

TESTIMONY FOR BALANCED TRANSPORTATION

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, as one who has worked for a balanced transportation system since coming to Congress I was especially interested in testimony given by the National League of Cities/U.S. Conference of Mayors before the Senate Banking Committee. For those of my colleagues who may not have had the opportunity to review this excellent statement, I am inserting a copy of it in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES, U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS, AMERICAN TRANSIT ASSOCIATION, INSTITUTE FOR RAPID TRANSIT, RAILWAY PROGRESS INSTITUTE BEFORE THE SENATE BANKING, HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS ON S. 3939, FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1972

This statement represents the consolidated views of the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the American

Transit Association, the Institute for Rapid Transit and the Railway Progress Institute.

We would like to say at the outset that we consider it wholly appropriate that the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee is hearing testimony regarding the impact on mass transit of provisions of S. 3939, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1972. This bill, reported by the Senate Public Works Committee, will have considerable effect upon the financing and administration of the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act.

Since this Committee fathered that Act and wrote into it the growth and expansion necessary to achieve balanced urban transportation, it is natural that you have a chance to assess its relationship with the highway program.

We favor the involvement of the highway program in matters of public transportation and would hope that this close cooperation between the two Committees is continued. This is made more convenient by the fact that the 1970 Mass Transportation Assistance Act calls for a two-year updating in funding levels just as the Highway program is authorized on a two-year basis—with such review coinciding. The major point is that what is happening further serves to reflect and underline the fact that urban transportation will always involve both highways and mass transit.

The phrase "an idea whose time has come" may be a little overworked these days, but these hearings certainly demonstrate that balanced urban transportation is solidly in that category.

Representing those public and private interests who believe that mass transportation is essential to the future of urban and suburban America, we welcome this opportunity to comment further before this Committee.

When we last testified here, it was on the urban transportation amendments to the 1972 Housing Act. That bill, which passed the Senate 80-1, represented a significant and progressive approach to the problems of urban transportation. It is not necessary to reiterate now the many arguments presented then which justified a program of federal operating subsidies for mass transit.

We are confident that program will be enacted into law and would only point out now that events in transit since we last appeared have underlined the need for such a measure.

As stated above, the 1970 Mass Transportation Assistance Act requests the Administration to report every two years on the need for additional contract authority for the capital grants program. That report was due February 1, 1972. At this Committee's urging, our testimony in February was necessarily incomplete in that we said we would comment later—after Administration proposals—on the need for additional contract authority for the urban mass transit capital grant program.

It has been apparent for some time that if our urban transportation is truly to be balanced, then the major source of transportation funds—the Highway Trust Fund—must contain, in effect, a mass transit option. Thus we must face the details of not opening up the Highway Trust Fund, but of how it is to be used to achieve urban transportation goals. In other words, no one is mounting a raid on the trust fund... we are building in flexibility for an urban area to make its highway—mass transit decisions in the best possible way.

However, in adapting the Highway Trust Fund to meet mass transit needs, there are some major considerations which have to be taken into account.

The first consideration is obviously to what extent would highway funds be used for mass transit. Realistically, we believe that only the urban systems section and the provision for

utilizing funds in de-designated urban Interstate Highways would provide a source of funds for transit. However, given the highway needs of the nation and the schedule for completion of the Interstate Highway System, realistically there is not enough money in the trust fund alone to begin to meet the needs of transit as well—certainly not if our goal is balanced urban transportation. We will expand later on the degree to which other funds are needed to support current mass transit programs.

The second major consideration lies in the allocation of funds. We believe it is a mistake to rely on the present allocation system of highway funds for funding transit projects. The transit needs of our cities vary greatly—some are merely replacing equipment, others are planning and constructing entire new systems. A blanket distribution of funds, based on population, would not take such needs into account and would result in unwarranted amounts going to some areas while severely hampering the transit efforts of others. If an area is to exercise its option to balance its transportation among transit and highways, the federal government must take into account the differences among localities' plans and systems.

However, our reservations about these specific problems in no way signal a lack of support for the idea of a unified approach to the funding of urban transportation.

The bill reported by the Senate Public Works Committee goes a long way towards meeting most of our concerns. Certainly a most progressive bit of groundwork has been done and it is reasonable now to expect that a general agreement among the various interested parties can be reached.

We have long believed that there is a demonstrable coalition of interests among the highway and transit user. It does not take every energetic research to show that as urban and suburban highways improved and expanded (say, since 1950), transit usage has dropped overwhelmingly—from 17 billion annual passengers to currently, 7 billion. This drop in ridership has led to the increasing bankruptcy of local transit systems with the resulting public takeover and tax support.

Now that the highway program has reached the stage of concentration on the urban systems, the relationship with transit has been brought into sharp public focus. A stark illustration of the problem was recently given by the research department of the Chicago Transit Authority. It calculated that 86% of the people who go to and from downtown Chicago on a typical weekday do so by some form of public transportation. If that 86% had to switch to automobiles instead, it would mean at least 166,000 additional cars would have to be driven and parked downtown each weekday. It would mean that 148 new lanes of expressways would have to be constructed (tripling the current number of lanes); 50 million square feet of parking would then have to be provided which would mean tearing down most of the downtown buildings, constructing three and a half levels of parking space over the area and then rebuilding the skyscrapers and other buildings.

That may be fanciful but it illustrates the dilemma of public officials who must plan for the future of urban transportation. Can we continue to invest precious public funds only in freeway systems—systems which may generate even more dependence on the private automobile—when a properly planned transit system might better serve the mobility of the public? The question is not freeway vs. transit, but how much of each.

That is the question frequently being asked in editorials, public hearings, state houses, and council chambers across the nation. It is that question that the Administration has quite properly addressed itself to; and it is the question which we want to specifically comment on today.

If one of our concerns about using the Highway Trust Fund is not enough funds for transit, what is enough? The key to this is what the states and cities have geared themselves up to spend (along with local matching funds) based on the promise of federal funding as presented in the 1970 Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act.

Currently, these are pending with UMTA close to \$5 billion worth of capital grants projects. Much of this reflects local effort and capacity generated by the contract authority provided in the 1970 Act. A detailed look at this local effort reveals that the states and cities have taxed themselves to provide about \$2.7 billion in matching funds over the next 5 years.

In Illinois, the Chicago Urban Transportation District has been created and granted authority to generate revenue bonds of at least \$400 million. The state has been granted authority to provide \$200 million to finance capital grants.

The State of Massachusetts has approved funding of \$125 million of capital grants for transit.

The California legislature has approved earmarking of the sales tax for transit purposes. This will generate about \$75 million a year for five years for capital purposes.

Atlanta voters, in a historic bond issue, passed a regional sales tax for transit purposes. This will produce about \$483 million of funds for local matching over the next five years.

Minnesota provided authority to the Twin City area to impose additional property taxes. This will produce about \$20 million at the local level over the next five years.

The State of Pennsylvania is expected to provide \$56.5 million for capital purposes during fiscal 1972. These funds are part of the State general obligation funds. The 1973 request is for \$77 million. These funds are to be matched by local funds in requesting Federal funds. Over the next five years at least \$250 million in State funds can be expected to be authorized.

For the last three years the city of New York has authorized, from general funds, at least \$100 million a year for capital purposes. There remains \$270 million in unobligated funds from previously appropriated monies. For the next five years the city can be expected to authorize \$50 million a year for matching Federal dollars. This is to be added to the \$450 million remaining from the 1967 New York State bond issue authority. Furthermore, the State of New York by special referendum has made available \$1 billion for transportation improvements.

The State of Maryland has recently dedicated \$900 million in transportation revenues to match federal funds for the next 5 years.

Depending on the final percentage of the Federal share for capital grants, this \$2.7 billion in local funds would indicate a demand for between \$6 and \$8 billion over the next five years. This is in addition to the needs for research and demonstration projects as well as bus replacement—currently estimated at \$200 million each.

Obviously these needs must be tempered by the traditional constraint imposed by planning, engineering and construction time tables. However, at the very least it is obvious that these capital needs cannot possibly be met out of existing or projected revenues from the Highway Trust Fund alone.

It would appear at this time that the principle of supporting the bulk of mass transit programs from general revenues is a sound one, even though there is justification for the use of some trust fund monies for transit purposes. A large part of that justification is that the source of about half of the trust fund money is user taxes generated within urban areas. If some of these funds are returned to those jurisdictions.

for either highway or transit usage, then you are giving the proper degree of flexibility to the local transportation decision makers. Obviously this implies that existing mass transit program will continue to be funded at promised levels. Transit needs and political reality would tend to dictate continued reliance on general revenue funds for the bulk of the various transit programs.

The other element to consider in assessing the need for additional contract authority for the capital grants program is the implication of the pending 1972 Highway Bill. The transit-oriented provision in this bill authorizes \$800 million a year for the urban highway system, TOPICS and public transportation purposes, of which \$300 million a year is specifically earmarked for transit. The bill further provides that if a locality de-designates Interstate Highway mileage, those funds involved can be spent for public transit purposes.

It is extremely difficult to estimate precisely what affect these provisions would have on the level of funding for transit capital grants proposals. However, aside from these potential funds, transit's demonstrated needs would require a minimum funding of at least \$1 billion a year. This is the figure contained in the Administration's budget for FY 1973.

For the five year authorization period, this would mean adding \$2.9 billion in contract authority to the \$2.1 billion carried over from the 1970 Act. After two years, the urban mass transit needs would be reassessed with the added value of having a record of expenditure resulting from the new provisions in the 1974 Highway Act.

There are four other points that should be considered in connection with the transit amendments and with the provisions pending in the Highway Bill.

The first point is that it is important not to make any distinction between modes in public transportation. Section 142 of the Senate Highway Bill would expand the use of funds generated by the Highway Trust Fund to include the purchase of transit buses. This does not go far enough and, indeed, discriminates against those cities whose transit depends largely on rail systems. An increasing number of the nation's cities provide not only bus transit, but subway and commuter rail service as well. Transit system planning has progressed to the stage where these elements are now integrated with and interdependent on each other. Public funds support all three in most such areas. We feel it is important that such modal integration continue and that the new emphasis on system (rather than project) planning dictates that no distinction be made as to availability of funds.

If Highway Trust Fund monies are now going to finance public transportation, it makes sense to include all modes and not just single out buses. The main point here is that if we want a metropolitan area to have flexibility about using urban transportation funds for both highways and transit, then that flexibility should include the option of using funds for a variety of transit modes. We recognize that the amount to be made available out of the Highway Trust Fund are not large enough to include the expensive needs of rail systems, but we believe this problem can be dealt with more properly by increasing the contract authority under the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act.

We understand that an amendment to broaden the usage of Highway Trust Fund monies to include rail as well as bus is beyond the jurisdiction of this Committee. However, as a policy question, we seek your support for an amendment such as that proposed by Senator Cooper in the Committee Report as an individual view. This proposal recognizes, quite properly, that it is the urban systems section of the Highway Bill that contains the funds most likely to be avail-

able for transit purposes. This then is where the option to include rail as well as bus should appear.

Second is the question of the amount of the Federal percentage for the capital grants program. The present provision of the Federal share amounting to a ceiling of 66% (with a floor of 50%) has proved difficult on two points: The uncertainty of localities being able to count on the maximum grant, and the question of equity with the highway program.

The Senate-passed transit amendments gave the Secretary of Transportation discretionary authority to provide up to 90% of the Federal share of transit aid projects. The Administration has indicated a preference for funding projects at a uniform 70%. Therefore, in reality any "up to" 90% authorization would come out, in practice, to 70%. This makes the 90% illusory. Rather than relying on such a 90% provision with the justification that it bears a relationship to the Interstate Highway program, it seems to us that a far better case can be made for a mandatory 80% level. Such an 80% uniform Federal share for transit projects truly is in balance with the Federal aid highway program because it is the equivalent to the average share for the Interstate Highway Funds in combination with the ABC program funds.

With the Interstate Highway system funded at 90% Federal—and these billions of dollars continuing to be spent over the next several years—and a smaller amount for the ABC system available on a 50% basis, the result has been overall that state and local governments have put up about 20% to get \$5 billion a year in Federal Highway funds. The 1972 Highway Bill changes in the funding didn't really affect the Federal share because while the 90% Interstate money was cut back by \$750 million, the Federal percentage was raised to 70% on the remaining ABC funds. (See Footnote).

Thus if mass transit is to be in real balance with the highway system, the logical place to start is with the Federal share in funding.

Point three relates to the fact that all funds spent for mass transit, whatever their source, should be subject to the standards and criteria established by the administration of the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act of 1970. It is necessary to avoid any dual planning or regulations just because the funds may come from the Highway Trust Fund. This will require amendment to Section 9 of the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act of 1970 which will allow these funds to be spent for the planning of projects funded by the Highway Act.

The fourth point relates to the administration of the capital grants program. We fear that any proposal that combines transit and highway funding under the Highway Trust Fund alone could presage the virtual dismantling of the Urban Mass Transit Administration. There is no reason why the opening up of the Highway Trust Fund to transit projects should preclude U.M.T.A. from developing a constructive relationship with the Highway Administration—especially if such Highway Trust Fund transit monies serve to complement general revenue funds authorized by the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act.

Continued and comprehensive oversight by this Committee on the operations of the Urban Mass Transportation Act and the Urban Mass Transportation Administration to assure that any expansion of eligible uses of Highway Trust Fund monies will be supplemental to, and not in lieu of, Urban Mass Transportation Act funding, and to also ensure that U.M.T.A. and the Federal Highway Administration work together to implement a coordinated and balanced transportation policy utilizing both highway and rail systems.

In conclusion, we believe that the action the Congress will take this year on several proposals affecting urban transportation will cap an eight-year effort to revitalize mass transit—or at the very least to preserve it as a viable alternative to the over-dependence on the private automobile as the primary means of urban mobility.

For the sake of balancing our urban transportation systems between highways and transit, it is fortunate that these financial considerations come when the Interstate Highway System moves toward the final planning stages. It is fortunate, because we are being forced to consider both needs together and the riding public can only benefit by having funds and policy debated in such an atmosphere.

The utilization of highway revenues for mass transportation purposes, as well as the Federal program of operating assistance are both ideas which have been debated and tried at the state and local level. Such state and local programs have worked well as far as they have gone. There is nothing in their experience to signal that comparable Federal programs would be either unfeasible or unjustified. Indeed, if anything, the situation is such that only the Federal government can take the action that will save not only urban transportation, but through it our cities themselves. We are pleased and proud to have a role in this process which we feel will guarantee safe, convenient and economical urban transportation to all who both need and desire it.

Program	Federal share	Local share	Total	Federal share, percent
Highway Act 1970:				
Interstate system.....	\$4.000	\$0.444	\$4.444	
Other trust fund.....	1.474	.631	2.105	
Total.....	5.474	1.075	6.549	85
1972 (Senate bill):				
Interstate system.....	3.250	.361	3.611	
Other trust fund.....	2.475	1.060	3.535	
Total.....	5.725	1.421	7.146	80

REVENUE SHARING

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I have two editorials dealing with revenue sharing. One editorial is from the Washington Evening Star of September 18; the second is from the Los Angeles Times of September 17.

Last week the Senate passed this \$30 billion piece of legislation by a very large vote. There is another side to the case, however. These editorials point out certain facts that I think are important to consider.

I have also prepared a table of deficits in Federal funds and interest on the national debt for the period 1954 to 1973, inclusive. I wish to point out that the interest on the debt—just the interest charges—in the 1 year from 1972, which was the last fiscal year, to this fiscal year increased \$1.5 billion. The interest on the \$30 billion revenue-sharing figure, which will be about \$4 billion over the 5-year period, will further add to the interest charges which taxpayers must bear.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two editorials and the table which I have had prepared be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVENUE SHARING

WHERE WILL REVENUES COME FROM?

Wash. Star-News, September 18, 1972, editorial:

"... The [revenue-sharing] money obviously will represent deficit spending, and it will increase the pressure for new federal taxes.

"We won't belabor the point too much, for it looks as if nothing at this point can stop the revenue-sharing bill. . . .

"... But it remains a question as to where Uncle Sam will get the revenues to share with the states and cities."

REVENUE SHARING RESERVATIONS

Los Angeles Times, September 17, 1972, editorial:

"Political realities being what they are, revenue sharing could not be enacted without cutting every town in the country in on the deal. The money is spread so thin, as a result, that it will be of only limited benefit in the places where it is most needed.

"Also, under general revenue sharing, no strings are attached; recipient governments can spend the money according to their own scale of priorities. There will, predictably, be cases where the judgments will be open to question.

"... when President Nixon first proposed federal revenue sharing, it appeared that the program could be paid for without raising federal taxes. That is no longer the case. There have been enormous increases in federal spending and both presidential candidates have proposed yet more increases in the form of massive federal aid to primary and secondary schools.

"The enactment of revenue sharing makes it all the more certain, in fact, that regardless of campaign oratory, whoever is elected President will end up having to ask Congress for higher taxes."

DEFICITS IN FEDERAL FUNDS AND INTEREST ON THE NATIONAL DEBT, 1954-73 INCLUSIVE

[In billions of dollars]

	Receipts	Outlays	Surplus (+) or deficit (-)	Debt interest
1954	62.8	65.9	-3.1	6.4
1955	58.1	62.3	-4.2	6.4
1956	65.4	63.8	+1.6	6.8
1957	68.8	67.1	+1.7	7.2
1958	66.6	69.7	-3.1	7.6
1959	65.8	77.0	-11.2	7.6
1960	75.7	74.9	+0.8	9.2
1961	75.2	79.3	-4.1	9.0
1962	79.7	86.6	-6.9	9.1
1963	83.6	90.1	-6.5	9.9
1964	87.2	95.8	-8.6	10.7
1965	90.9	94.8	-3.9	11.4
1966	101.4	106.5	-5.1	12.0
1967	111.8	126.8	-15.0	13.4
1968	114.7	143.1	-28.4	14.6
1969	143.3	148.8	-5.5	16.6
1970	143.2	156.3	-13.1	19.3
1971	133.7	163.7	-30.0	20.8
1972	148.8	177.7	-28.9	21.2
1973 ¹	152.6	190.4	-37.8	22.7
20-year total	1,929.3	2,140.6	211.3	241.9

¹ Estimated figures.

Source: Office of Management and Budget and Treasury Department.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia has a great deal of wisdom in the area of fiscal responsibility, and I know we will enjoy working to-

gether very much, indeed, when we bring up the Roth measure, which would place a ceiling on the Federal budget.

I do not think there is any way we can handle this problem other than to say, "This is the ceiling." I am delighted that the President supports it, and I think we can do what we did in 1968 when the Williams bill was passed and we required, for the first time, a \$10 billion cut. That is the way to handle the budget—by controlling expenditures.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I am glad to join my friend from Illinois in putting a limit on expenditures, and I shall be glad to support putting a limit on the debt.

Mr. PERCY. I accept the first offer, and I will consider the second.

CONSTITUTION WEEK

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, during this week we celebrate the 185th anniversary of the signing of the U.S. Constitution.

This is an occasion when each of us should review this document which protects our civil rights and outlines our civil responsibilities.

Since its signing on September 17, 1787, the Constitution has withstood the challenges of time and the impact of new philosophies and concepts of government. Throughout the years, the Constitution has served as the polar star which kept our system of government on course toward the creation of a "more perfect union."

The fact that it remains the oldest written Constitution in active use illustrates the timelessness of its ideals and the foresight of our Founding Fathers. Knowing that an inflexible Constitution could not deal with changing times and circumstances, they drafted a document which established the essential framework for the American Nation. Succeeding generations, while recognizing the permanence of the basic ideals contained in its articles, have added to the document other amendments required to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." The fact that only 26 amendments have been ratified until the present indicates that change is made with care and caution.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest potential threats to the liberties expressed in the Constitution are indifference and political expediency. Through indifference to the violation of the rights of some, the treasured rights of all are also threatened. Through political expediency, some might attempt to turn the basic yet fluid framework into a rigid structured monolith. For the sake of the country we must not let either possibility occur.

It is the duty of each citizen to know both his rights and responsibilities under our Constitution. Only then will each of us be assured the rights which we all enjoy. During Constitution Week, I would

hope that each person in this Nation, in studying the provisions of this timely, yet timeless cornerstone of our Nation, would contemplate the circumstances of its development and the continuing responsibility of each of us to fulfill its purpose.

For the interest of my colleagues, an editorial and a "Letter to the Editor" on "Constitution Week" from the September 18 edition of the New Britain, Conn., Herald follows:

CONSTITUTION WEEK

Just what relevance does the United States Constitution have in the daily life of an American citizen in today's society? Does it dominate his life, or is it merely a once-important document that launched a country but has now lost most of its meaning?

These are solid questions to ask yourself at anytime, but especially this week which has been proclaimed by federal and state leaders as "Constitution Week." Hardly ever in this nation's history have the rights and responsibilities embodied in the Constitution been more in doubt, more ignored, or held in contempt than they are now.

"We the people of the United States," our forefathers wrote in the Constitution, "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

But who among us constantly strives for the common good, tranquility and welfare? How many of us are truly interested in achieving a "more perfect union"?

There's a dignity of life written in the Constitution that is somehow lost in today's society. It has been crowded out of our lives by prejudice, deceit, dishonesty and self-righteousness. Freedom of speech, probably our most precious liberty, has come to mean shouting, a drowning out of the other person's opinion. Originally intended to facilitate an easy interchange of ideas and opinions, this right only too often produces a lot of noise, bereft of dignity or respect for contrary views.

Look around: Do you really care what another person thinks, whether that person is your husband, wife, child, co-worker or neighbor? Or do you hold him in esteem merely because he's willing to listen to your views or complaints? Do you accept your responsibility to work with him for a better existence for both of you, and for the other people in your life?

This country's Constitution is still a great and relevant document, but it can't be expected to work on a "grand" scale if person-to-person cooperation and dignity is lacking. Think about it this week: What are you doing to keep your own rights, freedoms and responsibilities alive for yourself and for others?

CONSTITUTION WEEK OBSERVANCE URGED

DEAR EDITOR:

The Esther Stanley Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution would like to call attention to the fact that the week of Sept. 27-23, has been designated by an act of Congress and by proclamation of the President, as Constitution Week.

The Federalist Papers were written to explain the Constitution, which was being considered for adoption by the several states of our Nation. Thomas Jefferson called this collection of essays "the best commentary on the principles of government ever written." The Constitution was finally ratified by late 1788, and George Washington became our first President in April, 1789. The U.S. Constitution was a triumph of conservative statesmanship. The framers of this document deserve much

credit for the success of our Republic; although this body of men actually lacked faith in the people, they nonetheless composed a document which set up a government structure that could be converted into government by the people without bloodshed. The framers of the Constitution insisted in 1787, and the Constitution insists today, that law is the price of liberty; duty is the price of happiness; social order is the price of individual development; deliberation is the price of wise decision; and Constitutionalism is the price of Democracy.

This being the 185th anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution, we urge all citizens to rededicate this period for thoughtful study and consideration of the events that led to the framing of the Constitution, and of the means of preserving it from those who would destroy or weaken it. In appropriate observance, all residents, merchants and public buildings should display the U.S. flag each day during Constitution Week.

MAY H. KLOBBER,

Chairman of National Defense, Esther Stanley Chapter, DAR.

LEE HAMILTON'S WASHINGTON REPORT ON THE ISSUES FACING AMERICA'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I include the second in my series of Washington Reports on the issues facing America's public schools:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN
LEE HAMILTON

The growing crisis over the funding of public schools has fostered efforts to find alternatives for the reform of the present system. Proposals for more equitable school financing fall into three categories: (1) reform of the present state-local fund sharing system, (2) assumption by the states of the revenue-raising efforts now exercised by local authorities, and (3) increased federal assistance.

REFORM OF THE PRESENT SYSTEM

The states now provide 40.9 percent of the total, nationwide revenues for secondary and elementary education. However, the methods of distribution are such that serious disparities exist in total school revenues between poor and wealthy school districts. This is mostly due to the political necessity of giving all districts a share of state funds, and consequently the rich districts are made richer while the poor districts do not receive enough to close the gap between them and their wealthy neighbors.

Some of the proposals to modify existing systems of shared state and local funding include:

1. The standardization of property assessment methods and tax rates, which would equalize local tax burdens and have some equalizing effect on revenues in poorer areas where assessments are below the state's average.
2. Adjustment of the state formula for distribution of school funds to equalize per-pupil revenues for all districts.
3. Tying state aid to local tax efforts, in which the state would guarantee a particular level of per-pupil funding to school districts taxing themselves at a prescribed rate. Those choosing to tax themselves at a lower tax rate would receive a proportionately lower level of state support.
4. Create new school district boundaries to equalize financial resources among the school districts.

While the proposals do provide a more equitable method of state and local funding of public education, they ignore some very difficult political realities: (1) the equalization of state distribution of funds would be resisted by the richer districts, whose funds would be given to poorer districts, and (2) the restructuring of school district boundaries would be resisted by richer districts whose resources would be spread over poorer areas.

FULL STATE FUNDING

Giving the states full responsibility for all non-federal educational funding, the approach favored by the President's Commission, would involve two principal tasks: Changes in taxation, and the establishment of an equitable formula for the allocation of funds to school systems.

Changes in taxation almost certainly would involve the reform of property tax to distribute more evenly the tax burden, either by establishing a state-wide taxing rate, or by establishing varying rates to accommodate special educational costs in different school districts. New revenue sources also would be developed, and conceivably, school support could draw on income and sales taxes, revenues, and possibly from value-added taxes.

FEDERAL AID

Federal aid, which now amounts to about 7.1 percent of the total cost of elementary and secondary education, has been directed to special educational needs, such as low income areas, or areas where federal installations decrease the local property tax base.

Expanded federal aid programs could serve to reduce disparities in financial resources among the states, alleviate the disparities in existing state-local funding methods, substitute for local property tax revenues, or be used to induce states to reform their school finance methods.

A number of bills calling for increased federal aid have been introduced in the Congress, but early action is not expected on any of them. Much additional research, reflection and debate is needed before a consensus on the best kind of assistance develops.

VARIOUS ASPECTS OF WHEAT SALE TO RUSSIA AND THE COMPLEXITIES

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there are those who have had-mouthed the recently announced U.S. wheat sale to the U.S.S.R. even stooping to the point of maligning the integrity of U.S. Department of Agriculture officials because of alleged questions of timing.

While I am the first to express my belief that the American people are entitled to know the ramifications of large Government transactions which affect the lives and economic well-being of our people, nevertheless the timing of the recent attack on this grain sale can hardly be viewed as anything but political in motivation and may very well jeopardize our chances for future grain transactions and jeopardize an increase in income to the American farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Mr. Dean Parsons, president of the Great Plains Wheat, Inc., in a letter to the editor of the Washington Post of September 14 placed the whole issue of the grain sale

in perspective. I wish to have this fine analysis included in the RECORD at this time:

VARIOUS ASPECTS OF WHEAT SALE TO RUSSIA AND THE COMPLEXITIES

You have recently carried various articles and editorials about the U.S. grain sale to Russia. Various aspects of this sale should be pointed out to those not familiar with the wheat industry and the complexity of grain trading.

It is a tribute to American agriculture that the U.S. could supply any one country an estimated 400 million bushels of wheat in one year. Fears that the U.S. could be running out of wheat and protests that the U.S. would even run short appear to be unfounded. Even with the Russian business, U.S. wheat stocks are expected to be about 600 million bushels by the end of June 1973. This does not even begin to consider the 1973 wheat crop, part of which will be available as early as May 1973. With the recent increase in wheat prices, the winter wheat acreage should be substantially expanded this year. Considering the amount of land which could quickly be shifted into the short production cycle of wheat, it is difficult to conceive of the U.S. even being short of wheat.

Much has been made of the export payments for wheat exports, but little light has been shed on how this program works. Exports subsidies, which are but a fraction of the money the wheat sale to Russia will bring into the U.S., do not normally leave this country. Nor do they necessarily become part of the exporter's profit. If an exporter has sold wheat at the equivalent of \$1.65 per bushel and he has to cover the wheat on a domestic market which has risen to \$1.85 per bushel, he has not pocketed the amount of the subsidy paid over the \$1.65. The subsidy accrues to the benefit of the seller of the wheat—a farmer, a farm cooperative, a grain elevator, a grain dealer or a speculator not connected with the grain trade.

In calculating the amount expended for export subsidies, it is also necessary to consider some very important offsetting factors: A large reduction in USDA payments to keep acreage out of production; significant government savings on storage and interest payments if the wheat had remained in grain elevators in the U.S.; and government sales of wheat stocks on the open market at prices higher than those at which it acquired the wheat, thereby making a profit which is used to apply against export subsidies paid.

Without the export subsidy program, the U.S. is hard pressed to compete with monopoly state trading organizations such as the Canadian Wheat Board on sales of this magnitude. The Canadian Wheat Board can, for example, name a price to a customer for an entire quantity, and the price is maintained no matter what else the market does. The Wheat Board also controls and may limit the prices farmers get for their grain. In the U.S., this would be impossible, since the market is free and moves freely in response to buying activity. A seller could suffer incredible losses if he had to sell at a fixed price and had no assurances that the f.o.b. port price would remain relatively unchanged, for this is what the wheat boards of other exporting countries do. Without some sort of assurance, the shipper could not even begin to consider accepting such an order, and the business would be lost to the U.S. If the effort was less than perfect it should be perfected, because otherwise the U.S. will be shunted aside in world trade—and not merely in grain trade—while other governments secure the benefits of international trade for their people.

It must by now be obvious to everyone that the United States must improve its balance of payments and this most logically through an improvement in its balance of

trade. Most economists find it difficult to see this improvement coming in trade of industrial products, considering the almost insurmountable competition from countries such as Japan and members of the European Community. More and more we are looking to agriculture to provide the improvement, and the U.S. farmer and the U.S. Department of Agriculture are aware of the responsibility which has fallen to them. Expanded agricultural exports to the Eastern Bloc countries figure large in this effort.

Victims of the unfavorable attention which has been focused on the Soviet sale are two USDA officials who appear to have been more guilty of unfortunate timing than of bad intentions. Those who know Clarence Palmy and Clifford Pulvermacher know they have always been dedicated public servants. To infer a connection in the timing of the sale announcement and their departure from the Department of Agriculture appears to be straying far afield. Mr. Pulvermacher announced over a year ago, well before he had any inkling of this year's sale, that he would retire this year. Mr. Palmy had for months prior to the sale and well before he could have known it would take place or that it would be so large, intimated rather openly that he would soon be leaving the Department of Agriculture. If the USDA made a mistake in judgment it was in not being prepared for the Soviet purchases. The USDA had expected the Soviets to purchase some grains but felt sure it would be feed grains and not wheat. There were also some early indications that the Soviet crops could be short this year, although no one—including undoubtedly also the Soviets—could have guessed very early the extent of the shortfall.

The grain sale to Russia is a positive action and should be applauded, not criticized. It is undoubtedly far better for the wheat farmer, the farm implement manufacturer, all of agribusiness, the people they employ, and the U.S. citizen to see agriculture on a firm basis by putting idle acreage into production and selling on the world markets the produce which is not needed at home.

DEAN PARSONS,
President, Great Plains Wheat, Inc.
WALL, S. DAK.

SOCIAL SECURITY: WHEN A RAISE IS NOT A RAISE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, millions of low-income elderly and disabled people are discovering that they will receive little or no benefit from the 20-percent social security increase, because of cutbacks in other federally assisted programs. More than 50 House Members are now sponsoring legislation to deal with this problem by requiring that the 20-percent increase be disregarded when determining benefit levels for other Federal programs.

The following article from the Minneapolis Star provides a good case example of the need for this measure:

SOCIAL SECURITY: WHEN A RAISE IS NOT
(By Joe Blade)

Along with 29 million other Americans, Mrs. Mary Freed will get a 20-percent increase in her Social Security payments Oct. 3.

Big deal!

Mrs. Freed's monthly check will go up \$27 to \$162.40. Because of that increase:

Her rent will rise from \$26 to \$33 on her efficiency apartment administered as public housing in an old building at 1706 Stevens Av.

Her aid-to-the-disabled payments of \$22 a month will cease. She will be over the limit (\$78 plus rent) that set by the state as the maximum financial aid level.

The medical assistance (medicaid) program will drop her. She will be reinstated, however, as soon as she spends \$80.40 on medical costs. Then she would go on medicaid again, but only for six months.

She should spend that amount quickly because she takes medication for diabetes, a heart condition, pains in her legs, a steel ball in her shoulder and, not surprisingly, "nerves."

Her total expenses are going to run at least \$42.80 a month more because of that \$27 increase in Social Security.

"Why in hell when a person gets to 65 and no good don't they take a person out and shoot him instead of torturing him to death?" she said. "I would if I was running things."

Mrs. Freed is a 65-year-old widow. She is one of millions of Americans who will benefit only slightly or not at all from the largest Social Security increase in history.

The reason: When an electioneering Congress approved the 20-percent boost with an eye on the elderly vote, it failed to make adjustments in other assistance programs.

It is the poorest of America's elderly who face tragedy as a result. It is they who most need extra income from Social Security as well as aid from other programs.

But because those benefits are based on income, they will lose much—or all—of that 20-percent boost. Some will lose the other assistance as well. It works like this:

Old Age Assistance such as aid to the disabled and to the Blind must be cut virtually dollar-for-dollar as the recipient's income increases.

In 1970 Congress exempted \$4 of that year's Social Security raise from cuts in Old Age Assistance. There was no such action this year. And that \$4 exemption expires on December 31 of this year.

Food stamps will be lost by 1,269 of Hennepin County's 4,359 Social Security recipients who now purchase them. Their income will rise above the maximum of \$180 for a single person and \$245 for a couple.

Another 2,297 persons will pay more for their stamps. For example, one 72-year-old man whose Social Security is going up \$30 to \$178.50 a month will pay \$26 for \$36 worth of stamps. He had been paying \$24.

Public-housing rent is fixed at 25 percent of income after deductions for certain expenses. When a tenant's income goes up, a quarter of the increase is added to the rent.

Some tenants may be pushed above maximum incomes of \$4,300 for single persons and \$5,200 for couples, again figured after certain deductions.

But the extra income will not be a basis for eviction until the tenant's regular two-year eligibility review, promises James Lemley, director of management at the Minneapolis Housing and Redevelopment Authority.

Medicaid, or medical assistance for the poor, will be lost by about 700 of Hennepin County Social Security recipients who now receive it.

Almost all of these persons will be returned, welfare department officials believe, after a "spend-down." If six months' income over maximum levels—\$145 for individuals and \$202 for couples plus a \$4 "pass-through" goes for medical expenses, they become eligible for the next six months.

Veterans pensions for impoverished veterans and their dependents also are reduced as income increases. However, the reduction is

less than dollar for dollar and is least for recipients with the lowest incomes.

Furthermore, none of these pensions will be changed until the end of the year, giving Congress time to act.

The buck stops with Congress if the rules are to change. The state Legislature could raise the outdated standards in Old Age Assistance, but the Legislature does not convene until 1973.

A variety of bills have been introduced in Congress to eliminate taking back money through one program that was handed out through another.

Minneapolis Rep. Donald Fraser is one of 55 co-sponsors of a bill that would require the entire Social Security increase to be disregarded by other programs.

The problem now is that the November election which was a major cause of the problem, now is so near that Congress may adjourn before cleaning up the conflicts.

EVALUATION OF OUR NATIONAL PRIORITIES THE EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, the congressional legislative questionnaire is one of the most important vehicles available to the Members of Congress to reach out and secure a real grassroots, cross-section of views and opinions of our respective constituencies and the exchange of this data among our colleagues here in the Congress has provided a unique and viable sounding board for us to be guided by in developing and passing legislation to meet the critical needs of the people of our country and help shape and direct the destiny of our democracy in domestic and international relations.

Conversely, these legislative questionnaires give our respective constituents an opportunity to analyze and evaluate the goals and achievements of Congress and, in turn, to have their say the American way as to their feelings and recommendations on what we are doing and what we should be doing to respond to their needs and help resolve the major issues of deep and vital concern to all of our people.

The congressional redistricting that has taken place this year has changed the constituency in my district as well as those in many other regions of our country. West Paterson and Little Falls of Passaic County have been placed in the 11th Congressional District of New Jersey; Garfield and Wallington of Bergen County have been placed in my Eighth Congressional District. I am looking forward to receiving the replies to my biannual questionnaire from my newly redistricted constituency, which geographically and statistically speaking may be different than my previous constituency, but this 1972 legislative questionnaire will be the consensus of the people of the Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey which, combined with

the responses from the constituencies of all of our respective districts, will provide a highly valuable bellweather to all of us in forming judgments and exercising our responsibilities to all of our people.

I think it is imperative that my colleagues here in the House continue to exchange this valuable data and would suggest that, in addition to sharing our constituencies' evaluations with each other, we by all means must disseminate the results of our legislative questionnaires among the members of our respective governing bodies, State legislators, and all public officials of our communi-

ties. As soon as my 1972 Congressional Legislative Questionnaire is ready and the tabulation completed, I will provide the results to the aforementioned officials in order that all of those serving in Government will be privy to the reflections, thoughts, and views of the constituency in the Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey.

The cooperation of the residents of my district in taking the time and effort to study, evaluate, and respond to my legislative questionnaire is indeed deeply appreciated by me and I am proud of their responsiveness, interest, and concern for their government and the

critical issues of the day. As a yardstick or measurement of the action taken by this Congress and our achievements in meeting the priorities established by the constituency of my Eighth Congressional District, I am recording here in our legislative journal for comparative purposes the views and observations that I received in response to the congressional legislative questionnaire I provided the residents of my district just prior to the commencement of the 92d Congress. Mr. Speaker, a tabulation by percentages of the responses I received to my previous legislative questionnaire is as follows:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Our involvement in Vietnam has now reached the 14-year point. What course should we now pursue?			
(a) Step up military action to defeat North Vietnam and the Viet Cong?	55.4	22.3	22.3
(b) Proceed with gradual withdrawal of our troops leaving the battlefield fighting to the South Vietnamese, but continuing our conference efforts to bring peace to the area?	64.9	16.3	18.8
(c) Should Congress set a definite date for withdrawal of our troops?	25.9	49.8	24.3
(d) Complete withdrawal of our military forces leaving the decision to be reached on the future of South Vietnam to those principally involved—South Vietnam, North Vietnam, and the Viet Cong?	31.4	42.5	26.1
(e) Should the Congress of the United States exercise a stronger partnership with the President in all matters of international involvement or should they, contrary to their explicit responsibility under the Constitution, limit their participation to the singular determinations of the executive branch of the Government?	48.3	17.3	34.4
2. Would you favor enactment of legislation compelling a President to get congressional approval before sending or committing American troops to any foreign land?	54.6	39.4	6.0
3. Should we hold in abeyance further testing and development of the expensive Safeguard antiballistic missile system (ABM) and the multiple war head missiles (MIRV) until an agreement is reached or not reached on arms control at the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) being held by the United States and Russia?	35.8	42.1	22.1
4. Should we sharply reduce the size of our troop assignments in Europe and Asia with a 2-fold purpose—placing greater responsibility on other nations to maintain peace in their areas and to make more funds available for our domestic programs?	78.4	15.7	5.9
5. Do you favor the United States selling additional Phantom and Sky Hawk airplanes to Israel?	54.4	30.1	15.5
6. Should the Federal Government be required by law to share national tax revenues with State and local governments?	65.1	19.8	15.1
7. Do you feel voluntary restraints by all sectors of the economy would be sufficient to slow down inflation?	28.8	57.5	13.7
8. As a last resort would you favor wage, price, profit and credit controls?	63.6	25.5	10.9
9. With regard to the environment, do you favor:			
(a) Barring lead in gasoline?	68.2	11.7	20.1
(b) Heavier fines and stricter enforcement of the laws against industrial pollution of our air and water?	91.9	1.2	6.9
10. Do you favor additional scholarships and loans for college students from low- and middle-income families?	65.2	21.3	13.5
11. Do you think that more comprehensive programs of employment training and opportunities, educational opportunities, and improved housing would significantly ease racial tensions in our cities?	50.7	40.4	8.9
12. President Nixon has proposed a welfare plan under which a federally guaranteed income would be available to those on relief and which also provides benefits for the working poor. Do you think the idea is a good one?	43.5	40.9	15.6
13. Would you favor the establishment of a complete volunteer military force and the ending of selective service (the draft) keeping in mind greatly increased salary cost to attract volunteers?	45.2	45.3	9.5
14. Do you favor a system which provides for alternative services (governmental, VISTA, Peace Corps, Red Cross) to military service?	50.8	37.7	11.5
15. Should the Federal Government set quotas to limit foreign imports of certain products to protect American industry from foreign competition?	59.6	29.6	10.8
16. In order to meet the financial needs of our own country's domestic priorities, should the Federal Government cut back foreign aid and limit assistance to those countries whose security is considered to be in the vital interest of the United States?	68.4	21.6	10.0
17. Would you favor making it a criminal offense to mail unsolicited or unasked for pornographic advertising to a person—adult or minor?	76.8	17.2	6.0
18. Do you favor election of Presidents by popular vote in place of the present electoral college system?	82.7	11.5	5.8
19. Do you favor a requirement that packages be labeled to show the per unit cost of an item?	84.0	9.0	7.0
20. Do you favor Federal funding for drug abuse education and stricter Federal control?	84.1	10.3	5.6
21. Do you favor additional funding of Federal rehabilitation programs for narcotic addicts?	66.8	21.5	11.7
22. The House recently passed a bill increasing social security benefits by 5 percent and with an escalator clause to keep pace with the cost of living. Do you think this is appropriate and adequate?	62.3	26.3	11.4

PARCEL POST DAMAGE CUT 25 PERCENT

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I welcomed the recent announcement made by the U.S. Postal Service which called attention to the fact that parcel post damage has been cut 25 percent.

It is certainly no secret that the American public has become annoyed with the Postal Service's past record of parcel damage. But, as a result of the Postal Reorganization Act, progress is now being made.

I have been told that a new system of parcel post processing centers—the bulk mail network—is scheduled to be in full operation by the end of 1975. This streamlined, mechanized system will handle the Nation's bulk mail volume more efficiently and at a reduced cost.

Meanwhile, the Postal Service has begun to improve parcel post service by

eliminating excessive package drops from conveyors and by replacing worn equipment with new mechanized systems. It has been projected that the Postal Service will cut damage to parcels 50 percent by next summer.

I am pleased to call attention to such efforts being made by the Postal Service to improve mail service, especially in the area of parcel post.

TIPPECANOE COUNTY IN INDIANA HAS HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1972

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring an editorial on the high educational level of one of the counties in my Congressional District to the attention of my colleagues. I am proud to note the editorial which appeared in the September 11 issue of La-

fayette Journal and Courier commends Tippecanoe for having the highest average level of education among all Indiana counties. This is particularly pleasing to me as a member of the Education and Labor Committee and the Select Subcommittee on Education.

In commemoration of this achievement, I insert the editorial into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

HIGHEST IN THE STATE

Tippecanoe County can take deserved pride in its record for education as disclosed by a recent survey by the United States Bureau of Census.

Tippecanoe was rated tops among all of Indiana's counties in the level of education reached with 69.5 per cent of the males 25 and older and 66.5 per cent of the women in that category having completed high school.

The median educational level attained by Tippecanoe County residents was 12.6 years for men and 12.4 for women. And 57 per cent of the males and 40 per cent of the women here between 20 and 49 have completed one or more years of college.

Only Monroe County came close to the Tippecanoe County record, with 67.3 per cent of the men and 64.4 per cent of the women being high school graduates.

The records of these two counties contain a single common denominator and that is, each is the seat of one of the nation's great universities. So the presence of Purdue and Indiana must account for much of the achievement.

Certainly the impressive presence of these big centers of learning carries in its impact a high regard for all education, as well as a better access to it. Thus the luck in our histories that brought these colleges to us has rewarded us handsomely.

There is a further impact from the universities, and that is a generally higher economic level for the entire community in the higher per capita income engendered by its payroll and in the kinds of jobs that the generally higher educational level attracts to a city. This, in turn, has provided the means for better support of education.

The wallings at the high cost of education have grown and some still claim that the investment has not paid off. But an examination of the counties lower in educational achievement will reveal more stinting on educational budgets, and a lower level of the "good life" for the community—not to mention fewer and lower opportunities.

The counties that have been sufficiently impressed with education to support and use it to the maximum of their ability have been the ones to profit most from its product in terms of jobs, income levels, better kinds of jobs, and a more viable community.

So, doubtless, we have Purdue here, and Bloomington has Indiana there, to thank for our records of educational achievement and its rewards. But we also have the resolution of our populaces to thank for backing their appreciation for education with the support they have given it over the year.

With the Census Bureau's confirmation of our educational achievement, we must not allow expediency to tempt us to diminish our regard and support for this fundamental commodity.

PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTEES ARE AN EXTENSION OF OFFICIAL POLICY

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, making appointments is perhaps one of a President's most important and most underrated duties. So far as appointments to the judicial system are concerned, they are perhaps his immortality. But while President Nixon's appointments to the courts have been widely noticed, criticized or applauded, little is said about his ambassadorships; and the President's choice of ambassadors leaves much to be desired.

For example, he has sent a Texas oilman to South Africa, a man named John Hurd. The U.S. official line on South Africa is that we are opposed to apartheid, that we would not oppose erosion of apartheid from within. But policy differs from policy statements. Policy is billions of dollars of investments in apartheid-ruled countries. Policy is sending over an ambassador who, according to columnist Jack Anderson, uses black political prisoners to pick up pheasants in his hunting expeditions, and who refers to black Africans as "Nigras."

I have recently learned of another in-

stance in which policy and pronouncements do not match—when we look at the character and behavior of a U.S. ambassador abroad.

The official line on the Paris Peace Talk is that we are doing everything possible to achieve peace through discussion. Policy is sending a peacemaker to Paris who is ignorant, rude, and insensitive.

On September 15, 1972, I received a letter from Mr. Cyrus Eaton concerning his recent trip to Paris. He told me that he had met with representatives of France, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, North Vietnam and the Vietcong Provisional Government. He learned that, "Porter's offensive and belittling attitude posed an insurmountable stumbling block to reaching agreements with the other side." It is an inescapable conclusion that Porter's demeanor amounts to official policy.

When Cyrus Eaton talks about peace, the diplomatic community should give him its full attention. When he says, "Unless Porter is replaced, there is absolutely no hope for the negotiations," then I believe him and this Congress should also. His judgment on questions of this nature is infallible.

Mr. Eaton sent me a clipping, from the September 8 International Herald Tribune, describing Ambassador Porter's rude and disgraceful conduct. And as Mr. Eaton told me—

Bad as [this report] is, I am told that it is mild compared to what Porter actually said.

The article follows:

[From the International Herald-Tribune, Paris, Sept. 8, 1972]

INSULTS EXCHANGED BY ENVOYS, AT PARIS PEACE NEGOTIATIONS

PARIS, September 7.—U.S. Ambassador William J. Porter today labeled the Viet Cong's Provisional Revolutionary Government "the southern branch of Hanoi's war machine."

He got a prompt, angry reaction from the Communist side at the Paris peace talks. "Fallacious allegations and empty lies," said the Viet Cong's chief delegate, Mrs. Nguyen Thi Binh, to newsmen at the end of the 158th session.

"An escalation of provocation," said Nguyen Minh Vy, North Vietnam's deputy negotiator, still replacing Xuan Thuy, who is said to be resting on doctor's orders.

Saying the peace conference must deal with facts, Mr. Porter objected to the "pretentiousness of the titles" used by the Viet Cong.

"It would simplify matters here were you to abandon ridiculous pretenses and accept the fact that the world perceives the Viet Cong as the southern branch of Hanoi's war machine—for it is nothing more than that," he said.

At a press briefing, Viet Cong spokesman Ly Van Sau snapped that Mr. Porter "should make another tour of duty in Vietnam to learn the reality, but naturally in certain regions he will need the permission of the Provisional Revolutionary Government."

Mr. Porter said the Viet Cong are not provisional "for they are only the latest embodiment of a conspiracy beginning with the Indochinese Communist party 40 years ago."

"Nor are they revolutionary, for nothing could be more reactionary than to persist in Asia's old miseries of war and oppression," Mr. Porter continued.

MOBILIZATION AND COMBAT

The U.S. chief delegate said the Viet Cong's problem "is its lack of representativity. No

one elected it into offices it doesn't fulfill, it administers nothing, and the only programs it carries out are mobilization and combat under external orders."

Mrs. Binh responded that the American program of Vietnamization "is going bankrupt irretrievably" and this had led the United States "from one defeat to another." She said the Saigon army has "proved the inability of its existence without the massive support of U.S. air, naval and logistic forces."

The delegations agreed to meet again next Thursday.

A RARE MAN

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday morning, many of my colleagues and I attended the funeral service of a dear friend, and our respected and admired colleague, William Fitts Ryan.

From the moment I received word of his death, I knew that a time would come in which we—his colleagues—would join in eulogy, and I tried from that moment on to extract from Bill's life story that one deed, that one act, that one bold position that would be considered the hallmark of his career. It would be to this that I would address myself today.

On Monday evening, I went to the funeral home in New York City to visit Priscilla and their children and perhaps, in some way, share their burden. But, with the same strength and fortitude that Bill so often displayed, it was Priscilla and the children who were giving comfort to those who came.

Yet, at the funeral service on Wednesday morning, a young man of 21 rose to tell us about his father. The young man, in his own words, managed to speak not only for his mother, his sisters, his grandparents, and friends, but for all those who loved Bill Ryan, for all those who felt a great burden by his death, and for all those who were suffering a deep loss.

I will read the words of William Fitts Ryan, Jr., and I am sure we will all agree that Bill, Jr., speaks for all of us:

EULOGY BY WILLIAM F. RYAN, JR.

My father was a rare man. Rare because in an era of growing cynicism he kept faith. In a time when people were losing their values he strengthened his. When fighting injustice seemed to be passe—he fought harder. Always trying, always straining to the utmost to fight any injustice, inequity, or wrongdoing. He was a perpetual champion of what is best.

Yes, my father was a rare man. A man about whom it could be said he had no price. A man who would not be tempted except by justice.

Integrity never had a more faithful follower than Bill Ryan.

Yes, dad was a rare man, no great backslapper, no great hall fellow-well-met but a man who inspired people, enlarged lives, and created love—love from every kind of people—young and old; rich and poor.

And now he is gone. A short life well-lived. He set a standard—a standard of integrity and courage.

His first congressional vote was for civil liberties—his last against the war in Vietnam. All the votes and congressional activities in between were based on the same sense of justice, the same fundamental decency

and integrity which motivated the first and the last.

Throughout his career he not only voted and acted according to his conscience but also never forgot he was his people's servant. Underneath what some saw as a powerful and demanding personality was a deep humility and compassion. The sense that he was there to serve not to be served. He had a warm humanitarian's heart; people meant something personal to him; he tried to help those who needed assistance as he sought to aid a friend—he was just plain color blind—he could not see black or white or yellow or brown—he just saw people—human beings; his brothers and sisters in the human family.

In paying their last respects it was the many constituents—the people he served—who gave the greatest witness to his goodness.

I can think of no better way to describe the standard that my father followed than that which is said in the following quotation by Edmund Burke:

"Certainly, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinions high respect; their business unremitting attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasure, his satisfactions, to theirs—and above all, ever, and in all cases to prefer their interest to his own. But his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure—no, nor from the law and the Constitution. They are a trust from providence for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable."

Dad was a rare man and we are grateful to him for coming to us and we will miss him greatly.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I insert a statement of my financial assets and liabilities:

Equity in conditional sales contract of real estate, 208 E. 29th St., Indianapolis, \$4,000.

Store building, 227-235 E. Ohio Street, Indianapolis, \$95,000.

House, 207 C St. SE., Washington, D.C., \$55,000.

GI endowment insurance—cash value, \$6,225.70.

U.S. Government retirement fund—amount paid in with interest, \$21,934.64.

Oldsmobile, 1966, F-85—115,000 miles, \$350.

Coin collection, \$100.

Checking account at U.S. House of Representatives, Sergeant at Arms, \$1,008.14.

Savings Account—Indiana National Bank, \$5,369.27.

Household and office furnishings, \$1,500.

Entitlement to Korean War 10 percent disability compensation, waived while in public office—exact future value unknown.

Great Dane dog—C-5, priceless.

Great Dane pup—U-2—not yet house trained, current liability.

INDEBTEDNESS

Mortgage, Metropolitan Building Association—8 percent, \$24,235.36.

STATEMENT CONCERNING BULGARIAN NATIONAL HERO NIKOLA PETKOV

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, on September 23 we mark the 25th anniversary of the judicial murder of the Bulgarian national hero Nikola Petkov.

It is especially fitting in 1972, at a time when there is much discussion of "detente," of an "era of negotiation," and of an "end to the cold war," that we consider the real nature of communism and the manner in which it has brutalized so many freedom-loving peoples.

It is important to reflect upon the history of Bulgaria which led to the tragic death of Nikola Petkov.

After the Communist-inspired Fatherland Front seized the government and the Red army occupied Bulgaria in 1944, the Communists methodically undertook to consolidate their rule. As their control became nearly absolute, an attack was launched on the old Tirnovo constitution, and "popular requests" were trumped up for a new one. In September, 1946, the results of a plebiscite eliminated the monarchy and declared Bulgaria to be a republic. The following month, elections were held for a Grand National Assembly which would enact a new constitution. After the new legislature convened in November, Georgi Dimitrov formed his government.

As far back as July 1954, Nikola Petkov sent a memorandum to the Inter-Allied Control Commission demanding postponement of the elections which the Communists had scheduled for the end of August, 1945. These elections were to involve only one list of candidates, headed by the Communist Party. As a result of the memorandum, the Prime Minister declared that Petkov had resigned, although he never formally did so. In protest, Nikola Petkov and other cabinet ministers broke up the Coalition Government, and thenceforth openly opposed the Communist dictatorship. Upon intervention of the Control Commission, the elections were postponed until November 18, 1945.

In October 1946, Petkov headed the opposition in its election campaign against Communist-Soviet attempts to seize full control of the country. Petkov, after his election, unmasked in Parliament the intentions of the Communists and their leader, Georgi Dimitrov, former Secretary-General of the Comintern. He accused them of being Stalinist agents, and said that their hands were stained with the blood of innocent Bulgarians and that they wanted to make Bulgaria a Soviet province.

For his efforts to keep Bulgaria free and independent, Petkov was charged with conspiracy against the state. He

was sentenced to die on the gallows, and was later secretly executed.

Prior to his execution, a Communist representative promised him a pardon if he signed a petition declaring his repentance. Petkov made this reply:

You are even trying to desecrate my sacred memory. My sentence was passed by your Moscow masters and no one can revoke it. I do not seek mercy from you! I want to die so that my people may be freed sooner.

The Communist leaders of Bulgaria are frank to admit that theirs is a totalitarian state. Vulko Chervenkov, prime minister until 1956, stated that:

No institution, organization, or person can be above the Politburo and the Central Committee. All important issues of the government of the country must be decided by the Politburo and Central Committee. Those guilty of deviation from this Bolshevik rule must be held responsible and punished.

The government which Nikola Petkov sought to keep free and independent has become nothing more than an instrument of Soviet colonialism and tyranny.

Men such as Nikola Petkov have for many years been attempting to tell those of us in the West what communism is really like. Too often, we have refused to listen.

Brave men and women have shown their opinion of communism by fleeing from it whenever the opportunity has arisen. The Berlin Wall was constructed, in violation of all international law and allied agreements, because the people of East Germany would not, of their own accord, remain in a Communist state. Macao and Hong Kong contain millions of Chinese who have fled from the tyranny of Mao Tse-tung. More than 1 million Vietnamese fled to the South after the Communists took over North Vietnam, and tens of thousands of North Korean soldiers refused repatriation at the end of the Korean war. The Communists do not permit people to vote with ballots, so the people have voted against communism with their feet, the only means available to them.

Those who naively say that communism is not really a danger should review the careers of men such as Nikola Petkov, men who, in their own time, argued against the concept of a "popular" or "united" front with the advocates of tyranny. Such policies did not work then. Bulgaria's enslavement is adequate proof of that fact. Such policies will not work now.

Let us look forward to the day when Bulgaria will once again be free, and when Nikola Petkov will take his rightful place as a national hero who warned his people of the danger of tyranny, but was not heeded. It is my fervent hope that this day will not be too long in coming.

LOU CASSELS OF UPI

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Columbia State, one of the South's lead-

ing newspapers, wrote a splendid editorial commending Lou Cassels.

Formerly senior editor at United Press International, highly distinguished and admired nationally and internationally in the field of journalism, Louis Cassels now resides with his lovely and charming wife, Charlotte, in Aiken, S.C., in my congressional district.

Lou continues to write UPI's "Religion in America" column and is the author of six books and numerous magazine articles. In addition, he teaches journalism at the Aiken branch of the University of South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to share this warm and outstanding editorial with Lou's many friends in the Congress and throughout the Nation.

The article follows:

THE VIGOR OF YOUTH

Veteran journalist Louis Cassels favored his United Press International clients the other day with a perceptive commentary on the role played by trees in making this world both habitable and enjoyable.

The arboreal heroes of his article were the "healthy young trees" which consume carbon dioxide and give out oxygen, meanwhile cooling the atmosphere in the process.

We trust that Mr. Cassels, who has returned to his native Aiken County after having made his name in big-time journalism, will permit us to accentuate the "young" in his reference to our leafy friends.

Too often, overly zealous environmentalists and conservationists rush to the defense of every tree which seems threatened by axe, saw, or bulldozer. In most instances, we tend to agree with their efforts to "spare that tree," but it should be noted that the "healthy, young trees" are the ones which contribute to our ecological welfare.

Old trees, or those which have reached that advanced stage of maturity when their magical chemistry has ceased to function, can outlive their usefulness just as do we mortals. And in the very nature of things, it makes sense for them to yield the way to younger trees which, in the process of growth, purify our air, protect our soil, and beautify the countryside.

This is not to suggest that all trees should be felled upon reaching maturity. Many of them serve usefully as ground cover, shade providers, and scenic sights long after they have passed their prime. But mankind is best served by those "healthy young trees" to which Lou Cassels has fittingly paid tribute.

THE NATURE OF NATIONAL SECURITY

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, today Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN's national security panel presented its report to Senator MCGOVERN.

The panel has produced an excellent analysis covering the basic principles behind Senator MCGOVERN's alternative Defense budget. This document outlines the principles on which Senator MCGOVERN would orient our Defense Establishment. Specific sections are devoted to the nature of national security; the military budget and national priorities; strategic arms; general purpose forces; military

manpower; military procurement; and the conversion of defense production to meet domestic needs.

The report has been prepared by a distinguished group of leaders with special expertise in the defense field. The cochairman of the panel are Paul Warnke, former Assistant Secretary of Defense, Clifford L. Alexander, Jr., a former member of the National Security Council staff, and Herbert F. York, former director of Defense Research and Engineering.

So that my colleagues may become more familiar with the MCGOVERN panel on national security's views, I will be placing in the RECORD for the next several days chapters of the entire panel's report to the Senator.

The first section, entitled "The Nature of National Security," discusses the basic and fundamental principles upon which national security is based.

I recommend it to my colleagues for their careful study.

I. THE NATURE OF NATIONAL SECURITY (Presented by Vice Chairman Clark M. Clifford)

Military power is essential to our national security. But national security does not rest exclusively or even primarily on that military power. To think and act as if it did, in today's world and with today's problems, is delusive and destructive. The Nixon Administration's conceptions of national security and foreign policy reflect this fallacy.

We continue to need military strength to prevent any possibility of attack on our own territory or on allies whose independence contributes to our safety and well-being. But the forces we need for this purpose can be armed and maintained at a cost significantly less than that which we now pay. There must be a new and searching look at the uses and limits of military power, for this is the prerequisite to achieving a new and sensible ordering of priorities and to avoiding the folly of excessive reliance on armed might as an instrument of foreign policy.

Our international influence is best achieved by the attraction our society exerts upon other nations, particularly upon those who now grope for an identity and political form of their own. But unless we find and use the funds that are necessary to deal with our own pressing social, economic and environmental problems, we will be unable to regain the common sense of national purpose, the trust and confidence in each other that are the foundations of our true security. If we cannot again become a society that operates effectively to ensure the health and welfare of all our people, we will cease to attract other nations and thus forfeit our influence.

We cannot cope with our internal problems in the final quarter of the Twentieth Century if we continue to devote the major share of controllable federal revenues to military purposes. Nor are dollar costs alone the most damaging aspect of the present trend. The more ominous consequence of the great increases which will be built into future defense budgets if we embark upon the new, unnecessary weapons programs now proposed by the Nixon Administration is that they can be rationalized only by resort to unreal hypotheses and by evoking baseless fears.

Our mounting domestic difficulties will not go away. If we ignore them because we are transfixed by the remote risks of external aggression and the even more remote danger of penetration by an alien ideology, our national security will indeed be in grave danger. If, instead, we demonstrate the wisdom to take a proportioned view, to maintain those arms and armed forces actually

needed to meet any realistic threats to our physical security, we will find the strength to deal with these threats and with our corrosive domestic problems as well.

A sound start toward this objective is to abandon the mindless rhetoric that now dominates much of the debate about military spending. The Nixon Administration suggests that less lavish expenditures would make us a second-rate power and would eliminate our ability to negotiate effectively with our international competitors. It characterized any attempt at significant reallocation of federal funds as a turn toward isolationism that would endanger world peace. Such loose charges rest on an outmoded and unsound concept of the role of military force in the modern world. We are a first-rate power not only because of our military might, but because we combine vast and diversified economic and technical strength with solid yet flexible democratic institutions. We have more than adequate military strength to preserve our status. What we need is to pay more attention to the future of our political and economic institutions. The Nixon Administration, however, continues to burden our economy with inordinate defense expenditures based on its erroneous assumption that mere military power can achieve peace and stability.

Implicit in the Nixon military planning are three outmoded conceptions about our national security and the military power we need to protect it:

1. that it is our responsibility and destiny to undertake *unilaterally* the policeman's role throughout the world;
2. that our military might should play a decisive role in influencing the political development of other nations;
3. that numerical superiority in weapons connotes, in itself, an improvement in national security.

History has given us special responsibilities in Europe and Israel—responsibilities we will never abandon. Nor can we ignore our formal commitments to Japan, Korea and other nations, even though time has altered their significance. Our commitment to NATO is fundamental and should be supported by American forces sufficient both to deter attack and to maintain the sense of confidence in Europe that attack is remote. With our military aid and in the absence of Soviet intervention, Israel has shown the ability to take care of itself. Present developments on the Korean peninsula give hope that this lingering sore may at last be healed. Japan grows steadily more capable of self-defense except against the nuclear threat. If civil or local war should break out elsewhere, we should make manifest our national interest and concern through diplomatic representations, offers of mediation, economic assistance, and support for multilateral peace-keeping initiatives sponsored by the United Nations. But beyond these steps, military restraint by the United States can do far more to restore stability to troubled places than any indulgence in the pernicious notion that through the use of American armed force we can effect a better, more democratic situation.

We have been told by the President that America must remain the "peacekeeper in the Asian world." And in his recent appearance before the Republican Convention's Platform Committee, Defense Secretary Laird urged there be no "abandonment of the nation's role in helping to maintain peace." We have indeed a responsibility to help in maintaining peace. But it is a responsibility that can rarely be discharged by the introduction of American firepower. Long and painful experience suggests that this leads not to peace but to political dependence, agony and devastation for small countries and to the dire risk of confrontation between the nuclear powers. The time has surely come to renounce any American right

or duty to use military force in other peoples' internal quarrels. We have no manifest authority from mankind to impose our brand of justice as we see fit.

The second outmoded concept of national security is that American armed forces should play a decisive role in the political development of other nations—in particular, that it can be effective in arresting tendencies toward acceptance of a Communist form of government. There was once a time, following World War II, when the spread of Communism was synonymous, or nearly so, with the spread of Russian power. But that time is long since past. At least since the Sino-Soviet split in 1957, Communist ideology has been increasingly a relative doctrine, showing itself in widely differing forms, usually in countries with rigid socio-economic structures or vast disparities between rich and poor. Manifestations of Communism in the contemporary world are not necessarily related to Soviet or Chinese power. From these facts, we need to derive two policy guidelines: First, the threat to us arises from Soviet, and to a lesser extent from Chinese, power; Communist ideology unconnected to Russian or Chinese power is not a serious threat, however baleful we may regard it. Second, like all other ideas, the Communist idea cannot be suppressed by military force. It can be defeated by a better idea.

Our nation has been slow to recognize these important distinctions. Even after the fragmentation of the Communist movement was far advanced, we feared the spread of national liberation wars in which insurgents (often calling themselves Communists) might, with outside help, overthrow Westward-looking governments. In response we developed doctrines and techniques of counter-insurgency and cast ourselves in the role of shoring up all such governments, no matter how dictatorial or corrupt, because they were faced with internal rebellion that called itself communist. Painful experience has now shown us that where a government sympathetic to the United States cannot maintain a broad base of support, even with our economic and military aid, the intervention of American troops is not a solution to its political problems. *A government that is not safe from its own people cannot be saved by American military force.*

Yet immediately after propounding the ambiguous Nixon Doctrine in Guam in 1969, President Nixon told Thailand's military rulers that America would be proud to stand with that government "against those who threaten it from abroad or from within." And reports from Defense Secretary Laird have in the past listed "political agitation" and "insurgency abroad" as threats our armed forces must be prepared to counter. This year's statement omits any such explicit reference, but we still hear disquieting suggestions of the need to cope with "less sophisticated forces" and "the ever-present danger of modern revolutionary warfare." Such expressions look too much like mirror images of the Brezhnev doctrine by which the Kremlin seeks to justify military intervention in Eastern Europe when internal developments threaten the doctrinal purity of another socialist state. A budget which aims at the capability to meet such objectives is not only excessive—it is incompatible with our national security.

The place for ideological competition is not the battlefield but in the free marketplace of ideas and in the quest for social and economic advances. In that arena we can compete with confidence and pride. Our Declaration of Independence affirmed the right of a people to alter or abolish its form of government. No foreign government should look to us for protection from internal change. Counter-insurgency is neither a workable nor a worthy purpose for the application of American military power.

Our collective security arrangements with certain nations help to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and reduce the danger of war. But the maintenance of these arrangements does not require us to intervene in every local conflict throughout the world in a futile attempt to demonstrate the credibility of American security guarantees. It is a false and dangerous doctrine that every local triumph of revolutionary groups somehow weakens the security of Japan, Israel and Western Europe, and therefore demands our intervention. Indeed as Vietnam has amply demonstrated, undertaking such ventures diverts our energies and attention away from building lasting relationships with our allies and ends up weakening the fabric of international relationships upon which our security ultimately rests.

The third outmoded concept is the attribution of political value to the possession of military hardware far in excess of any practical purpose. Repeatedly, the Nixon Administration has claimed political as distinguished from military value for our profligate defense expenditures. We are told that, regardless of the enduring reality of the strategic balance, the mere appearance of Soviet numerical advantage in any weapons category could have a debilitating effect on our foreign policy and would erode the confidence of our allies. We are, for example, urged to worry about the increased number of sailing hours chalked up by the Soviets in the Mediterranean, and this becomes an argument for adding to an American naval capability there that already dwarfs that of the Soviet fleet.

Where a numerical advantage or disadvantage in any part of the arms arsenal is without military meaning, it can have a political meaning only if we give it one. The present attempt to maintain an American edge across the entire range of weapons grossly distorts our allocation of available resources, yet nothing is added to our national security. The Soviet Union has shown it can endure the fact that we have 16 aircraft carriers and they have none. We can surely endure numerical inferiority in certain weapons categories without danger to our real security. Such asymmetry is explicitly recognized in the Interim Offensive Agreement. Indeed the idea of total symmetry is unreal. Our present strategic deterrent is more than adequate for the present and foreseeable future. It is more than adequate to serve as a basis for further SALT talks that are aimed at further control and reduction of strategic arms. These facts would be quite apparent if the Nixon Administration would simply stop "poor mouthing" our capability and viewing the near-term future with spurious alarm.

This report shows that the current U.S. course is the wrong course. It also outlines a new approach to national security. Those who argue that this new approach means a return to isolationism are deceived by their own narrow definition of our national security and of the policies needed to ensure it. For just as our national security itself means more than military power, so our interest in the world and in the preservation of world order involves much more than foreign bases and troops abroad. A pervasive involvement with other nations in trade, in investment and in monetary arrangements is not isolationism. On the contrary it constitutes the basic fabric of world order. We need strong and ready armed forces, but we also need realistic recognition that our armed forces constitute only a moderate part of our international influence and prestige. Only through such recognition can our defense budget be brought within more reasonable bounds.

The following sections of this paper outline our national security needs and how they can be met. The first deals with this stultifying impact of our present military expenditures on our domestic economy and our do-

mestic programs. Next discussed is the vital issue of Strategic Nuclear Forces and what we need to be sure they are never used. Our requirements for General Purpose Forces are then reviewed in the context of what is necessary to deter or meet any military assault on our vital interests. The key issue of military manpower is considered against the current background of poor morale and an unsatisfactory ratio of combat to support forces. The enormous waste and the urgent need for reform in weapons development and procurement are then detailed.

Finally, this report deals with the question of converting to more peaceful and productive uses those industrial facilities now unnecessarily devoted to production of weapons of war. The Nixon Administration seeks to frighten the workers of America into the belief that our economy cannot stand peace. This Marxist notion that a free economy requires the artificial stimulus of war has no legitimate place in our political debate. The genuine needs of our society can be met only if we muster all available talent and technology. These precious assets should not be squandered on the making of arms that yield us no return.

MARKETING GRAIN

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, admittedly the marketing of grain is a very complicated business and difficult to explain in the few words that most readers are willing to read. Given this situation, it could be expected that editorials going enough to the heart of the situation would not be plentiful. I think two such editorials have appeared in newspapers in recent days and that they should be set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to be more readily available to all.

One is an excellent editorial which appeared in the Des Moines Sunday Register of September 17, 1972 and is as follows:

WHAT'S THAT ODOR IN THE GRAIN?

Instead of blustering about a retraction from Senator McGovern for impugning his integrity on the grain deals with Russia, Agriculture Secretary Butz would be well advised to come clean on all the details. Blustering will not remove the suspicion arising from the musical chairs rotation of executives between USDA and the leading grain exporting companies during the time the deals were being made.

There is a strong smell of favoritism in the report by a USDA official Thursday that he was told to inform grain export companies of a change in export subsidy arrangements ahead of the effective deadline. This apparently gave some companies an opportunity to make deals for substantial extra profits.

Butz cannot deodorize this situation by talking about the great benefits to America from large grain sales to Russia—everybody concedes that. But were the benefits dished out evenly or weighted toward the grain companies? Or were honest mistakes made in handling information about the grain deals?

It is clear that many wheat farmers were unable to benefit from the rise in prices caused by the extraordinary sale to Russia. There is doubt that USDA controlled information releases with the farmer's interest in mind. A report by a U.S. agricultural attaché in late June indicating a much shorter Rus-

sian grain crop than previously forecast was not released by USDA.

Can the farmer be sure some members of the grain trade, who obviously are on intimate terms with USDA officials, did not have earlier information than the public? Butz said the release of the Russian crop report was held up because it was "confidential", since it came through diplomatic channels. He said its accuracy was doubted and more information was requested. The latter is a good reason, assuming no hints leaked out to the grain trade.

The most questionable part of this affair is the handing out retroactively of juicy export subsidy payments to the grain companies. When USDA finally realized that the world price (as well as the U.S. price) was being jacked up by the grain sales to Russia, it recognized that the export subsidy was no longer needed. But it gave the exporting companies a week to buy grain and still get in on the subsidies—amounting to 47 cents a bushel by that time.

USDA has long had a reputation for integrity in the release of crop report information and in all handling of agricultural information which is of market significance. Elaborate procedures are followed on assuring fairness and avoiding leaks. The recent happenings in the grain trade and its connections with USDA have shaken farmer and public confidence.

Congress needs to dig all the way into this and not be diverted by the undoubted diplomatic and economic advantages of the grain sales to Russia.

Another editorial I would like to call to the Member's attention is from the Washington Post of September 17, 1972, and it is as follows:

WHEAT, DOLLARS, AND A FEW FAVORS

The more the Agriculture Department explains about the Russian wheat sale, the deeper and more disquieting the questions become. Secretary Butz's evangelistic enthusiasm for the wheat deal is not contagious. This massive transaction now raises several different kinds of issues. First there is the pecuniary scandal, in which a few trading companies made large profits through inside information furnished to them alone by the department. Next there is the failure of American trade negotiating strategy, in which our government was misled and exploited by the Russians. They have taken us on a gigantic hayride that will cost the American public some hundreds of millions of dollars in subsidies and higher domestic prices. Finally, as a matter of foreign policy, we have given the Russians commercial advantages that we do not apparently offer to anyone else. It is a gratuitous affront to our regular and reliable trading partners.

In the scandal, a new element has now come to light. On Aug. 24, the department decided that the export subsidy was finally getting too high and it prepared to abandon its policy of matching price rises with subsidy rises. Someone at the top level of the department told a lower official to call half a dozen trading companies and warn them. The official did in fact telephone half a dozen major traders and passed on the message before the market closed that day. Those whom the department neglected to call were, of course, the others who deal on the same market: domestic businesses like the millers and bakers, the grain cooperatives, the farmers and, if Mr. Butz will pardon the expression, the general public.

The generally accepted way for a government agency to announce a change of policy is to tell the news services, and the generally accepted time is after the close of the market. The department ignored both of those rules.

Wheat is bought and sold on a speculative

and wildly competitive market where inside information is readily convertible into cash. The public will doubtless hear more about the content of these phone calls when Congressman Purcell of Texas continues his hearings on Monday. But it is already established that the department was feeding valuable information to a few selected middlemen, to the obvious disadvantage of both domestic buyers and the wheat farmers.

More broadly, the wheat deal calls into question the competence of the American negotiators who produced this bargain for the Russian government. The Russians needed to buy the wheat a great deal more than we needed to sell it, but they induced us to shell out well over \$100 million in subsidies to entice them. This aspect of the fiasco deserves particular attention, since the administration is now embarking upon further trade agreements with the Russians. In the case of the grain sale, it appears that the people at the top of the department did not fully grasp the meaning of the reports of crop failure from our embassy in Moscow, and the data from the weather satellites. They were persuaded that the Russians mainly wanted to buy feed grain. Instead, Russia went first for wheat and bought one-fourth of the American crop at the low subsidized price.

The Agriculture Department attempts to defend the subsidies by arguing that they are essential to keep our wheat competitive with the world price. As we have said before, the world price this summer was the American selling price. No other nation had wheat for sale in any substantial quantity. This truth is confirmed by the recent announcement of the sale of American wheat to China. The Chinese did not come to the United States to buy it. They went to a French trading company, which came to the United States only after it was unable to buy elsewhere. Our sale to China is also subsidized. China, incidentally, does not suffer a food shortage. It imports wheat because, evidently, it wishes to export its own rice, which it sells at a higher price to earn foreign exchange.

As foreign policy, in the broad sense, the wheat sales are characteristic of the Nixon administration. It has frequently been noted that Mr. Nixon has been much more solicitous, and much more successful, in his dealings with our former adversaries, the Russians and the Chinese, than with our traditional friends and allies. In grain exports, the contrast in our treatment of the Russians and the Japanese is striking.

Congressman Neal Smith of Iowa has pointed out that, in our feed grain sales to Russia late last year, the United States gave the Russians better terms than it was giving the Japanese at that time. In the wheat deal this summer, all buyers presumably got the same price. But the Agriculture Department discriminated in another manner. It held the price low and stable while the Russians were buying. Now that they have bought all they want, the department is letting the price rise. Those who buy steadily, year in and year out, must now pay more. It is an odd way to treat the Japanese at a time when we are berating them for not buying more American products.

Secretary Butz keeps suggesting that this summer's wheat sale opens a vast new market for American grain. Russia is, in fact, a very erratic customer. Russia grows its wheat very far north, where the weather is fierce and the crop fluctuations are extreme. In a bad year like this one, Russia must buy heavily abroad. In a normal year, they buy much less. In a very good year, they put wheat on the world market to compete with ours. Japan, on the other hand, buys American wheat at a constant rate and is, in any normal year, by far our biggest customer for it. Yet it is to the benefit of the Russians that we bend the structure of our subsidies.

THE NATIONAL-DUQUESNE WORKS CELEBRATES 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the National Division of National-Duquesne Works, United States Steel Corp., located in McKeesport, Pa., has just observed its 100th anniversary as a leader in the pipemaking industry of the world.

Its record over the past century is replete with outstanding achievements, not only in the production of pipe and well casings, but in the innovation of new products as well. The National plant's anniversary was the object of public acclaim earlier this month but overshadowing the celebration was the haunting question: What of National's future?

What is in store for this facility which has given so much to the industrial growth of America over more than half of the Nation's nearly 200-year history? Mr. Edgar B. Speer, president of United States Steel Corp., supplied the answer in his speech at the anniversary dinner.

The future of National, and similar plants, Mr. Speer stated, is closely linked to the ability of the plants to supply superior products vital to solving the growing energy crisis which confronts America. There is not a supply of energy fuels to match the obvious demand for their use. Why?

The fact is, as Mr. Speer so accurately notes, America's expanding industrial might and changing life styles is demanding more and more energy in enormous quantities and the effort to meet this demand is one of the greatest challenges in our history. Part of the ability to overcome this challenge rests with the industries involved, but a part also depends on the wisdom, courage and the initiative of the Congress and the Federal Government.

Mr. Speer points out the Federal Government has been lax in not establishing a national energy policy. The Government does not know where our energy will come from in the future or in what form. He also says the present rate of oil and gas drillings are far too low to meet the growing energy burden.

Supporting his view is the National Petroleum Council. In a projection to 1985, the Council sees only a small increase in the production of domestic oil and an actual decrease in domestic natural gas production. They also see the disturbing picture of America's need for these energy fuels depending to a greater degree on imports, particularly oil imports.

Mr. Speer had some intriguing questions about this projection. He wanted to know if this is really the way our country should go? Is it the only way? Can the Federal Government move to alter the apparent course?

Over the past 20 years, Mr. Speer said the Federal Power Commission, which regulates the price of gas in the field, had done such an effective job of holding down the price that it seriously cur-

talled the incentive for gas exploration to discover new sources. As a result, our known gas reserves today are at a recent history low.

The Nation faces some serious economic consequences if the Federal Government continues to ignore the growing energy crisis and relies, instead, on imported energy fuels.

Our balance of payments would be affected. It has been predicted imported oil could cause an annual outflow of American dollars at the shattering level of \$20 to \$25 billion in less than 15 years.

National security also must be considered. I believe it an extremely risky gamble to depend upon sources of energy located thousands of miles from our shores for our national defense. I am sure all of us know that some of these sources are in areas which often become hotbeds of international tension.

American jobs certainly are a factor to be considered. They would be affected by such a policy, not only in industries directly engaged in this work but also in related industries which supply material and services used in developing oil and gas resources.

It appears obvious, then, we must begin concentrating our efforts toward a greater reliance on domestic supplies of energy, not on foreign sources. I believe the National plant and other similar plants in the Nation can do this—provided they are given assurance and assistance through a realistic energy program established by the Federal Government.

From an equipment standpoint, Mr. Speer is confident the National plant could compete anywhere in the world in the production of its products. But, he adds, it would be ironic if National and similar mills would have to operate at an unsatisfactory rate at a time when there is widespread awareness of the energy problem.

Mr. Speer also touched on another issue which has been debated many times in the House. It concerns the trade advantages our Government offers to foreign manufacturers to sell their products here while, at the same time, American manufacturers, one way or another, are prohibited from selling abroad.

As an example, our Government permits casings, tubing, and line pipe to come into our country on an almost-free-trade basis, while our products have no such freedom in other principal markets of the world. Oil country casing, for instance, is produced by the United States, Canada, Mexico, and Argentina. Imports of these products into the United States are subject to a duty of 7½ percent. But our exports to Canada are hit with a duty of 10 percent; to Mexico the duty is 45 percent; and to Argentina it is up to 90 percent.

In addition, as many of us here realize, foreign steel producers often receive generous subsidies from their governments to sell in export markets and the United States is the most attractive of all.

Mr. Speer believes, and I concur, that American workers will fight and win a share of any world market if the fight is fair. Consequently, unfair trade advan-

tages given certain countries should be removed—or we should adopt countervailing duties.

As a steelmaker, Mr. Speer knows full well the damage unrestricted foreign steel imports caused in our domestic industry under the weak voluntary arrangement our State Department negotiated with Japan and Western Europe in 1968. It is not surprising, therefore, that he has reservations about the effectiveness of the 1972 voluntary arrangement under which more than 16 million tons of steel will be shipped into the United States. He rightly assumes this is too much of the American market to put into the hands of foreign competitors.

American steelworkers, who already have lost an estimated 100,000 jobs to foreign imports, will feel the impact again. But, so will the Federal Government since the loss of wages by the steelworkers will be reflected in the loss of revenue derived from the Federal income tax.

Mr. Speer pointed out the combination of high manufacturing costs in our country, combined with the subsidies foreign governments grant their industries, severely hamper our ability to compete for world markets. He said the market for oil country goods outside the United States is over 1.4 million tons, but American companies will ship only about 100,000 tons into this market because of this combination.

The answer lies in a partnership of progress between union, management, and Government. The productivity committee of union-management have made progress in solving their share of the problem. Now it behooves the Federal Government to meet its responsibility, establish an energy policy, equalize trade advantages and take the necessary action to enable the National plant, and others, to meet the pending energy crisis on a pragmatic and economically sound basis.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speer is confident the National plant, the American worker and the American steel industry can and will do their part in this fight. It remains only for the Government to act accordingly.

PRICE INTRODUCES BILL TO RAISE FARM INCOME AND AGRIBUSINESS INCOME

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would change the formula in the present law for calculating wheat certificate payments and feed grain price support payments for farmers participating in the current wheat and feed grain program.

Under the present law wheat certificate and feed grain price support payments are made in two stages. Wheat support payments, for one, are made in early July and again in December. The total of these payments reflects the difference between the average prices received by the farmers for wheat and

feed grains during the 5-month period of July 1 through November 30 and 100 percent of parity price for wheat or \$1.35 per bushel in the case of corn and comparable levels for other feed grains.

As a result of the strong demand for grain occasioned by the Russian grain sale, the market prices for wheat and feed grains during the 5-month period of July through November in the case of wheat, for example, have averaged much higher than the market prices earlier in the year.

My bill would change the 5-month July 1 to November 30 period, in the case of wheat, and the October 1 to February 28 period, in the case of corn, to a 9-month period including the month of January 1 to September 30 for calculating the average market prices. This bill would be in effect for this year and next and would encompass the impact of the Russian grain sale.

The purpose of my bill is to spread out over a longer period of time the basis for the calculation of market prices under the price support formula. This process will more accurately reflect the marketing conditions facing grain farmers throughout the year. It will, of course, make the average price received by farmers lower in formula, but it will raise the amount of payments they will receive.

To put it another way, my bill would extend the benefits to all wheat and other grain farmers participating in the program, not just those selling wheat early. It would, of course, benefit the early sellers, too. By using the 9-month period in the formula which is both more equitable and more accurate, all grain farmers would receive greater benefits under the program.

REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN ED ESHLEMAN

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will be sending my constituents a newsletter. I am including the contents of that newsletter in the RECORD at this point:

REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN ED ESHLEMAN PROPERTY TAXES

In all of the public discussion about the growing tax burden, the property tax has come under heavy fire. For one thing it has more than doubled nationally in the past 10 years. It is also very regressive—placing the heaviest burden on senior citizens, low income families, families with fixed incomes, and farmers.

The reaction against the property tax has been felt in many areas where citizens have rejected new raises in the millage rate. Furthermore, the current system of local property taxes as a source of public school financing is being challenged in the courts and in some cases has been declared unconstitutional.

Therefore, any reasonable plan for tax reform must include some method for helping states relieve their property tax burden. It will do no good to replace the unfair property tax with another tax that is equally unfair. But it is clear that millions of home-

owners across the country want something done and expect Congress to act.

IKE ON DEFENSE

Since President Eisenhower's warning about the "military-industrial complex" is so widely quoted these days, I thought you might be interested in another of Ike's statements regarding national defense.

In a special message to Congress in 1960 he said, "that just peace which has always been and which remains our primary and common goal can never be obtained through weakness. The best assurance against attack is still the possession and maintenance of free world strength to deter attack."

CUTTING COSTS

It is not difficult to see that cutting the costs of government means in large part reducing the number of Government employees. Most of the expense of running Government is a matter of paying personnel. For the past several years there has been an effort at the Federal level to reduce the number of employees. The chart at the right shows that Federal civilian employment has been headed downward since 1969.

LINCOLN'S VIEW OF DUTY

Abraham Lincoln had some wise observations on many aspects of public life. His comments on duty seem so appropriate to me that a copy of what he had to say now hangs in my Washington office as a reminder.

Lincoln stated, "If I were to try to read, much less answer, all the attacks made on me, this shop might as well be closed for any other business. I do the very best I know how—the very best I can; and I mean to keep doing so until the end. If the end brings me out all right, what is said against me won't amount to anything. If the end brings me out wrong, ten angels swearing I was right would make no difference."

COMING CONFUSION

"Dear, would you drive down to the store and buy a liter of milk, two meters of muslin, a half-kilo of butter and a demi of Coke? And be sure you keep your speed under seventy kilometers or they'll pick you up."

Someday that's how we'll be figuring things if Congress approves changing over to the metric system within the next ten years.

If it all sounds very confusing just remember that we'll have several years to gradually work into the new system. The problem is if we don't change, the rest of the world will leave us behind. In trade, travel, science and other vital international relationships we will find ourselves outsiders and unable to compete or communicate.

The decision before Congress is whether or not we can afford to run that kind of risk even if we are likely to experience some national confusion for a time.

CHAMBER COMES TO CONGRESS

I'm pictured at the left with members of the Lancaster Chamber of Commerce who came to Washington recently to discuss legislative issues. We met on the Capitol steps and then went inside to begin a series of meetings and discussions.

TWO APPROACHES

There are two ways to approach a problem. One way is to find fault. I prefer finding solutions.

"DOC" MORGAN

Thomas E. (Doc) Morgan (D-Pa.) is my guest columnist in this newsletter. He is a medical doctor who represents Pennsylvania's 26th District and is dean of our congressional delegation. It is the work of the delegation that is the subject of Doc's editorial.

GUEST EDITORIAL

The Pennsylvania congressional delegation steering committee consisting of three Democrats and two Republicans is a bipartisan

activity which was initiated by Governor William W. Scranton in 1963. The committee is composed of myself as chairman, and William A. Barrett, Daniel J. Flood, John P. Saylor and Herman T. Schneebeli.

The steering committee reflects the views and serves as the voice of the entire Pennsylvania congressional delegation. It functions continuously as a unit and many times as individuals through its chairman.

Since its formation the Pennsylvania congressional delegation steering committee has become a very effective force in assisting the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in numerous and varied matters.

In addition to frequent meetings of the steering committee where problems affecting the State of Pennsylvania are discussed, delegation luncheons and dinners are arranged for representatives of the State's business and industry which enable them to discuss with the entire Pennsylvania congressional delegation their problems. These functions have proved beneficial to the economy of our State.

The Pennsylvania congressional delegation composed of twenty-seven House Members and two U.S. Senators is proud of the bipartisan close-knit association which they enjoy in cooperation with the steering committee and which is the envy of other delegations in the United States Congress.

SOME THINGS I HAVE BEEN SAYING

About Congress

At this point, where Congress stands could be summed up this way: There's lots of work to do, and the time to do it is running out.

About gun control

As I have said on many occasions about the rights guaranteed under the Constitution, they are meant to be exercised in a responsible manner. In the case of handguns, it seems to me that this fact means that the purchase of such weapons should be limited to responsible persons. Thus, I could favor legislation that would establish a stringent procedure for assuring that only responsible individuals purchase handguns, but I will not vote for an outright ban of them.

About busing

Letter to a Constituent, August 31, 1972

I have opposed strongly the forced busing concept. There is enough evidence to convince me that the job of providing a quality education for all students, regardless of race, is not something you accomplish with a school bus. Busing suburban children to the inner city or inner city kids to the suburb may be some social planners' idea of good schools, but I can't see that the children involved will end up getting a better education.

About food stamps for strikers

Newspaper Column, August 3, 1972

It has been pretty conclusively proven that availability of food stamps to the families of strikers has enhanced the ability of strikers to hold out for their demands and to this extent the Federal Government, in effect, negates its hope for prompt settlement of work stoppages. In addition, of course, I feel it is grossly unfair for taxpayers to have to foot this bill for those voluntarily not working.

About Vietnam

Letter to a Constituent, June 22, 1972

In regard to our missing and prisoners of war, an acceptable cessation of the war must include both the return of our living and a complete and neutral accounting of all those we believe to be held by the enemy.

About Federal spending

Letter to a Constituent, August 16, 1972

Every American should give some thought to the possibility of higher taxes as he watches Congress go on its spending spree.

Sometime, somehow, someone is going to have to pay for all of this, and that someone is going to be the taxpayer. Unless some brakes are put on now, the already overburdened taxpayer is going to get hit up again. And I doubt, and the President doubts, that any of the Federal programs are something that most people want to support with additional taxes.

OLYMPIC TRAGEDY

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. du PONT. Mr. Speaker, I offer for inclusion in the RECORD a letter from the Delmarva Ecumenical Agency. The letter expresses most eloquently the sadness and outrage we all feel about the senseless massacre in Munich.

We must agree that violence does indeed beget violence, and as Governor Carvel suggests in his letter we must rededicate ourselves to the peaceful solution of our problems.

The letter follows:

DELMARVA ECUMENICAL AGENCY,

Wilmington, Del., September 7, 1972.

HON. PIERRE S. DU PONT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DU PONT: The Executive Committee of the Delmarva Ecumenical Agency at its monthly meeting at its Executive office in the Blue Hen Mall, Dover, Delaware on September 6, 1972 expressed its shock and deep concern about the massacre of the eleven members of the Israeli Olympic team.

In the Olympic arena dedicated to better understanding and brotherhood this untoward violence is decried as the worst possible way to bring the attention of the world to whatever inequities that may exist.

We pray that this shocking event may have the effect of causing all people of good will to realize that in this world today violence in whatever area begets violence, and we pray that this example may cause us to dedicate ourselves and our future to bring solutions of any and all problems no matter how vexatious they may be.

We express our deep sympathy to the families and friends of all the unfortunate victims.

Sincerely,

ELBERT N. CARVEL,
Chairman.
DONALD E. LEITER,
Executive Director.

CHANGES IN NATIONAL NEEDS AND PRIORITIES

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, all of us are keenly aware of the problems which result from changes in national needs and priorities. We are also conscious of the responsibility which the Congress has in recognizing, encouraging, and supporting sound and reasonable programs which provide for transition of our engineering and scientific manpower re-

sources which are so vital to our national strength; from defense pursuits to other national needs in civilian and domestic areas as improvements in the international situation and our essential defense commitments permit.

We are also cognizant of the difficulties of local governments in effectively utilizing engineering expertise and results of research which may be applicable in day-to-day operations such as transportation and traffic, communications systems, sanitation and pollution and public safety. More effective application of technology at the local level can assist communities in providing improved public services and better living conditions for people in those communities. Certainly everyone is concerned about harnessing our tremendous technological capability to improve the quality of life and that must be done where people live and work.

Recently, my attention was called to what I feel is an important although small program initiated by my alma mater, Auburn University, with the support of the National Science Foundation. Based on the public service and extension concept which is so inherent in the land-grant university tradition, the school of engineering of Auburn has employed two engineers who were "displaced" from the defense-aerospace programs in Huntsville. After a period of special transition education and training, one of the men was placed with the city of Anniston and the other in Geneva, which has four rather small towns with which the engineer is working. A unique and important aspect of the program is that the university is providing a base of engineering and scientific support by both faculty and students. Such interaction provides very realistic inputs to the education and research programs of the university. This integral relationship also builds into the system an essential component of continuity and renewal.

These two men have successfully completed the transition from defense-aerospace engineering to community engineering and are performing needed and valuable services in their new environment. You will be interested in knowing that one has just bought a new home with the hope that his "conversion" is permanent.

Another project which was undertaken by Auburn University this summer with the city of Montgomery, Ala., involved two faculty members and five students, who worked directly for the city in studying more efficient use of computers, improving vehicle maintenance systems, reviews of municipal codes for subdivision development and land-use planning. Two engineering students and three graduate students in planning were involved and the experience they have gained will be a valuable part of their education. One of the engineering students has expressed an interest in working as an urban systems engineer with the city of Montgomery when he graduates next year.

I wish to take this opportunity to commend the National Science Foundation for supporting these programs which have great potential for accomplishing delivery of technology at the local level

to support efforts of Government in providing better services to the public as well as Auburn University for its initiative in developing this dynamic system which serves as a model in our efforts to create better intergovernmental-institutional systems to bring to bear our technological resources, utilizing existing institutions and capability on local problems. Such new programs may contribute substantially to effective focusing of our resources in new directions which changing national priorities indicate are essential to meet public needs.

LET US TAKE ANOTHER LOOK AT REVENUE SHARING

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, all of a sudden everyone is predicting a tax increase and using the revenue-sharing bill as a major justification—or as the whipping boy. Well, at least we are now forewarned, and I for one intend to take a new look at this bill when it returns from conference.

Also, what about the social services limitation provision added in conference which penalizes the mentally retarded through omission? The House version had no such limitation provision.

And what about the Federal audit discussions now being bandied about? As a news article in the September 16, 1972, edition of the Washington Post pointed out:

Cities and states must annually advertise their plans to use the money in local newspapers and report to the Treasury Department, which may audit the books.

What about the rising cry that revenue sharing is fiscal irresponsibility? An editorial entitled "Revenue Sharing Is a Trap," published in the September 17, 1972, issue of the Columbus, Ga., Ledger-Enquirer, presented an excellent discussion on this topic.

The editorial reads:

PEANUTS FOR WHAT WE PAY OUT: "REVENUE SHARING" IS A TRAP

(By Glenn Vaughn)

My prediction is that we as taxpayers are going to rue the day we stood by and allowed ourselves to be lured into this "revenue sharing" business.

While local elected officials have been walling about it and no doubt are licking their chops now that both houses of Congress have passed it, we're borrowing ourselves into a trap. It's just another way for our big federal government to get much bigger while at the same time making us all more beholden to it.

This country already is spending \$25 billion-plus more per year than it is taking in and "revenue sharing" will add another \$6 billion per year in red ink money, greatly intensifying the pressure to raise federal taxes even more.

If Congress were more interested in serving the best interests of the people than in keeping its same tight grip on the purse strings, it could help the hard-pressed local governments by simply reducing federal taxes by an amount equal to what it voted

to "share." With that much pressure off, local elected officials could collect their own tax revenues, which is as it should be.

Various public estimates have put Columbus' share of the "revenue sharing" program at about \$3.5 million. It pleases me, of course, that a cut in property taxes will be forthcoming. But the fact is that \$3.5 million is just a drop in the bucket compared to what we in Columbus pay out each year in federal taxes.

In 1969 we paid \$55.7 million in income taxes alone, plus another \$37 million in employee-employer Social Security taxes. It's a lot more this year. And there's no telling how many millions our citizens are paying out in corporate taxes, gasoline taxes, excise taxes, liquor taxes, cigarette taxes and so on.

The revenue-sharing plan is advertised as one with "no strings attached." How long, dear reader, do you think that's going to last? And since our system will immediately become dependent upon "revenue sharing," what do you think the "strings" will be when they are attached?

Sen. David Gambrell voted against revenue sharing and this is one time he's solidly in my corner. He said he saw no justification for enacting a program of that magnitude with no restrictions. . . .

The senator continued: "It does not replace or reorganize existing federal assistance programs under which nearly \$30 billion is being spent each year . . . and what is more alarming, no restraints or incentives are contained in the program to encourage careful spending of these funds at the local level. . . ."

It just doesn't make sense to funnel all that money to Washington, through the cumbersome federal bureaucracy and back again. What's really frightening about it is that this is just a small beginning to an entirely new way of life with power centralized in Washington like we've never dreamed about.

Even as big a lump of money as the five-year, \$30 billion program is, when sprinkled out over the country it is going to be like gold dust into the wind.

Temporarily, it is going to be a pretty good deal for local elected officials. It seems like having your cake and eating it too when local governments can get public revenue to spend without having to ask their constituents for it. But the euphoria is going to be short-lived because the taxpayers are going to demand the promised property tax cuts in equal measure.

But even at that it is quite obvious we could get a whale of a lot more for our tax dollars if we paid them directly to our local government rather than diverting them through that incredible federal sifter.

When, fellow citizens, are we going to stop kidding ourselves about "federal money?" When are we going to stop allowing ourselves to be deluded by those who are magnanimously sharing our own money with us?

These are valid questions and have now come much clearer into focus. Let us take a fresh look, a close, hard look at that conference report.

TRIBUTE TO ZEAKE JOHNSON OF TENNESSEE FOR HIS DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AS SERGEANT AT ARMS OF THE HOUSE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as the Honorable Zeake Johnson, Ser-

geant at Arms of the House, retires after more than 17 years of distinguished and dedicated service, I want to take this means of paying tribute to this outstanding Tennessean.

Zeake Johnson has served the Members of the House faithfully and conscientiously—and has carried out his duties as Sergeant at Arms with diligence and devotion.

Zeake Johnson has been loyal to the traditions of the House of Representatives in his service as Sergeant at Arms. As the guardian of the mace, he has symbolized the parliamentary heritage upon which the House was founded. He has carried out his many duties and responsibilities with honor.

Zeake Johnson was born in Dyersburg, Tenn., on April 2, 1910, and later moved to Jackson, Tenn. He served as Assistant Sergeant at Arms of the House from 1937 to 1942 when he enlisted in the U.S. Coast Guard.

Following his honorable discharge in 1945, he continued his interest in public service. In 1955 he was elected Sergeant at Arms of the House, a position which he has held through succeeding Congresses. In 1968 he was also sergeant at arms of the Democratic National Convention.

Zeake Johnson is a great Tennessean and a great American and as he enters upon his retirement, which is richly deserved, we all wish him the very best of good luck and success for the future.

HIGHWAY INTERESTS SEEK TO SUBVERT AND UNDERMINE ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, September 19, 1972, the other body passed S. 3939, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1972.

Included in that bill is section 147 entitled "Termination of Federal-Aid Relationship."

The objective of this section is to undermine and subvert two other acts of Congress which have received widespread citizen support; namely, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act.

Section 147 of the Senate bill—and an identical section 13 in H.R. 16656 which was approved on September 13, 1972, by the House Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works—would "terminate" all portions of the San Antonio North Expressway as a Federal-aid highway project. This is described in the August 18, 1972, Senate report (S. Rept. 92-1081) on S. 3939 as an "unusual" step.

Indeed, it is not unusual for the highway interests of this Nation to seek to undo the efforts of Congress to protect the public's right to enjoy our parklands, wildlife areas, and a clean and healthful environment. These special interests do not like the fact that our Nation has

awakened to the need to protect our environment. They want a free hand to exploit and develop, willy-nilly, in the name of progress.

NEPA has been described as a "full disclosure" law intended to make decisionmaking more responsible. But these special interests dislike such laws because they do not want to disclose their activities and work in a fishbowl-like atmosphere that encourages the public to learn more of their plans.

But they are afraid to undertake a frontal attack on NEPA and other environmental laws. So now they seek to chip away at NEPA by carving out exceptions and rendering the law toothless. The San Antonio termination provision of S. 3939 and H.R. 16656 is one of those exceptions. If we allow this exception, they will ask this House to approve another exception in section 139 of H.R. 16656 concerning the Three Sisters Bridge and there will be more, I assure you.

I urge you not to allow this to happen in 1972.

The San Antonio highway was first suggested in the midfifties by the San Antonio City Council. In 1960 the Texas Highway Department recommended two alternate routes for the road—one of which would go through the Brackenridge-Olmos Parklands.

In 1961, a bond issue passed for acquisition of the right-of-way. But, according to our distinguished former colleague, now a Federal judge, Homer Thornberry, "No particular route was specified on the proposition as it appeared on the voters' ballots."

In 1963, the State settled on the park route.

After Congress enacted section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, which is aimed at preserving our parklands, the San Antonio Conservation Society in 1967 requested that a different route be selected. When their request was denied, the society filed a lawsuit in December 1967.

In January 1968, the then Secretary of Transportation said there had been no approval by DOT for this right of way, and in April 1968 he sought an analysis of the project.

On September 23, 1968, the DOT Secretary gave conditional approval, but it never was effective, because in February 1969 the State refused to accept the conditions.

On December 23, 1969, DOT Secretary John A. Volpe approved two end segments outside the park, but not the middle section in the park, and called for a study of the park section. But in January 1970, the State objected to this approval and in April 1970 refused to make the study.

But on August 4, 1970—after enactment of NEPA—the State reversed itself and agreed to the study if Federal funds would be available immediately for the two end segments.

On August 13, 1970, Secretary Volpe agreed and on August 24, 1970, bids were authorized.

On September 1, 1970, when the citizens learned of this, the lawsuit was revived "claiming they had found out about the Secretary's action only through the newspaper."

The August 18, 1972, Senate report on S. 3939 states—Senate Report No. 92-1081, on page 42:

The State obtained initial route approval from the Federal Highway Administrator and purchased all right-of-ways and completed all relocation with approximately \$7 million in State and local funds prior to the changes in Federal law which now involve it in legal controversy. The Secretary of Transportation approved the letting of construction contracts prior to recent Federal court decisions defining the standard by which the administrative approval was to be reviewed. Thus, the project has twice been caught by changes in Federal law and procedures affecting its completion as a Federal-aid project."

According to our former colleague, Judge Thornberry, the State did not obtain any approval from the Federal Highway Administrator prior to enactment of section 4(f) or NEPA. Moreover, DOT's approval of construction contracts for the two end segments occurred 8 months after NEPA was enacted into law on January 1, 1970, and well after the court case had been filed.

Thus, the project was not "caught," either twice or even once, "by changes in Federal law and procedures."

In the lawsuit—*Conservation Society v. Texas*, Civ. No. 30915, Aug. 5, 1971, 2 ERC 1872—Judge Thornberry of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals described the parks in question and concluded:

II. Preservation of Parklands: The Brackenridge-Olmos Basin Parklands are unique park and recreation areas situated at the headwaters of the San Antonio River and surrounded by a densely populated urban area in San Antonio, Texas. The Parklands contain Sunken Gardens, an open air theater, two golf courses, the San Antonio Zoo, picnic areas, nature trails, and many acres of green, open space. While there is a factual dispute concerning the exact number of acres threatened by this proposed expressway, it appears that the expressway will require the use of between 116 and 250 acres of parkland.

III. Noncompliance with the Statutory Law: Our task is simplified greatly to begin with because it is undisputed that the Secretary of Transportation complied with none of the above-quoted statutes in his approval of the two "end segments" of this expressway. No environmental study under N.E.P.A. has been made with respect to these two "end segments," and the Secretary has demonstrated no effort by anyone to examine the section 4(f) "feasible and prudent" alternatives to the route followed by these two "end segments," which come right up to, if not in to, the Parklands from both the north and the south. Thus, it requires no discussion to establish that there has been no compliance with any of the above-quoted statutes.

Moreover, Judge Thornberry said that—

Section 4(f) "does not authorize" DOT to separate a "project" into "segments." In short the Secretary acted beyond the scope of his authority.

He then said:

By the Secretary's own admission, he adopted this piecemeal solution in order to defuse a controversial situation by attempting to strike a compromise between those who were determined to build the highway and those who were determined to save the Park. The problem with the Secretary's solution to the controversy is that he misconceived his role. The conflict between Parklands and Highways has already been resolved in the Halls of Congress, which is the proper place in our system of Government for priority decisions to be made. And,

as the statutes here in question make clear, parklands and environmental values are considered paramount. See *Citizens to Preserve Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe*, 401 U.S. at —, 91 S. Ct. at 821-22 [2 ERC 1250] (1971).

But, despite these acts of Congress and Judge Thornberry's decision, DOT and the State seek, through S. 3939 and H.R. 16656, to run roughshod over the public, destroy part of the public's parklands, and ignore the laws of Congress and proper court decisions.

The Sierra Club, comments on this matter in a September 20, 1972, letter to me, as follows:

SAN ANTONIO NORTH EXPRESSWAY

We are opposed to Sec. 113, which would overturn a recent federal court decision and allow a "segment" of a Federal-aid project to be built by state funds, thereby avoiding compliance with federal laws and procedures in constructing the controversial segment of the Federally-aided highway. Such an action is objectionable not only on the merits of the case for the North Expressway but also because it sets a dangerous precedent and amounts to piecemeal dismemberment of federal statutes, most notably section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act and the National Environmental Policy Act.

THREE SISTERS BRIDGE

We are opposed to Section 139 because it would deprive both District of Columbia and Virginia citizens of their basic democratic right to judicial review of violations of federal and state law in constructing the Three Sisters Bridge. It would also deprive citizens in all the states of the right to judicial review of any determination which may be deemed to carry out the "mandate" of the Federal Aid to Highways Act. Section 140 would abolish all the provisions of local District of Columbia highway law in relation to all Interstate highway projects, thereby leaving District of Columbia and federal officials free to use any procedures they wish in constructing these massive, destructive highways. We urge you to delete sections 139 and 140.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

The rights of citizens and the present environmental protection practices must not be destroyed by the Highways authorization bill. Rights such as NEPA and the requirement that all highways are subject to environmental impact statements and Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, which protects parks and wilderness areas, must not be circumscribed in any way.

The Congress should not be a party to these attempts in S. 3939 and H.R. 16656 to subvert and undermine NEPA and section 4(f). The House will, by rejecting this attempt, make it clear to the public that its environmental concerns are not more rhetoric and that our environmental laws must be respected and lived up to by Federal agencies and the special highway interests.

When the bill is before the House, a number of my colleagues will formally join me in urging such rejection.

SMALLER TOWNS HIT AGAIN

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, when Congress voted to take the postal service out

of politics, we thought we were making progress toward a new era of efficiency and better service.

But almost every day I receive letters in my office complaining about slow delivery and a general deterioration of postal service, especially in our rural areas.

The Atwater Herald, a weekly newspaper in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District, recently carried an editorial on postal service, which to inform my colleagues, I would like to insert into the RECORD.

I call attention specifically to the editor's remarks about a differential in postal services between urban and rural areas. As he asks, are not all of our citizens "first class" and should they not be provided with equal first-class postal service?

SMALLER TOWNS HIT AGAIN

For several weeks, the Postal Department has been attempting to realign its organization. This is apparently being done by a variety of methods.

There are two which do strike at the Post Offices in smaller towns very hard.

In communications sent to our local postmaster, there are indications that our service will be trimmed.

Hours of service time during the day is on the top of the list. This means opening the post office counter later in the morning closing it over noon hour and closing early in the afternoon.

Why?

Aren't we in rural Minnesota or rural anywhere, just as important as the people who live in first class post office areas? Aren't our postage rates the same as everywhere in the nation? And, yet the department wants to give us third rate service.

If we must sacrifice on service at our level, then why should we pay the same rates as the first class offices?

I understand, the department wants to cut costs—But, why do it in the smaller offices on service. Are these big sectional centers so efficient?

Another point—Ole Hovey has been a clerk here for twenty some years. Now the department comes along and says you cut to 20 hours a week.

Sure, he is given other alternatives, but in some cases this could mean loss of revenue to a community as well.

I don't buy this cut back in service—we're paying first class—then let's keep what we have.

HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION ACT

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, with the approaching congressional action on the Highway Transportation Act, I felt that many of my colleagues would have more than a passing interest in the September 7 testimony of William J. Ronan before the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs of the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee. Mr. Ronan is chairman of the Metropolitan Transportation Authority in New York, which administers a regional commuter railroad system, as well as the New York City subway and bus service. Taken together, this urban transportation system services 7 mil-

lion people per weekday. Mr. Ronan's testimony follows:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY WILLIAM J. RONAN

Mr. Chairman and members of the Senate Subcommittee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, my name is William J. Ronan. I am President of the Institute for Rapid Transit which includes among its members the public agencies which operate every rail rapid transit system existing in the United States, Canada and Mexico, as well as representatives of metropolitan areas that are planning rail rapid transit systems. Agencies that are members of the Institute also operate the nation's largest urban bus systems. These rail and bus systems serve areas having a population of some 55 million.

I am also Chairman of the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, which is responsible for New York City subway and bus service, and the regional commuter railroad lines. The Authority's daily weekday ridership is almost seven million.

I would like to commend President Nixon, the Congress, Secretary Volpe and the members of this committee for the progress that has been made in recent years by this Congress and the Administration in providing more money and federal resources to aid our urban bus and rail transit systems.

Thanks to this action we have begun to redress the imbalance in transportation financing and resources in our urban areas. However, the disproportionate public investment in highways has persisted.

I would like to discuss briefly two legislative proposals which would provide new initiatives in giving state and local governments the needed flexibility to develop balanced transportation:

First, we think that those provisions of the Senate Bill constituting the proposed Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1972 which would expend the use of highway funds to include bus transit improvements, are a move in the right direction. However, we would like to see these provisions expanded to include other modes of public transport such as street cars, new light rail transit vehicles and people movers—which are very much part of the new urban technology—as well as the more conventional rail transit facilities. The provisions, as they are now proposed, permit funds for trolley buses, as an example—but would not permit trolley cars or other viable transit alternatives now available to our cities. The provisions, as written, do not go far enough and, indeed, handicap those cities whose transit depends largely on rail systems. Transit system planning in these cities has progressed to the stage where it is essential that these elements be integrated. We feel it is vital that such modal integration be encouraged by the Congress and that the new emphasis on system—rather than project—planning dictates that no distinction be made as to availability of funds.

If we want a metropolitan area to have flexibility in using urban transportation funds for highways, rail transit, buses and other new modes of transportation, then that flexibility is dependent upon a broad and nondiscriminatory funding base within the law.

Obviously, the monies which would be made available through the Highway Trust Fund under this bill are not large enough to provide for the needs of rail systems. But, we believe this problem can be dealt with by increasing the contract authority under the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act.

Our second proposal relates to the level of Federal assistance for capital improvement projects. The Federal share now fixed for mass transportation projects, has a ceiling of 67 percent (with a floor of 50 percent).

The Senate has already recognized the inequity and inadequacy of the low mass transit assistance levels. Transit amendments in the Senate-passed 1972 Housing Bill would give the Secretary of Transportation discretionary authority to provide up to 90 percent.

However, the lack of a mandatory level of assistance has created uncertainty on the state and local level in planning major projects. We propose a fixed Federal contribution of 80 percent. This follows the precedent of Federal aid in the highway act which has mandatory levels of contribution (90 percent for Interstate projects and 70 percent for other major programs). This 80 percent figure is easily justified in relation to the highway program in that it is the equivalent to the average Federal share for all highway programs.

Both of these proposals which I offered today are further documented in a consolidated statement which has been submitted for the record. I respectfully urge your favorable consideration to insure that mass transit is given its rightful place in our nation's transportation policies and plans for the future growth and development of our cities.

BAD TREND

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, all of us are aware of the continuing trend of the decline in numbers of the family farm and a corresponding increase in the number of giant corporate agricultural production units.

This situation is of prime concern to our newspaper editors in rural Minnesota.

An example of that concern is an editorial by O. B. Augustson, an editor who has long been a well-informed student of the rural scene, in the West Central Daily Tribune of Willmar in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, and to inform my colleagues and all of the other people who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I insert this excellent editorial by Mr. Augustson.

The editorial follows:

BAD TREND

If one walked down the street of an urban city and met one acquaintance after the other, each one would tell of some store going out of business. There would be a number of them—enuf to paint a serious picture. The final exclamation would be—Gracious me, what is happening to our town?

The above is a fanciful scene. But the one we portray now—is not fancy—it is fact. Walking down the street and meeting other folks who tell us that this family farm is going, on the rocks, we hear of one, we hear of two, we hear of too many.

We should be alarmed at this last scene. But strangely enuf we seldom note such alarm. Just as if those loss of family farms means nothing at all. No thought of the future when the loss of such small farms will mean something when they are no more. As a rural banker said some time ago—the family farm is the backbone of our rural town. If one thinks enuf on this subject one would exclaim about that second scene—Gracious me—what is happening to our countryside?

Just now it seems that the wet spring, late seedlings etc. may reek havoc with some small farmers and could be curtains for those worst situated. Add to the trend where the family farm goes down the drain. Then gobbled up by the big farmer or even the corporate outfit?

Talked to a friend the other day who had attended the State Fair and like most farm-

ers they visited machinery hill. They were struck with the fact that on the hill the smallest plow exhibited was an eight bottom. Indicate something?

Surely there is something to ponder about by us city folks and the industry which produces our sustenance. Things may not be the same in the distant tomorrow.

CONTRACTS AND GRANTS IN THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform this body of a situation which has arisen within the National Health Service Corps; a situation which I protest because the administration has ignored the intent of Congress in administering this program.

In passing the Emergency Health Services Personnel Act, Congress recognized the serious shortage of doctors and medical personnel in many urban and rural areas of this country. The intent of Congress in passing this legislation was to place doctors and medical personnel into these areas to provide direct medical services. This intent seems simple to understand. Doctorless communities need doctors, nurses, dentists, and medical supplies. To meet these needs was the intent of Congress when it passed the legislation which was enacted into law on December 30, 1970.

In July I learned that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had determined to use more than \$1 million of the National Health Service Corps funds for contracts and grants in management development and manpower planning for doctorless communities.

These contracts follow:

CONTRACTS

HSM 110-72-423: "Problem-Oriented Management Development," \$738,900.

HSM 110-72-279: "Identification of Elements of a Range of Rural Health Care Models," \$41,409.

HSM 110-72-415: "Developing Health Care Planning for Physicianless Counties in the Mountain States," \$26,516.

HSM 110-72-417: "Developing Health Care Planning for Physicianless Counties in the Mountain States," \$35,420.

HSM 110-72-298: "Developing Health Care Planning for Physicianless Counties in the North Central Plains," \$49,054.

HSM 110-72-418: "Developing Health Care Planning for Physicianless Counties in the Rural South," \$69,427.

HSM 110-72-419: "Developing Health Care Planning for Physicianless Counties in the Rural South," \$122,633.

This administration claims to be striving to increase health benefits to our citizens, and yet in 18 months HEW has failed to fill the quotas for medical personnel provided by the National Health Service Corps. HEW has succeeded in awarding over \$1 million in contracts for management development and planning, and in the same time has managed to get less than one-half of the medical personnel approved by Congress for 144 com-

munities actually on the job.

HEW seems to prefer to be a planning agency rather than an agency which offers direct health care services. In fulfilling this desire, it has turned its back upon the intent of Congress and is using taxpayers' money to meet the whims of the administration rather than meeting the needs of this Nation's citizens for health care. These actions on the part of HEW serve to undermine the National Health Service Medical Corps just as the administration has hindered and undermined the success of the Public Health Service Hospitals by administrative ruling.

As serious, perhaps, is the secrecy surrounding the granting of these \$1 million contracts. On the one hand, this administration is crying for community control. On the other hand, the administration is ignoring regional and local planning groups in the granting of contracts for planning from the National Health Service Corps budget and is making contract agreements from Washington, D.C. The regional office of HEW was informed of these agreements after the fact, thus undermining all community control in health planning.

In view of the seriousness of this matter, I have today turned over all relative information to Congressman PAUL ROGERS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment. His committee will have the opportunity to request an investigation by the General Accounting Office into the propriety of using these funds in this manner.

I inform you today of this situation because such actions by HEW undermine not only the health services of this country, but the very legislative responsibilities of this body.

FORTAS' FORTE

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, former Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas has been reappointed to a 10-year term on the Board of Trustees of the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. This quasi-governmental institution has spent many millions of dollars on its marble museum of culture. Originally the Center was not supposed to cost the taxpayer anything, but at last count over \$40 million in Federal funds had been appropriated to this monument. Its purpose was to provide a place to "develop" our national arts. But it has fallen into fiscal chaos due to cost overruns and mismanagement.

While a trustee does not receive any direct compensation for his duties, there are many side benefits to massage the ego of the entrepreneur. Trustees may use a private box on special occasions, for example. No doubt Fortas, who failed to win confirmation from the U.S. Senate for his nomination as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, will find this helpful in buttering up prospective law clients.

Maybe it will help to gloss over the fact that he was found unfit to head the High Court. He should not have been reappointed to any position of public trust, but especially not one charged with straightening out questionable finances.

SOVIET JEWRY

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union has a long history indeed of persecution of its Jewish citizens. This has now culminated in our time in the unconscionable act of charging exorbitant fees to those seeking to emigrate from Russia, on the theory that the Government must be reimbursed for its investment in the education of its citizens. Directed primarily at the Jews of Russia who have been applying in ever-increasing numbers for exit visas, this fee can only be described as "ransom money," for the figures involved go as high as \$25,000 to \$30,000 in some instances.

The plight of Soviet Jewry has rapidly deteriorated over the past few weeks in many other ways as well. There have been a number of arrests of outspoken Jewish individuals, telephone lines have been cut, broadcasts from foreign nations have been jammed, and many prominent persons have lost their jobs on trumped-up charges.

On Thursday, I attended a briefing on this matter by Mr. Leonard W. Schroeder, who was specifically delegated by Soviet Jews to speak in their behalf. He outlined clearly the demoralizing effects of these recent developments and, in particular, the many ramifications of the imposition of this "head tax" upon the Jewish population of the Soviet Union. He estimated that perhaps 150,000 families are now in the process of applying for exit visas, representing a total of nearly 400,000 individuals. In Moscow alone, it was estimated that nearly 40 percent of those applying would be subject to this excessive—indeed, impossible—tax requirement. For these people, and many others, such a move represents the end of all hope of ever escaping the depression and harassment that is now clearly a matter of official Soviet policy. Moreover, many young people are now withdrawing from universities, and will now be subject to military service and may not be able to leave the country for years thereafter.

Mr. Schroeder emphasized most strongly that the Soviet Jewish leaders with whom he visited in Moscow believe that the only hope of rescinding the tax is if massive political and economic pressure can be mounted in the West. Mr. Speaker, this is our task in the U.S. Congress; this is where we may offer real assistance from the American people to the Jewish people of Russia.

It has been announced that the signing of a comprehensive trade agreement with the Soviet Union is expected before

the end of this year, and possibly within weeks. We must grasp this opportunity to put the Soviets on notice that we will not trade in commodities with a nation that trades in human lives. Congressional approval of many aspects of these new trade initiatives is necessary for their finalization. Among these are the granting of most-favored-nation status to the U.S.S.R., the extension of Commodity Credit Corporation loans, the extension of Export-Import Bank credits, and modifications in the Overseas Private Investment Corporation regulations.

I feel strongly that we must condition these new trade agreements upon the rescinding of this educational tax. I urge all of my colleagues to repudiate this heinous treatment of Jews, and repudiate it in the strongest manner possible at this time.

REVENUE SHARING

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I sent a questionnaire to all postal patrons in the district which I represent in the month of May 1971 and of 26,000 and more replies received to the question "Do you favor revenue sharing with the States if it requires increased Federal deficit spending?" 24.6 percent voted "yes" and 66.3 percent voted "no".

Two interesting editorials appeared recently in the Jacksonville, Fla., newspapers. The first is entitled "The Revenue-Sharing 'Gift.'" It appeared in the September 15 Jacksonville Journal. It reads as follows:

THE REVENUE-SHARING "GIFT"

Ever since the mythical Lorelei lured sailors to their deaths by enticing them onto the rocks upon which she dwelt, mankind has been gulled by the idea that some pleasures in life are absolutely free.

And so we see the spectacle of the Congress of the United States passing a "revenue-sharing" bill that is supposed to solve the financial problems of the state and local governments of this land with some more of that "federal" money—which, presumably, springs out of the ground painlessly in Washington.

Both the House and Senate have now approved revenue sharing bills which will send state and local governments some \$30 billion in "federal" money during the next five years.

We are assured that this will help stem the upward spiral of state and local taxes. Maybe it will, but it is insane to question those wise men on Capitol Hill and ask them where the money for this largesse is coming from.

Well, we don't have to ask them. It is going to come from the same pockets that would have financed the state and local government tax increases, if they actually did materialize in lieu of a federal revenue sharing bill.

After the bill becomes law, you can expect to see some escalation in the promises of the candidates in this year's Florida elections, because they will have more money to spend and thereby can keep more promises—without the balancing risk of having to raise taxes to finance them.

As for congressional candidates, they will point with pride to the "gifts" they have be-

stowed on the populace, and will expect votes in return.

But somebody is going to have to pay that \$30 billion, and we doubt if it will be the coconut gatherers in Tahiti.

The September 14 edition of the Florida Times Union carried the following editorial entitled "Revenue Sharing: Down to the Wire."

REVENUE SHARING: DOWN TO THE WIRE

Two major tasks remain as the revenue sharing showdown—the House-Senate conference committee to reconcile differences in the separate versions of the plan—comes finally on center stage.

"Finally" because it is now more than three years since President Nixon sent the original proposal, which he often called his "number one" domestic legislative program, to Congress.

The first of these tasks must be resolved in the conference itself: The Senate not merely should, but must, stand fast on the "no strings" provision in its formula for distributing the funds among the states and cities.

The House bill would, in effect, tell the states how to run their own tax affairs (in utter defiance of the spirit of the legislation) of they are to share fairly in the proceeds.

The House bill does this by penalizing those states whose citizens do not choose to enact a state income tax. The Senate bill permits (without any loss of any kind) the citizens of each state to determine freely their own tax structure on state taxes.

There are other differences in the formulas of the separate bills, but this is the most crucial part, the matter of principle on which there can be no compromise. The House's insistence on telling states how they must run their own state tax policies is an intolerable encroachment of the federal government upon the prerogative of state governments.

The second essential task cannot be accomplished by the conference committee, but nevertheless remains an obligation on both houses of Congress.

The principle of revenue sharing, it must be remembered, is to permit state and local officials—rather than supposedly all-knowing bureaucrats in far away Washington labyrinths—to utilize their first-hand knowledge to assess local priorities, device local solutions tailored to local problems.

This principle absolutely does not mean more "deficit spending" as some revenue sharing opponents have claimed: It means rather that the same money will be spent with first-hand knowledge, without staggering bureaucratic overhead; in other words, spent more effectively.

Before revenue sharing, Washington spent this money in a confused welter of categorical and specific grants in aid. Frequently, the Washington specifications for spending did not match the local needs.

Suppose, for example, a community had a downtown section of structurally sound, restorable houses, but the specific federal urban renewal program for restoring houses was out of funds, while the program for razing and building anew had money left.

The community would be faced with the choice of (a) getting nothing or (b) getting what it didn't need and in the process spending much more than necessary to achieve the desired goal.

As the \$35 billion (over five years) revenue sharing program comes into being, Congress' obligation—to achieve the principle sought—is to reduce, in like amount, the confused maze of federal programs which formerly served the same purpose (but less effectively).

Indeed, Congress could well find that, as revenue sharing begins working, many of these programs, with their expensive over-

lapping paper empires, are not necessary at all.

THE CRISIS IN PANAMA BROADENS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as our Government is negotiating the retrocession of the Panama Canal to the country of Panama, it is well for our people to be kept advised as to the current political climate in that country.

The Panamanian dictator, Brigadier General Torrijos, is a self-appointed chief executive rather than President. And the 505-member Panamanian Congress has no legislative powers except to serve as a rubberstamp for the dictator.

One example of its mode of operation is the recent takeover of a United States, privately owned, light and power company. The company suffered financial hardship because the government refused to pay its bill of some \$2.5 million. This led to expropriation by Panama and settlement at \$0.30 on the dollar of some \$73 million of investment. There remains some question as to when, if ever, the compromised settlement will ever be paid. Apparently, Torrijos is following the leadership of Allende of Chile.

Under this ruthless self-asserted power, calling itself a government, what kind of treatment can we expect if we surrender the Panama Canal?

I include related newscippings:

[From the Evening Star and Daily News, Sept. 13, 1972]

STRONGMAN GETS BACKING OF NEW PANAMA BODY

PANAMA.—Panama's newly elected constituent assembly bestowed chief executive powers by acclamation yesterday on Brig. Gen. Omar Torrijos, the strongman who assumed power four years ago.

Torrijos, who had said he did not want to be elected president because his time would be taken up in ceremonial duties, will retain control of the 6,000-man National Guard. It is the country's only military force.

The 505-member Assembly of Community Representatives was elected in August. It has no legislative powers, but is meeting to approve a Torrijos-sponsored constitution and to elect a president and vice president.

No title was specified for Torrijos, 42.

He told the assembly he would strive to "decolonize" Panama, a reference to his pledge to wrest control over the Panama Canal Zone from the United States.

PANAMA FORCES BOISE CASCADE TO SELL HOLDINGS

Panama has forced the Boise Cascade Corp. of Boise, Idaho, to hand over its \$73 million electric power company in Panama for \$22.5 million, it was learned today.

The transfer will involve \$1 million in U.S. currency to be paid immediately and the balance early next year, according to an agreement in principle worked out last weekend.

Boise Cascade had been negotiating under the gun for nearly 90 days.

The forced sale drew immediate criticism on Capitol Hill, when Rep. John M. Murphy, D-N.Y., chairman of the Panama Canal subcommittee called it "expropriation 1972 style" and said he plans to hold hearings

on pending development loans to Panama.

The State Department declined comment.

Events leading up to the sale began on May 31, when nine Panamanian officials, including the chiefs of the secret police and the National Guard's intelligence unit, walked into the utility's Panama City offices and announced that the government was taking over.

The complaint was that the utility, known as Fuerza y Luz (Power and Light) owed approximately \$2.5 million in generator fuel bills to Texaco and Esso. The government claimed it was intervening in the public interest because the oil companies were threatening to cut deliveries, which would cause a blackout in Panama City and Colon.

Boise Cascade, which acquired the utility in 1969, contended that bills were unpaid because the government itself, a big consumer, was approximately \$2.5 million in arrears with its electric bills.

At the end of 30 days, however, and with a payment schedule seemingly worked out, the Panamanian government entered a new complaint.

Boise Cascade, it charged, had failed to provide some \$50 million in promised new service to suburban areas. It gave the company an Aug. 31 deadline to come up with an "equitable" selling price. If no agreement could be reached by that time, it declared, the government would have no choice but to take over with no responsibility for payment.

Boise Cascade negotiators, led by company vice president and legal counsel John Clute, got their Panamanian counterparts to extend the deadline one week and, finally, to agree to \$22.5 million settlement.

A company spokesman, reached yesterday at the firm's head office, would confirm only that agreement in principle had been reached and that final closing "should take place within a couple of weeks."

Murphy said he will hold hearings on loans to Panama "to see if, as matter of fact, America is going to help Panama pay for the rip-off of Boise Cascade."

Murphy long has been a critic of Panama, and of proposals to negotiate a canal treaty more favorable to Panama.

In the meantime, negotiations for a new canal treaty are at a standstill. Negotiators last met three months ago. The Panamanians returned to Panama City from Washington for "consultation" and to await national elections in both countries.

THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE SPARTANBURG HERALD

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, on September 16, 1972, the Spartanburg Herald in South Carolina, entered its 100th year of service to the Spartanburg area.

The newspaper started as "The Orphan's Friend," published by the Reverend R. C. Oliver to instruct youths at the Carolina Orphan's Home in the art of printing, to earn money to aid in financing their care, and to serve the community as "a desirable paper for the family circle." In 1875, the newspaper was purchased by T. Stobo Farrow, Robert J. Daniel, and H. Bascom Browne and the name was changed to the Spartanburg Herald.

During its 100 years of publication this newspaper has served as the eyes and ears and, as is so often the case with newspapers, the conscience of the com-

munity. The Spartanburg Herald has never ceased to be "a desirable paper for the family circle."

Mr. Speaker, on this centennial anniversary I want to congratulate the Spartanburg Herald and the many talented and loyal employees who have contributed to its fine history. The reason for the newspaper's longevity is, I believe, admirably expressed in the following editorial printed by the Spartanburg Herald on its 100th birthday:

CONSTANT REFLECTOR OF THE COMMUNITY

Today's Spartanburg Herald is a special issue taking note of the start of the 100th year of the existence of this publication.

Scattered throughout this edition are reproductions of pages from The Herald from the various decades since the 1870's.

Those pages reflect the tempers of the times, the good and the bad, the bitter and the sweet, the concerns and the actions of Spartans and their neighbors in the world.

The Spartanburg Herald has been primarily a reflector of the times in its news pages. That is the role of the news.

Not reflected so much in the news pages, perhaps, is the conscience of the newspaper and the feeling of community pride and responsibility that goes with the publishing of a responsible journal of events.

The Spartanburg Herald has consistently shown its conscience in its editorial pages—supporting, advocating and urging its readers toward creating a responsible and responsive government, a healthy and thriving business and industry, modern and effective facilities, the finest educational opportunities.

Today's special edition devotes most of its news space to a reflection through pictures and stories of the history of the Spartanburg area community for the past 100 years or more.

This edition mirrors the progress and the pleasures of the years, briefly in many instances, but always with the idea that the citizens of this community, in their time, did aim for the goal of a better community.

So, the story of the start of the 100th year of the Spartanburg Herald is not just the story of a newspaper. It is the story of the community working, playing, learning, praying, building, planning, laughing, crying, hoping...

There is a strong sense of rededication in the start of this 100th year of service. The commitment of The Spartanburg Herald to community improvement and the challenge of maintaining a responsible and responsive voice in this community are goals that have not tarnished or faded with the years.

As a vital business in this community, The Herald salutes its other business and industry colleagues. As a vital link in the communication line between citizen and the world arena, The Herald pledges a continuing effort to communicate events as intelligently and as thoroughly as time, talent and space permits.

Finally as a citizen, The Spartanburg Herald salutes all of its readers for their effort in the common goal we all seek—building a better community.

The decades ahead are still the challenge

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

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

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

How long?

DEDICATION AND ADDRESS AT CAST IRON SOIL PIPE INSTITUTE

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, the Cast Iron Soil Pipe Institute and its member companies recently dedicated a brand-new research facility in Woodland, Calif. Though this event took place many hundreds of miles from my home State of Alabama, it was a proud day for my State and for the citizens of my congressional district, for we are very proud of the cast iron soil pipe industry. The principal speaker at this dedication was my esteemed colleague, Representative JAMES C. CORMAN from the 22d District of California. The gentleman said on that occasion that cast iron soil pipe is, among other things, a California industry. This was well said, for this great industry has shed its economic blessings among many States. They are welcome. I begrudge them nothing, so long as no one is allowed to forget that it is Anniston, Ala., and no other place which proudly bears the title "Soil Pipe Capital of the World." My colleague from California also stated—

The innovations that will flow from this tower may well revolutionize the plumbing industry.

I would like to add a hearty second to that remark, and to the gentleman's further observation that—

The cast iron soil pipe industry has never sought to make its future at the expense of the homebuyer or the building owner.

In this time of rapidly deteriorating building standards and plumbing codes; in this decade when so many of our citizens are rightly becoming alarmed that more and more home buyers' dollars are buying less and less construction quality; I proudly salute the Cast Iron Soil Pipe Institute and its member companies for their breadth of vision and faith in the future.

At this point, I would like to include Congressman CORMAN's excellent address in my own remarks:

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES C. CORMAN AT THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW RESEARCH FACILITY OF THE CAST IRON SOIL PIPE INSTITUTE, WOODLAND, CALIF., SEPTEMBER 15, 1972

Members of the city council of Woodland and the board of supervisors of Yolo County, representatives of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and other Federal agencies, and representatives of the State of California here present, ladies and gentlemen:

I appreciate this opportunity to come up to the district of my good friend and colleague, Congressman Bob Leggett, who asked me in a very special way to convey his personal greetings and his regrets that he could not be here today.

It is indeed a great privilege to be invited to participate here today in this great

significant event which marks a new milestone in the progress of a proven, reliable industry, the scene itself is striking, with the new 11-story tower standing out against the background of a fertile, rich agricultural valley, it is a symbol perhaps that, no less than agriculture, the industries which depend on human production can also renew themselves.

Here is the cast iron soil pipe industry, for decades a leader in its field against every type of industrial competitor, thinking new thoughts and dreaming new dreams, looking to the future with confidence. Certainly the taste of success is not new to the cast iron soil pipe institute. This trade association numbers in its membership manufacturing firms which produce over 95 percent of all the cast iron soil pipe and fittings produced in the United States. This industry has long been the acknowledged leader in the production of drain, waste and vent pipe and fittings. There has never been a close second. Only last year, the industry enjoyed its third million-ton sales year in history, according to reliable statistics published by the United States Bureau of the Census.

Once again this year, according to statistics published by the same official source, the industry appears to be on its way to a banner year, this is certainly a record that speaks vitality. It is also an industry willing to change, willing to ask hard questions and to examine its present methods of operation, willing to believe that things can be a great deal better than they are, willing to get up and to try the new when men might have expected that it would sit back and rest upon old laurels.

And yet, as a public servant duly elected by thousands of voters in a certain defined constituency, I know well that I do not discharge my public responsibility by praising an industry simply because it has exercised a little imagination and constructed a new research facility. Given the right kind of motivation—and the hope of dollar profit generally supplies that motivation—anybody can do that.

Anybody with the right amount of brains and money and the right combination of circumstances is capable of gouging the home buying public for the sake of a little extra dollar profit. It does not take great character to manufacture a cheap substitute building material and to place it on the market where either there is no building code or where the local code has been smashed to bits by an over zealous authority from on high. To recognize building codes for what they are and what they can become when rightly used, to recognize the just interest of the home buyer, to resist the temptation to gouge that home buyer—this is what requires a greater measure of moral character.

In my service on the House Subcommittee on Government Procurement and Economic Concentration, I have developed an appreciation for the need to have standards and codes in order to protect the consumer. In the old institution of the local building code, or plumbing code or electrical code, when rightly used, may be found a vast resource for protecting the just interest of the home buyer—if only prospective home buyers would recognize this fact. I really cannot identify myself with the contemporary craze to smash down locally adopted building codes and plumbing codes, and to leave all discretion and all judgment in the hands of a small group of public officials at a higher level.

I believe that local autonomy is very necessary in code matters, so that if a local citizen suffers because of a local official's mistake or misjudgment, then it is the local official who must bear the responsibility for his decision right there on the spot. Otherwise, we are always passing the buck off to someone at a higher level, and assuming that this person at a higher level has performed all the testing and experi-

mentation called for in the public interest—but most of the time this is not the case.

It is a very welcome thing therefore to find in the building industry a group of manufacturers such as the members of the Cast Iron Soil Pipe Institute who throughout a period of rapid change maintain their allegiance and their commitment to the state and local code. Within this context they are not willing to rest complacent on former achievements, but they reach out to the future, ever looking, ever experimenting, for the new discovery that will bring the time tested values of cast iron soil pipe to a new buyer, at a lower price made possible by their own research and experimentation.

I am proud to be here today. I am proud to be part of this industrial event which has so much promise for the future. Cast iron soil pipe is, among other things, a California industry and I am proud of the foundaries and the businesses that make their home in California.

The Cast Iron Soil Pipe Institute and its member companies are re-investing their money to help provide a brighter future for the American home owner. No less than the growers who till the length and breadth of this great valley, they are sowing back some of their profits in the hope of a richer harvest at some future time. This great research tower which we dedicate today may well have a profound effect on building methods all over this great Nation. The innovations that will flow from this tower may well revolutionize the plumbing industry.

The Cast Iron Soil Pipe Institute realizes that, if you want to remain in first place, you have to borrow a little from the present in order to gamble in the future. The Cast Iron Soil Pipe Industry has never sought to make its future at the expense of the home buyer or the building owner. Ladies and gentlemen, your industry deserves to remain in first place. I believe that here today you are taking the essential steps that are necessary to insure that you will remain in first place, provided only you continue to serve the consumer who is the first reason for your effort and the first cause of your success. I can only wish you continued success and share your hope that you will continue in first place for many years to come.

ROLLING WITH THE PUNCHES

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the unofficial "Philosopher in Residence" of the House of Representatives continues to write succinct essays on various facets of our life. He is Joe Machugh, known to most Members these past 20 years as the kindly soul who greets us with a cheery word as we jog from our offices to the House floor. His latest essay has unusual literary merit, particularly in an election year, and I insert it in the appendix as a portion of my remarks:

ROLLING WITH THE PUNCHES

(By Joseph V. Machugh)

Were life itself for the most part to consist of smooth sailing, happy landings and striking success of personal pursuits—'twould indeed be an idyllic existence. However, under such improbable circumstances, beneficiaries of that Utopia might suggest "plight of the poor, little rich boy" reared inside the walled mansion and grounds of the family home—and whose parents had spared the rod and spoiled the child—giving him free and untrammelled reign for his every desire.

Inevitably, sooner or later that life would begin to pall and, as in the instance of our "first parents"—he would look for some new and untried source of stimulation—without bonds of discipline—that indispensable ingredient for success of all human conduct—universally resented by millions of the shortsighted but, like other Laws of Nature—imperatively-lasting and inflexible as the force of gravity within the orbit of the Earth's surface.

Everyone has read accounts of infants who have fallen from fairly great heights or of accidental dropping of professional acrobats—none of whom sustained any ill-effects from their respective falls. Explanation of such occurrences: a baby cannot reason and is totally unaware of fact of falling and/or inherent danger to him therefrom. The acrobat has learned *not* to stiffen his body in resistance to the movement of dropping. So, both "roll with the punches" in relative relaxation and thereby fail to emerge as statistics in the area of news reporting.

Isn't there a potent lesson—parable like—in cases of the child and the acrobat? We all agree that life rarely proceeds without ripples or torrents of disturbance. Our innermost and ardently-desired plans oft do go awry, even as our autos break down on most inopportune occasions, i.e., start of vacation or en route to distant destinations. When those exasperating developments occur—the least admirable of our emotions spring into immediate action. Temper, anger and irritability and naturally seeking to blame someone else for the distress. And hate rises, too, from those ashes of discontent like Phoenix and in the throes of the victim's displeasure he will be far from remembering a treasured wisdom: "Hate always hurts the hater much more than the hated!"

To profit from the parable—why not emulate the tot and the tumbler in connection with the punches of life's encounters? If, instead of getting angry—he devotes energy and attention to what can be done to remedy the situation, he may find roots of the trouble and perhaps he himself may be able to make necessary, temporary adjustments at the scene and lo, they could be "off and away in a jiffy!"

So, too, in connection with vastly more important incidents of the complicated existence in the sophisticated and shrinking World of today. If we would place a brake on our own explosiveness, take time to analyze the situations and seek to evolve corrective approaches—would we not be rolling with those punches? We can be as certain that such obstacles *will* arrive—as we are of death and taxes. Hence, why not promise ourselves *in advance* to be prepared and waste no valuable time in blowing off steam or in allowing it to fester inside to create internal pressures which could be even more harmful to ourselves than a short burst of emotional anger.

Few if any situations, domestic, international—or in between those poles—would not lend themselves readily to application of this simple counsel of wisdom: "Think it through first—and then try to smile back in the face of adversity." Moreover, there are those who have advocated An Eleventh Commandment: "Always Preserve a Sense of Proportion—irrespective of what happens!"

In Lives of The Saints we can read about one of them who, after having been spat upon—responded to that shameful insult merely by saying: "Just how important will be this incident in the light of Eternity?" That Saint had wasted none of his emotions in anger; he had done himself no harm; and on the contrary he had strengthened his character immeasurably. Now, place that incident alongside its antithetical opposite: 'An eye for an eye—and a tooth for a tooth!'

For, if the Pen is mightier than the Sword—and Restraint rewards those who practice it—why not start to inculcate in

minds of our rising and magnificently adroit youngsters of today—this cardinal Rule of Conduct:

Let's roll with the punches of life whenever they rear their ugly heads—as we may be sure they will do. And then the future World can be at least a wee bit better place in which to live—for having taken time by the forelock and prepared in advance for those repeatedly inevitable adversities.

WHY ROCKY'S NOW FOR NIXON

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Miami Herald on August 20, 1972, recounts the close working relationship which has developed between President Nixon and Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of my State. Because of my deep admiration and affection for both of these great public leaders, I am pleased—but not surprised—by what the authors term, "the Rockefeller-Nixon thaw." Both have the Nation's future very much in mind, and both are committed to a better America for all its citizens. With the hope that the article, written by Vera Glasser and Malvina Stephenson, might be interesting to many of my colleagues, I now include the full text thereof:

WHY ROCKY'S NOW FOR NIXON—STORY BEHIND THAW BETWEEN TWO GOP GIANTS INVOLVES HENRY KISSINGER AND JOHN MITCHELL

(By Vera Glaser and Malvina Stephenson)
NEW YORK.—In a political switch which has been quietly building, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller will laud Richard Nixon as a "great innovator" in his nominating speech Tuesday night.

Rocky's tribute will dramatize the thaw between two giants of Republican politics, former rivals for the presidency and ideological foes.

The New York governor's appearance will help brighten a generally dull convention, and his emerging rapport with Nixon is expected to have long-range impact.

In an exclusive interview last week Rockefeller noted the Democrats' recent mandate for change and said, "The President has done more to rethink our relationships and the structure of our institutions at home and abroad than any President we've had."

The story behind the Nixon-Rockefeller thaw is a fascinating personal and political saga. It involves such other towering figures as Presidential assistant for national security Henry Kissinger and former Attorney Gen. John Mitchell.

In addition to giving a glimpse of his nominating speech, the New York governor discussed his personal relations with Nixon, his own future plans, and philosophized about his failure in earlier years to win the nation's highest office.

He hinted he will run for a fifth four-year term as governor in 1974 and appeared cool to taking a Cabinet post.

He shied away from presidential talk for 1976, although a "liberal" type like Rockefeller would have an edge if the big states win their present fight for a change in convention rules.

At 64, Rockefeller is youthful, full of bounce, magnetism and good humor. Had he been able to win his party's nomination in the Sixties, many believe he could have won the White House.

As the director of Nixon's reelection cam-

paign in New York, Rockefeller gives him a "good chance" to win the traditionally Democratic state. He said he has always viewed Nixon as a "progressive." Rockefeller recalled telling a Nixon critic, "Remember, I ran against this man twice. I support him now because he is dealing with the hard, tough realities of today in a clear, constructive way. Others have promised, but he has delivered at the crucial moments."

As an example, Rockefeller cited the recent exodus of Jews from the Soviet Union to Israel, which he has said resulted from Nixon's recent talks in Moscow. Rockefeller not only was instrumental in getting the long-simmering issue on the summit agenda, but gave the Nixon accomplishment world headlines recently during a visit to Jerusalem.

He jabbed at former Attorney Gen. Ramsey Clark for "inconsistency" on his recent trip to Hanoi. Noting that Clark served under President Johnson, Rockefeller said "I don't remember him saying any of those things then, and yet the activities (in Vietnam) were far greater then."

Rockefeller was singled out as the most effective governor in U.S. history and his vast achievements touted in "Megastates of America" by Nell R. Peirce.

"My only regret," the governor chuckled, "is that I didn't have a chance to do it for the country. But that's life."

A long-time friend doubts Rockefeller has "mentally or emotionally" gotten the Presidency out of his system.

Between sessions of the legislature in Albany, Rockefeller works in a modestly furnished Manhattan townhouse near the Museum of Modern Art, filled with treasures he loves. A block away is a small museum of primitive art, where he often lunches. He is a renowned collector of modern art and an amateur photographer.

In addition to the family estate at Pocantico Hills, Rockefeller maintains a Fifth Avenue apartment. He and his second wife, "Happy", entertain there and on quiet evenings romp with their two small sons.

Rockefeller's divorce from his first wife was said to have ruined his chances for the presidency in 1964. He described Happy as a "very, very intuitive, astute person in terms of human values."

On the day Rockefeller was interviewed, he was deeply involved via long distance on two nationally headlined issues.

"I've talked to Washington three times today regarding amendments on revenue sharing in the Senate Finance Committee," he said. Rockefeller is the foremost proponent of the measure to return some federal tax revenues to the states.

Meanwhile, he took urgent calls from GOP state chairman Charles Lanigan in Miami Beach, who was pushing in the convention rules committee for an increase in big-state delegates.

Rockefeller and Nixon are allied on revenue sharing, but disagree on the delegate issue. Conservatives see expanded big-state delegations as a possible block to the Presidential potential of Spiro Agnew.

The Rockefeller-Nixon thaw began early in 1969.

When Nixon offered former Rockefeller aide Henry Kissinger a top White House post, the astonished Kissinger consulted his good friend Nelson, whom he had supported for the Presidency in 1968.

"Take it, of course," Rockefeller advised.

One of Nixon's first Presidential acts was to send Rockefeller on a mission to Latin America. Rockefeller also sits on the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board.

Thus Kissinger became a bridge between the two men, and to a lesser extent so did New York lawyer John Mitchell. The latter had worked with Rockefeller on state financial matters before becoming Nixon's attorney general.

Beyond the personal relationships, the

Nixon-Rockefeller warmup involves a complex web of mutual interests and political pragmatism.

Rockefeller wants revenue sharing and needs Nixon's help to get it. Nixon, the politician, needs Rockefeller to help carry New York in November.

"They have been very supportive of each other," a Rockefeller aide said.

With a twinkle, the governor recalled that the thaw began "when Nixon was elected President. It really related to the things he has done. I have supported every president—after he got in office—since Roosevelt."

And so, when the governor wants to break-fast with the President, it is easily arranged.

"I don't bother him unless I've got something to say," Rockefeller said. "If he's done something I think is very good, I call him up and congratulate him."

Nixon reciprocates and sometimes calls Rocky for advice.

A few unpleasantnesses have ruffled the water. Rockefeller was said to be furious when Nixon wrote Cardinal Cooke in May, opposing liberalization of abortion laws at a time when the issue was pending in the New York Legislature.

Some say Nixon's choice of Rockefeller, the man he once called a "party divider" and "spoilsport," to nominate him was a bow to the GOP's liberal wing intended to offset the choice of Agnew, darling of conservatives, as Nixon's running mate.

As for his own presidential ambitions, Rockefeller said:

"It is hard for a Republican who can get elected in New York—especially three or four times—to make the noises and take the positions which endear him to people (Republicans) in other parts of the country. My trouble is that I feel my responsibilities to those who elected me. Sometimes doing a good job for them is not fully understood in other parts of the country."

He described himself as "better presidential material before I was elected governor than I have been since, because then I hadn't done as many things."

Pounding the table for emphasis, Rockefeller said that senators and congressmen "don't have to do anything in terms of actually carrying things out. They just make statements and vote. This is a lot easier than having the hard, operating responsibilities."

He described himself as "never one who looks backward and regrets what I did or did not do. I've been very fortunate and have had a very exciting, delightful, wonderful life."

"Right now I'm focused on the convention, nominating the President and helping him get elected. Frankly, this is the most important thing I can do for the country."

ASPIN PRAISES NAVY DECISION ON LITTON

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, many Members of this House have been concerned about two large shipbuilding contracts between Litton Industries and the Navy to build 30 DD-963 destroyers and five LHA landing helicopter assault ships.

Some months ago the Defense Contract Audit Agency found that Litton Industries was charging the Navy for work that that corporation was performing on civilian contracts. A little more than \$7 million is involved.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report today that as a result of a series of negotiations between Litton Industries and the Navy that on August 14, Litton Industries agreed to a \$7,137,750 settlement with the Navy.

The Navy, has obviously struck a good bargain and deserves to be congratulated.

DISGRACEFUL OFFICIATING AT THE OLYMPIC GAMES IN MUNICH

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, over the past 2 weeks we have been treated to the grossest type of International athletic behavior imaginable. I refer, of course, to the officiating at the XX Olympiad in Munich, Germany. I had originally intended commenting on the scandalous officiating, after the first week of competition, but the tragedy of the bestial and insane murder of the Israeli athletes rendered the incompetent officiating de minimus. However, in light of the disgraceful behavior by the officials in denying our Olympic basketball team its victory, I feel compelled nevertheless to comment on what can only be termed anti-American officiating at the XX Olympiad.

I would like to quote the oath taken by the officials at the Olympics, which is as follows:

In the name of all judges and officials, I promise that we will officiate in the Olympic Games with complete impartiality, respecting and abiding by the rules which govern them, in the true spirit of sportsmanship.

After setting the tone of the officiating according to the oath, I would now like to run quickly through some of the events of the Olympics which indicate that the officials have conducted themselves in a manner contrary to their Olympic oath.

In the very first days of the Olympics, Reginald Jones, a 21-year-old middleweight from Newark, N.Y., lost out in a highly incompetent and controversial decision to his Russian opponent, Valerij Tregubov. Reggie Jones hit the Russian with everything but Brezhnev and Podgorny, but still could not get the decision. In my early years, I was a boxer, so I know when you leave your opponent bleeding and crying you have won the fight. Judges from Liberia and Malaysia gave the decision to Jones; a Yugoslavian judge voted for the Russian and two other judges, from Niger and Holland, called it a draw. However, Olympic rules say that a judge calling a draw must state his preference and they then both ruled for the Russian. This decision was so blatant that it touched off a 20-minute demonstration in the Olympic boxing hall. I cite this as an example of what continually befell most of our other Olympic boxers, many of whom came a-cropper of bad decisions so that we ended up only with one gold medal and three bronze medals. Some of those

decisions were absolutely unbelievable in their bias and poor judgment.

Again, take the case of Victor Auer, who won a gold medal in rifle. Mr. Auer had equalled the world record with a score of 598 out of a possible 600, which was electronically verified and posted as the official result, the runner-up North Korean scored 595. In the intervening 2 hours, the targets were taken down and examined in a closed door session and contrary to the electronic device it was ruled that the North Korean had shot a record 599 rather than 595, and was belatedly declared the winner. In addition, during the match the North Koreans continually shouted instructions to their shooter which was clearly in violation of the rules of international competition. Does it not seem strange that on this occasion the results of the electronic tabulation were discarded but a day or two later a Swedish swimmer was awarded a gold medal over one of our swimmers in what appeared to be a dead heat when the officials claimed the Swede won by one-two thousandths of a second?

In the diving competition, the judging was so poor that it bordered on an international scandal. For example, one of our divers who finally won a medal was ranked eleventh and twelfth by the Russian judge.

And who could forget Bob Seagren being denied the use of his fiber glass pole in the pole vault for unspecified reasons with the result that all his competitors used the poles they had been jumping with for months and Seagren had to compete with a totally unfamiliar pole. The boy was understandably bitter.

Then there was the case of George Wood being denied a gold medal in the shot-put when his shot hit the Olympic flag record, apparently beating his opponent, only to be told that he lost by a centimeter.

In no instance was an American appeal judged affirmatively during the entire Olympics, including Jim Ryun's fall in the 1,500 meter semifinal heat. Ryun claimed he was fouled but his appeal was denied. Obviously, the holder of the 1,500 meter world record did not just fall down. And imagine denying 16-year-old Rick Demont his gold medal because his asthma medicine contained ephedrine.

And last but not least, was the exhibition on Saturday at the basketball hall between the United States and Russia when the gutsy United States team came from behind to win the game only to be denied their victory and the gold medal by incompetent and viciously unfair officiating. When Doug Collins was driving in for his layup, which would have been the winning basket, he was hit by a football block by one of the Russian thugs. Ultimately, the foul was called, but the player should have been banished from the game for such gross tactics. Fouls were called on our players every time they touched the Russians.

After being knocked unconscious, Doug Collins came back and sank the two clutch free throws which put the Americans ahead. While shooting his last free throw, the Russians called for time out, which was clearly a violation of international rules of competition. At this point, with 1 second left, the officials

called time and set the clock back to 3 seconds, allowing the Russians to inbound the ball. The 3 seconds elapsed and the Russians failed to score. The officials then again gave them another 3 seconds and they inbounded the ball. This time, the ball was thrown the length of the court to their Alexander Belov, who knocked one American player down and another American player out of bounds, and then dumped the ball in the basket. The Russian should have been called for traveling and charging, but the Russian team apparently won on this play after being given three chances after the game had ended. Apparently, the officials were determined to give them enough additional time until they could sink the winning basket.

Obviously, our appeal was turned down by the World Basketball Federation and the Olympic Rules Committee, after 14 hours of deliberation. The Brazilian referee refused to sign the scorecard and indicated he would protest along with the United States. The official scorekeeper stated to Howard Cosell on television that the U.S. team had won. Never in all my years of being associated with sports have I seen such unfair, biased, and malicious conduct.

R. William Jones, secretary general of the International Amateur Basketball Federation, and the man who without authority twice ordered the Russian team to be awarded three extra seconds, stated at the awards ceremony:

But they [the Americans] have to know how to lose, even when they think they are right.

With such an arrogant and biased attitude by this Briton, who was one of the key officials, no wonder the game had such a bizarre ending and one so disastrous to our team.

I was extremely proud that our boys had the good sense and the character to refuse the silver medal. Such acceptance on their part would have been a ratification of a clear wrong. I know it was not easy for them to come away with no medal when they were the best team and when they won the gold medal, but since they won the gold they did the proper thing in not settling for less. So far as I am concerned, those boys are all pure gold.

The entire fabric of officiating and the judging with respect to the American athletes at the XX Olympiad only serves to confirm our suspicion that we really do not have very many friends in the world and that we had better make sure at all times that we are dealing with the other international communities from a position of strength. Such situations as these I have just outlined make one wonder about the wisdom of cutting our defense budget \$32 billion as advocated by Senator McGovern. The events at the Olympics in Munich should serve as an ample warning to the Americans that unless we continue to maintain a position of national strength in the international community, we will find ourselves getting the short end of the stick.

With respect to the officiating at the Olympics, I can only say: shame, shame.

CHILD CARE: A GROWING PROBLEM

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD at this point an article from the August 1972 issue of the AFL-CIO American Federationist entitled, "Child Care: A Growing Problem."

The article was written by Jane O'Grady, the able and respected legislative representative of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, a union which has pioneered in the development of child care centers.

The article follows:

CHILD CARE: A GROWING PROBLEM

(By Jane O'Grady)

By the end of this decade, the majority of American children will have working mothers. The trend of ever larger numbers of women joining the workforce has changed American society drastically from what it was just a few years ago.

With that change has come the transformation of care for the pre-school and school-age children of working mothers from an isolated, individual problem into a subject of national concern—just as the demise of the family farm a few decades ago contributed to the national willingness to provide for the aged and retired on a stable basis through Social Security.

The official government figures on working mothers are indeed dramatic. In 1950, 22 percent of all mothers worked full- or part-time; in 1970, the percentage has doubled to 42 percent. In 1950, 33 percent of mothers with school-age children (6 to 17 years) were in the labor force; in 1970, more than half (52 percent) of these mothers were working. And, while only 14 percent of the mothers with pre-school children under 6 years worked in 1950, today 32 percent are in the workforce.

Most of these women are working—and will be working in the future—out of economic necessity. They are either the sole support of their households or are supplementing the inadequate earnings of their husbands. But the changing view that women have of their role in society today will also add to the workforce many women who wish to work for the personal satisfaction of using their education, skills and creativity. And current efforts to reduce welfare rolls, particularly by requiring welfare mothers to accept job training and employment, will add further to the numbers of women with children participating in the workforce. Most families receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children today consist of a mother and children, with no father present. In December 1970, 7 million children were on the AFDC rolls, 2.3 million under 6 years of age. If their mothers are to be sent out into the labor force, some provision for the care of these children will be required.

While the influx of women into the workforce has made the child care problem visible, it has not necessarily helped clarify what kind of child care the nation should be seeking. For analyzing the need for child care solely in terms of the increasing numbers of working mothers runs the risk of inadequate consideration of the range of possible solutions. It becomes all too easy to say simply that places must be found to "park" the children while the mothers are at work. Such a solution leaves out a critical ingredient—the needs of the growing child.

NEED FOR CHILD CARE

Many other changes taking place in American society today form a broader view of the national debate over society's obligations to young children. The urbanization of the American family is one such social change. More and more families are living in the isolating atmosphere of the big cities, which reduce opportunities for close familial and neighborly contacts for children. The heightened mobility of the American family to urban areas and between urban areas increases the extent to which families must rely on their own resources for the early nurturance of their offspring.

Another factor is the nation's attempt, exemplified in the Great Society programs of the 1960s, to eradicate the sources of poverty—ignorance, lack of skill training, poor emotional and physical health. Combined with this focus on the disadvantaged is the growing recognition of the special needs of all children, even from the most affluent families, who suffer emotional disturbance, mental retardation or physical disability and who are in desperate need of personalized care and family support services.

Perhaps most important in this broad view is the recent documentation by psychologists, psychiatrists, educators and medical professionals of the critical significance of the first five years of life. The experiences of children in their pre-school years can become crucial to their future abilities to function as productive adults, the experts tell us.

The circumstances of a rapidly changing society give the issue of child care a wider dimension than the mere need for baby-sitting services while mothers are at work. We are talking about greater and more profound changes in the American family and its pattern of living; about society's responsibilities to its citizens, even down to the youngest child; and advances in educational theory that recognize the importance of learning experiences of the early childhood years. And thus we are talking about child care as playing a significant social role in the well-being and healthy development of the nation's children.

These terms help to dictate the ingredients needed in child care services. While the home and family remain the central focus of the child's life, supplementary developmental services can contribute to the intellectual, social, emotional and physical growth needs of all the nation's children—from infants to teenagers. Such programs can have a constructive influence on children and their families, helping functioning families to lead more satisfying lives, assisting children to become productive adults. A humane concern for the full development of human potential is the reason for a national commitment to the needs of young children.

Licensed day care homes and centers in the United States today have spaces for about 700,000 children. That figure is pitifully small in a nation with 76 million children under 18—32 million of whom have mothers who work.

Whether the potential need is narrowly defined as the pre-school children of working mothers, or the broader need of young children from all walks of life who could benefit from early childhood educational experiences, the 700,000 figure speaks eloquently of the nation's lack of commitment. And more than half of these centers are proprietary ones, operated by people seeking a profit in the business of child care. Since providing quality care is an expensive undertaking, to add a profit on top of that requires that relatively high fees must be charged for the child care service. Consequently, most of the users of these centers are children from relatively affluent families.

PRESENT CHILD CARE PROGRAMS INADEQUATE

On the other hand, for children from welfare families, there are some opportunities, though severely limited, for government subsidy of child care services. Under the Social Security Act and the Economic Opportunity Act, the federal government has set up a limited matching grant system with the states to provide day care services for welfare mothers who are working or are in training and who need day care for their children. Headstart, a comprehensive pre-school program for poor children, is perhaps the best publicly financed child care program now in operation. At best, however, only 300,000 children are served in full-year (Headstart) programs; 200,000 in summer programs.

In the vast majority of cases, low- to moderate-income families make provision for their children in the best way they can, which usually consists of the free services of another family member or close relative or an outside babysitter at minimal cost. In a distressingly large number of instances, the children from such families are left on their own, or virtually under their own care. While some of these arrangements may be adequate, many of them offer little opportunity to stimulate the growth and development, or even protect the safety, of a young child. For most children with working mothers, TV is the nation's provider of child care service.

Current resources in this country, both private and public, leave a large gap between the very poor who are served—inadequately—by government programs and the more affluent who can pay for costly day care and nursery school services. In between are the families who have too much income to be eligible for the government programs and too little income to afford privately operated child care, even if they could find it available.

LOCAL AND PRIVATE CHILD CARE INITIATIVE

By any standard of measurement, the nation lacks a comprehensive system of developmental child care services. However, some local efforts in the child care field have been undertaken over the years with some success. No doubt, thousands of children and their families have received beneficial services from programs developed and run by church groups, parent cooperatives, local community organizations and business and labor groups. Although no systematic survey of the wide variety of these individual child care efforts is possible, they exist in communities all over the country; many people have contributed many hours, often volunteer hours, to their creation; and they have answered a need and provided a benefit to the limited numbers of children and their families involved. Through the pooling of resources and the use of available facilities, child care reaches a fortunate few in these local community programs.

Industry involvement in child care—what little there is of it—seems to be pragmatically generated in large part by a desire to improve the working potential of the women in its workforce. A happier workforce, with less absenteeism and more production, is often cited by industry leaders as the provocation for providing child care services for the children of their women workers. Some industries, as a consequence, have begun to provide in-plant or nearby facilities, often operated through the private educational groups which have sprung up in the child care field. Most of these facilities require a payment on the part of the participating parents and most are limited to the children of the plant workers. These programs too provide a needed service for the participants.

Union involvement in the field of child care stems from a desire to be of help to their membership in as many aspects of their lives as possible—the trade union philosophy that recognizes the union member as a participant in the larger society with social

needs that go beyond an adequate paycheck and good working conditions. Thus child care activities fit logically into the list of services provided to union members over the years—health insurance, pensions, low-cost banking services, low-to-moderate income housing, retiree centers, college scholarships and pre-paid legal services.

Two regional affiliates of the Clothing Workers have developed child care centers. Baltimore began its program in the mid-1960s. Today, in five local areas in Maryland, Pennsylvania and Virginia, this union operates child care facilities for approximately 1,000 children of its members. These centers are staffed by professionals in the field of child care; offer a complete range of developmental services; and charge a minimal fee of \$1 per day per child for the service rendered.

In Chicago, the Clothing Workers operates a pilot child care project adjacent to its headquarters, serving 60 children of its members. This center also offers a complete range of educational, social, medical and nutritional services, all free to the participating families. This program in Chicago is being used as a research and demonstration project by other educational institutions and government agencies in the field of child care.

These union-sponsored child care programs are financed through contributions (percent of payroll) by the employers under contract with the respective union organizations. To make this possible, it was necessary to amend the national labor relations law, which keeps a tight check on joint labor-management trust funds by spelling out specifically the fringe benefits such funds may be used to finance. Child care had to be added to the list by congressional action to amend the Taft-Hartley Act. This change in the law opens the way for all unions to make child care, like pensions and health insurance, a subject of collective bargaining with their employers.

Other unions, notably the New York City local of the Teachers, have also developed child care programs for their members as well. The United Federation of Teachers has established an early childhood program in New York under contract with the city Board of Education, designed to provide care and education to the children of teachers returning to teach in poverty areas as well as to serve the needs of the community's children.

The Communications Workers, a union which has over 50 percent women members, is participating in experimental child care centers in Washington, D.C., and in Chicago. It is hoped that these centers will serve as pilots for other CWA installations across the country and in several of CWA's 10 districts, research studies on child care are under way.

NEED FOR FEDERAL COMMITMENT

All of these efforts by private organizations, including the efforts of labor and management, fill an important need in the communities they serve. But while the creativity and resourcefulness may be commendable, even under the best of circumstances these private efforts are not and cannot be the entire answer.

The only answer to the broad problem of early childhood developmental care is a massive federal commitment to the provision of such services for all children. Individual efforts or private group efforts will always be too few, too costly, or too limited.

The national significance of quality child care has not escaped the attention of Congress, where efforts have been made to devise a program which takes into account both the necessity from the influx of mothers into the workforce and the potential of skilled care in the development of pre-school youngsters.

COMPREHENSIVE CHILD CARE BILL OF 1971

For some years, such congressional leaders as Representatives John Brademas (D-Ind.) and Patsy Mink (D-Hawaii) and Sen. Walter F. Mondale (D-Minn.) have recognized the need for a national solution to the crisis in child care. But one of the most concentrated recent efforts ran into a roadblock in December 1971 when President Nixon vetoed the comprehensive child care bill with a rationale that included the implication that such federal action would "lead toward altering the family relationship."

At present, Congress is working on legislation that will accomplish something while neutralizing the political considerations at work last year—in short, picking up the pieces from that veto and trying again. Part of the impetus is from a broadly-based coalition of private organizations which came into existence in early 1971 to promote the bill which Nixon vetoed.

Prominent in this child care coalition were the AFL-CIO, the Ladies' Garment Workers and the Clothing Workers. Other organizations affiliated with the coalition, which numbered 26 in total, include the Auto Workers, the League of Women Voters, the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, the National Council of Churches, the National League of Cities-U.S. Conference of Mayors and the Washington Research Project Action Council.

These groups adopted a statement of principles for devising federal legislation, including:

That programs must be of high quality, comprehensive and developmental, oriented to the needs of children and available to all children;

That parents must be directly involved in decisions affecting their own children;

That programs must be locally controlled and flexible enough to meet individual community needs;

That programs must be designed to include children with a variety of backgrounds;

That adequate protections must be provided to assure that the needs of minority group and economically disadvantaged children are met; and

That substantial new public funds would be needed to begin to meet the compelling and immediate need for these services.

RENEWED CONGRESSIONAL EFFORT ON CHILD CARE

As the second session of the 92nd Congress got underway in 1972, the renewed effort on child care took the form of a separate piece of legislation worked out in cooperation between the Democratic and Republican sponsors of the 1971 bill. Strong efforts were made to meet the objections expressed by the President in his veto message. Additional hearings were held to accommodate some of the opponents of the legislation. This bill, the Comprehensive Headstart, Child Development and Family Services Act of 1972, emphasizes quality developmental care, with significant parental involvement and local control, as did the 1971 bill. The bill seeks to build on the successful Headstart program and sets free services at an income level below the government-defined poverty level of \$4,320 for a family of four.

Under the Senate bill, a state, city or county with a population of 25,000 or more could apply to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to be a sponsor of programs in their locality. This application must include an overall child care program design meeting the requirements of HEW sets up. Upon approval of a program, the Secretary of HEW will designate that state, city or county as a "prime sponsor" of child care programs and will allocate funds based on the number of children to be served.

Once a unit of government has become a prime sponsor, the governor, mayor or county executive will set up a Child and Family

Service Council made up of parents of eligible children and other public members with child service skills to approve an administering agency for the child care program in their areas. At that point, local community groups who wish to operate child care centers—churches, parent cooperatives, unions or business groups—would make application to the designated administering agency. Such an application would indicate the kind of facility, program, staff and operating costs of the proposed center. The child care administering agency will then approve these project applications for the actual operation of child care centers under its jurisdiction.

RECENT SENATE ACTION

Federal funds will pay 90 percent of the operation of such programs; in some instances of need, the federal share can go up to 100 percent. Project applicants will make up the additional 10 percent through public or private funds in the form of cash, goods, services, or facilities, including union or employer contributions.

This bill was debated and passed by the Senate in June 1972 by a vote of 73-12. Attempts were made again by Republicans to reduce parental involvement and increase the size of local communities eligible to sponsor programs. Several modifications in the bill were made during the Senate's deliberations. The principal, and perhaps most controversial, change is the amendment offered by Sen. Peter Dominick (R-Colo.) which would allow the Secretary of HEW total discretion in choosing among competing applicants for prime sponsorship of child care programs. The fear is that political considerations would result in states being selected over local communities to run programs—with a consequent loss in direct parent control and participation by minorities in the running of centers for their children.

With the strong bipartisan effort involved in the child care bill just passed by the Senate, the House may be able to achieve a similar, bipartisan bill. If the House can be persuaded to pass a companion bill to the Senate measure, a new child care bill may be on the President's desk before the November election—perhaps an incentive to a presidential signature.

The shape of the present legislation benefited from the work done in 1971 on the earlier bill, which was introduced in the Senate by Mondale. Through a series of hearings before the Mondale Subcommittee on Children and Youth, a persuasive case was made by professionals in the field of child development as well as concerned representatives of private organizations for the need for federal legislation in this field. After full deliberation in the subcommittee and the full Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, the Child Development bill was made part of a bill to extend the life of the Office of Economic Opportunity. On the committee's unanimous recommendation, the Senate adopted this measure in September last year.

HOUSE CONSIDERATION

In the House, a child development bill introduced by Rep. Brademas and 97 other House members was added as an amendment to the OEO extension bill on the floor of the House in September 1971.

The House and Senate bills were similar in many respects. They both established a system of federally funded comprehensive child care services, emphasizing health, educational, nutritional and social developmental components. Both bills gave priority to children from disadvantaged families—for poor families, the services were free; for families above low-income levels would pay fees. Both bills included a diversity of programs which could be provided depending on the need for such services in individual localities. This range of programs included those for infants to 14-year-olds; full or part-time care, night care and after-school programs. Both bills emphasized local control of programs through

a prime sponsorship mechanism which would have allowed small units of local government to become day care sponsors for their localities. And both emphasized, through participation on local program councils, the involvement of parents in the planning and monitoring of child care programs in their communities. The Senate bill cited a specific funding request of \$2 billion; the House bill called for an open-ended authorization of funds.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION

It was clear early in the consideration of this legislation that the Nixon Administration had serious reservations about embarking on a major new social program such as envisioned in the child development bills. The Administration opposition was based in large part on an unwillingness to spend additional federal monies for a program of this magnitude. The Administration had already taken its stand on child care in their welfare reform proposals, which called for \$750 million for day care services for the children of welfare mothers who would be required to accept work or training under the terms of the welfare legislation. As a consequence, the Administration made little effort to seriously involve itself in the design of the legislation as it made its way through Congress.

Republican members of both the House and Senate did do battle over some of the provisions of the child care bills. The principal battlefield was the issue of the involvement of the states in the operation of the programs. The proponents of the legislation were strongly opposed to funneling the child care monies into state-run child care operations. States had not shown particular interest or motivation in the child care field under existing legislation; there was no reason to think they would improve appreciably in this respect with the passage of new child care legislation.

Also, the bill's proponents felt strongly that local sponsorship of programs would permit the best kind of parental participation, another issue which created controversy. Some attempts were made to reduce the parents' role in the planning and operation of child care programs to merely advisory ones. These efforts were largely unsuccessful.

Also at issue was the level at which free services were to be provided. The proponents of the legislation argued strongly that families with incomes that were low but still above the government-defined poverty line should be given an opportunity for free services under this legislation in order to obtain a socially desirable economic mix of children in the centers.

It was at the point of the conference committee meetings to iron out the differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill that Administration displeasure became a serious obstacle. The Republican conferees warned that the bill was in for a veto on the grounds of high cost, too high an income figure for free services and too much local and parent control. The conference finally agreed on a bill, but three of five Senate Republicans and five of six House Republicans did not sign the conference report.

The conference report on the Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1971 retained strong parental involvement in program planning, authorized \$2 billion for program operation, allowed localities with populations of 5,000 or more to be designated as prime sponsors and made services free to families of four below the \$4,320 income level, with fee schedules established above that income figure. The conference report passed both houses overwhelmingly—and the child care bill went to the White House as part of the renewal of the poverty program.

PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR CHILD CARE

A major effort was mounted by the coalition of private organizations to urge the

President to sign the bill, but on Dec. 9, 1971 President Nixon vetoed the legislation and issued one of the most controversial veto messages of recent days. In it, he made several points with regard to the child care program which were hotly disputed by the proponents of the legislation. The President stated in his veto message that the child development legislation had been passed "in the absence of a great national debate upon its merits" and that "neither the immediate need nor desirability of a national child development program . . . had been demonstrated."

Critics of the President's veto were quick to point out that comprehensive child development legislation had been the No. 1 priority recommendation, after thorough discussion and debate, of the participants in the President's own White House Conference on Children, representing national organizations with broad constituencies of parents, educators, child development experts, minority groups, community groups and church groups.

The most insidious charge the President leveled was the one about altering the family relationship, claiming that the bill committed "the vast moral authority of the national government to the side of communal approach." This was said despite the strong emphasis in the legislation on parent involvement in the day-to-day operations of programs and its wholly voluntary character—as opposed to the Administration's alternative in its welfare legislation forcing children into daycare programs while the mothers were required to seek work and training.

An attempt to override the veto by a two-thirds vote of the Senate was unsuccessful but the vote of 51-36 did reflect majority support for this legislation in spite of the presidential objections — and guaranteed that a renewed effort would be made in the second session in 1972, as it has been.

However the new legislative efforts turn out in this session of Congress, the social pressures and growing concern for full development of the potential of the nation's children will continue to be a major prod to legislators to devise appropriate and responsive social structures. It is no longer a question of whether American families and their children should have child care services available to them, but whether the child care they do have is good—good for the child, good for the family and good for the country.

CAR SAFETY

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Washington Star-News, by Robert Irvin, disclosed a new and interesting development in the continuing controversy between the air bag and passive restraint. Supporters and detractors of the air bag generally agree that when these devices are installed in the dash or steering wheel hub, they provide little or no protection for side impact collisions or secondary crashes.

Allied Chemical Corp., already heavily involved in air-bag development and a major supplier of seat belts has recently come up with an air belt which would appear to combine the advantages of the air bag and the belt thus minimizing the limitations of each system used alone. The air belt is just what the name sug-

gests, a belt which inflates in a collision. Yet because it is a belt, it continues to provide protection should the inflation mechanism fail.

But any rejoicing over this ingenious invention needs to be tempered by the fact that neither the air belt nor the air bag have been tested and proved to be safe and reliable under normal driving conditions. Unfortunately, the Allstate Insurance Co., in its eagerness to reduce highway fatalities, has, through its advertising, left the mistaken impression that testing to date has conclusively proved the reliability of the air bag. This is simply not the case.

What we do know is that air bags work great on test sleds. These results are definitely encouraging but hardly conclusive. If Americans drove to work or the grocery store on test sleds we could, with complete confidence, order their installation without further delay. But, the automobile operates in a far less controlled and predictable environment. Until we have extensive air bag experience in cars under normal driving conditions, we should not force them upon the driving public. Today we have a couple hundred cars on the road with passenger-side-only air bags but we have no accident experience to evaluate yet. General Motors is expected to equip 1,000 1973 model cars with air bags on the driver side, as well as the passenger side, but there is serious question whether this number of vehicles is a large enough sample to establish reliability prior to installation of all cars built after August 15, 1975, as motor vehicle safety standards presently require.

Dr. Lawrence A. Goldmuntz, Assistant Director of the White House Office of Science and Technology recently stated that if we are willing to accept "a failure rate of less than 1 per 100,000 air bags per year, then it would be necessary to test 120,000 air bags for 1 year." Dr. Goldmuntz concluded that "the fleet tests contemplated are not adequate to demonstrate air bag reliability."

Hopefully, those responsible for testing the various restraint systems, whether it be the air belt, air bag, or something else, will move quickly to provide meaningful testing under actual driving conditions. Unless we move quickly, we will never be able to meet the 1975 deadline for across-the-board installation of these much needed safety devices.

The article follows:

ARE AIR BELTS CAR SAFETY ANSWER?

(By Robert W. Irvin)

DETROIT.—An auto safety device combining the best features of seat belts and air bags has been invented by Allied Chemical Corp. The device is an inflatable seat belt. The company says preliminary tests indicate it will provide protection as good as, or better than, air bags. In addition, it should be fail-safe and thus less hazardous to use than the controversial air bags.

Allied has not publicly announced the device, which was invented only two months ago and is still in the development stages. But in recent days it was demonstrated to auto firms and federal safety officials. They are enthusiastic, and that is how word leaked out.

It's understood the government wants to put 10,000 in cars as soon as possible for test-

ing, and some auto executives are also eyeing tests in the coming months. But the device is a year or more away from mass production.

Supporters feel the system could result in a long delay of the still unproven air bags, which the government wants to see installed on all 1976 model cars.

The new device operates on the same principle as an air bag—it pops open automatically in a crash.

The air bag pops out of the instrument panel and steering wheel, triggered by an explosive charge, and a person is supposed to be protected by plunging into the gas-filled bag.

The air belts, in contrast, are worn like any other seat belt. The belts are two inches wide and can be made to resemble conventional belts, but they are hollow, like an inner tube or a life vest.

In an accident, a small canister of gas fills the belts until they are 6 inches in diameter. The body is forced against the inflated belts, and this has an effect similar to the air bag, but is considered better.

What's more, the inflated belt keeps a person snugly in his seat and this makes it possible for him to take advantage of the energy-absorbing characteristics of the car itself.

The belt stays inflated long enough to provide protection in a rebound crash, where cars collide more than once, or another car or object is hit after the first one. The belts also provide protection in roll-over crashes. Air bags do not offer the same protection in a rebound or roll-over accident.

I tried the Allied system at the firm's research center in Mount Clemens, Mich., the other day. They had the air belt installed in a seat mounted on one of those impact test sleds used in research laboratories. They didn't fire the sled, they just inflated the belt.

When it is inflated, it presses hard on the chest and midsection. In fact, if it remained inflated, the passenger would have difficulty breathing. But it never stays inflated for more than a quarter or a half second. However, even when it deflates, you still have the belt around you.

That is the fail-safe feature. If, for some reason, the belt doesn't inflate in a crash—through a sensor failure, for example—you still have the protection offered by any lap-shoulder belt.

Or, if the belt should inadvertently inflate, it is not as hazardous as an accidentally inflating air bag would be. This is because an inflated belt does not block the driver's vision.

The fact remains, however, that neither the air bag nor the airbelt has yet been used by a human being in an accident.

What's more, if the air belt were to be used in place of the air bag in 1976, it would require a change in the safety standards. The rules require a passive safety system (something which operates automatically, like air bags). On the other hand, the air belt is like any seat belt—it is an active system. It must be buckled before it does any good.

However, unlike the air bags, all of which go off in a crash regardless of whether all seats are filled, the air belts only operate if they have been buckled.

Allied makes air bags and seat belts, so it is well covered whichever way the industry moves. Through the Jim Robbins Seat Belt Co., it makes millions of belts used in current cars.

Its air bags are being used in hundreds of 1972 model Mercury cars which are now on test around the country. It also expects to provide air-bags for General Motors' planned test of 1,000 new 1973 model Chevrolet cars, with the bags in both the steering wheel and the instrument panel. (Mercury only has the bags in the panel.)

The company says it can build 500,000 air bags a year at its Mount Clemens facility and expects to provide several thousands for the 1974 GM cars. GM is going to sell them as optional equipment on some 1974 models.

Donald G. Radke, president of Allied's automotive products division, talked about prospects for the air belt. "The federal government has asked us to furnish 10,000 quickly and we will sell these to them at a nominal cost," he said.

"If all this jells, we hope to have them installed by the first of the year," Radke said.

He said he believes the air belt, on which Allied has applied for a patent, has a much better chance of being accepted than the air bag, and it would be cheaper. He indicated the cost of the belts would be only a third that of the bags.

The important thing, he said, is that the air belt "does the job as well or better than the bags. A postponement of the air bag timetable is what we are hoping for."

Radke said Douglas Toms, head of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, "has seen the belts and he is very enthusiastic."

Radke said no one is giving up on bags, but "we see this as an interim system."

TWELFTH ANNUAL SURVEY OF DISTRICT OPINION

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just concluded my 12th annual survey of district opinion. Perhaps the strongest, although not surprising, reaction was to a question I did not ask. Question 5 asked what Congress should do if additional revenue is needed to close the gap between Federal income and expenditures. Fully one-fourth of those responding penned me a special note stating that, instead of new taxes, they wanted to see cuts in Government spending. Never before has a question prompted so many people to write individual comments.

The three areas most often mentioned as prospects for budget cuts—question 7—are foreign aid, space exploration, and the Vietnam war. Also, most Illinoisans want to see the Government payments to farmers cut substantially—question 6. Whether farmers or nonfarmers, the response was overwhelmingly in favor of a limit on farm payments, and most felt the lower the better.

Strong support was shown for President Nixon's initiatives to improve relations with China, the Soviet Union, and Eastern Europe—question 2. In line with this, I have agreed to head Governor Ogilvie's Agricultural Trade Mission to Moscow which leaves tomorrow.

The country remains divided over what to do about those young men who left the United States rather than serve in Vietnam—question 4. After the war has finally been ended and all American soldiers have returned home, perhaps it will be possible to work out a compromise solution which will permit many young men to return to their families in exchange for a substantial period of compulsory service to their country.

The results of the survey follow:

RESULTS OF 12TH ANNUAL SURVEY OF DISTRICT OPINION

	Yes	No	Undecided		His	Hers	Total
1. The Supreme Court has held that busing can be used where needed to bring about racial integration (as distinguished from racial balance) in public schools. Do you consider this a just decision?				5. The current Federal deficit will be \$40,000,000,000. Last year it was \$23,000,000,000. Next year it is forecast at \$25,000,000,000. If additional revenue is needed to help close this gap, what should Congress do?			
His.....	2,167	8,837	777	(a) Increase income taxes.....	1,693	1,186	2,879
Hers.....	2,181	8,364	1,017	(b) Increase excise taxes (gas, tires, tobacco, liquor, travel).....	4,213	4,574	8,787
Total.....	4,348	17,201	1,794	(c) Establish a new, value-added tax (similar to a national sales tax).....	2,718	2,176	4,894
2. In general, do you support the President's moves to improve relations with China, the Soviet Union, and eastern Europe?				6. At what level do you favor limiting Government farm payments?			
His.....	10,546	1,075	435	(a) Present \$55,000 per crop.....	575	499	1,074
Hers.....	9,917	1,171	657	(b) \$20,000 per farmer.....	3,236	2,405	5,641
Total.....	20,463	2,246	1,092	(c) \$10,000 per farmer.....	2,828	2,458	5,286
3. Should the President have authority to impose a mandatory settlement on widespread, prolonged strikes in the transportation industry (docks, railroads, trucks, barges, aircraft)?				(d) \$5,000 per farmer.....	3,920	3,867	7,787
His.....	9,787	1,899	333	(e) No limit.....	300	297	597
Hers.....	9,937	1,467	448	7. Substantial cuts in spending are needed.			
Total.....	19,724	3,366	781	Where would you cut most?			
4. Many young men left the country rather than serve in Vietnam. After the United States is out of Vietnam, what should be done with regard to those who wish to return to the United States?				(a) Agriculture and rural development.....	1,904	1,276	3,180
(a) Let them face criminal penalties now in law.....	6,027	4,062	10,089	(b) Aid to cities.....	3,022	2,108	5,130
(b) Let them clear their record by 3 years military (or other compulsory Government) service.....	4,842	5,659	10,501	(c) Anticrime programs.....	494	323	817
(c) Grant them amnesty.....	988	1,206	2,194	(d) Consumer protection.....	1,285	845	2,130
				(e) Education.....	1,634	1,001	2,635
				(f) Foreign aid.....	10,663	8,179	18,842
				(g) Health.....	419	285	704
				(h) Housing.....	2,272	1,682	3,954
				(i) Income security programs.....	2,642	1,876	4,518
				(j) National defense.....	1,733	1,119	2,852
				(k) Natural resources and the environment.....	817	596	1,413
				(l) Space explorations.....	7,981	6,452	14,433
				(m) Transportation.....	2,305	1,828	4,133
				(n) Vietnam war.....	7,983	6,210	14,193

OLYMPICS—SIGNS OF OUR TIMES

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, station WSPA radio and TV, Spartanburg, S.C., a few days ago aired an editorial which, using Munich as a backdrop, called for a universal rededication to the curtailment of crime and terror and the promotion of peace and good will. I join in that call and insert the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

OLYMPICS—SIGNS OF OUR TIMES

Now that the 1972 Olympic Games have gone into the record books, it may be well for all countries involved to take stock and determine what can be done to prevent another Munich.

Certainly, if the countries who participate are not willing to sign a binding compact to do all they can internationally to stop hijacking of airlines and other international terror and murder which is becoming so common, then there is a serious question as to whether the Olympics should continue.

The United States in the United Nations and through diplomatic channels have been trying to get some agreements for cooperative action along these lines but without success. Those countries who are promoting world revolution apparently do not want to work for international law and order and curtail their own espionage activities.

If the Olympics are continued, then WSPA is of the firm opinion that the United States Committee should set up some better screening process. Certainly participants who are not loyal to their country and their government should be excluded and athletes should be selected strictly according to their ability and without favoritism.

WSPA was struck with awe when one Ken-

yan athlete, winner of a Bronze Medal, stood respectfully at attention while two American athletes, winners of Gold and Silver Medals stood nonchalantly and chatted while the band played the National Anthem of the United States. Had it been the Kenyan who had shown this disrespect to America, it would have been an insult. But when our own representatives show such discourtesy, it was disgraceful. These two Americans in an interview with Howard Cosell of ABC said they knew what they were doing, and one said he could not in good conscience stand at attention during the playing of the National Anthem because of the way his race had been treated in the United States.

The Olympic Committee censured the American Committee and banned these two Americans from further participation in the games and they were right in their action.

The big tragedy of the Munich Olympics, of course, was the murder of members of the Israeli team. WSPA can add nothing to the world condemnation of such a senseless and cruel act.

This kind of terror is spreading; and unless law-abiding nations combine to put an end to hijacking and murder, then it is doubtful if a climate can be provided in Montreal four years from now which would be conducive to the holding of the Olympics.

As a first step in this direction, the people of the United States should put their own house in order.

In recent years the Supreme Court in its decision has shown more concern for those guilty of crime than for the victims of crime. The final blow as the Court's decision on capital punishment. Whenever a court say punishing a murderer by death is "cruel and inhuman" regardless of the guilt and the heinousness of the crime, there can be no law and order in this country.

Before 1976 rolls around, WSPA expresses the hope that all nations, and especially the United States, will have rededicated themselves to curtailment of crime and terror and promotion of peace and good will; otherwise, what could happen in Montreal could dwarf the tragedy and mistakes of Munich.

FACTS OF FAILURE

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, for the past year, much has been written about the proposed Housing Act of 1972. With the action of the House Banking and Currency Committee on September 19, 1972, reporting H.R. 16704 to the House, the stage is now set for debate on a measure of vital concern to all Americans, particularly residents of urban centers.

Once again articles are appearing, repeating much of what has been written in the past and directly or impliedly critical of the congressional response to date of the administration's proposals or to the facts of the urban crisis, particularly those facts relating to low-income housing. This criticism is tendered notwithstanding the unprecedented time both the Subcommittee on Housing and the Committee on Banking and Currency have spent in both open and closed sessions considering this bill.

During the past year the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs of the House Government Operations Committee, which I chair, has been conducting an investigation of the operations of the Department of Housing and Urban Development with emphasis on the operations of the Federal Housing Administration. Our finding of fact in Detroit culminated in a unanimous report of the full committee containing a series of recommendations applicable to Detroit and virtually every major city where inner city scandals and program failures have subsequently been found to exist.

These findings received extensive coverage by the national media. Throughout I have endeavored to bring to the attention of my colleagues a fair representative sampling of journalistic attitudes, representative news coverage, and editorial opinion.

John Herbers of the New York Times, and William Lilley III and Timothy B. Clark of the National Journal, throughout the course of a year-long investigation by the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, have written a number of thoughtful, well-balanced articles dealing with the complex and highly technical field of urban housing, both subsidized and unsubsidized. In addition to viewing the facts of housing failures first-hand as our subcommittee has, they have gone behind the facts in a never-ending search for root causes and have independently concluded that both the executive and the legislative branches have thus far failed to respond to today's urban housing crisis.

I regret that the rules of the House do not permit the printing of both articles in their entirety. I earnestly commend that each of my colleagues endeavor to read both articles:

"Urban Report/Block Grant Transit, Reorganization Plans Languish in Congress" by William Lilley III and Timothy B. Clark, National Journal, volume 4, No. 38, pages 1459-65; and

"Federal Reform Unlikely Despite dal" by John Herbers, New York Times, September 20, 1972, page 1.

I believe it to be significant that both reporters, approaching the issue from somewhat different perspectives, expressed concern that the problems of corruption and manipulation of the Federal Housing Administration have not been dealt with either by the bill as reported out by the committee or by administration initiatives.

The view expressed by our distinguished colleague from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY) cited by Mr. Lilley, of member concern as to how programs can be administered to avoid scandal is of special significance to the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs due to efforts in Detroit and with the Department of Justice to insist upon an accelerated nationwide coordinated effort against widespread criminal activity in virtually every major city. The belated convening of grand juries is not enough. We will continue to press for a response to the full committee recommendations from the Attorney General. It seems appropriate once again to quote from the Capehart hearings concluded in 1955 dealing with FHA graft, profiteering similar in many respects to the current situation.

It has been frequently said that the best law the mind of man is capable of drafting will not work if incompetently and improperly administered; and that the worst law of the Congress will not result in inequities if properly and competently administered . . .

The general attitude of FHA seems to have been that it was an agency for the builders and for their benefit. While deeply concerned with inducing builders to construct more projects, FHA appears to have been unconcerned in maintaining the standards of integrity and competence required of Government agencies in the public interest. (FHA

Investigation—Report of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, 84th Congress, 1st Session, January 6, 1955.)

In our consideration of the Housing Act of 1972, have we done all that we can do legislatively to insure that our laws are administered competently, minimizing the risk of corruption from within? Have administrative responses to the current undenied crisis been adequate? Both reporters have clearly challenged the Congress as a whole to consider these and other questions. By pointedly reminding us that the facts of Detroit, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Chicago, will not disappear with the passage of H.R. 16704, certainly none of us should be deluded into believing that we have solved the problems of Detroit and other major cities where abandonment is spreading rapidly. It may well be that the harsh facts of inner city housing problems do not lend themselves to an instant legislative response. Can we, however, as a Congress commit ourselves to the seeking of an approach that can hold out a realistic promise of seeking a solution? Certainly the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs is determined to continue to seek out the facts, to make its recommendations, to evaluate responses made as to their effectiveness.

The issue before us then, in my judgment, is not so much what the Housing Act of 1972 will do, but what it will not do. I believe that working cooperatively, pooling our committee expertise, we have the resources and will to deal with the facts of failure. That is the challenge of the articles to which I have referred. We must accept that challenge.

JAMES P. "SPOT" MOZINGO

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, South Carolina has lost one of her most distinguished legislators and brilliant members of the legal profession in the untimely passing of the Honorable James P. Mozingo III.

During his 34 years in the South Carolina Senate, "Spot" Mozingo epitomized the highest traditions of that great body. It was my high privilege to serve with him in the South Carolina General Assembly for several years, and over the years he remained a warm personal friend.

Senator Mozingo's contributions to good government in our State are legion. As chairman of the Senate Education Committee, and chairman of the Governor's education committee, he had a crucial role in the fantastic progress our State has made in education.

A graduate of the University of South Carolina Law School, Mozingo served at various times on the board of trustees of that university, of Clemson University and of Winthrop College. He helped develop one of the Nation's greatest road

systems through his chairmanship of the senate highways committee.

And as vice chairman of the senate finance committee "Spot" Mozingo supported the sound fiscal policies that have provided our State with one of the highest credit ratings enjoyed by any State in the Nation. Along with Senator Edgar Brown, he was largely responsible for one of the best State governments in the Nation.

James P. Mozingo's keen intellect, unusual knowledge of human nature, persuasiveness in debate and willingness to adopt new and better trial techniques contributed to his status as one of the leading advocates in the legal profession. He was certainly one of the greatest lawyers of our time.

His skill as an attorney was recognized nationally by his service as president of the American Trial Lawyers Association; and he also served as president of the Darlington County Bar Association. In the courtroom as well as in the general assembly, he possessed a keen wit and sense of humor that became legendary.

"Spot" Mozingo came from a distinguished family long active in the public life of Darlington County and South Carolina. Many honors came to him, which he richly deserved, including the new Darlington County office building being named in his honor, and an honorary degree from Clemson University. He was one of our State's best known and most distinguished citizens.

Mr. Speaker, my people join me in extending to Mrs. Mozingo and the entire Mozingo family our deepest sympathy and respect.

THE DECLARATION OF
INDEPENDENCE

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission prepares for the Nation's 200th birthday, it behooves us to pause for a moment to reflect on the past so that we may better understand the present and the future of this great country.

Said Patrick Henry:

I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. I know no way of judging of the future but by the past.

Our Founding Fathers themselves studied the past and in so doing, they manifested in the Declaration of Independence the belief that all men are created equal, endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, and whenever any form of government becomes destructive to these ends, the people have a right to change their government to insure their safety and happiness.

The belief in these principles derives from antiquity, and to this very day people the world over continue to fight to have these basic rights instituted in their daily lives and countries.

When you consider the men and what they later accomplished, it can be stated without contradiction that never in the history of our country have so many great men with great minds come together—willing to sacrifice everything in order to work for the good of the country—as during our Revolutionary period.

Thomas Jefferson, one of the most outstanding statesmen the world has ever known and who will always be a pillar of history, wrote the Declaration of Independence.

There were 56 men who signed the Declaration of Independence, and it is interesting to note that of these 56, two became Presidents of the United States; three served as Vice Presidents; 11 became Governors; six served as U.S. Senators, and three as Representatives; three served on the Supreme Court; one served as Secretary of State and one as U.S. Treasurer; and two became presidents of universities.

Five of the 56 signers were from New Jersey. These were: Abraham Clark, born in Elizabethtown, N.J., who later served as U.S. Representative from New Jersey from 1791 to 1794; John Hart, born in Stonington, Conn., a farmer by profession who died before independence was won from the British; Francis Hopkinson, born in Philadelphia and a lawyer and jurist by profession, who served as a U.S. district judge from 1789 to 1791. Mr. Hopkinson is credited by some historians as having designed the U.S. flag in 1777. His greatest contribution to the cause of American liberty came in his writings of political satires that helped mold public opinion in favor of the revolutionary cause and the ratification of the Constitution. There was Richard Stockton, born in Princeton, N.J., and a lawyer by profession who was imprisoned by the British during the Revolutionary War—the Stockton homestead in Princeton is now the Governor's mansion; and lastly, there was John Witherspoon, a clergyman by profession who was born in Yester, Scotland. Mr. Witherspoon served as president of the College of New Jersey, which later became Princeton University.

I am indeed proud that such outstanding men from my home State of New Jersey were present and contributed so greatly to the birth of our Nation.

Said Cicero:

History is the witness that testifies to the passing of time; it illuminates reality, vitalizes memory, provides guidance in daily life, and brings us tidings of antiquity.

As we move forward to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the founding of our Republic, let us reflect on an old document which is as relevant today as the day it was written, and which continues to inspire and guide people everywhere in seeking a better life and world in which to live.

COMPARISON OF GI BILL ALLOWANCES FOR VIETNAM VETERANS AND THOSE OF WORLD WAR II

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, since the Veterans' Affairs Committees of both Houses of Congress have been considering legislation to increase the monthly educational allowances under the GI bill, there has been much comment about the adequacy of present benefits when compared to educational benefits available to World War II veterans. Members of the other body, in particular, but some of our own as well, have cried for benefits that are comparable to those received by World War II veterans.

Mr. Speaker, let me state categorically that if today's veterans were paid educational benefits on the same basis as their World War II predecessors, about half of them would receive less money than they now receive.

I was shocked, Mr. Speaker, to read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD recently that one Member of the other body had labeled Vietnam veterans as "the most shabbily treated veterans in our history." He went on to say:

Today's veterans are receiving about one-third of the help from Uncle Sam while going to school as their fathers received under similar conditions in the 1940's.

Mr. Speaker, this Member of the other body demonstrates a remarkable ignorance of the law and the facts. His statement simply is not true.

What are the facts?

Because there was and is a legitimate need to evaluate the adequacy of current Vietnam era GI bill education and training benefits in comparison with what virtually everyone assumes to have been the more generous World War II program, the Veterans' Administration has prepared a comparative analysis study of the two programs.

This study notes that four of five college trainees under the current GI bill are enrolled in public schools, many of them paying little or no tuition. A large percentage of these veterans—about half—would receive less monetary benefits if they were paid on the same basis as their World War II predecessors.

A Vietnam era full-time trainee, with no dependents, now receives \$1,575 for a 9-month school year—\$175 a month for 9 months. This rate would now be significantly higher if the other body had not delayed 5 months before passing a bill to increase GI bill allowances paid by the Veterans' Administration. Back in March, the House approved legislation authorizing an increase in these allowances.

Nonetheless, the allowance now paid a Vietnam era full-time trainee, with no dependents, is higher than the current dollar value of the World War II subsistence allowance—\$1,118 in 1971-72 constant dollars—combined with the

average cost of tuition and fees in public colleges—\$367 for the 1971-72 school year.

The current GI bill is more liberal than the World War II program to the extent that it imposes no ceiling on combined earnings and subsistence allowance, as did the World War II program.

Under both programs, trainees generally found it necessary to work, part time or full time, to supplement their Veterans' Administration benefits. The World War II program, however, precluded many trainees from receiving a subsistence allowance, or very little at the most, because the ceiling of \$210 on combined earnings and subsistence allowance—\$270 for veterans with one dependent, \$290 for veterans with more than one dependent—barred or drastically reduced their receipt of subsistence allowance payments.

By contrast, today's Vietnam era GI bill would permit these same veterans to receive full Veterans' Administration allowances, with no reduction because of their earnings. For example, the married veteran with two children, over the course of 36 months of full-time attendance in college, can receive \$8,280, with no limit on outside earnings.

In several other respects the entitlement provisions of the current GI bill are more liberal than the World War II program.

At least one of seven Vietnam era veterans receives more months of entitlement than would have been granted for the same service in World War II. These are the veterans who are released after 18 months, but with less than 2 years of service. They receive a full 36 months of entitlement, but would have received less under the World War II program—1-year plus 1 month for each month of service.

Unlimited free entitlement is provided Vietnam era veterans to enable them to complete their high school training or to take special courses which are prerequisite for their selected program of training. Thus, these educationally disadvantaged veterans receive the necessary catch up training, but save their full entitlement to 4 years of college, or 36 months of such other training as they may select.

Under the World War II program, such catchup or remedial training was charged to the veteran's original entitlement, thus reducing the amount remaining for his selected program.

Furthermore, Vietnam era veterans, who are having difficulties with their studies, may receive special tutorial assistance for which the Veterans' Administration will reimburse the cost. Free tutorial assistance was not available to World War II GI bill trainees.

While 7.8 million World War II veterans have cause to remember fondly and gratefully their GI bill education and training assistance from the Veterans' Administration, I think it is abundantly evident from this comparison that the Vietnam era veteran has fared at least as well as his World War II counterpart.

This same Member, Mr. Speaker, said: The quality of care in Veterans' Administration hospitals today is perhaps the saddest case of all.

It is most unfortunate that veterans and their families, hearing statements of this nature, must needlessly wonder and worry about the availability and quality of VA hospital and medical care which they need and to which they may be entitled as veterans.

Here are the facts.

The budget for VA medicine has nearly doubled in just the past 3 years, going from \$1.4 billion in fiscal 1969 to \$2.7 billion in this fiscal year.

Today, the Veterans' Administration has 32 percent more doctors on duty than it did 3 years ago, 16 percent more dentists, 31 percent more nurses, and 20,000 other medical and paramedical personnel.

The length of stay in VA hospitals has been shortened by 3 days in the past 3 years. There have been nearly a thousand new medical units added to the Nation's largest and finest hospital system.

The \$155 million budgeted for construction this year is the highest amount in 21 years.

In addition to treating an all-time-high 1 million patients in its hospitals this year, VA medicine will handle 11 million outpatient visits, also a record number.

On an average day in fiscal 1973, there will be 167,000 former servicemen who will need, and who will receive medical care from the Veterans' Administration.

In this fiscal year, the Veterans' Administration is going to add 248 new medical units to its hospital system, including 12 new drug dependence treatment centers, bringing to 44 the total number of centers opened by VA in a little more than a year, thus insuring that VA will care for many more veterans than the 20,000 cared for in fiscal 1972.

I think that the following hard facts not only suggest but compel the use of the term "quality" to describe the Veterans' Administration hospital and medical care program today.

All of VA's 168 hospitals are accredited, and many of them are affiliated with the Nation's medical teaching schools. Nearly one-half of VA's full-time physicians are board-certified specialists, and nearly one-half hold active faculty appointments at medical or dental schools affiliated with VA hospitals.

Additionally, VA hospitals are affiliated with nearly 1,000 graduate departments of psychology, graduate schools of social work, nursing schools, occupational therapy schools, physical therapy schools, pharmacy schools, plus universities, colleges, junior and community colleges, and technical and vocational schools having courses for professional or technical allied health workers.

On any given day, VA medical research investigators are involved in nearly 6,000 research projects. Among the accomplishments, or shared accomplishments of VA medical research, have been the elimination of tuberculosis as a killer

disease, the perfection of kidney transplants, the development of portable hemodialysis units for home use, the laser cane for the blind, the heart pacemaker, and most recently, the implanting of nuclear heart pacemakers in two veteran patients at the Veterans' Administration hospital in Buffalo, N.Y.

This year approximately 62,000 persons will be trained in health care delivery by the Veterans' Administration.

Nearly one-third of all physicians now practicing, and approximately one-half of those entering practice each year, have had some or all of their postgraduate training in VA hospitals.

Additionally, the Veterans' Administration contributes directly to the education each year of over 1,000 dental students, over 20,000 basic nursing students, 23 percent of all social work graduates, 32 percent of all dietetic interns, 20 percent of all Ph. D. candidates in clinical psychology, and 25 percent of all pharmacy interns and residents.

It is difficult to understand how anyone familiar with these facts could label the quality of care in VA hospitals as the saddest case of all.

The employment picture for Vietnam veterans has also come in for its share of criticism. Again, what are the facts? In October 1970, President Nixon, in response to charges that the Vietnam veteran was not getting a fair deal in the job market, inaugurated a nationwide campaign to place the returning veteran into productive employment. Under the direction of the President's Jobs for Veterans National Committee, a massive, well-coordinated effort by Federal, State, and local governments, veterans organizations, business, labor, and industry groups, to find training and employment possibilities for returning GI's, was launched. Principally as the result of this program, the Secretary of Labor recently announced that at least 1.3 million Vietnam era veterans had been placed in jobs or entered job training during the 1972 fiscal year.

In July 1971, the unemployment level for Vietnam veterans had reached 8.6 percent. In July 1972, largely as the result of the efforts of the President's Jobs for Veterans Committee, the unemployment figure had been reduced to 7.2 percent. While the jobless rate for veterans still lags slightly behind that of non-veterans, significant progress has been made and will continue.

For the young veteran interested in establishing his own business, the U.S. Small Business Administration recently announced a new program under which Vietnam era veterans will be eligible for business loans, Federal Government contracts and management assistance.

These are some of the special efforts, Mr. Speaker, geared specifically to the Vietnam veteran. In the more established veterans benefit programs—compensation for service-connected disabilities, pension for permanent and total disability that is unrelated to military service, home loan guaranty, hospital and medical care, and survivor benefits, Vietnam era service qualifies under precisely the same criteria as veterans of other wars.

No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with

those who say, "This Nation has not delivered in the case of Vietnam era veterans." Our people will forever be indebted to the veterans of all of our Nation's wars, including those who served in Vietnam, and we will continue our efforts to demonstrate our gratitude by perfecting the structure of benefits for veterans of all wars.

BLACK DAY AT MUNICH

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, all of us were shocked and saddened at the outrageous assassination of the Israeli members of the Olympic team.

Historically, the Olympic games have been the ultimate in competitive sports and while the competition among nations has been intense it has been restricted to athletic competition.

As many of my colleagues know, I had an active role in the conduct of the winter Olympics of 1960, which were held in my home county in California at Squaw Valley. There one of the things that impressed me greatly was the spirit of sportsmanship among people of all nations regardless of the intensity of the competition.

This Nation of ours, as was the whole world, was shocked at the violence in Munich earlier this month. The superior court of the State of California for the county of Plumas spoke for all of us when it declared:

The court states that the evening recess shall be in the honor of the following Israel Olympic team members slain while participating in the 1972 Olympics in Munich, Germany:

Moshe Weinberg, Yosef Romano, David Berger, Mark Slavin, Yosef Gottfreund, Eliezer Halfin, Zeev Friedman, Yacov Springer, Andrei Spitzer, Kehat Shur, Amitzur Shapiro.

The court quotes the following in their honor:

"Do not mourn, do not weep on such a day.
Off, and back to work, away. Away.
Plowman, push your plow,
Sower, sow your seed,
A thousandfold toil.
A thousandfold build.
Ye shall plant, ye shall dig,
Gather stones, raise a wall,
Build a road smooth and straight
For the day of freedom, the day of light

This day's pain paves the way
For redemption next day.
Blood of those who fell
Cries—ah, hear it well—
Back to work, be brave.
Save yourselves, and save."

One of the things which makes this a great nation, I believe, is the concern of our people for their fellow man. This concern was demonstrated by the minutes of the court for September 6, quoted above, and I wanted to share this demonstration with my colleagues.