

costs of fire science programs; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. ADAMO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONOVER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FISH, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN):

H.R. 16967. A bill to provide financial aid to local fire departments in the purchase of advanced firefighting equipment; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 16968. A bill to provide financial aid to local fire departments in the purchase of advanced firefighting equipment; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. ADAMO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONOVER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. FORSYTHE):

H.R. 16969. A bill to provide financial aid for local fire departments in the purchase of firefighting suits and self-contained breathing apparatus; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 16970. A bill to provide financial aid for local fire departments in the purchase of firefighting suits and self-contained breathing apparatus; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. ADAMO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONOVER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. FORSYTHE):

H.R. 16971. A bill to extend for 3 years the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to carry out fire research and safety programs; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr.

CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 16972. A bill to extend for 3 years the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to carry out fire research and safety programs; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. ADAMO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONOVER, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. FRENZEL):

H.R. 16973. A bill to establish a National Fire Data and Information Clearinghouse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 16974. A bill to establish a National Fire Data and Information Clearinghouse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. ADAMO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONOVER, Mr. DENT, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mrs. FRENZEL):

H.R. 16975. A bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to extend the provisions of that act to construction materials used in the interiors of homes, offices, and other places of assembly or accommodation, and to authorize the establishment of toxicity standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 16976. A bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to extend the provisions of that act to construction materials used in the interiors of homes, offices, and other places of assembly or accommodation, and to authorize the establishment of toxicity standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. ADAMO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONOVER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. FORSYTHE):

H.R. 16977. A bill to amend the Hazardous Materials Transportation Control Act of 1970

to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations providing for the placarding of certain vehicles transporting hazardous materials in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 16978. A bill to amend the Hazardous Materials Transportation Control Act of 1970 to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations providing for the placarding of certain vehicles transporting hazardous materials in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 16979. A bill to provide that the recent action taken by the Federal Housing Commissioner in abolishing the adjusted premium charge imposed by section 203(c) of the National Housing Act shall be effective with respect to certain mortgage prepayments occurring on or after March 1, 1972; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 16980. A bill to establish in the State of California the Toyon National Urban Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 16981. A bill to authorize \$2,500,000 to be appropriated to the Winston Churchill Memorial and Library in the United States for the construction of educational facilities at such memorial and library, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 1320. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the second Sunday of October of each year as "National Grandparents Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSO:

H. Res. 1143. Resolution providing monetary allowances for toll-free telephone service for telephone calls to the district offices of Members of the House, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LANDGREBE:

H.R. 16982. A bill for the relief of Sergei Kourdakov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 16983. A bill for the relief of Del Monte Fishing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COLUMBUS DAY, 1972

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, next week we celebrate Columbus Day—a national

holiday that honors the man whose courage and imagination contributed to a new era of human existence.

Whether we honor Christopher Columbus on the second Monday of October or on the traditional date of October 12, we can capture the importance of this holiday by recognizing the accomplishments of a man who more than

anybody was responsible for turning the eyes of Europe westward across the Atlantic to a new age.

The Genovese explorer, Cristoforo Colombo, was indeed a remarkable man. Combining the creativity of the romantic with the precision of the scientist, he challenged the established procedures and norms of his day. Through personal

daring, determination, continuous optimism, and a deep and abiding faith, Columbus managed to receive the assistance he needed to seek the truth he sought.

The voyages of Columbus stirred the imagination of still other explorers, many of whom were fellow countrymen. These voyages opened the gates of Europe and led to one of the greatest migrations in world history. Indeed, the 30 million people who have emigrated to America could look upon Columbus as the "Father of All Immigrants." He, too, left his home in search of new opportunity, and his search led him to discover a new land—a land of freedom and personal liberty where every man in search of a new life could compete as an equal with his neighbor.

In the following years hundreds of thousands of Italians have made the long voyage to the new world in search of a new life. Through skill, hard work, decency, and honesty, these Italian Americans have made outstanding contributions to the growth of this Nation and to the increase in our knowledge of ourselves and our world. In the arts, business, public affairs, science, sports, and every walk of life, the accomplishments of these great people have enriched and sustained us.

Mr. Speaker, the great strength of America lies in its diversity of people and customs—all part of a single nation. For this reason, the important accomplishments of Columbus belong to Americans of every ethnic background. Yet, to more than any other people, this holiday belongs to the millions of Italian Americans, to the generations who came to the New World and added, by their lives, new strength and substance to our Nation.

And so, in honoring the 480th anniversary of the first voyage of Columbus, I would like to pay special tribute to the Italian Americans whose pride, love, dedication, boundless energy, and creative talents have upheld the dream of Columbus—the dream of new opportunity for all men.

ON AUTOMOBILES AND A LIVING WORLD

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I include the following article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was written by William D. Ruckelshaus, Administrator of Environmental Protection Agency, and was carried in the Los Angeles Times on Sunday, September 24, 1972. The article was adapted from a speech made by Mr. Ruckelshaus to the American Automobile Association. It touches on the important problem that we have today concerning the pollution of our atmosphere by the automobile. The problem is one that we will definitely have to find an answer for along the lines that he suggests.

The article follows:

CXVIII—2113—Part 25

ON AUTOMOBILES AND A LIVABLE WORLD

(By William D. Ruckelshaus)

Americans all want cars and one of the problems is that 75% of us get them. The very popularity of the automobile now seriously threatens its usefulness. In many of our cities we are confronted by pollution, congestion, noise, delay, ugliness and urban breakdown on a scale that has not been seen since the last days of Imperial Rome.

It seems clear that we will have to be more imaginative in our use and even design of the automobile if we are to ensure the amenities of civilized living and keep that instant mobility we all want.

It is significant that your organization recognizes the importance of controlling exhaust emissions and the importance of searching out alternatives to the internal combustion engine. Until an alternative is found, we should make certain that control devices work and continue to work throughout the life of the car.

That means not only that we provide incentives for quality equipment in the first place, but that we train good men to service it and keep it operating at maximum efficiency.

Given present power systems, exhaust emission controls cannot do the job by themselves where traffic volumes are too great or atmospheric conditions are unfavorable. In such cities as Chicago, New York, Philadelphia, Denver, Los Angeles, Cincinnati and Washington the public must find itself for the possibility of substantial changes in commutation habits.

As we head toward the air quality deadlines under the Clean Air Act in 1975, these cities—and others—will be considering their options. We will be hearing more about metered traffic, exclusive bus lanes, staggered working hours, restricted parking, dispersed employment, and sanctions against the man who drives his six-passenger car to work with no one else in it.

Statistics now show that the rate of occupancy of cars during peak load periods is down to 1.2 persons per vehicle and—at the present rate of passenger decline—by 1980 one out of every three cars will be tooling along without a driver.

That wouldn't be much more absurd than the present practice of encasing one man in 5,000 pounds of steel, adding 400 horsepower and then making him creep along at 5 m.p.h. breathing a combination of synergistic poisons.

The sheer aggravation that was once the curse only of downtown commercial districts is now spreading to suburban shopping and work places as well. Even the national parks are so burdened with cars as to jeopardize the very serenity our people desperately seek.

Some say the answer is simply to build better highways; others that the automobile should be eliminated in our more congested areas and replaced by mass transit. My profound belief is that attempting to solve the problems of modern living by attacking a piece of that complex is wrong because it's shortsighted.

The automobile is part of the larger mosaic of American life. If an understandable picture is to emerge from the pieces, we must comprehend how they all fit.

We desperately need a broad systems approach integrating emissions control of motor vehicles with highway planning, land and energy use, resource conservation, demographic factors, economic growth, and the protection of wilderness and countryside. We need transportation that is fast, safe, reliable and ecologically responsible.

If we limit our attention to the problem of pollution pure and simple—or perhaps I should say impure and simple—then we will fail. We will fail for the reason that in the total world environment, everything is connected to everything else.

Consider, for example, the contribution of the automobile to costly suburban sprawl and the waste of urban land. It requires a highway network of enormous expense when tax dollars are needed to address other social problems. The automobile kills over 50,000 Americans every year. It is expensive to service and repair.

You have all heard talk about an energy crisis in the United States. We have not yet reached the crisis point and we may never do so.

As the cost of energy rises, we will have to cut the present waste of our fuel resources. There may even be temporary shortages of one fuel or another. Patterns of consumption in industry, in domestic heating and cooling, and in transportation could change greatly over the next decade.

Traditionally, we are prone to think of efficiency as mere speed: Jet planes and gleaming new automobiles seem almost by definition to be highly efficient. Actually it isn't so.

A research team at Carnegie-Mellon has compared the transport modes in terms of passenger- and ton-miles per gallon of gasoline equivalents. They found to no one's great surprise that you get 200 passenger miles per gallon out of a double-decker suburban train but only 22 passenger miles per gallon from a 747 jumbo jet or from the family automobile carrying the standard load of 1.2 people. Even buses are five times as efficient as cars.

So considering that gasoline used in private cars represents one-fifth of all energy used in the nation, and that vehicle miles are rising 4% to 5% annually, we must strive to use this fuel with maximum efficiency.

How then can we get around the energy-resources-pollution-urban design impasse? How can we broaden the modalities of movement?

One answer that obviously needs much more attention is mass transit. It should be deliberately employed—like housing and the utility infrastructure—as a major element in the design of more efficient cities.

Air conditioning, express service, attractive interiors, quiet low-emission engines, flexible routes, courteous service, seating arrangements which recognize the importance of "personal space"—these features might lure the suburbanites back to town, where their financial presence, moral commitment and political leadership is vitally needed.

Fast and reliable public transportation would certainly open up suburban light-industrial jobs to inner-city residents. Jobs which today go unfilled could be filled by those who need them.

We should realize that not everyone can afford a car, not everyone wants to drive, and that nobody really wants to drive everywhere all the time. We need more flexibility of choice; we need means of transportation that bring people into contact with each other and not just with machines.

Winston Churchill once said in a characteristic fit of hyperbole that the worst disaster in the history of mankind was the invention of the automobile. The people do not seem to agree.

A questionnaire was circulated a few years ago noting the air pollution, noise and congestion caused by the automobile, the displacement of tens of thousands of homeowners and small businessmen by highways, the destruction of natural beauty, the tens of millions of injuries and the almost 2 million deaths during this century and so forth—and people were asked, "It is worth it?"

Eighty-five per cent responded with an enthusiastic and unqualified "yes." I think that tells us how strongly Americans feel the need for the sense of autonomy and freedom provided by the automobile. So I hope nothing I have said today will be taken as an attack on this venerable and necessary American institution, which is so much more than

a way to get from one place to another.

The automobile is indeed here to stay. It will continue to have a dominant role in the exurbs, on the farm, between cities over short distances and as an alternate mode of transportation everywhere. But we must supplement it if we are to get the most efficient service out of it. Henry Ford himself has said so.

Downtown, for example, the worker or shopper should be able to get around in automated, low-speed, easy-access people-movers of one kind or another, like the one linking the campuses of the University of West Virginia at Morgantown.

In the suburbs we should modify the system which has made countless wives into chauffeurs for their children, trapped in an endless round of ferrying the kids back and forth to school, to the dentists, to the scouts and to friends. Perhaps we can look to dial-a-bus, which has already been tried in Had-donfield, N.J., or other methods to provide alternatives to those who want them.

As for transportation to the airport, the air-cushion train powered by a linear-induction motor could be an answer during the late '70s. It could also make a real dent in medium-haul travel times from one urban nucleus to another, especially along the Atlantic, Pacific and Great Lakes corridors.

Overall, according to the Department of Transportation, the revolution in mobility will require as much as \$33 billion in the next 10 to 20 years. Some of this money may be diverted from the highway trust fund; whatever its origins it will be well spent. We don't have to go from one place to another in ways that are time-consuming, wasteful of fuel, nerve-wracking or socially destructive.

But in a broader context, we must question whether we need to do so much moving about the landscape in the first place. The four-day week would eliminate up to 20% of rush-hour pollution weekly.

Maybe people could even do more of their work at home. Modern telecommunications could replace a lot of hours wasted in traffic and in the office, where one's physical presence not only is unnecessary but often impedes the transaction of business.

Above all, in discussing the future of the private car we must not fall into the trap of being mere participants in endless pro-versus anti-automobile debate. We need not be either to be pro-humanity.

The open road is no longer simply an invitation to adventure but also a problem and a challenge. We have it within our power to create a kind of mobility which transcends movement for its own sake or movement compelled by circumstances. We can formulate a life style which guarantees the variable mobility a complex society requires.

JOSEPH BILLECI AWARDED TITLE OF "CAVALIARE" BY ITALIAN GOVERNMENT

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, one of my California constituents, Joseph Billeci, will soon be honored with a testimonial for his outstanding service to the Grand Lodge of California and to the Italo Americans of California. Only recently Mr. Billeci was awarded the star of solidarity and the title of "Cavaliare" by the Italian Government for his noteworthy efforts in Italian-American relations.

As a holder of the title of "Commen-

datore," conferred upon me in 1968 by the Italian Government, I would like to commend Mr. Billeci and welcome him to the select ranks of Italian Americans honored by Italy.

Mr. Billeci's record demonstrates the tremendous vitality of a country fortunate enough to be a melting pot for citizens from a variety of ethnic groups. Although Mr. Billeci is a native-born American, his community activities have been honored by both his hometown, Pittsburgh, and his ancestral home, Italy.

Mr. Billeci's parents came to this country in 1900. His early life was one of struggle and hardship. Joseph Billeci's education ended in the 9th grade and at 16, he went to work for Redwood manufacturers as an office boy. By the time he was 26 he had worked his way up to the position of sales representative. Later Mr. Billeci was to serve on the Pittsburgh School Board, city council, and retirement board. Between 1966-70 he served as mayor.

The posts and awards held by Joseph Billeci go on and on. He is past president of the Young Men's Institute, and currently the head of the 15,000-member Grand Lodge of California organization. In the Grand Lodge of California of the Order of the Sons of Italy he has served on the statewide scholarship commission, auditing commission, and board of trustees.

Mr. Billeci's community record is one of the most impressive I have seen. I sincerely hope that he continues such work and encourages others to do the same. His testimonial is sponsored by the Sons of Italy and will be tendered on Columbus day, the first time in history that such a testimonial has been tendered on this occasion.

INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the September 25, 1972, edition of the Peoria Journal Star discusses the wave of terrorism which has been with us on the international scene for many years but which has become so intensified in recent months. I commend its text to my colleagues and insert the text of the editorial in the RECORD.

THE ROOT OF TERRORISM

(By C. L. Dancey)

Newsweek magazine has used its vast facilities to reveal in some detail the shape of "terror" organization and training throughout the world in the fall of 1972.

Its up-to-date report with some detail confirms the background "essay" editorials, inspired by the Olympic massacre, three weeks ago here in the Journal Star.

The time has long since come when the attitudes about the violence and war problems of this world need to be faced realistically and the conditions that exist in 1972 recognized. First we must abandon the cliches of a generation, on both sides of that debate.

It is not only tiresome but hopelessly irrelevant to continue the standard attitude that (1) there is a vast, unified "Communist Conspiracy" against the free world in which government and clandestine policies are neatly coordinated and plotted; and (2) the notion of "monolithic Communism" simply does not apply in 1972 and therefore the concerns about war, containment, and terrorism are all nonsense and ought to be tossed into the ashcan.

Both have become standards of the "anti-war" and "hit-em-harder" positions, and both are vast oversimplifications that simply do not deal with the current problems realistically.

The facts are that the "tactics" of terror were developed into virtually a science, chiefly under the leadership and certainly under the sponsorship of the Soviet Union during the past 40 years.

These tactics and the basic philosophy that supports them are no longer part of the central policy of the Soviet Union itself, because they no longer suit its situation or its needs as they once did—and because Stalin's successors have a natural fear and certain revulsion concerning methods which once threatened their lives under Stalin at home.

The developed doctrine and its developed skills and special practitioners, however, have not just faded into the mists. They have simply moved into those movements that still fanatically look to "world revolution" by subversion.

When Nasser turned to precisely those tactics as the only really usable means available to him to "drive out foreigners" from the Arab world (at first), the center of such schooling, arming, propaganda, and plotting moved to Cairo.

It was extensively used against other Arabs for many years.

Ultimately, in Yemen, it was the basis for a coup bringing in a pro-Nasser government which promptly found itself on the verge of extinction because of the popular reaction of the armed and able Bedouin tribesmen of Yemen.

Ultimately, that government was maintained in power by the commitment of as many as 70,000 Egyptian troops (who suffered a great many casualties and fought for several years).

Thus we see the pattern and "link-up" between a terrorist manager and chief operating behind the cover of a diplomatic passport from Yemen.

Likewise, the Algerian terrorists and later organized armed forces which come to power (ousting the French) in Algeria were also Nasser proteges.

And here we have seen the repeated link between U.S. terrorists and "revolutionists", who have so often sneaked or hijacked their way to Algerian asylum.

Syria, from time to time, even more than Egypt, had become a virtual Soviet satellite, with the Russians using them as the "funnel" for organization, training and arming the Palestinian "guerrillas," for bullying tiny Lebanon into putting up with them, and for trying to bully Jordan into a like cooperation.

One might put it this way. Raw terrorism is a technique made into a science by the Russians, who developed the experts, the textbooks, the philosophy, and passed it on worldwide. The Terror specialists from Ireland to Asia, from the Middle East to Latin America, all speak the same language with some such groups in the U.S. That language is no longer Russian or even Leninist Communism—but it is a dialect of that derivation, and still has the tacit support of the Kremlin because that support, rather than non-support, is what they think the situation requires of them.

It is not "monolithic" but it is time to recognize that Bernadette Devlin, Angela Davis, Jane Fonda, the Panthers "in exile" in Algeria, Sirhan Sirhan (in his diary), the

Black September gang, like the Viet Cong often seem to employ the same phrases, while each is exploiting a different situation in a slightly different way, and all receive the same "international" propaganda support from the same people in the same terms—from formal organs to the United Nations debates.

And all seem to have read the same textbooks with the possible exception of Miss Fonda, whose statements are sometimes as bizarre as her statistics and who seems to have swallowed somebody's line of baloney but not heard it well—with the result that she spews out "facts" which make even her own side blush for their exaggeration and manifest inaccuracy.

In short, there seems to be a lot of "sub-contractors" around the world drawing techniques and philosophy from the same source, using it, each in his or her own way, and mutually supporting each other.

That isn't a monolith. But it IS a serious and specific problem, and it appears that at its very roots is the Doctrine of Terror as a political instrument.

Only Miss Fonda is sometimes talking "non-violence" but she talks such only as an injunction against resistance, and constantly defends the originators of the violence.

The greatest freak situation of all in this kind of world in 1972 is the emergence of a presidential candidate who plays into their hands, and too often is an apologist for the specialists in Terror Tactics.

A CHINK IN NADER'S ARMOR?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Leah Young has written a revealing column on the subject of the illusory infidel, Mr. Ralph Nader, which I submit for the RECORD.

A CHINK IN NADER'S ARMOR?

Three liberal, usually pro-consumer, Democrats killed no-fault automobile insurance in the Senate last month, and some disgruntled staff aides are blaming Ralph Nader for the death. The senators, Thomas Eagleton (D, Mo.), Frank Church (D, Idaho) and Joseph Montoya (D, NM), all stressed that bringing no-fault to the floor for a vote would be an exercise in futility since the House would not act on legislation this year, even if the Senate did. So they joined southern states rights Democrats and Republicans supporting the President and voted to refer no-fault insurance to the Judiciary Committee for study and thus kill the bill.

Three weeks before the Senate vote, House Commerce Committee Chairman Harley O. Staggers (D, W. Va.) told Nader he would see to it that no-fault auto insurance was voted out of his committee. And, Nader passed this information on to staff members of the Senate Commerce Committee who were busy rounding up votes. He made no effort, however, to talk to anyone himself, even though no-fault insurance—insurance in which a subscriber's own insurance company pays for injuries regardless of which driver is at fault for an accident—is considered one of the most important consumer issues to have come up in Congress in years.

Why has Nader, the consumer advocate with seeming interest in every consumer issue, ducked no-fault? The usually accessible Nader refuses to talk to reporters on the subject, won't return phone calls, and has instructed Lowell Dodge, his associate in charge of the Center for Auto Safety, not to

speak for him on the issue. When this reporter requested a written statement from Nader (in lieu of an interview since he refused to return a phone call), his key aide at the Center for Responsive Law, Ted Jacobs, said Nader did not like "being black-mailed" into making a statement just to avoid being accused of ducking the issue. Jacobs then proceeded to read me what Nader had said criticizing the Senate Commerce Committee's bill for not going far enough: "There should be much higher benefits," he said. Oddly enough, Nader never told the committee that, and in fact when he testified on another matter he was asked his views and said he had not made up his mind.

Proponents of no-fault point to a Department of Transportation (DOT) study that shows that the present "tort" system returns only about 44 cents in benefits to consumers for each dollar paid in premiums to insurance companies. The Senate no-fault bill would have paid accident victims for basic economic loss, including medical and rehabilitative expenses and wage loss up to a maximum of \$125,000 while still allowing lawsuits for pain and suffering in severe injury cases.

There are three main reasons why no-fault has earned the enmity of most state insurance officials, many insurance companies and the American Trial Lawyers: 1) A federal bill creates a major national presence in insurance matters which Congress has heretofore relegated to the states. 2) It severely restricts the right to sue. While no-fault advocates say that the right to sue for intangible losses due to someone else's negligence is restricted, not eliminated, others fear that it is an opening wedge against the citizen's unrestricted right to sue those who harm him—a right being developed by public interest law groups in areas of product liability and the environment. 3) The Senate antitrust and monopoly subcommittee calculated that for the year 1969 parties to auto accident litigation ultimately will pay legal fees totalling \$1.1 billion, or about one-fourth of the total income of the legal profession that year.

The American Trial Lawyers Association has been fighting no-fault both in Congress and in state legislatures, where the administration says it favors its enactment. Even though the administration argued forcefully against federal no-fault legislation in the Senate, Nixon's consumer adviser, Virginia Knauer, and others have been lambasting the Trial Lawyers for their lobbying against no-fault in the state legislatures. The Trial Lawyers are accused of gutting real reform in six states that have enacted inadequate legislation and of killing no-fault outright in such major insurance states as New York and Pennsylvania.

So why is Nader ducking the no-fault issue?

On July 27 the American Trial Lawyers Association voted to donate \$10,000 to Nader's auto safety work. They also pledged themselves to raise an additional \$10,000 from their membership to finance an index of automobile defects. Two years ago Nader suggested to the Trial Lawyers that they donate one percent of their receipts to public interest law firms. Although his suggestion has not yet been acted upon, the Trial Lawyers' newly elected president J. D. Lee says he hopes to meet with Nader this year to discuss with him ways that lawyers can devote more time to public law work.

Mr. Lee bristles at any thought that Nader is remaining neutral on no-fault because of his warm relations with the Trial Lawyers. He says it is easy to see why Nader did not endorse the Senate bill. "It's not in the consumer's interest. It is a big man's, big business bill that would allow the \$52 billion casualty insurance industry to run over the consumer."

Another consumer advocate who has championed no-fault and discussed it with Nader says Nader is ignoring the issue because he is "afraid that if lawyers are wiped out they won't be around for other things."

SCANDALS IN INDIANA

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Columbia Journal made notice of an alleged bankruptcy ring which three Indiana daily newspapers have apparently tried to sweep under the rug. The Columbia Journal is to be congratulated for publicly calling to task the members of the Indiana journalism fraternity for failing to face up to their responsibility.

The article follows:

[From the Columbia Journalism Review, October 1972]

INDIANA PAPERS, PLEASE COPY

In decades past, journalists became familiar with the phenomena of national press intervention in regional stories—often in the South—when the local press was reluctant to do the job. That situation now occurs less and less in the South, but one can find variants elsewhere. The Dayton, O., *Journal Herald* has become involved in a similar situation on a story for which it crossed the state line.

In December, 1970, the *Journal Herald* asked Keith McKnight, an investigative reporter, to look into charges that the two U.S. Senators from Indiana were linked to an Indianapolis "bankruptcy ring"—an operation that used bankruptcy court proceedings to enrich a chosen circle of lawyers and officials. In April, 1971, the *Journal Herald* assigned a second man, Andrew Alexander, to the story. They worked for a year before their newspaper was ready to publish their findings in an eleven-part series that began last April 10.

The findings were intricate—indeed, the series makes extremely difficult reading—but substantial. The stories claimed to confirm existence of the bankruptcy ring and charged a great variety of improprieties and illegalities. They showed that one large bankruptcy was handled by men who were also fund-raisers for Sen. Birch Bayh in 1968, and that there never had been a complete accounting for Bayh's campaign finances in that year. They also asserted that a former governor, Matthew E. Welsh (who is the Democratic candidate again in 1972), had been appointed in a bankruptcy proceeding in which he allegedly dealt with a company linked to organized crime.

Recognizing that Indiana lay beyond its own circulation territory, the *Journal Herald* took care to see that its series was distributed in that state. Before publication it sent copies to three dailies, in South Bend, Kokomo, and Evansville. It also gave a copy to the Associated Press.

If the *Journal Herald* had thought that these steps would ensure publication in Indiana, it was soon disillusioned. Not one of the three dailies used the series, nor, the *Journal Herald* found, did other papers—despite a detailed summary transmitted on the AP regional wire each day. One radio station—which the *Journal Herald* people dubbed Radio Free Indiana—called Dayton every day for the latest information, which it broadcast: the station was WIBC, Indianapolis. A momentary beam of hope came when the

Indianapolis *News* reprinted a *Journal Herald* editorial demanding disclosure by Sen. Bayh; then a court reporter for the *Star* produced a story raising the question of indictments in the case. But the reporter abruptly was removed from his beat, and the Pulliam newspapers resumed their silence.

The story did only slightly better on the national level. On the CBS program *Face the Nation*, Sen. Bayh was questioned by three correspondents; they referred to the *Journal Herald* findings repeatedly, but in the end permitted the Senator to discredit the story's sources without forcing him to rebut its substance. Two syndicated columnists—Clark Mollenhoff and Milton Viorst—also wrote about the case, and there was a further brief flurry of attention when Republican Congressmen from Indiana called for investigation.

But the silence in Indiana has left the reporters deeply frustrated. McKnight says, "Never in my ten years of journalism have I witnessed anything so blatantly and unalterably wrong. Yet my partner and I are powerless to do anything about it. Our objectivity has since become encumbered by outrage, but even if it was not, the shouts of two journalists, in Dayton, O., don't carry very far."

It is not necessary to endorse the findings of the *Journal Herald* to question the silence across the line in Indiana. The charges are documented; they deserve, at the least, serious rebuttal.

MASSACRE OF ATHLETES IN MUNICH

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I have received a moving communication from my distinguished friend, Mr. Brooks Bradley of Dundalk, Md., about the massacre of Israeli athletes in Munich. Mr. Bradley mourns the deaths, yet offers hopes for a brighter future. I should like to share this communication with my colleagues:

In the beginning the people came, the torch was lit and the games opened with clear sky, warmth and good spirit.

The athletes, thousands strong, began their performances of skill and dedication amid great expectation and rejoicing.

The days and nights continued. The crowds grew in size and the contestants vied in their excellence. Pride was everywhere and it was a very good thing.

Then, with but a few days remaining, and out of all the joy of youthful competition, tragedy came and eleven men were struck down. The World gasped and many hearts were broken.

In the morning the coffins were sent home. Some people thought the Games should be stopped. Wiser heads prevailed and the Games were delayed for one day.

The people mourned.

Is it not strange that this brief delay among all the sunny and happy days proceeding, would produce a final extra day that dawned cold and overcast—and it rained? People said the rain was mixed with tears and this could very well be true.

As this last day began to reach the end, darkness came to the stadium and the earth was still heavy from rain. The people came again as never before; and the athletes came

on the field by legion and they embraced and there was festive music and dancing, for who knew better than they, there is—a time to weep and a time to laugh, a time to mourn and a time to dance."

On that night, at the very end, the torch of the XX Olympiad was extinguished and darkness covered the earth.

As the thousands watched, a sign was lighted which read, 'Montreal 76'. Then in the sky high above this vast gathering, a magic rainbow was illuminated and it arched above the heads of all the people to see—if they would only look up.

Above this rainbow of hopes and dreams, of joy and tears there was a much brighter yet invisible sign that said to me, in God's name let us begin anew.

In the end the people went home while the earth was still wet, some say with tears and this could very well be true—for 'the eleven' had gone home—before.

W. BROOKS BRADLEY.

THE 11TH TRIENNIAL CONGRESS OF AMERICANS OF UKRAINIAN DESCENT

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this time the message I presented to the 11th Triennial Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Descent, for the information and consideration of my colleagues. The message follows:

Mr. Chairman and Members of this 11th Congress, it gives me great pleasure to be able to express my wholehearted support for the work of the 11th Triennial Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Descent.

The freedom of the Ukraine has been short-lived. Whether Russia was run by czars or commissars made no difference to the Ukrainian people whose brief glimpse of freedom lasted scarcely two years. The Ukrainian people, who have suffered greatly from the aggression and harsh policy of the Soviet Union, have also been neglected by the non-Russian world. This is why the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is so important and why its role deserves due recognition today by all freedom-loving peoples. As the most powerful advocate in this country of freedom and independence for the Ukraine, the Ukrainian Congress Committee has an outstanding record for which it should be proud. For its dedicated work for the preservation of freedom at home and the establishment of liberty in the Ukraine and in other captive nations, the UCCA has been recognized and highly praised by leading public figures including Presidents of the United States.

Today the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, as one of the Union Republics of the USSR, is a charter member of the United Nations but is not allowed to enter into direct relations with any of the free nations of the world. It still remains, in the opinion of the leaders in the Kremlin, an area to be used to serve their designs without regard to the principles of democracy or the wishes of the subject people.

There are some 54 million Ukrainians in the world today. In terms of population they rank in Europe next to the Russians and Germans. Most of these people live in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. Since the end of the Second World War, nearly 70

nations have gained their independence and most of these countries are far smaller than the Ukraine both in numbers and size. But the Ukraine, in theory an independent state, is, in fact, a colony of the Soviet Union. Her people are captives and victims.

If any way can be found to alleviate the plight of these people, it will be with the aid of the UCCA. Founded in 1940 this patriotic group has been a powerful advocate of freedom and independence. Its overall objective is to enlist the support of the United States and all other free nations for the salvations of the Ukraine and other lost countries.

No form of tyranny or dictatorship should ever be allowed to kill the precious flame of freedom that belongs to all mankind. This flame has shone and is shining in the darkness of oppression. With the help of the UCCA, it will not be extinguished.

EFFORTS OF CLEVELANDERS TO MAKE THE U.S.S. "COD" A MUSEUM-PARK

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, Navy Day 1972, October 13, will be celebrated in a very special way in Cleveland, Ohio, for on that day a group of concerned citizens and civic leaders will gather for a benefit dinner in behalf of a unique and imaginative project to convert a World War II U.S. Navy submarine into a park-museum. The U.S.S. *Cod* served proudly in combat in the Pacific, and it is now docked at the lakefront in Cleveland.

Recently a group of public spirited citizens joined together to form the Cleveland Coordinating Committee for *Cod*, and, under the chairmanship of Daniel Mausser, they are now endeavoring to solicit funds so that the *Cod* can be purchased from the Navy, raise the ship out of the water, and make it into a park-museum which would be a recreational as well as an educational benefit for the entire community. There would be no charge for admission to the craft, and guided tours will be given by the members of Navy Reserve units in the area, Sea Explorer Ship 272, and the Boy Scouts of America.

As Chairman Mausser has said, in addition to being a memorial to the sailors who were a part of the Silent Service, the *Cod* Park-Museum will be "a comprehensive museum depicting the development of submersibles from the most primitive through the most visionary concepts. It will also be a continuing deposition of man's development of under-sea craft and lodging, as he accepts the challenges implicit in his growing awareness of dependency upon the resources of our ocean-seas."

The members of the Cleveland Coordinating Committee for *Cod* have shown a dedication to community service which is of the highest order, and for their work all of Cleveland is in their debt. I salute these fine citizens, and wish them well in their undertaking.

CONFIDENTIAL SOURCES OF
NEWSMEN

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 3 is currently holding hearings on a most important matter.

Just 3 months ago, the Supreme Court, by a vote of 5 to 4, held that a newsman may be forced to divulge confidential information and its source to grand juries.

I think that the decision was wrong as a matter of law. But, even more importantly, I am acutely aware of its possible consequences.

What this decision has done, in my view, is to potentially allow the Government to annex the news media as a law enforcement agent, as well as to increase the power of the Government to harass and intimidate the press.

Therefore, I have introduced H.R. 15972, a bill which would assure a newsman absolute protection of his news sources.

I did so not to grant any special privilege to newsmen, but rather to fully protect every American's first amendment rights.

I hope that my statement to the Judiciary Subcommittee will be of interest to all Congressmen as they consider this matter:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN JEROME R.
WALDIE

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity to testify today on behalf of H.R. 15972, a bill which I have introduced to protect the free flow of information which is guaranteed to every American by the First Amendment. The recent 5-4 Supreme Court decision in the "Caldwell" case, holding that the First Amendment does not inherently guarantee to newsmen a constitutional right of refusal to disclose news sources before grand juries, was unfortunate and unwise.

It has evidently brought to an end a period that had seen the Court encouraging the press into assuming an expanded view of its role, and it has certainly served warning on Congress that we can no longer sit back and expect the judiciary to lead the way in protecting the preeminence of the First Amendment.

The Warren Court, recognizing the increasing need for a free and unfettered press in an ever more complex society, vigilantly protected the press' First Amendment rights from all onslaughts. The results were wider freedom to gather, publish, and comment on the news. During the 1960's, the Supreme Court fully appreciated how easily First Amendment rights could be undermined, and how easily its advocates could be intimidated and obstructed with even the slightest concession to countervailing pressures. It had, for instance upheld a newsman's testimonial privilege before legislative inquiries.

Now, it appears that this protective attitude is fast-fading, if not dead. It is being replaced by a view that apparently intends to cut back on privileges heretofore afforded to the news media; a view that perhaps even prior restraint is not forbidden by the First Amendment.

Indeed, the most alarming aspect of this attack on the First Amendment, and the

Supreme Court's acquiescence in it, is that this case is but part of a concerted effort by the Nixon Administration to curtail most of the individual freedoms guaranteed to us by the Bill of Rights.

Justice Stewart was correct in stating that the majority in the "Caldwell" case took a "crabbed view of the First Amendment," and showed "... a disturbing insensitivity to the critical role of an independent press in our society."

Furthermore it was indeed "chilling" to find that the Court had resorted to a "balancing" test in rejecting the First Amendment claims of the news media. For many years it has been conceded that the First Amendment, because of its position at the cornerstone of our freedoms, must be granted greater deference than just one of many competing interests on the scale of contemporary values and pressures. The First Amendment is a very delicate instrument—once the process of erosion starts, it will soon disappear.

The Nixon Court has made the point in this case that First Amendment rights must be subservient to the alleged needs of the criminal process. The same reasoning can be applied to the "exclusionary rule" pertaining to illegal searches and seizures, and, I suppose, somewhere down the line to the self-incrimination provisions of the Fifth Amendment. Where will the "balancing" stop?

The "Caldwell" case, when joined with the Gravel decision of the same day, clearly indicates to me that we should not wait to find out.

Justice White, writing for the majority in the "Caldwell" case, noted that Congress, of course, could always pass legislation designed to protect a newsman's testimonial privilege. I think that it is now incumbent upon us to take the lead in protecting the First Amendment, and to pass appropriate legislation.

The interest of the public in having a free, unhampered press with the absolute ability to probe and reveal information necessary to a democratic society should be beyond dispute. Consequently, I have introduced H.R. 15972 which would, quite simply, assure a newsman absolute protection of his news sources.

Two other methods have been mentioned as alternatives to the absolute privilege. I find neither satisfactory.

The Justice Department claims that its two year experience under the Attorney General's "Guidelines for Subpoenas to the News Media" makes any legislation unnecessary. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that any of us are naive enough not to realize that what are "guidelines" today can be "past policy" tomorrow. More likely they could be "clarified" out of existence. I, for one, am not willing to entrust such a vital aspect of freedom of the press to the political machinations and pressures within the Justice Department of any administration, present or future. I think that the necessity for clearly defined rights in the areas of newsman's testimonial privilege is self-evident.

The second proposed alternative is the qualified privilege—subject to divestment upon showing that 1) the information sought is clearly relevant to a specific violation of the law, 2) the information sought cannot be obtained by alternative means less destruction of First Amendment rights and 3) there is a compelling national interest in the information.

I am sure that other witnesses will have much to say on this point, but, in my view, it is readily apparent that any "qualified" privilege will be subject to the same abuses and open-ended interpretations as the present "guidelines". How can anyone know if the information meets the above criteria

until after it is disclosed? I fear that we will open up "fishing" expeditions for many a prosecutor across the country.

In any case, whether abused or not, a "qualified privilege" will tend to dry up news sources and the people's "right to know" just as quickly as the present situation. My impression is that the use of confidentiality in digging out stories is now more extensive than ever. And this is a welcome change. But these efforts will be substantially impeded if confidential information and its source is not protected when necessary.

I cannot imagine a Black Panther, an informer against organized crime, or anyone else who would be willing to risk his neck on the decision of a judge as to whether or not a newsman must divulge certain information and its source. The threat, the mere possibility of disclosure, is all that is needed to effectively "chill" First Amendment rights in this instance.

As Mr. Fred W. Friendly noted in the current issue of the *Columbia Journalism Review*:

"A journalist who enters hostile territory, whether it is Watts, on the Columbia campus, or in Attica prison yard, is handicapped enough without having himself viewed as an arm of the law collecting a rogues' gallery for future prosecutions. The effect of agents posing as cameramen and reporters is no less deceptive than that of a reporter masquerading as an officer of the law... If there is to be a newsman's privilege law, it cannot be a product of a judicial decision. Protection must come from those who make laws, not those who interpret laws..."

Mr. Chairman, I know that you and the subcommittee will give H.R. 15972 every consideration that its importance deserves.

ROLLER - SKATING COCKATOO
BRINGS \$2,000 FEDERAL DEATH
BENEFITS, CHICKEN RANCHERS
GET \$1.54

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to eulogize a euthanized cockatoo.

Now this was not a garden variety pink parrot, mind you, but a fledgling movie star whose career as a roller skater was snuffed out by a grim gasser from the Department of Agriculture. The Man from Ag asphyxiated the cockatoo as part of the Department's efforts to stamp out the epidemic of exotic avian Newcastle disease now threatening every bird in the country. The roller skating cockatoo was one of the millions of birds that have been eradicated in southern California the past several months, but there the resemblance ends.

Mr. Speaker, fortunately the cockatoo's demise was not too tragic. Its owner received \$2,000 from the Federal Government in recognition of its projected earning power as a performer. But tragic endings are all too common in the Newcastle program. A pet store owner can receive \$2,000 for one bird while hundreds of poultrymen whose life's work is being wiped out are brushed off with \$1.54 per bird, which figure will not enable a poultryman to resume his business.

Imagine how this disparity sets with farmers who are being sacrificed by the Department of Agriculture in an attempt to save the rest of the country's poultry. I again call on Secretary Butz to establish a fair reimbursement value for the loss of those who raise lowly layers—a figure that shows as much equity for farmers as movie moguls.

Articles from the October 1 Riverside Press Enterprise, and the October 3 Los Angeles Times describe the irony of this situation very well:

ROLLER-SKATING COCKATOO GOES TO DEATH FOR \$2,000

A double-waddle cassowary might be worth \$650, but \$2,000 for a cockatoo!

Appraisal records at the Federal-State Newcastle Disease Task Force headquarters in Riverside contain the fact that \$2,000 was paid to the owner of a "Molluscan cockatoo."

Asked to explain what seemed to be an especially expensive indemnity payment for a bird that had to be killed to halt the spread of Newcastle disease virus, a task force appraiser explained:

"The cockatoo could roller skate."

The \$2,000 payment went to Dr. Laszlo de Borondy, who owns Casa de Pets, 11814 Ventura Blvd., in Studio City.

De Borondy was able to produce a receipt, the appraiser explained, to show that he had paid \$2,000 for the cockatoo.

De Borondy, in addition to the \$2,000 he got for his roller-skating cockatoo, possessed other birds that apparently had talent. For example the task force paid him \$315 for a mynah bird, \$367.50 for a blue-front Amazon parrot, and \$300 for a "Military Macaw."

"Actually," the appraiser said, "De Borondy's cockatoo was worth about \$3,000. We underpaid him."

"That cockatoo," it was further explained, "was a movie star. He (de Borondy) showed us his movie contracts he had with various studios."

De Borondy was contacted to find out more about his prize cockatoo, but he refused to discuss his dead bird.

"I'm going away to a zoo convention," he said, "and I don't want to talk about it now."

Whatever his name was, the star cockatoo went out with a certain flair and style.

"Before we euthanized him," the appraiser explained, "we had him roller skate for us the last time."

"Then," he grimly added, "we gassed him."

BIRD SKATES—THEN IT'S PUT TO DEATH IN FIGHT ON DISEASE

A show-business cockatoo demonstrated its ability to roller skate for a Newcastle Disease inspector. The inspector then assigned it a value of \$2,000 and gassed it to death in a plastic bag.

The cockatoo, destroyed along with scores of other exotic birds at a Studio City pet shop, was part of \$14 million in birds killed in the state and federal campaign to stamp out the infectious disease.

"It was not an idle request," Sid Moore, spokesman for the Newcastle Task Force in Riverside, explained Monday. "We didn't want to see the bird rollerskate for the fun of it. The appraiser had to be sure the bird was talented enough to be worth the sum paid."

Lazio de Borondy, owner of the Casa de Pet shop, said the bird had appeared in movies and on television. The trained bird had been exposed to the disease when a shipment of birds was brought in from Thailand.

Thailand is one of the Asian locations where the disease is endemic among the bird population. De Borondy's shop was—in the term of the task force—"depopulated" Aug. 10.

After a 30-day quarantine period De Bor-

ondy was able to replace his stock with birds which had not been exposed to the disease. He now has 500 birds in the place.

Moore said that De Borondy was paid \$13,532 for 485 birds. Prices included \$315 for a mynah bird and \$367 for an Amazon parrot.

As the Riverside-based task force tallied up millions in depopulated fowl, the sheriff's office there was pondering what to do about hundreds of destroyed roosters which had apparently been used as fighting cocks.

Moore said that the birds were routinely paid for. "It is not illegal to raise the birds," he said. "All we are concerned about is if they were exposed to the disease."

Cockfighting is illegal—and so is possession of a bird with intent to engage in cockfighting. The intent has often been hard to legally prove.

Prize cocks destroyed were valued at \$25, in some cases—and the owners were paid accordingly.

"Promoters of cockfights trim the comb on fighting birds, so the bird's opponent can't grab the rooster's comb in its beak and kill it with its spurs," explained Chief Deputy Sheriff Sam Lowery. "Apparently many of the birds paid for were cocks with trimmed combs."

The California quarantine area has been reduced in recent weeks and now includes parts of Ventura and Los Angeles counties, the southeast corner of San Bernardino County and the western third of Riverside County and all of Orange County.

THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL PUBLIC EMPLOYEES COLLECTIVE-BARGAINING STATUTE

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, for more than 35 years collective bargaining has been the foundation of American labor relations policy. Yet teachers and other public employees have often been denied the same bargaining rights provided private employees by the National Labor Relations Act. Much frustration and confusion has arisen because of the reluctance of most States to provide fair collective-bargaining legislation effecting public employees.

This year marks a decade since Federal employees were guaranteed minimal bargaining rights by Presidential Executive order. The momentum stimulated by President Kennedy's order and the collective-bargaining statutes of a few States have created a drive for legislation which is irreversible.

The chaotic situation existing among the various State statutes has clearly shown the need for Congress to enact a workable, and fair public employees relations act. There is no clear pattern of public employee relations policy at the State level. Much of what is now established is confusing at best.

Several years ago, there may have been some doubt regarding the constitutional authority of the Federal Government to regulate the employment relationships between State and local governments and their employees. However, the Federal Government has recently extended the Fair Labor Standards Act and title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act to State

and local governmental employees. If there is any further doubt, the Presidential Executive order which abrogated hundreds of thousands of public employment contracts and overrode State legislation budget appropriations with the so-called wage price freeze clearly shows Federal intervention into State and local employer-employee relations.

Collective bargaining for public employees and teachers is not completely analogous with private sector bargaining. It will be Congress responsibility within the next year to draft legislation which provides a balance of power between the two parties in collective bargaining. There is a great disparity throughout the country as to the skill and sophistication of both public employees and teachers on the one hand, and municipal employers and superintendents on the other hand as to their collective-bargaining skills and experiences. The Federal Government should institute a major program of training in collective bargaining that would benefit both sides. Similarly, we need to examine the feasibility of a system of mediation and conciliation services for public employees throughout the country.

Any law regulating the process of collective bargaining between public employees and their employers must be structured to provide the optimum bargaining climate to effect an agreement without the need to strike. Many problems which erupt into confrontations stem from an inequitable bargaining climate. The best climate is created when the parties have equal power and are required by law to bargain in good faith. If either party has a legislated advantage, the process may be frustrated and agreement hindered. The balance of power necessary to promote agreement is dependent upon each party having at its disposal and control alternatives for which the other party has respect.

One of the characteristics of an optimum bargaining climate is the existence of established procedures at impasse of which both parties are aware in advance. The mechanism must create sufficient pressure upon both sides to force an agreement at the bargaining table. A procedure which does not bring to bear on both sides virtually equal amounts of pressure to reach agreement will frustrate the process, cause delays, and force open confrontations and strikes. A variety of tools and established procedures must be available to the parties at impasse. However, restricting the actions available to one side without comparable impairments upon the other will only frustrate the process and further complicate the impasse.

Another critical issue to produce a good bargaining climate is the establishment of an agency to regulate and enforce the process of collective bargaining. Various alternative proposals have been suggested for the agency. Whether the agency is within NLRB or a separate unit it must establish procedures for hearing labor cases quickly and have the power to resolve differences expeditiously. The agency should be vested with both prosecutorial and adjudicatory functions to assure power to resolve disagreements and unfair practices by either side.

OXNARD, CALIF., HOME OF THE AMERICAN LITTLE LEAGUE CHAMPIONS

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a moment of our time to pay tribute to a fine group of young men in my congressional district. Recently, a senior all-star team from the Oxnard Sunset Little League journeyed all the way from California to Gary, Ind., to participate in the Little League Senior World Series.

They played against teams from not only the United States but teams from Europe, Mexico, and China. They lost the world title to Nationalist China but they returned home No. 2; probably the greatest group of goodwill ambassadors the city has ever had.

The team members included: Daryl Samuels, David Escobar, Walter Moody, Alan Pinedo, Sterling Bruner, Larry Guiterrez, Victor Brown, Frank Rodriguez, George Hill, Mike Olivera, Craig Yonkers, Jimmy Lapointe, and team captain, Tom Barber.

Adults active in the league are Don Meisner, manager, Ernest Alamillo, coach, League President Emile Lapointe, and Larry Smith.

I wish to also present a very excellent editorial from the Oxnard Press Courier that certainly expresses the sentiment of a great California community on the success of their future leaders:

OXNARD'S CONQUERING HERO'S SALUTED

Everyone in Oxnard, baseball fan or not, should be extremely proud of the greatest group of goodwill ambassadors the city has ever had—the national champion Sunset Senior League All-Stars.

These young teen-agers had to be awed by the collection of teams that gathered in Gary, Ind., last week for the Little League Senior World Series. Many participating teams, such as the champions of Europe, Mexico, China and Puerto Rico, probably never heard of Oxnard before.

But, thanks to the outstanding play of our scrappy baseballers, many young players will be returning to their homelands this week with words of praise for the never-say-die team from Oxnard.

After the locals bowed in the opener to Puerto Rico by a score of 3-2, most observers felt they would soon fall by the wayside. But they underestimated the talent and grit of the Oxnard gang that fought from behind time and again to gain the national championship and finish second in the struggle for the world title.

The local team makes no excuse—nor does it need one—for the defeat by Nationalist China in Sunday's battle for the world title. It should be pointed out, however, that Oxnard, after being dropped into the losers bracket by Tuesday's opening defeat, had to play five games in four days—Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and two Saturday—to gain the finals. China, after winning its Tuesday opener, played only two games in the next four days. China finished 4-0 while Oxnard was 5-2.

While they are naturally disappointed they could not bring a world title home with them, they have to be pleased with their great performance. They returned home as the best in the whole United States of

America—a feat that no other Ventura County team has ever accomplished.

The players, coaches and managers received a well-deserved heroes' welcome Monday afternoon and will be honored at a banquet in the Community Center Friday night. And, while they are enjoying their lofty position as 1972 U.S. champs, the younger Sunset Leaguers are undoubtedly looking to the future with hopes of going one better by conquering the world.

SENDS NEWSLETTER TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, in my continuing effort to keep my constituents informed of my work as their Representative in Washington, I periodically send them a newsletter describing my activities in Congress and my feelings concerning the important issues of the day. The following is the text of my most recent report:

DEAR FRIEND AND CONSTITUENT: The second session of the Ninety-Second Congress has passed the halfway mark—an appropriate time for me to highlight for you some recent actions in the House of Representatives.

I am most pleased to report that we may soon see the realization of nearly 25 years of dedicated efforts by veterans organizations to obtain "closer-to-home" medical care for Nassau and Queens veterans in need of these services.

As a result of steps I took in May to bring a Veterans Affairs Subcommittee hearing to this area to study and review the problem, progress has been made to secure 274 beds at St. Albans Naval Hospital for use by the Veterans Administration.

The overcrowded conditions at all veterans hospitals in the metropolitan area, coupled with the transportation hardships encountered by the families of patients who live in Nassau and Queens, bear out the critical need for these more readily accessible facilities.

Ever since I returned last winter from a Foreign Affairs Committee mission to the Far East where I investigated the rapidly increasing traffic in opium and its heroin derivative, I have attempted to eliminate this corrupt market.

After first focusing attention on Thailand as the major conduit for the international narcotic movement and criticizing its officials for not halting this illegal drug traffic, I introduced legislation to cut U.S. aid to Thailand—more than \$200 million this year.

My amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act to suspend this aid—until such time as President Nixon determines that sufficient steps are being taken by the Thais to control the flow of opium—has been passed by the House of Representatives.

I am particularly gratified by these results. While it is essential we continue to spend millions on drug treatment and rehabilitation programs, I am firmly convinced that the only effective way to end the drug menace is to eliminate the scourge at its source.

In my efforts to contain lawlessness and violence while working to eradicate its root causes—inadequate housing, poor education, unemployment, drug addiction and despair—I have co-sponsored new legislation to increase funding for police manpower, especially in high population areas as New York City. This bill would strengthen and upgrade our law enforcement agencies to en-

able its men to pursue their task with dignity and community cooperation. I have confidence the Congress will act favorably on this measure before the session ends.

In brief, these past months have been a busy and productive time. In future issues of my newsletter, I will detail for you information concerning the status of other problems affecting our nation and our communities today.

Sincerely,

LESTER L. WOLFF,
Member of Congress.

WOLFF PROTESTS KILLINGS

Expressing my horror at the senseless and tragic slaughter of the Israeli athletes at the hands of cut-throat terrorists, I appealed to my colleagues in the House of Representatives early on that infamous day to demand that the leaders of the Arab world take positive steps to halt these acts.

In a speech before the House I said: "I wish to express my sense of outrage over the killings of Israeli athletes by Arab terrorists. It seems incredible that hate and hostility, so alien to the spirit of the Olympic games, could invade the village where the great athletes of the world are quartered in peaceful relations."

"I cannot help but wonder whether the Arab world will evidence in this situation some degree of conscience. They have often in the past gloried in mindless slayings perpetrated by their own terrorists, but surely now with world opinion arrayed against them, they will take steps to halt these outrageous acts. I call upon them to take such steps. By doing so they will evidence some sense of decency, some sense of humanity, some respect for peace, some regard for the conscience of the world. This terrible act of violence gravely threatens the peace of the Olympic games, but its tragedy must not be allowed to end forever the hope for peace these games avow."

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Near East for the Foreign Affairs Committee, I further protested that week the entire question of discrimination against Jews.

I co-authored a "Sense of the Congress" resolution condemning the Russian government for its policy of inflicting a ransom on Jews in the Soviet Union who wish to emigrate.

In addition to the already imposed \$1,000 fee for an emigration permit and "other forms," the Soviet Union is now demanding a ransom of \$5,000 to \$25,000 for each Jewish person with a higher education who plans to go to Israel. This action, I believe, is reminiscent of Hitler's trading of Jews for trucks and Castro's demands of ransom for prisoners captured in the Bay of Pigs.

Neither the Russian government nor the Soviet Embassy in Washington will discuss this newly inflicted "policy." However, in the past the Soviets have shown sensitivity to world opinion when it concerns the plight of Russian Jews. I am hopeful that our "Sense of the Congress" resolution will initiate protests throughout the free world against this latest tool of repression.

WOLFF REPORTS TO CONGRESS

Consistent with my ongoing effort to investigate and voice strong objections to discrimination and bigotry wherever it exists, I felt it was my duty as a Congressman, who represents many constituents of Irish descent, to see for myself the conditions in Northern Ireland.

I made a personal fact-finding trip to both Dublin and Belfast in the hope of learning at first hand the extent of the civil strife and what possible avenues might be open to attain peace.

My intention as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee was not to intrude into the domestic affairs of another nation, but rather to gather the true facts behind the

violence and report my findings to the Congress. This I did upon my return when I appeared before the Subcommittee on Europe and recommended that the United States and all free people exercise "moral suasion" to convince the warring elements that peace must be found. (A limited number of copies of my report to the Committee are available through my offices).

That there is discrimination in Northern Ireland cannot be disputed. In one section of Belfast alone, 47 percent of the Catholic minority are unemployed as the result of bias in hiring practices and, throughout the north, Catholics are prohibited by archaic law from owning real property or voting.

I deplore this discrimination as I do racism in this country, anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, apartheid in South Africa and Rhodesia.

However, I also do not condone the death and destruction being wrought in Northern Ireland. If there is to be any hope at all for ending this violence, then we must first find the way to end the discrimination.

HERE'S YOUR OPINION

Earlier this year you received a questionnaire seeking your views on matters of genuine concern to all of us. The returns were unusually high—5% of all those surveyed answered. Below are the results of the questions I asked you—the residents of the new Sixth Congressional District. I wish at this time to again thank you for taking the time and effort to complete the questionnaire and mail it back to me. Your opinions help me to better represent you. If you would like further details on the results of the questionnaire, please request it from my Office.

(Answers in percent)

What do you consider to be the most serious problems in the nation today?

Indochina War—31.6;
Crime & Violence—27.0;
Inflation—11.9;
Drugs—8.0;
Unemployment—7.4;
Others—14.1.

If you could control federal spending, how would you like to see the money used?

Crime Control—28.4;
Jobs & Manpower—22.4;
Aid to Education—13.7;
Narcotics Control—9.4;
Consumer Protection—8.8;
Others—17.3.

What do you consider to be the most pressing problems in your community today?

Property Taxes—43.4;
Crime—16.4;
Drugs—13.8;
Education—10.9;
Others—15.5;

What course of action do you favor in Indochina?

Immediate withdrawal of all forces in exchange for release of POW's—40.2;

Withdrawal of American ground forces with continuing aerial support—21.3;

Immediate withdrawal of all American forces, ground and air—20.9;

Military Victory—10.7;
No Opinion—6.9.

How do you rate present wage & price controls as administered by the Price Commission?

Moderately Successful—38.7;
Unsuccessful—33.3;
Totally Ineffective—24.2;
No Opinion—3.8.

Should the federal government administer a system of comprehensive national health insurance paid for through payroll deductions similar to Social Security?

Yes—58.1;
No—31.3;
No Opinion—10.6.

Do you favor federal controls of all weapons?

Mail Order Sales, Yes—91.5;

Shotguns & Rifles, Yes—72.4;
Handguns, Yes—86.4.
Do you favor legalization of marijuana?
Yes—29.8;
No—61.2;
No Opinion—9.0.
Do you favor busing to achieve racial integration of schools?
Yes—15.2;
No—79.9;
No Opinion—4.9.

AVERAGE MAN LOSES IN McGOVERN PLAN

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Diego Union, Sept. 5, 1972]

AVERAGE MAN LOSES IN McGOVERN PLAN

(By Richard Wilson)

The new McGovern tax and welfare plan appears to be heading into the same miasma of uncertainty and doubt as the \$1,000-for-everybody scheme he abandoned.

His arithmetic may be wrong again, according to some analysts, and the reforms he proposes—mainly taxing capital gains at regular rates—will not produce the revenue needed to finance his welfare plan. Increasing doubt attaches to the feasibility of cutting Pentagon costs \$10 billion for three successive years.

These technicalities take second place to the main weakness of the McGovern plan. The average man, it is sad to report, will look in vain for any prospect of substantial relief.

Soaking the rich to help the poor will leave the man in the middle about where he was. Not a penny more will the wage and salary earners pay in taxes under his newly revealed plan, McGovern says. Not a penny less, either.

As a political exercise, the new McGovern scheme thus lacks the kinky fascination of \$1,000-for-everybody, without any compensating gimmicks to excite public interest.

Those who followed the political campaign in the presidential primaries realize that McGovern's new plan is not a convincing response to the yearnings of tax-burdened voters. The voters who listened to the two Georges, Wallace and McGovern, were happy enough to soak the rich, but they also wanted relief for themselves. They will not get much of the latter under the McGovern plan.

The average taxpayer knows only what he reads about capital gains. Increasing estate taxes is academic for him. Scaling down investment tax credits for business and repeal of accelerated depreciation rules mean nothing to the average taxpayer.

He may be convinced that closing loopholes and taking away tax breaks from the rich and the corporations is only just.

But if his annual confrontation with the Internal Revenue Service is to squeeze from him the same, or larger, portion of his income as before, he is likely to wonder what this tax and wealth sharing talks is all about.

If he continues to ask questions, the final answer he will get is that McGovern's spending plans are so big that personal income taxes would have to skyrocket to finance them.

So McGovern would take \$22 billion more from corporations and people who have had gains in the value of their property, add it to the \$30 billion saved on the Pentagon, and distribute \$54 billion in a large variety of ways—\$15 billion to local school systems, giv-

ing government jobs to a million people, expand the number receiving Social Security by 3 million, give a minimum of \$4,000 annually to families with no other income, and provide income supplements for the working poor.

The scale of such activity arouses substantial doubts that McGovern's \$54 billion—even if he could save and raise it—would cover anywhere near the huge costs implied.

In the process of trying to do so, it is the sober judgment of reasonable men that he could bring on a new wave of inflation, a stock market panic, and paralyze the country's economic growth—which has been resumed at a satisfying rate.

The McGovern plan, nevertheless, was received calmly in the financial East and the reasons for that complacency are plain. Eastern financial leaders do not think there is much likelihood that any significant portion of McGovern's plan, even if he were elected, would be adopted by Congress.

The Democratic Congress, in fact, has refused to enact virtually everything McGovern talks about in his revised tax plan. Democrats have ruled Congress since 1954. Every tax reform McGovern advocates has been before Congress in one form or another since then.

Rep. Wilbur Mills, Democrat of Arkansas, whom McGovern would nominate as Secretary of the Treasury, has been chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, where tax bills originate, since 1959. Nothing has happened. Mills, in fact, was author of one business tax break which McGovern now desires to repeal. McGovern himself now espouses what he earlier disavowed, a drastic change in taxation of capital gains.

The new plan merely enlarges the area of inconstancy and uncertainty which surrounds the McGovern campaign without giving the average taxpayer even the slightest hope for the relief he desires.

LEA—100 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, from October 12 to October 20 of this year the Louisville Education Association will be celebrating 100 years of service to educators, children, and the cause of better education generally in the Louisville, Ky., area.

All of us know that a lot of changes in education have taken place in the century that has elapsed since the LEA began its functions. These changes have brought new challenges, new problems, and greater difficulties to those who are charged with the education of our young people. Those problems and difficulties—many of them—are still with us. But the LEA continues to strive—as it has in the past—to bring the educational resources of the Louisville community to bear on these problems so as to insure the same kind of quality education that has been their goal—and our goal as citizens—for all these years.

On this golden anniversary of the LEA, then, I think it is fitting to offer that organization—and all the members who have worked for and in it down through the years—the thanks and gratitude of our community; and to offer them encouragement and best wishes for the challenging future.

Thank you.

WATER FLUORIDATION REPEALED
IN SWEDEN

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, mass forced fluoridation of public water supplies remains a prime goal of the social justice experimenters.

Such a grandeur scheme was authorized by Sweden with one city participating over a 4-year period. The Swedish Parliament in 1971, rebelling at its people being forced to submit to laboratory like experimentations, repealed its law which had given local governments, under strict guidelines, the right to fluoridate their public water supplies.

The Parliament in repealing its "national health law" stated that "now the experts do not agree about the effects of fluoridation upon the skeleton, the kidneys, and other inner organs." The Parliament further stated that infant mortality had increased in the United States since water fluoridation was begun here.

I ask that a self serving report issued by the National Board of Health and Welfare in Sweden—which is pro-fluoridation—follow my remarks:

CONCERNING WATER FLUORIDATION IN SWEDEN

On the 18th of November 1971, the Riksdag (the Swedish Parliament) repealed the law of the 30th of November, 1967, which had given local government, by special permission of the National Board of Health and Welfare, the right to fluoridate their water supply. Consequently, the National Board of Health and Welfare wishes to provide the following information in respect to the question of water fluoridation in Sweden and how it has been dealt with.

PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS AND PROPOSALS

Investigations of water fluoridation were conducted in Sweden in 1953 and 1958 through the agency of the National Board of Health (now part of the National Board of Health and Welfare). They were based on the previous findings of foreign as well as Swedish investigations. The National Board of Health recommended in a proposal to the Government in 1958 that local governments wishing to fluoridate their water supply should be able to obtain the permission to do so under certain conditions. During consideration of the proposal, however, it became clear that the issue was so controversial that legislation in respect to the matter would be out of the question at the time. The matter was set aside for the moment. It was decided that the National Board of Health should arrange further investigations in order to find other means to provide primarily children and adolescents with fluoride.

WATER-FLUORIDATION IN NORRKPÖING 1952-1969

The fluoridation of the water supply in Norrköping, a town of 90,000 inhabitants, began on local initiative in 1951. As the city was provided with water from two different water supplies, fluoridation was undertaken in half of the town, the other half serving as a control sector for estimating the reduction in dental caries frequency. The reduction recorded in Norrköping proved to be in accordance with the findings of earlier investigations on water fluoridation in other countries. In the beginning of 1962, however, it was necessary to cease fluoridation, as the Supreme Administrative Court in Sweden

then realized that existing laws did not contain any provisions for water fluoridation. The public health committee in Norrköping tried to procure permission from the authorities to proceed with the fluoridation for at least five more years.

THE RIKSDAG LEGISLATION IN RESPECT TO WATER FLUORIDATION

In 1962, a Government bill was presented to the Riksdag concerning the fluoridation of water supplies. The Riksdag committee's report on fluoridation stated that nowadays fluoridation experts almost all agree that fluoride has a considerable prophylactic effect on tooth decay. The results have been such, continued the report, that further experiments with fluoridation would be justified.

In November 1962, the Riksdag decided to pass the law concerning the fluoridation of water supplies. Among the Members of the Riksdag, 221 voted for it and 96 of them voted against it.

While the matter was being dealt with, several bills were introduced before the Riksdag which insisted that the Government proposal should be refused. It was claimed that water fluoridation was a violation of an individual's personal rights and that daily consumption of fluoride could be injurious to health.

INTERPELLATION AT THE 1966 RIKSDAG, REGARDING FLUORIDATION

At the 1966 Autumn Session of the Riksdag, an interpellation was presented regarding the experience of fluoridation of water supplies. The Minister of Social Affairs emphasized in his answer that experience has shown fluoride to have a considerable prophylactic effect on tooth decay. Good results have been obtained in dental care of children by mouth rinses and dental application of fluoride, but the best results are those obtained by combination of these two methods with the water fluoridation. According to the Minister, water fluoridation was not injurious to health.

A NATIONAL FLUORIDATION COMMITTEE IS APPOINTED

In 1967 the Government appointed an advisory committee for the technical questions of fluoridation: the so-called "fluoridation committee". In June 1968, the National Board of Health issued instructions on the water fluoridation to the waterworks.

NEW BILL FOR THE REPEAL OF THE FLUORIDATION ACT

At the 1968 Riksdag, a bill was introduced for the repeal of the Fluoridation Act. It was claimed that no one could know for sure the consequences of water fluoridation. The National Board of Health and Welfare, the Swedish Dental Society and the Swedish Society of Medical Sciences submitted their comments to the Government. They all recommended a rejection of the bill based on the fact that no investigations justifying a repeal of the law existed. The bill was defeated by the Riksdag by a vote of 254 to 54.

The next year an interpellation regarding the fluoridation question was presented to but not considered by the Riksdag.

THE NATIONAL BOARD OF HEALTH AND WELFARE DISCUSSES THE WHO RECOMMENDATION IN RESPECT TO THE QUESTION OF WATER FLUORIDATION

In June 1970, the National Board of Health and Welfare arranged a conference, concerning the water fluoridation which was attended by a number of the Board's scientific advisory committee and other experts. The purpose of the conference was to specify whether there were any recent results of medical or odontological research worth consideration during further discussions of the fluoridation question at the National Board of Health and Welfare in accordance with WHO's recommendation. The main subjects treated at the

conference were: the existing epidemiological investigations in areas with an optimal content or more of fluoride in the water and variations in resistance as well as the fluoride consumption of different individuals. In connection with this conference, the task of furnishing supplementary information pertaining to the fluoridation question was assigned to certain scientific experts by the National Board of Health and Welfare. The Board arranged, in October 1970, a conference on other collective prophylactic methods against tooth decay that could serve as alternatives or complements to the water fluoridation. It was then made clear that neither local fluoride application nor other prophylactic means against dental caries can presently replace water fluoridation.

REPEAL OF THE FLUORIDATION ACT

At the 1971 Riksdag, some members of the Riksdag had introduced bills for the repeal of the Fluoridation Act. They claimed that the fluoridation question has changed since the decision was made in 1962, because, in their opinion, the experts now did not agree about the effect on the skeleton and the inner organs that could be caused by fluoride. A too heavy consumption could e.g. disturb the renal function. To these risks of a medical nature the backers of the bill also wished to add certain technical, legal and ethic aspects. It was maintained that many people regarded fluoridation as a violation of an individual's personal rights, as something which created a feeling of anxiety among people.

The Riksdag committee objected to the bill, however, on the plea that a well-balanced supply of fluoride in the water resulted in a considerable decrease in the frequency of dental caries, and that water fluoridation, according to present indications, was superior to all other forms of mass prophylactic measures. Furthermore, it was stressed that since the Fluoridation Act had been passed, further results have shown the favourable effects of fluoridation. The committee stated also that there was no reason for a repeal of the Fluoridation Act until the results of the current investigations by the National Board of Health and Welfare were made known. The committee therefore requested that the Riksdag reject the bill.

During a long debate in the Riksdag the same arguments as those in the bills were presented. Furthermore, some members of the Riksdag stressed the fact that there were said to be differences between natural fluorides in the water and those fluorides added when fluoridating drinking water. It was also claimed that certain strong concentrations of fluoride could cause chromosome damage and that infant mortality had increased in the United States since water fluoridation was begun there.

Other members of the Riksdag claimed instead that no damage caused by fluoride could be proved except for a slight discoloration of the teeth. This was not sufficient reason to abstain from the possibility of improving dental health in Sweden.

The Riksdag decided, nevertheless, by a vote of 137 to 126, to pass the bill repealing the Fluoridation Act.

The Riksdag resolution to repeal the Fluoridation Act, consequently, is not based on any proposals presented by the Swedish Government or the National Board of Health and Welfare, but is entirely based on bills introduced by private members of the Riksdag. Nor do the bills rest on petitions or statements made by odontological or medical institutions or organizations. The resolution to repeal the Fluoridation Act is therefore to be regarded strictly as the result of general political considerations. In dealing with the matter, many members of the Riksdag were evidently influenced by increasing alarm about the risks in our society of further in-

October 3, 1972

dustrial water pollution. Some of the members have also regarded water fluoridation as a coercive measure; a violation of an individual's personal rights.

APPLICATIONS FOR WATER FLUORIDATION

The National Board of Health and Welfare has allowed, by virtue of the present law, five towns (municipalities) to fluoridate their water supplies provided that they observe the provisions issued by the Board in 1968. Most municipalities have not yet, however, submitted supplementary data to the Board on the technical prerequisites required before beginning fluoridation. The city of Norrköping has not yet begun fluoridation either. One reason, besides the rigorous demands placed on water-works preparing for fluoridation, by the National Board of Health and Welfare, is that the political authorities have chosen, because of opposition against water fluoridation by certain groups in society, to delay beginning such fluoridation pending further developments. The same attitude has no doubt delayed the technical preparations at other water-works qualified to begin water fluoridation.

FURTHER INVESTIGATIONS INITIATED BY THE NATIONAL BOARD OF HEALTH AND WELFARE

The aforementioned supplementary investigations initiated by the National Board of Health and Welfare concerning fluoridation will continue. The Board hopes to be able to render its final rescript during the first half of 1972.

PRESENCE OF FLUORIDE IN DRINKING WATER

According to available information, about half a million of Sweden's eight million inhabitants are provided with drinking water from municipal water supplies with a fluoride content of 0.8 ppm F or more. Furthermore, a great number of families have their own well, sometimes with a high content of fluoride.

WHERE ARE THE VIETNAM PROTESTERS TODAY?

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter the following article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was written by Mike Royko and appeared in the Los Angeles Times on Sunday, September 24, 1972.

I am hopeful Mr. Royko is incorrect in his assumption that the immorality of the Vietnam war as it was perceived by our young Americans was only due to the impact it might have posed to them personally. I do not believe the anguish of recent years was based on that shallow premise. But it might have been.

The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 24, 1972]

REALITIES OF WAR FADE—SO DO CRIES OF IMMORALITY

(By Mike Royko)

It wasn't very long ago that a job recruiter couldn't show his face on a college campus without being suspected of war crimes. If he were connected with the manufacture of anything less benign than marshmallows, he might have to flee, with cries of "murderer" in his ears.

That was when the peace movement had little difficulty mobilizing hundreds of thousands of people, most of them young, to

gather at the Pentagon and protest the war.

When President Johnson ignored their views and sent more troops to Vietnam, they formed behind Sen. Eugene McCarthy and convinced Mr. Johnson that he should retire to Texas.

Then when the Democrats nominated Hubert Humphrey, they took to the streets of Chicago and the resulting chaos tipped the balance of that election.

The key word throughout that period was "immoral." The war was immoral. Those who encouraged it were immoral. Those who profited from it were immoral.

Young orators uttered millions of words about how they were not going to go across the sea to shoot at innocent Asiatic women and children.

Most people agreed that this was no ordinary generation, or generations, of young people. They were hailed for being aware, unselfish, idealistic, and flatly against the waste of human life. Make love, not war, was their slogan.

If a politician thought he could send them to shoot at strangers, he was a war criminal. If a politician thought as they did, he was their hero. That's the way it was a short time ago. Now the question is: Where did everybody go?

The campus is quiet. Football is again a more popular sport than seizing the dean's office. College presidents don't need a hot line to the National Guard.

The organized peace movement has shrunk to almost nothing.

And the most surprising development of all are the political popularity polls.

At this point, they show that the majority of the nation's young voters prefer President Nixon to Sen. McGovern.

That's almost enough to send McGovern's strategists in for shock treatment. They were sure that if anybody would support McGovern, a long-time Dove, it would be the warring young voter.

Now they don't know what to make of it. While it is true that their man doesn't have the youthful appeal of a Kennedy, President Nixon isn't exactly a Mick Jagger, either. So why should Mr. Nixon suddenly become so popular with the young?

The answer might be that many of those young people don't hate it as much now that they don't have to go where the shooting is.

Now that Mr. Nixon has pulled most of our ground troops out—and has left the killing up to our bombers—nobody chants anything like "Hey, hey, L.B.J., how many kids did you kill today?"

Few of them make speeches about the war being "immoral," although one could argue that it is probably even less moral to wage a massive push-button air war, with little risk to ourselves. Rather than warfare, it becomes a form of execution, from a supersonic firing squad.

But the polls would indicate that this is morally satisfying to a lot of young people. Stories about the number of air strikes we flew yesterday don't offend their morality so much as stories about the size of the monthly draft call.

Many of them have even taken an interest in other aspects of the campaign, such as wondering if McGovern would be a competent administrator. In 1968, none of them cared if Sen. McCarthy had enough administrative skill to pick out a necktie in the morning.

I hope nobody takes this to mean that I am being critical of these young people for exercising their right of free choice. Not at all.

In fact, I'm more likely to trust people under 30. They really aren't that different after all. And now, Dow Chemical Co.'s recruiters probably can hire all the bright young men they need.

THE PLEA OF A SMALL BUSINESSMAN: "SAVE ME FROM MY GOVERNMENT"

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the liberal majorities of both Houses of Congress are so busy dreaming up and passing new, sweeping, and extremely costly laws allegedly to save our citizens from the trials and tribulations of life that they have become blind to the fact that citizens in increasing numbers are crying: "Help! Save me!" And they are not asking to be saved from their own problems, but from their Government which is supposed to be solving those problems. We have passed laws to provide for income security for the aged, the disabled, the abandoned; we have enacted floors for this, and ceilings for that; we have required stringent new regulations dealing with health, safety, and pollution, and the list goes on.

But as we continue to pile up the burden of great cost for these ever-more-generous and comprehensive programs, little do we know that we are approaching the threshold, the limit, the proverbial straw that broke the camel's back.

Mr. Speaker, let us be honest with the American people—we, the Congress have nothing to give. Government services are not free. There is no such thing as Federal money. What we give to one citizen or group of citizens, we take from another. And since private enterprise and our working citizens pay all the taxes, we are asking—no, we are telling—them to pay more and more for our extravagance. But there is a limit to their capacity to pay. Unlike the Federal Government which can simply raise taxes as new revenue is needed, private industry or individual taxpayers cannot raise their incomes to pay their heavier tax load—instead, they are squeezed in the tax vise harder and harder, with nowhere to go except down.

Mr. Speaker, I know of what I speak because the citizens are letting their voices be heard. There are some in Congress who will not listen; they turn a deaf ear upon the workers and producers, and instead court the takers, the talkers, and the wanters. Some would suppress the talk of a taxpayer revolt, or they would deal with it like the proverbial ostrich who sticks his head in the sand rather than face a dilemma. I for one will not ignore the citizens who pay the bills for Government. At this time I wish to share with my colleagues in Congress, with the agencies of the executive branch of this Government, and with all those who come with hands outstretched for more money and services from the Government cornucopia, a letter from a constituent who has reached his limit of tolerance—I can explain no better than he the case for a return to commonsense to the Halls of Congress:

HON. BOB PRICE.

DEAR BOB: I have come to the crossroads in this little elevator business. I have been

making a living the last few years here but I think it is time to sell or to close the doors because:

1. Cost of Millers Mutual Insurance has increased 29% the last two years to 58%.

2. Franchise tax has increased from \$225.00 per year to \$445.00 per year.

3. Workers Compensation has increased from \$5.00 per \$100.00 to \$8.50 per 100.00.

4. The great Social Security has increased every time Congress meets.

5. Pollution cost is too much even to consider. Engineers say it will cost approximately \$40,000.00 for this plant.

6. OSHA is another immediate cost.

7. State, county, and school taxes are increasing as usual.

After these things are considered "CCC" will not pay a reasonable amount for storage or handling of grain, so therefore you cannot charge others more for storage and handling.

The last man I had was paid \$2.25 per hr. to start with and then I raised it to \$2.50 and he averaged 46 hrs. per week. He worked nine months. I couldn't afford much more overtime than the six hours. Loss and damage resulting from his mistakes, his salary, Social Security, workers compensation, workers insurance would cost me about \$9,000 per year.

With all these things being increased regularly, I don't see any future in any small business.

"Thanks for everything,

FINIS O. KEETON.

THE RIGHT TO TRAVEL: HOUSE DEFEAT OF H.R. 16742

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House very wisely defeated H.R. 16742, the unconstitutional incursion reported by the Internal Security Committee which would have imposed Federal criminal penalties on Americans who travel to "hostile areas," including North Vietnam.

The 140 Members of Congress who stood up for civil liberties yesterday did so at very substantial political risk to themselves, for this bill arose in a heated, emotional, political atmosphere.

Once again, Members of this House who stood up to defend the Bill of Rights were falsely accused of jeopardizing the national security; their patriotism was impugned.

The action of the House yesterday in rejecting this bill was consistent with constitutional doctrine enunciated by the Supreme Court in a line of cases extending over two decades.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the Record my reasons for opposing H.R. 16742, as set forth in my dissenting statement published in the committee report:

RESTRAINTS ON TRAVEL TO HOSTILE AREAS—
DISSENTING VIEW OF CONGRESSMAN ROBERT F. DRINAN

The bill is captioned "Restrictions On Travel to Hostile Areas," a title which would seem to suggest that those of us who care about civil liberties are once again being restrained from traveling to the mountainous files of the Internal Security Committee (HISC).

Before I set forth my main objections to this ill-conceived, ill-considered, and uncon-

stitutional proposal, I think my colleagues are entitled to an explanation of why, in the body of this Report, my vote in opposition is not recorded.

At 5:43 p.m. on Friday, September 22, my office receptionist received a telephone call from a HISC staff member who indicated that the chairman had decided to hold a hearing on this bill Monday morning, September 25, at 11:00 a.m. A 45-minute hearing was held, several witnesses (all favorable to the bill) spoke, the committee proceeded directly into executive session, a vote was taken, and the committee adjourned by 12:20 p.m.

At the very moment the sudden vote was taken, I was speaking on the floor of the House on the critically important subject of release of American prisoners of war—a subject about which all of us are deeply concerned; indeed, a subject intimately connected to this bill.

Immediately after speaking, I raced back to the committee room, only to be told that the vote had been taken in my absence.

Thus, in less than an hour and a half, HISC held its hearings, mark-up, committee discussion, and vote on this bill—a bill on a matter of very substantial constitutional complexity, of grave social consequences, and of high controversy in our nation.

In its characteristic way, HISC made it virtually impossible for critical witnesses to appear. In its characteristic way, HISC once again flouted the rules of the House, in this case rule XI(f)(1), which provides:

Each committee of the House (except the Committee on Rules) shall make public announcement of the date, place and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by the committee on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing, unless the committee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. If the committee makes that determination, the committee shall make such public announcement at the earliest date.

This bill is absolutely not within the jurisdiction of HISC. For years, pursuant to House rules and traditions, the Judiciary Committee has exercised thoughtful and impartial jurisdiction over passport-related legislation. Legislation similar to H.R. 16742 was referred to the Judiciary Committee in the 90th Congress (H.R. 14428), the 91st Congress (H.R. 383 and H.R. 14893), and the 92d Congress (H.R. 16488), for example.

HISC's jurisdictional mandate simply does not reach all around the world. It does not reach into Indochina. It does not reach into the Passport Office. And it does not reach into the established and long-exercised jurisdiction of our Judiciary Committee.

This bill is unconstitutional on a number of grounds, perhaps most importantly its proposed deprivation of the right to travel without provision of substantive or procedural due process. As the Supreme Court has stated in *United States v. Laub*, 385, U.S. 475, 481 (1967), *Zemel v. Rusk*, 381 U.S. 1 (1965), *Aptheker v. Dulles*, 378 U.S. 500, 517 (1964), *Kent v. Dulles*, 357 U.S. 116, 125, (1958), and elsewhere:

The right to travel is a part of the liberty of which the citizen cannot be deprived without due process of law.

Some people have called this "the Jane Fonda bill." I call it the "Anthony Lewis bill" after the prize-winning New York Times reporter whose informative dispatches from Hanoi gave the American people a rare insight into the nature of the calamitous injury we are inflicting on Indochina. This bill would prevent Anthony Lewis and Richard Dudman of the St. Louis Post Dispatch and John Hart of CBS and all of their colleagues from reporting the news from Hanoi as they see it.

Haven't we learned the lesson, even after the Pentagon Papers, that when the Gov-

ernment is the only source of news the people are told lies and half truths?

And what about the implications of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to which we are a party (not to speak of our own Bill of Rights) on this bill? That basic international agreement states in Article 13:

1. Everyone has the right of freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state.

2. Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.

When the Soviet Union, also a signator of the Universal Declaration, violates that provision, as it most certainly has in the cases of the more than 150,000 Soviet Jews who seek to go to Israel, Congressmen and the people of the United States are justifiably outraged.

Israel and North Vietnam are very different. But before we pass such a bill as this, let us consider the rationale of the Soviet Union in refusing to allow Jews to travel.

The Russian journalist-diplomat, Victor Louis, in a dispatch from Moscow (New York Times, Op Ed, September 7, 1971) defended the persistent Soviet refusal to allow Jews to travel on the ground that Israel was the enemy of the Soviet Union. He argued that Russia could not so treat its enemy and the enemy of its Arab allies.

Now, through this bill, the United States would prevent its citizens not from emigrating to North Vietnam, but from merely visiting that country.

We cannot consistently speak out against the Soviet freeze on the right of Jews to move about and at the same time support this bill.

If any American citizen or resident commits treasonous acts in North Vietnam or anywhere else, the Department of Justice should and will prosecute. The laws of treason are fully adequate to the needs of our nation.

This is not an anti-treason bill. It is an anti-free travel bill. It is an anti-free speech bill. It is a bill consistent with the anachronistic cold war views of HISC. But most of all, it is a political bill. It was born in old-fashioned stump politics and the appeals to emotion typically associated with election-year politicking. Calm, reason, and more than one and a half hours of consideration are warranted—in fact, they are indispensable to the passage of sound legislation.

ANN KOZUSKO HONORED FOR 20 YEARS' SERVICE

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor and privilege of representing a dedicated resident of Parma, Ohio, who is being honored this week for 20 years' devoted service in civic and charitable efforts. In addition, she has been treasurer of the city of Parma for 11 years.

This remarkable and highly esteemed citizen is Mrs. Ann Lesko Kozusko and I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that hundreds of people associated with civic, charitable, church, and public service institutions will pay tribute to her in Padua High School in Parma on Friday evening, October 6.

Mrs. Kozusko has been a volunteer or

officer in more than 50 worthy causes. This outstanding lady more than merits high praise for her selflessness, beautiful character, and splendid citizenship. The world needs more Ann Kozuskos.

RUNAWAY HOUSES, A CREATIVE ALTERNATIVE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, runaway houses are a creative alternative for children who, angry with parents and their parents angry with them, divorce their families by running away. Carol Nunnelley, reporter for the Birmingham News, describes in the following articles from *Dialogue*, volume 4, No. 2, 1972, some of the despair felt by both children and parents when a child runs away from home, and she indicates how a runaway house can fit into the lives of these families:

BARNSTORMING

(By Carol Nunnelley)

Long hair, blue jeans, baggy shirt. Maybe she's 16 or 17 but she's as likely to be 13, 14, 15. She's wandered into one of those parks or down one of those streets. Every city has one now. Kids know where they are. "I'm new in town," she says. "I need a place to stay." She'll have a place that night. Whatever food there is, the group will share. It's easy for a girl, not really very hard for a boy.

The woman's voice on the other end of the phone line is straining to be composed and polite. The voice is used to a life of dignified self-reliance, is uncomfortable with asking strange reporters for help. "The man at the desk said to talk with you," she says. "My daughter has been gone two weeks. We're frantic. He said you might know the name of a new place where runaways go." The list of places in Birmingham is short, quickly voiced. After each one, the mother says: "Yes, I've tried there already." Finally, only "I'm sorry" is left to say.

Parents and teenage children. Angry with each other, hurt with each other. And finally, more and more often these days, the children are the ones to file for the family's divorce. They run away.

In every city, there are people who find themselves sandwiched between skittish kids and frantic parents.

A group of them who work in Birmingham agreed to meet and talk about the runaway problem. Ron Yount, who began dealing with runaways as a Youth for Christ staff member in Birmingham and is now working to establish Aletheia House, an independent, religiously-oriented runaway house; Patty Goldman, a counselor with the newly founded Salvation Army hostel for runaway girls; Howard Melton, Health Department coordinator of drug abuse programs in Jefferson County; Mrs. Kitty Douglas of Jefferson County's Family Court.

How many runaways are there in Birmingham? Nobody really knows. Jefferson County Family Court records show nearly 500 officially reported runaways during 1971—most of them girls, most of them white. That, of course, does not include kids who run away from somewhere else and

come to Birmingham. And street-wise Ron Yount is convinced many runaways just aren't reported anywhere official.

Embarrassment might be one reason. Having a child leave home causes gossip on the block and at church. It can even endanger business promotions.

Too, Yount feels, official reporting often just doesn't do much good. Police don't really look for runaways.

"I say 'What does she look like,'" Yount recalls from long and frequent practice. "It's always the same. Long hair, wearing blue jeans and a baggy shirt. That general description could fit 200 kids." So busy police generally have to settle for running a check on the young people picked up for some other reason—drugs, thefts, disturbing the peace.

One thing Yount is sure of is that in the three years he's been dealing with Birmingham runaways, their ages have gotten steadily younger. Three years ago, they were 16 and 17. Now he says they are "starry-eyed teeny-boppers" of 13, 14, 15.

Running away, of course, holds a traditional spot in America's growing up heritage. Generations of youngsters have been weaned on Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn. Dondi is currently running away in the funny papers.

Yount, Mrs. Douglas, Miss Goldman all see some of the Huck Finn search for adventure in today's runaways—though they may be less hardy than Huck.

"I've had kids call up and want to make reservations," Yount says. "One said 'I'm going to run away next Friday. Can I stay there?'"

The group agreed, however, that most often running away in the 1970s is sparked by serious problems—"a real cry for help," Mrs. Douglas says—coupled with ready opportunity.

Miss Goldman says the girls she sees at the Salvation Army hostel have really serious problems at home—they are beaten there or sexually molested.

But perhaps the nearest universal for runaways is their search for love—without a hassle. And there is a whole cultural scene built around this very idea.

"They have a pattern," Yount says. "There were a million kids at Woodstock and most of them got there by just leaving home or school and coming."

"The whole spirit of the freak movement is to share everything, down to the last penny."

Miss Goldman says this milieu offers an immediate way to survive—but also speaks to much deeper needs.

"That's what the kids are running away to find—that caring—and then parents wonder why they don't want to come back," she says.

The price—from adult, parental points of view—can seem awfully high for this "caring". Venereal disease, drug abuse, pregnancies and illegal abortions are hazards.

But often there is a vast chasm of viewpoint. "The kids think they're doing pretty good," Yount says. "Dad says 'you're living like a bum.'"

"I don't know any girl who sets out to get gonorrhea," Yount says. "It's part of a relationship." The bad things that happen seem often to be viewed as simply the calculus you get if you work in the garden. "A price worth paying."

And Yount says he often finds great willingness on the part of runaway kids to take responsibility. "When I find kids living together," he says, "they've often reconstructed a family—a substitute authority, figure, a girl who acts as mother—but with a basic caring built in."

"Parents aren't always right," Yount says. "We don't choose sides . . . we don't report kids and we won't force a child to make contact. We just say to parents that if we come across their child we'll try to have them contact you."

What to do about frantic parents is, however, a tremendous problem, often a more difficult problem than helping the runaway kids get themselves together.

Miss Douglas believes a runaway child often manages to send parents a message.

"Sometimes for the first time the parent realizes that nothing is as important as my child," she says.

For such parents in Birmingham and most other places the two weeks or two months or sometimes longer they must wait before any word is hell. In Birmingham, almost no one is working to keep in touch with the street scene in order to be able to help parents answer even the basic question, "Is my child alive?"

Parents' reactions however are as individual as those of the kids—and often they include more than pure love and concern. Sometimes there is resentment that a possession is leaving and in such an embarrassing way.

"Why are they doing this to hurt us? parents ask. And sometimes, Yount says, they take the route that has already caused so much resentment in their children—giving their money but not themselves. Dad will pay the high price of a private detective to trace the runaway but he'll not get out to do the looking himself.

Mrs. Douglas believes strongly that a helping agency's main aim should be to restore the family unit. Miss Goldman and Yount wonder if this is really always possible.

"When you say to parents 'we've really got to work with this girl', that's fine," Miss Goldman says. "But when you say 'we may need to work with the family,' it's a whole different attitude."

"They (parents) will promise you the moon when their kid's gone," Yount says. "But when the kid's back it's a whole different thing . . . a lot of guys got saved in the war when the shelling was on."

Once the runaway is discovered alive, the reaction often changes to, "My kid's run away. He's on Southside, he's got to be crazy. Put him in Third North (a hospital psychiatric wing) . . ." Yount says.

"It's the competition," Miss Goldman says. "the idea that I should raise my kid as well as my next door neighbor."

For workers caught in the middle, the heat can be considerable. Yount has been blamed with encouraging runaways because he helps them. (His response: "Do you blame the fireman for the fire?")

Sometimes parents storm into runaway houses threatening police and lawyers.

Technically, Melton notes, people who help underage runaways are running a legal risk. Police, however, often help runaway houses calm angry, jealous parents. They see the problem and know how hard dealing with disillusioned young people is.

"Think where they'd be if they weren't here," Miss Goldman often tells parents upset that the Salvation Army has housed and fed their missing child.

Running away, Yount notes, isn't just a reaction for kids.

"It's interesting to hypothesize how many Dads are running away from home by staying at work," he says, "and how many mothers are using worthy committee activities and bridge clubs as an acceptable way to get out from under family responsibilities."

Can families running in various directions be patched together again? Sometimes yes, sometimes no. But for runaway families in

Birmingham now, the fact of the matter is that very few people are even trying to help them get things together again.

YOU HOLD THEM WITH AN OPEN HAND
(By Carol Nunnelle)

A night inside, food, a chance to wash clothes, a call home if they want and "as much warmth as a family . . . can give in that length of time."

That's what Peggy and John Fuller and their large old home on Birmingham's Cliff Road mean to some of the young runaways who wander through Birmingham.

The Fullers started offering a night's respite to roaming young people about a year ago when Freedom House asked them to. "We had the room," Peggy explains simply.

Since then, about once a month Freedom House calls and the Fullers go to get their unknown guests. Most of the time, so far, the visitors have been boys. But girls come, too.

And none of them, Peggy Fuller says, are happy vagabonds.

The first to stay with the Fullers was a Mexican-American youth about 19. He told his hosts that he'd been on his own since he was 11 or 12.

"His parents just didn't want him, according to the boy," Peggy says.

One 18-year-old girl and her four-day-old baby stayed with the Fullers a few days after they got out of the hospital.

Another young girl, who had been hospitalized with a variety of venereal diseases, also stayed with the Fullers.

"The doctor had told her she'd never be able to have children," Peggy recalls. "The group she had been traveling with left her when she had to go to the hospital. She was planning to find them later."

One boy who had acted rather obnoxious during his visit, left a message written as a page in his diary but obviously meant for the Fullers to read.

"He said that it looked like every place he went where something good happened to him, he had to spoil it," Peggy recalls.

The Fullers have been amazed at some of the circumstances they have found.

One young woman, obviously retarded, spun an elaborate tale of running away from vacationing parents. But a check revealed that she had been on her own for some time, traveling from city to city earning her way as a mother's helper.

"And she was excellent," Peggy says. "She helped me around the house."

The young people who have come to the Fullers' house do not fit the popular stereotype of runaways as the wildly liberal children of privileged suburbia.

A few do fit this description, but most do not seem from wealthy or well-educated backgrounds, Peggy says.

Most, she says, aren't really very interested in politics. But in tastes and outlooks they represent a wide range from very conservative to very liberal.

So far, the Fullers have not had any real unpleasantness from either the kids or parents. They realize that keeping runaway youngsters could be legally risky but so far most of their visitors have been older teenagers, above the age technically considered as minors. And most, Peggy believes, were not away from home without their parents' consent.

Sometimes, the Fullers hear from one of the young people they have housed. And Peggy admits that the whole experience "could be heartbreaking if you let it be."

But, she says, "you have to realize there is a limit to what you can do. You're not going to save any of them, certainly not in a one night stay. You do all you can and let them go . . . you hold them with an open hand."

THE HOUSE RESTAURANT

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. du PONT. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD today a commentary on a recent meal a Delaware reporter from the Newark Post experienced as my guest in the House Members dining room. If anything, Mr. Kotowski was polite in his reporting of the events that took place. It was not an experience in gracious dining. My guest amiably suggested that if I lost the forthcoming election I could find solace in knowing that my opponent would, at some point, have to frequent the dining room.

Perhaps it is not necessary for the House Members dining room to be a four-star restaurant but I do not think it is too much to ask that the restaurant be brought up to the standards of Major Hoople's boardinghouse.

Mr. Kotowski's remarks follow:

NEWS WITH A SLANT

(By Bob Kotowski)

The 'Peter Principle' has struck another area of the federal government, the Congressional Dining Room.

I was in Washington recently and was invited to eat dinner in the House restaurant by Delaware Rep. Pete duPont and some of his Washington staff, and all through the ordeal I kept asking myself why he was punishing me.

To say that the service was bad is a gross understatement; it was virtually nonexistent.

Five of us sat at the table, expecting to be out in a reasonable length of time, but from the beginning we knew we had an interminable wait ahead.

After an initial fifteen or twenty minutes, a waitress graced us with her appearance and with pad in hand eagerly asked if we were ready to order. When told that we needed menus, she 'flashed' away to get some. The only problem with her quick departure was that she had not learned how to 'flash' back.

When she finally returned with the menus, she also had a large sheet of blank paper which she thrust at us and told us to write out our own orders . . . then flashed away.

An hour or so later she again returned, and quickly snatched the order, printed in clear, legible English, while practicing her disappearing act. Somehow in the five seconds that she spent at our table she managed to drop off five glasses of water that tasted as though it had been dredged from the bottom of the Potomac.

Sometime that same evening she returned to us with five salads, some vinegar and oil that no one had ordered, and an extra pile of silverware that was stacked next to me. Throughout the meal the stack became higher and higher, as the area next to my left elbow became a repository for stainless steel.

After another fast exit and a delay of two or three days, part of the main course was delivered to all but me. A glass of tomato juice was set before me along with a "No oysters" and another disappearing act.

When the rest of the party was halfway through their steaks and I was halfway through nibbling on the glass, she again appeared dropped off the remainder of the main course to the others, and took my order for a steak . . . which arrived while everyone else was wiping the last morsels of food from their mouths.

Somehow, despite the delays and mixups in the orders, we all miraculously got to eat our desserts at the same time. All five chocolate sundaes were delivered in one trip . . . along with a shrimp cocktail and two beers that had been ordered when the waitress first snapped up our hand-lettered order.

With service like that it's no wonder the House floor is rarely full; half of the Congressmen's time is spent trying to get some nutrition.

And if chocolate sundaes, beer and shrimp cocktail are the normal fare, it's no surprise that bills take so long to pass. Who can legislate while plagued with indigestion?

OWNERS OF ILLEGAL BIRDS GET INDEMNITY

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, today I ask two questions: First, can the Government take a man's business and his property without paying him just compensation? Second, can the Government pay for illegal property?

These questions are raised by the attached article from the Riverside, Calif., Press-Enterprise in a most interesting, in-depth report of efforts of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to control exotic Newcastle disease in poultry in southern California. I congratulate Mr. Dick Lyness, the writer, for his careful research, and for bringing these facts to light.

At the start of this year, exotic Newcastle disease was discovered in the poultry industry of southern California, having been introduced there with imported parrots. The U.S. Department of Agriculture with its State counterpart quickly quarantined eight southern California counties, started a program of inoculation, and undertook eradication of the disease by inspecting all flocks of poultry and destroying infected birds.

Since that time, about 6 million laying hens and other poultry in the area have been killed, and many poultrymen have been ruined financially. Those remaining are now indignant over indemnification procedures which they consider grossly unfair. They feel they may be sacrificed without fair compensation in order to protect poultrymen elsewhere. They say:

Eradicate the disease, but pay us for the costs of what you are doing and the fair value of the property you destroy.

The Department has paid from 50 cents to \$2 for laying hens and has said the law strictly prevents better compensation. Poultrymen say the loss to them may be \$4 to \$5 per bird. When they learn of \$2,000 Cockatoos and \$25 illegal fighting cocks, their outrage is understandable.

I call on the U.S. Department of Agriculture to reexamine its compensation procedures and to pay for the real costs and losses inflicted by its eradication program on poultrymen including loss of production and loss of sales caused by

eradication efforts or quarantines, and to also alter its procedures which now allow payment for illicit property.

Mr. Lyneis' article follows:

OWNERS OF ILLEGAL BIRDS GET INDEMNITY
(By Dick Lyneis)

Southern Californians who own illegal fighting birds, some in Riverside County, are being subsidized by the federal government.

An inspection of appraisal records of the Federal-State Newcastle Disease Eradication Task Force in Riverside shows that the U.S. Department of Agriculture has paid indemnity of up to \$25 per bird for thousands of fighting cocks, with the total perhaps as high as \$100,000.

The fighting cocks and hens, like chickens and other birds, are killed by task force personnel in order to prevent spread of the Newcastle disease virus.

Cock fighting is a violation of California's penal code. So is possession of such birds, Section 597j of the code reads:

"Any person who owns, possesses or keeps any cock with the intent that such cock shall be used or engaged by himself or by his vendee or by any other person in any exhibition of fighting is guilty of a misdemeanor. The fact that the cock's comb has been clipped shall be prima facie evidence of intention to use or engage such cock in an exhibition of fighting."

Task force appraisers have admitted to entering into agreements with owners of cocks with clipped combs.

One appraiser said: "I wouldn't be so naive as to say I didn't see any birds with cocks' combs clipped."

"It seems," he acknowledged, "that we are in a ticklish position of buying birds that are illegal in the first place."

Appraisal records which show indemnity payments by the task force are contained in seven thick volumes.

The records show that several flocks of hundreds of game birds have been "depopulated" by the task force.

When confronted with this information, a task force member acknowledged that thousands of gamecocks have been killed by the task force, with indemnity payments from the federal government to the birds' owners perhaps as great as \$100,000.

Although most of the game birds found by the task force were in the Chula Vista area, many were in the Riverside area, including one flock in Mira Loma where the owner was given \$4,000 in indemnity payments for 160 birds. The records revealed the presence of other smaller flocks of gamecocks in Mira Loma, Fontana and other nearby communities.

Spokesmen for the Riverside County Sheriff's Department, when informed about federal payments to gamecock owners in the county, indicated a strong interest in the operations of the state-federal task force.

Chief Deputy Sheriff John McCoy said investigators from the sheriff's department would attempt to examine the task force appraisal records to see if there is evidence of violations of Sections 597j of the Penal Code.

Dr. Jack D. Lamont, a California Department of Agriculture representative on the task force, explained that when task force personnel go onto someone's private property, "we are going there to enforce the laws of the Department of Agriculture of the State of California. We are there as guests."

"We are there," he explained, "to enforce our laws. If possession of fighting cocks was against the law of our department, then we would be interested."

Told the possession of fighting cocks was a violation of the penal code, Dr. Lamont said, "I do not know that personally."

Dr. E. C. Sharman, a federal agriculture employee who is serving as acting task force director, was asked how the figure of \$25 for a "depopulated game bird" was arrived at.

"Our appraisers," he explained, "contact people who are knowledgeable in the price of birds. What we pay these people represents the true market value of these birds."

"These birds," Sharman said, "are not there for egg production. They are a man's possession and he has a set value on it."

Lamont and Sharman were asked if it is their responsibility to report the violations of other California laws to other agencies, such as sheriff's and police departments.

Neither gave a direct answer, but both acknowledged it was an "interesting question."

Sheriff's department spokesmen said they are aware that illegal cock fighting sometimes occurs in the Riverside area, as it does, apparently, throughout Southern California.

Sheriff's Capt. L. E. Brooks said that although it seems obvious that the birds are being raised as fighting cocks, many of the birds' owners claim they are being raised as show birds.

There are certain indications, he added, however, that make it fairly obvious when a bird is being raised as a fighter.

For example, combs are removed from fighters so that their opponents can't get a hold on it with their beaks. A fighting cock could hold onto the other bird's comb and then slash into other parts of the cock's body with his "slashers" or "steel burrs" to inflict mortal damage.

Another indication that the cocks are fighters is that the birds' claws have been removed. The absence of claws indicates that slashers and steel burrs are strapped on to replace them.

Brooks said the sheriff's department is aware that there is a sort of cock fighting "season" in the American Southwest and in Mexico. Gamecocks don't fight at this time of year because they are still in their moulting season. This ends in the fall months, and cock fighting usually begins in November.

The presence of gamecocks in large numbers in Southern California indicates the likelihood that the birds are transported from place to place for the purpose of fighting. While transportation of birds for fighting purposes also is a violation of California's penal code, it also indicates probable violations of the task force's own emergency regulations.

It is a violation of the state agriculture code if any kind of bird is transported into or out of the Newcastle quarantine zone which, presently includes western Riverside and San Bernardino counties, Orange County, Los Angeles County and southern Ventura County.

Until recently, the quarantine zone also included San Diego County where, task force appraisal records indicate, the largest numbers of fighting cocks seem to be located.

If birds that task force personnel found are indeed fighting cocks, presumably the birds are transported to locations where cock fighting is known to occur frequently, such as Mexico.

Task force officials have said they are concerned about the possible transportation of birds from Mexico into the United States because Newcastle disease is known to exist in Mexico.

Wouldn't possession of fighting cocks by a person be a sure indication that they must be transported in order to be used? Sharman and Lamont were asked.

Lamont answered: "If someone has birds in their backyard and they move them out of the quarantine area, they are in violation of the quarantine. It is not our concern what they intend to use them for, but by the very fact that they would be moved out of the quarantine zone, it would be a violation of the agriculture code."

"But," he added, "we have over 40,000 people in the quarantine zone who own poultry and another 100,000 people who own birds. We know some people make illegal move-

ments, and if we have any evidence, we go after them."

"We have information right now," Lamont said, "on some illegal bird movements that we suspect are going to take place this weekend, and we have people investigating this, but with over 100,000 owners, it is impossible for us to investigate every case."

Sharman was asked why San Diego County was taken out of the quarantine zone when task force personnel had knowledge of thousands of potential fighting birds in the Chula Vista area, and that these birds might be transported into Mexico where they could be contaminated with the Newcastle virus.

"This is a danger," Sharman acknowledged, "and we recognize this up and down the Mexican border. We did confiscate one parrot that was infected."

He said the U.S. Bureau of Customs is co-operating with task force, however, "and if there is any suspicion of smuggling birds across the border for any reason, they are investigated."

Indemnity payments have been a bone of contention of Southern California poultrymen who say they are not being fairly compensated for their laying hens that are being killed by the millions by the Newcastle Task Force.

Although recently the U.S. Department of Agriculture raised top payments for "depopulation" of laying hens from \$2 to \$2.50 per bird, the poultrymen say the true value of their chickens is between \$4 and \$5 each.

Apparently the poultrymen aren't the only people who think they're not getting a fair deal from the task force.

One appraiser said gamecock owners are unhappy too (and he also acknowledged he is aware that he was appraising fighting cocks).

"We've been giving \$25 for fighting cocks," he said, "that their owners say are good enough to be worth between \$750 and \$1,000. In Puerto Rico, where they also have Newcastle and where cock fighting is legal, some of these birds are worth up to \$4,000."

A MOST BENEVOLENT YEAR

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of great pride to me to be fortunate enough to represent the most historic area in this great country of ours. Jamestown, where the first permanent colonists landed; Williamsburg, our foremost colonial capital, and Yorktown, where our Nation first become a reality, are all within a 15-mile radius of each other.

It is also a source of great personal pride to represent some of the finest people in the world. Among them, the names of Nick and Mary Mathews of Yorktown, must necessarily rank near the top. The Mathews are Greek-Americans who are deeply proud of being citizens of the United States, and their high sense of patriotism is a shining example for all of us. They have worked hard and they have prospered in a country which permitted them to do both. Over the years, their gifts have been many, but their most recent offer to the Virginia Bicentennial Commission is a true legend of unselfish philanthropy.

But all of this is much better said in a splendid editorial which recently appeared in the Times-Herald of Newport

News, Va. I think my colleagues will find it extremely interesting:

A MOST BENEVOLENT OFFER

When the United States began to dedicate parcels of land for recreation purposes 100 years ago, they were called "pleasuring grounds". Today they are called national parks, and when they include sites of significant historic interest, they are especially valuable in relating their stories to the growing numbers of visitors.

Such is the case on the Peninsula, where we are exceptionally blessed with hallowed grounds encompassing virtually the entire history of the United States from the little church at Jamestown to the Victory Arch in Newport News.

We are now preparing for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the nation's independence and there should be a great deal of attention on the Peninsula, where it all began. The national and state Bicentennial Commissions are showing increasing interest in the proper development of the Yorktown area where the Revolution ended with the surrender of the British forces under Lord Cornwallis.

Virginians should note with vicarious sense of pride that one of Yorktown's citizens and his wife, Mr. and Mrs. Nick Matthews, have stepped in to fill a fairly obvious need. They have offered to the Virginia Bicentennial Commission a 25-acre plot of land within walking distance of the hallowed ground of Yorktown's battlefield for use as a focus of visitors' activities for the bicentennial.

The Matthews are, as is generally known, the proprietors of one of the Middle Atlantic coast's most widely reputed seafood restaurants, Nick's Seafood Pavilion. Their generous offer of property is one of those exceptionally benevolent gestures that we see upon occasion from folks whose industry has been rewarding. Indeed, the Pavilion itself is a sort of institution, a unique manifestation of the interests and tastes of its owners, to the zeal with which these charming people have welcomed their patrons with a superb seafood cuisine over the years.

Indeed, the Matthews' at one time considered turning over their restaurant to the state of Virginia when they considered retirement, but to be honest about it, we can't quite imagine the Commonwealth's representatives turning out those superbly fashioned salads, each a work of a culinary art, nor maintaining Nick's decor in such a way that each visit is a new impact upon the visual senses.

Be all this as it may, the Virginia Commission would be well advised to look into the Matthews' offer, weighing, of course, the immense problems of traffic congestion sure to accrue as the bicentennial approaches, and the niceties of fitting the tract into the overall historic aspects of the area itself.

We bespeak the feeling of the community in our heartfelt "Thank you" to these gracious, generous people.

**MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?**

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE
OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 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?

**TENNESSEE WALKING HORSE
LEGISLATION**

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I recently received an interesting and important letter from Dr. James Naviaux, a constituent of mine. Dr. Naviaux has found that the methods and procedures used by the USDA veterinarians to implement the Horse Protection Act of 1970 at the just completed Tennessee Walking Horse Celebration, were inadequate. In this letter, Dr. Naviaux has detailed his findings. I am confident his suggestions for improvements in the implementation of this act will be of interest to my colleagues.

The letter follows:

PLEASANT HILL, CALIF.,

September 7, 1972.

Re Lack of Enforcement of Public Law 91-540.

HON. PAUL ROGERS,
Chairman, Public Health and Environmental
Subcommittee, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROGERS: I would like to report to you my observations of methods and procedures used by the USDA veterinarians to implement the Horse Protection Act of 1970 at the just completed Thirty-Fourth Annual Tennessee Walking Horse Celebration held in Shelbyville, Tennessee.

In Summary, the procedures used were obviously inadequate as there was gross evidence of violation of this Act present at the show whereas the majority of horses being shown showed clinical evidence of being sore. Despite efforts made by your office to obtain permission for me to be allowed in and observe first hand the examinations of the horses by the USDA veterinarians, I was denied this opportunity by Drs. W. Bird and E. Ongert, the veterinarians in charge. I was told that it was now their policy not to allow any "outsider" to be in the USDA inspection area while horses were being examined—not even for a congressional report. Dr. Bird did arrange for me to have their procedures outlined to me by Dr. Robert Leech.

The following were my findings and are my suggestions for possible improvements:

A. Selection of horses to be examined.—Random selection procedures are used only. Spot observers (4 to 6) are in the grandstand area to detect which horses appear to have a "sore lick." This is not difficult to note as such animals are in great pain, advance in a crouched manner while all attempts are made to have their hind legs placed under them as far as possible. Unfortunately, nearly all the horses showed clinical evidence of some degree of soring which nearly all trainers find necessary to obtain the desired "Big Lick." If two or more observers feel a horse should be examined, the animal is requested to report to the USDA inspection station following the class. On the average, two to eight horses were called in to be examined after each class, despite the fact that many classes would have from 20 to 50 entries.

Suggestions: Because the law is to protect the soring of any horse, I feel the selections should be arbitrarily as follows:

1) The top three horses of each class plus all other suspect horses in the class.

2) All horses rejected by the horse show veterinarians prior to their being shown and those excused from the show ring should be re-examined by USDA veterinarians to determine if the cause of their rejection or excuse

was because of soring. Under present procedures, most all horses turned down as lame or not serviceably sound by the show veterinarians, are not re-examined by the USDA veterinarians to see if they are in possible violation of the legislation.

B. Examination Method Used.—A horse selected to be examined is walked into the closed examination area where it is examined and a form is filled out by each of the examining veterinarians.

Suggestions:

1) All horses should first be examined in an area where they can be observed in motion as well as at rest. This should also be true for examinations performed by the show veterinarians. No such observations were made at the examination area by either USDA or show veterinarians.

2) All horses should be examined by two or more USDA veterinarians who then fill out a single report form—noting their findings of the horse in motion and at rest. The veterinarians then should specifically state their opinion as to there being clinical evidence that the horse has or has not been sored. The report should then be signed by each of the examining veterinarians.

3) To maximize the chances for a non-biased report and to minimize the chances of intimidation to the veterinarians, it would be best and desirable to use non-local USDA veterinarians. This is a very important point as there was ample evidence of tenseness and an atmosphere of pending violence at and around the inspection area. Also, Dr. Bird told me of his receiving numerous harassing phone calls at 2 o'clock-3 o'clock in the morning. There is no question that there is potential danger of physical harm to the inspecting veterinarians. At least out-of-state veterinarians could leave the area after the completion of the shows.

4) To minimize costs of the enforcement of this law, I would suggest using only the number of veterinarians deemed necessary to examine the horses. At the Celebration, several veterinarians (like Dr. W. Eskew) did nothing but man a clip board, doing clerk's work. All assigned veterinarians should be able to perform the necessary examinations.

C. Specific Complaints—

1) On my first entering into the area of the gate where horses enter and leave the arena, I observed entry No. 1702, a black Tennessee Walker, that had obvious blood covering his medial right front heel. I brought this to the attention of Dr. Bird and Dr. Eskew and asked that the horse be examined. After much persuasion, Dr. Eskew finally walked over to the horse standing outside the gate. He took a casual glimpse of the blood-covered heel and passed it off as a possible injury from the horse's hitting itself with its hind foot. Though this was a possibility, he showed no further interest nor did he attempt to examine the horse closely to determine the cause of the bleeding. Unfortunately, other horses with bleeding pastern areas were observed in the warm-up ring which were also not brought in for examinations.

2) While observing the show on the night of September 1, entry No. 433 was clinically, grossly in pain while in the show ring, and when I brought this to the attention of Dr. Eskew so that it might be selected to be examined after the class, he took no interest in my suggestion and it was not one of those "chosen" for the USDA examination.

3) Also on the night of September 1, entry No. 1114 was dismissed by the show veterinarians from the ring because of obvious lameness and the animal was not brought in for an examination by the USDA veterinarians.

Congressman Rogers, I sincerely hope—as I know you do—that the effective implementation of this legislation will be forthcoming as there should be no leniency toward

violators who subject these animals to such cruel and inhumane treatment.

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES L. NAVIAUX, D.V.M.

Dr. FRANCIS MULHEARN,

Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Dr. FRANK L. MILNE,

President, American Association of Equine Practitioners.

Mrs. PAUL M. TWYNE,

President, American Horse Protection Association.

Mr. JOHN HOYT,

President, Humane Society of the United States.

PROS AND CONS OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues have asked for pros and cons relative to the controversy over the highway trust fund versus balanced transportation system. To supplement the discussion in the committee report, I submit for the RECORD the following interesting article entitled "Superhighway—Superhoax."

[From The Reader's Digest, February, 1971]

THE FOLLY OF OUR SUPERHIGHWAY SYSTEM

(By Helen Leavitt)

The red, white and blue shield of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways is a familiar guidepost to American motorists. It is now posted along more than 30,000 miles of superhighways on a transcontinental network that will eventually stretch 42,500 miles. By any standard, the Interstate System is the largest public-works project ever undertaken by modern man.

When proposed by President Eisenhower in 1954, it was to be a chain of roads to serve interstate traffic. It was to bypass cities, enabling the motorist to drive from one corner of the country to another at high speed without stopping for a traffic light. Spurs from cities would connect to the Interstates, but there would be no massive highway construction in our cities.

It hasn't worked out that way. Some 5600 miles of "interstate" roads have already been built in cities, and 1900 more such miles are scheduled to open by 1974. During off-peak hours these urban freeways can work relatively well. But from 7:30 to 9 a.m., and from 4:30 to 6:30 p.m., drivers are likely to whiz along them at no more than 6 to 12 m.p.h. The horse and buggy did as well.

Serenely confident, however, that the solution to automobile congestion is more concrete, highway planners now advance schemes for double-decker lanes, tunnels, bridges and even more miles of city-adjacent highway. In theory, additional facilities should alleviate traffic jams. In reality, the new roads fill up as fast as the concrete hardens; traffic simply rises to meet capacity.

Meanwhile, profits on public transit nose-dive, rail and bus equipment deteriorates, and service is cut back. In fact, the government's vast investment in freeways has virtually scuttled all forms of land and water transportation except the automobile. Thus it has become essential for every American to maintain his own private transportation system, although in an area as small as a

city any other form of commuting system would be more economical and beneficial to the public.

CAPITAL CASE

How did we get on this course?

The original Eisenhower proposal envisaged mostly toll roads that would pay for themselves. The Highway Act as passed by Congress in 1956, however, provided that the system was to be financed through a Highway Trust Fund. All federal taxes on motor vehicles, gasoline, oil and ancillary equipment would be channeled into this fund and devoted solely to highway construction. From this account, the federal government would pay for 90 percent of the construction of interstate projects. States, collecting their own automobile-related taxes, would pay the rest.

The 90-percent federal financing proved to be an irresistible lure for politicians, contractors and state highway officials who wanted as much of the federal pie as possible and concluded that the highways should actually enter our cities. Washington, D.C., is a good example of what happened as a result.

In 1944, an engineering survey showed that an expansion of the efficient trolley system serving the city would be the most economical way to move large numbers of people. Expensive highways would not be required. But if nothing was done to improve mass transit, the survey concluded, people would return to the private automobile, "a trend that threatens to explode the city."

The report was ignored, and the engineers began promoting the expressway system. Other cities were planning them—why not Washington? By 1960, traffic congestion had grown so bad that House and Senate District committees declared that "any attempt to meet the area's transportation needs by highways, and private automobiles alone will wreck the city." Yet, by 1965, the Washington area had received \$500 million for major highway projects, and led the nation in freeway mileage per square mile and per capita. Its trolley system had received orders to dismantle.

As more and more freeways were constructed, population and retail sales in the city diminished. Taxable land dwindled as more than 60 percent of the land in the central business district became devoted to the moving and storage of automobiles. The homes of thousands of residents were demolished, and monuments and parks were engulfed by freeways. And anyone who witnessed the mass exodus of panicked suburbanites from the District on the afternoon preceding the riots of April 5, 1968, and the ensuing traffic jams on every major artery in the city, had living, stalled proof that in emergencies the system cannot effectively serve national defense, which highway advocates claim is an essential purpose.

NOT ENTIRELY AWARE

Why do we continue to pour billions of dollars into creating rivers of noise and exhaust gas sweeping into the hearts of our cities, eating up real estate, compressing people, cars and services into ever narrower confines? Because that's all the law allows. The money pours into the Highway Trust Fund in ever-increasing amounts each year, and must be spent for highways. House and Senate Public Works committees simply agree on a bill to authorize expenditures to meet the Fund revenues, and Congress passes it.

Even when a city has the temerity and perseverance to reject a proposed urban highway—as San Francisco, in 1966, rejected an eight-lane double-decker system in favor of its own rapid-transit train system—the conversion of cash into concrete moves on apace. San Francisco's portion of the federal highway funds simply reverted to California, and engineers planned more mileage for Los Angeles.

The 1956 Highway Act provided that public hearings should be held whenever an Interstate road was planned to bypass or go through a community. State highway departments are expected to measure public response and adapt their plans accordingly. But it hardly ever works out that way. Public hearings go unadvertised and unattended; or, if they are advertised, the voice of the people is largely ignored. For instance, after fighting highway interests and state and federal bureaucracy for years, a weary Seattle citizenry suffered the construction of a "12-lane ditch" right through the city, wiping out 5000 houses.

Politicians and engineers tend to dismiss citizens' objections to freeways as impractical, even crackpot. "The truth is," wrote a spokesman for the American Roadbuilders Association, "the local people are not entirely aware of their best interests."

OF HUMAN VALUES

The Bureau of Public Roads (BPR), an arm of the Department of Transportation, is charged with representing the public interest in federal road building. The Bureau continually talks about human values and the need to "bring more compassion" into the program. Yet its administrative task is so enormous—20,000 projects are now in some stage of activity—that it does not begin to supervise them effectively. The Bureau carries out what Congress, pressured by a gigantic highway lobby (contractors, engineers, gasoline producers, automobile manufacturers, truckers, billboard firms), enacts into law.

A classic illustration of what can result is to be found in the North Expressway in San Antonio. There, in spite of formidable public opposition, a proposed freeway is to curve, thrust and ram its way through, by or around an Audubon bird sanctuary, Olmos Creek (which would become a concrete ditch), a recreation area (wiping out a Girl Scout day camp and nature trail), a college campus, an elementary school, the zoo, a public gymnasium and outdoor theater, a residential area, a municipal golf course, and a wooded portion of the San Antonio River's natural watercourse. So much for human values.

Highway engineers justify urban expressways by noting that in America the automobile "is a way of life." True enough. But the fact is that the government's massive commitment to highways has left Americans with little choice. A 1968 study, partially sponsored by the BPR, asked whether the contribution to society made by the automobile was worth the air pollution, traffic congestion, demolition of property and homes, and the loss of thousands of lives annually. Eighty-five percent of the respondents answered yes. When asked why the automobile was worth all this, almost 50 percent replied, because it is the only form of transportation available.

UNENDING?

How much longer can we tolerate what has been done in the name of automobiles? Apparently there is no end to it. By 1966, the cost of the Interstate system had mushroomed from the original estimate of \$27 billion to \$46.8 billion. In 1968, a new act was passed, extending the life of the Highway Trust Fund and authorizing expenditure of an additional \$21.5 billion in 1970-74. Now Congress is considering extending the Trust Fund and the deadline for completion of the system through 1978, at a total cost of \$75 billion. If it follows through, neither the American people nor our representatives will be able to prevent Trust Fund money from being spent on highways—and on highways alone. Moreover, most of the money will be spent on urban freeways, the most expensive, destructive and inefficient segments of the system.

What can we do to establish sane, sensible

transportation? Clearly, these steps are "musts":

Citizens and communities must be allowed to retain some control over the number of automobiles they are willing to accommodate. In September 1969, officials at Yosemite National Park introduced a tramway bus service in the magnificent Mariposa Grove area and banned automobiles there in an effort to keep it from being ruined by smog and traffic jams. Now the ban has been extended to the eastern end of the park. Surely, if the need to ban automobiles in parkland can be recognized and dealt with intelligently, civilized urban man can respond in kind. Automobiles can be banned from specific areas of cities and limited in other areas. The carless street, successfully tried in Manhattan in recent months, is a first step. Direct rail lines to airport would be another. We can discourage automobile ownership by limiting the amount of city parking space, charging stiff bridge tolls, reserving existing lanes for speedy buses and even taxing individual parking places.

Congress must take measures to curb the power of all those who try to influence highway legislation. These measures should include full financial disclosure by legislators, administrators and lobbyists, and strict conflict-of-interest laws to keep separate the interests of private groups and public officials.

Most important, the Highway Trust Fund—chief cause of the vast imbalance of our transportation situation—must be abolished. The highway lobby avows that gasoline taxes can logically be used only to build highways. It would be equally "logical" to put all liquor taxes into a trust fund to promote and expand the liquor industry. Since inception of the fund in 1956, we have spent a total of \$195 billion on highways while spending only \$32 billion on all other forms of transportation—including the Coast Guard.

Revenue should continue to be tapped from petroleum and tire taxes, but the money should go into the general treasury so that highways, for the first time in 14 years, will have to compete with all other forms of transportation for funds. Then a state or community could request either a block grant from the Department of Transportation or appropriations for a specific project, and have some real chance to plan and buy a system appropriate to its needs.

The mass-transit bill signed into law last October—providing for \$10 billion to be spent on urban mass transportation over the next 12 years—is merely a step in the right direction. As long as the Highway Trust Fund remains intact, financing \$15 billion in concrete annually, we are ensuring mass-transit's financial failure. We must abolish the Fund and lend meaningful support to our sagging public transportation systems, if we are to have balanced transportation for our troubled cities.

BRING THEM HOME

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, a group of Navy wives in the Virginia Beach-Norfolk area have formed the "They're Not Forgotten Committee" in their deep concern for our men who are missing in action and prisoners of war.

Last week, this dedicated group of women circulated petitions in our area and collected more than a thousand

signatures. Although their message was directed specifically to the Virginia Senators and Congressmen, I believe that it has something to say to all of us in Congress, and for that reason I am sharing it with all of my colleagues:

BRING THEM HOME

Virginians care about Prisoners of War and Missing in Action. We urge you, all Representatives in Congress of the United States to increase your interest in them and work to bring about release and accounting. You can determine their fate!

Bring them home.

PEACENIKS USE PW'S TO AID McGOVERN CAMPAIGN

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the September 22, 1972, edition of the Knoxville Journal contained a most interesting article which seeks to explain the motivation underlying the recent release of three American POW's. I commend the article which follows, to my colleagues as a possible primer for understanding future political events in this presidential election year:

PEACENIKS USE POWS TO AID McGOVERN CAMPAIGN

(By Robert S. Allen)

WASHINGTON—A hoopla-staged meeting between Sen. McGovern and at least two of the three released POWs is planned by the leftist anti-war activists who sold Hanoi on the political value of returning them at this time.

Whether the calculating electioneering scheme can be pulled off is conjectural.

McGovern lieutenants have indicated he is ready and eager to participate to propagandize the Vietnam war issue. They see this as a golden opportunity to fanfare the South Dakota radical's long-held isolationist-dovish views.

But whether the POWs can or will take part is a question.

Once out of Hanoi's hands, they automatically resume status as active officers and subject to military control. Under military regulations they are barred from political activity.

Further, one of them, Navy Lt. Markham Gartley, is not on record as assailing either the war or the administration. There are no recordings of his engaging in Hanoi broadcasts or other critical propaganda. But his mother is another story.

Mrs. Gerald Gartley has been stridently and persistently in the forefront of the anti-war activists' agitation. She has denounced the administration and reputedly contributed to the McGovern campaign.

In leftist quarters, her vehement fulminations are credited as primarily responsible for her son being one of the three selected for release. Aged 28, he was shot down Aug. 17, 1968.

Whether Mrs. Gartley can influence her son to join in a McGovern electioneering stunt remains to be seen.

The other two POWs, Air Force Maj. Edward K. Elias and Navy Lt. Norris Charles, have very different records.

In taped recordings of Hanoi propaganda broadcasts and in interviews with former Attorney General Ramsey Clark, actress Jane Fonda and U.S. and foreign correspondents, the two pilots have denounced the Vietnam

war and the Administration. Both also have expressed support for McGovern.

As a consequence, it is assumed Elias and Charles would be willing to take part in the planned fanfare meeting with McGovern—if they can get away with it.

The release of the three POWs at this time was engineered by David Dellinger and Mrs. Cora Weiss, cochairmen of the so-called Committee Liaison with Families of Servicemen Detained in North Vietnam.

They strongly urged the move in secret meetings with the Hanoi delegation in Paris—stressing the propaganda and political value of doing this in the midst of the Presidential campaign. This advice was supported by Ramsey Clark during his carefully managed and publicized North Vietnam sojourn.

During Clark's visit, he delivered an anti-war harangue to 10 handpicked POWs, rated by the Communists as "cooperative." Charles and Elias were among that group.

Reportedly, Dellinger and Mrs. Weiss sought the release of five POWs—arguing that would be a "strikingly impressive" number.

Hanoi fixed the number at three and stuck by that.

Dellinger and Mrs. Weiss were consulted on who was to be released. After some discussion, their recommendations were approved. Apparently that's how Lieutenant Gartley was included—as a gesture to his vehemently crusading mother.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON TEACHER RECOGNIZED AS ONE OF NATION'S OUTSTANDING TEACHERS

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education contains an article on the varied and fascinating interests of J. Barre Toelken, a teacher at the University of Oregon in Eugene. Mr. Toelken has been honored by the Danforth Foundation as one of the Nation's outstanding teachers, and this article makes it clear why he was given this honor. The article "From Medieval Studies to a Larger Interest: Creative Processes" is an absorbing picture of an individual who takes teaching far beyond the walls of the classroom and makes his subject matter come alive for his fortunate students.

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues who are interested in excellence in the teaching profession.

The article follows:

PORTRAIT OF A TEACHER—FROM MEDIEVAL STUDIES TO A LARGER INTEREST: CREATIVE PROCESSES

(By Teresa L. Ebert)

EUGENE, ORE.—For J. Barre Toelken, who has been honored by the Danforth Foundation as one of the nation's outstanding teachers, teaching is but one of many pursuits.

He is an internationally recognized authority on folklore, a medieval scholar, an archivist, and a performing folk singer at concerts throughout the United States. He has made three records and been in a radio series on songs and ballads. A white man, he has been adopted as a "son" by a Navajo Indian and has developed special composition classes for Indian students. And he is an associate professor of English at the University of Oregon here.

"It's tough for me to pin down my own area

of academic emphasis," Mr. Toelken said recently, "because I don't think a lot of the artificial distinction between fields is viable any more."

Instead, his interests revolve around people.

CONCERNED ABOUT INDIANS

Mr. Toelken is closely involved with the welfare of the American Indians, particularly on the campus here. According to one colleague, it was he who bridged the gap between Indian students and the university.

The Indians were having such a difficult time adapting to the university that 90 per cent of them dropped out each fall. Mr. Toelken attacked the problem by establishing a composition class structured around an Indian point of view.

"The results," he says, "have been remarkable. The quality of the work is strikingly above any student theme I have encountered before. Since the writing program has been in operation, we have lost none of the Indian students except for personal reasons."

Mr. Toelken has an almost innate understanding of Indian culture. He lived intimately with the Navajos for three years as an adopted son of a tribesman. He participated in their traditions, lived off the desert, herded sheep—and buried as many as four of his tribesmen a week, mostly children.

UNDERSTANDING MINORITIES

"I love those people," Mr. Toelken says of the Indians. "They are fascinating, primarily because their culture is based on reciprocity. When it becomes clear that you are a reciprocating member, then so are they. It has nothing to do with your color or background. If you are a member of the family, then you are a member of the family, and that's the way it stays."

Remembering the suffering and death he witnessed with the Navajos, he has collected food and clothing for the last three years, driving 1,500 miles to distribute the vital items to his adopted tribe in Blanding, Utah.

Mr. Toelken's experiences with Indian culture have led to an understanding of other minority groups. "I can talk to him and share thoughts that I can't communicate to other whites, even my colleagues," says a black English professor. "He has been sensitized enough to know the feelings of blacks and minorities. I think one reason is that he is married to a Japanese-American, which makes the problems of being a minority in a white majority evident to him. It is important in his work that he have a sensitivity for the people he studies and teaches. This is what most students sense about him."

Mr. Toelken's interest in other cultures led him to organize a course in American ethnic literature at Oregon. Evenings and summers he teaches high school teachers about ethnic minority folklore. In addition, he has proposed the creation of an American Humanities Institute, which would recognize the arts of all ethnic minorities.

Although Mr. Toelken spends much of his time working with minority cultures, his primary academic efforts are in the field of folklore and medieval literature.

A MEDIEVALIST FIRST

In graduate school he studied medieval literature, which he says "provides a valuable perspective."

"But I can't see limiting myself to reading and teaching medieval literature without drawing larger conclusions," he says.

"I'm more interested in moving in the other direction—toward the study of what the subject can reveal about creative processes in general, which has led me into folklore. Folklore has become my academic interest, the center of my teaching and on-going research."

Mr. Toelken's work in folklore is based on a

long, close association with the oral traditions of both the Indian culture and his own. When he was a child in New England, folk-songs and ballads were an integral part of his family life. He began collecting songs and lore as he worked summers logging. He later tramped the backroads of the West and Southern mountain highlands. Now he collects folklore professionally throughout the United States and Europe.

HUMAN SIDE OF HISTORY

Folklore, to Mr. Toelken, is not a dead phenomenon of our cultural past, but a vital, continuing process. He calls folklore "the human side of history; the epitaph of man's soul."

Take jokes, for example.

"People," according to Mr. Toelken, "are often oblivious to the most important aspects of our culture. Everybody shrugs off the joke as insignificant. If I were to tell the state board of higher education that some of my students were studying jokes, they would think I was out of my mind. Yet that really reveals that Americans are slow learning how to study their own traditions."

"Jokes, although they pretend to be superficial and laughable are the best index of society's tensions. People joke about things which they are most uptight about. In our society, we jest about our two biggest hang-ups, sex and minority groups. If you add up the ingredients of the joke, the sum is a list of things which are tearing our country apart. One of our reasons for preserving all of these items is that its part of the on-going study of mankind."

UNCHRONICLED MATERIAL

Intent on preserving the folklore of the Pacific Northwest, Mr. Toelken, one of only two professional folklorists in the region, is overwhelmed by the amount of unchronicled material in an area he considers to be the richest cultural source in the United States.

Oregon, for example, has a large Russian community in which the people still maintain the traditions, costumes, and languages of pre-revolutionary Russia. Groups of Indians, loggers, cowboys, and Basques also live throughout the region.

"There is so much folklore here that I don't know where to start," Mr. Toelken says. "I just sit here with my head spinning. The only way I can get anything done is to interest the students in collecting it. If it weren't for the students, we would not have an archive."

The Randall V. Mills Memorial Archive of Northwest Folklore exemplifies Toelken's commitment to the field. His students organize and collect samples of both traditional and contemporary folklore, including GI slang from Vietnam, drug lore, mountain jargon, quilt patterns, and children's rhymes. The archive draws scholars from Europe to research the area. However, it is more than a resource center. It performs a vital operation by involving the student in the preservation of his own culture.

CULTURAL PATTERNS

Mr. Toelken tries to unite these various expressions of folklore into cultural patterns for the student. "Indians and primitives," he says, "already realize that everything they produce is based on the same premise, but they use different modes of expression. In folklore I want to get people in our own culture to realize that ballads and river boats are all part of the same patterns."

Mr. Toelken's responsiveness to different cultural perspectives was evident in one of his American Indian literature classes. Two Indian girls wanted to tan deerskins, making them into dresses for a term project, illustrating the process to the class.

"I couldn't buy that one," Mr. Toelken

says. "I tried to explain to them that deerskins are over there and that words are here. But, they couldn't understand. One of them said that deerskin dresses were the same thing as literature; it used the same pattern I had been talking about; it was just a different medium. That knocked me for a loop. It was exactly what I'd been saying all along in folklore, only I was wearing my literature teacher's hat and wanted them to come too close to the words."

FOLKSONG DEMONSTRATIONS

In the classroom, he expresses the cultural message of a folksong or ballad by interspersing his lectures with demonstrations of the folksongs he has learned in his long, personal association with the oral traditions of various cultures. He considers this approach, though, to be his "razor's edge."

"I am wary about performing songs, especially in large classes," he explains. "It makes me feel like an academic Johnny Carson. But I view the classroom as an interchange, with the teacher acting as a catalyst who has to use whatever means inspire the best interaction."

LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES A. VANIK IN THE 92d CONGRESS, 1971-72

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 1972

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as the 92d Congress draws to a close, I feel that I should state in the RECORD, for the benefit of my constituents, a description of the principal legislation which I have introduced in the House in 1971 and 1972.

TAX, SOCIAL SECURITY, ECONOMIC, AND DOMESTIC LEGISLATION

Following are several tables which describe some of the bills which I have introduced—either as original sponsor, or as a cosponsor—and their legislative status to date. In some cases, the legislative language which I supported was accepted virtually without change. In most cases, there were amendments as a result of hearings. Often the concepts included in these bills were accepted as amendments within larger bills. In addition to proposing original ideas and supporting—through the act of cosponsorship—proposals of my colleagues, I have tried as often as possible to testify and present evidence before the relevant committees in support of these proposals.

The legislation which I have introduced has generally been directed toward the protection of the average citizen and his family. It has been directed against unfair taxation and against tax privilege. It has been designed to provide protection during retirement years through more adequate social security and private pension plans. The legislation has attempted to provide increased health and educational services, increased employment during the current period of high unemployment, and improvements in the quality of our urban life.

The tables are as follows:

TAX REFORM

House Number	Date	Short title	House hearings	House passage	Senate hearings	Senate passage	Conference	Law	Notes
H.R. 7446	Apr. 7, 1971	To accelerate the schedule of personal deduction tax exemptions provided by Tax Reform Act of 1969 (to \$700 for 1971 and \$750 for 1972).	×	-----	×	-----	-----	Public Law 92-178	Revenue Act of 1971 provided \$675 personal exemption for 1971 and \$750 thereafter thus accepting major portion of H.R. 7446.
H.R. 8067	May 4, 1971	To make personal exemption for 1971 \$750 instead of \$650.	×	-----	×	-----	-----	do	Do.
H.R. 7494	Apr. 19, 1971	To raise revenue by tax reform through limitation of special oil depletion and intangible drilling allowances.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
H.R. 7561	Apr. 20, 1971	Eliminate percentage depletion deductions on oil wells, after cost recovered.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
H. Con. Res. 278	Apr. 22, 1971	To repeal asset depreciation range regulation promulgated by Treasury.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	Public Law 92-178	The ADR regulation originally cost the Treasury over \$3,000,000,000 per year. While the Revenue Act gave the force of law to most of the ADR provisions, some parts were eliminated, as per H. Con. Res. 278, thus saving the Treasury \$5,300,000,000 over a 3-year period.
H.R. 8223	May 10, 1971	Increased tax equity for single taxpayers.	×	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
H.R. 8619	May 29, 1971	Tax credit for education expenses of mentally or physically handicapped child.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	Other legislation which I have introduced and which will probably pass this year provides new legal standing for most handicapped to participate in public programs, such as schools.
H.R. 8757	May 26, 1971	Taxation of capital gains at death.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	Tax reform amendment designed to close major loopholes and bring Treasury \$2,500,000,000 per year.
H.R. 13878	Mar. 16, 1972	Tax Reform Act.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	Package of loophole closing amendments designed to increase tax equity and Treasury revenues by \$7.5 annually.
H.R. 14830	May 8, 1972	Fiscal responsibility amendment.	×	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	Tax reform bill designed to close tax loopholes and lessen size of deficit.
H.R. 15112	May 22, 1972	Replace oil quotas with oil tariffs.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	Pending elimination of oil import quotas, a tariff in place of quotas would eliminate windfall profits to oil importers while providing Treasury \$1,500,000,000 with no increase in oil prices.
H.R. 15889	July 17, 1972	Tax reform amendment.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	Would eliminate provision in law which allows a taxpayer to retroactively elect a different tax accounting method and then receive a tax refund with interest.
H.R. 9900	do	To exclude income of POW's from Federal taxation.	×	×	×	×	-----	Public Law 92-279	-----

ECONOMY AND EMPLOYMENT

H.R. 2494	Jan. 29, 1971	To provide additional funds for public works on an accelerated basis.	×	×	×	×	×	Vetoed	Legislation designed to reduce high unemployment through speedup of public works projects. After veto weaker bill repassed.
H.R. 13704	Mar. 9, 1972	Accelerated public works.	×	×	×	-----	-----	-----	Bill to reduce unemployment while completing vitally needed public projects. Aids for inner city areas.
H.R. 4105	Feb. 10, 1971	Prepare economy for conversion from defense to civilian activities.	×	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	Bill designed to aid scientists and engineers in move from defense projects to civilian social service projects.
H.R. 12012	Dec. 2, 1971	Expand Emergency Employment Act.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	Department of Labor appropriation bill, presently in conference, includes some increase in funds.
H.R. 13946	Mar. 20, 1972	To provide for public notification of price freeze violation.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	Testimony given to Banking and Currency Committee for more public awareness and control over phase II program.
H.R. 15506	June 14, 1972	To permit continuation of extended unemployment benefits in States with more than 4-percent unemployment.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
H.R. 16329	Aug. 10, 1972	Protection of employee pension plans.	×	-----	×	-----	-----	-----	-----

SOCIAL SECURITY AND OLDER AMERICAN LEGISLATION

H.R. 3360	Feb. 2, 1971	10-percent social security increase.	-----	-----	×	×	-----	Public Law 92-5	Cosponsored by 45 others. Passage of 10 percent retroactive to Jan. 1, 1971, fulfilling Democratic caucus resolution offered by Representative Vanik in mid-January 1971.
H.R. 7372	Apr. 7, 1971	50-percent increase in social security benefits with portion of cost paid from general revenues.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	Despite recent 20-percent increase payable in October 1972, need for more adequate social security program remains.
H.R. 3671	Feb. 4, 1971	To establish senior citizens skill and talent utilization program.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	H.R. 3671 generally included in provisions of H.R. 15657, passed House on July 17, 1972.
H.R. 5021	Feb. 25, 1971	Low-cost nutrition program for elderly.	×	×	×	×	-----	Public Law 92-258	Cosponsored with Representative Pepper.
H.R. 5871	Mar. 10, 1971	Age 62 computation point for determining social security benefits.	×	×	×	-----	-----	-----	Representative Vanik amendment included in H.R. 1: Social security and medicare amendments bill.
H. Res. 935	Oct. 20, 1971	That a White House Conference on Aging be held every 3 years rather than once every 10 years.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	Resolution discussed at December 1971 White House Conference on Aging. There is interest in this proposal among conferees and continuing consideration is possible.
H.R. 12136	Dec. 9, 1971	Strengthen and improve Older Americans Act.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	H.R. 12136 generally included in provisions of H.R. 15657, passed House on July 17, 1972.

URBAN PROBLEMS AND TRANSPORTATION

House Number	Date	Short title	House hearings	House passage	Senate hearings	Senate passage	Conference	Law	Notes
H.R. 9413.....	June 28, 1971	Revenue sharing.....	×	×	×	×	×		H.R. 11950 bill cosponsored with committee Chairman Wilbur Mills and contained urbanization factor. Senate version deleted these provisions, reducing share to suburbs. Final passage imminent.
H.R. 11950.....	Nov. 30, 1971								
H. Res 324.....	Mar. 17, 1971	Reorder priorities to suspend development of SST until rational urban mass transportation program can be implemented.							SST program terminated. Legislation pending which would place greater emphasis on public transportation rather than highway construction. (see below.)
H.R. 7427.....	Apr. 7, 1971	Remove limitation on size of urban mass transit grant any one State can receive.							
H.R. 9050.....	June 10, 1971	Establish transportation trust fund.							Senate passed a bill which permits highway trust fund moneys to be used for public transportation—such as buses. Supporting efforts to widen this concept to include all forms of transportation funded by a single trust fund.

EDUCATION

H.R. 6916.....	Mar. 30, 1971	To provide increased protection for historical and archaeological data.	×		×	×			
H.R. 6696.....	do.....	To require deposit of a copy of all copyrighted materials at main library of 12 Federal Reserve Bank cities.							
H.R. 7550.....	Apr. 20, 1971	Extra appropriation for Neighborhood Youth Corps for summer of 1971.							
H.R. 12578.....	Jan. 24, 1972	Increased authorization for special school lunch program for children in day-care centers and for children during summer months.	×	×	×	×	×	Public Law 92-443..	As 1968 author of this section of National School Lunch Act, Representative Vanik pointed out need for increased support for this program. Hearings resulted in further documentation of need with result that final bill provides open-ended authorization.
H.R. 13621.....	Mar. 7, 1972	To provide instruction for homebound handicapped children through tutorial services of college students.							
H.R. 14615.....	Apr. 25, 1972	Tuition tax credit for nonpublic school students.	×						
H.R. 16812.....	Sept. 26, 1972	Extend Social Security Act programs for training in social work.	×						

HEALTH

H. Con. Res. 155.....	Feb. 10, 1971	To maintain the operation of Public Health Service hospitals and outpatient clinics.	×	×	×	×	×		
H.R. 2163 (H.R. 2).....	Jan. 25, 1971	The Health Security Act.....	×		×				The health security bill has received some hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means. A major overhaul of the Nation's health delivery systems will be on the agenda of the 93d Cong. An amended version of these bills enacted Dec. 23, 1971.
H.R. 3659.....	Feb. 4, 1971	Conquest of Cancer Act.....	×	×	×	×	×	Public Law 92-218..	
H.R. 11011.....	Sept. 30, 1971								Despite considerable question as to the public health factors involved in the use of enzymes, the Surgeon General has permitted their use in detergents.
H.R. 5775.....	Mar. 9, 1971	To prohibit use of enzymes in detergents.							
H.R. 10081.....	July 26, 1971	To establish health standards for bottled drinking water.			×	×			
H.R. 10936.....	Sept. 28, 1971	Appropriation for Sickle Cell Anemia research and control.	×	×	×	×	×	Vetoed.....	Will probably be included in new HEW Appropriation bill now under consideration.
H.R. 14201.....	Mar. 29, 1972	To establish a separate Department of Health.							
H.R. 16470.....	Aug. 17, 1972	Mental Health Act.....							To provide medicare-type assistance in meeting enormous costs of mental and and psychiatric health care.
H.R. 16671.....	Sept. 14, 1972	Increased protection for mentally retarded in institutions.							

U.S. ELDERLY ON A TREADMILL

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, thousands of elderly people in the United States are on a treadmill for Government often gives with one hand and takes with the other. This is because major programs for the elderly, operated by different

Federal/State departments, impinge on each other.

I find no indication that it was the intent of Congress that this interaction of programs should deny increases to the recipients. But, in the absence of further legislative action, a great many persons at the very bottom of the income scale will, in effect, be denied the social security increase that Congress intended they be granted.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I want to place in the RECORD an article by David K. Shieler, which appeared in

the New York Times of October 2, 1972. The graphic case studies reveal the dimensions of the problem:

SOCIAL SECURITY RISE BECOMES A NIGHTMARE FOR MANY ELDERLY
(By David K. Shieler)

Like millions of other aged Americans, Marie Nashif of Denver will receive a 20 per cent increase in her Social Security check this month. But unlike most, she will not welcome the extra cash.

Mrs. Nashif is among the 187,000 or so elderly for whom Congressional election-year generosity has become a nightmare. The Social Security rise, voted by Congress June 30,

has pushed her income just high enough to make her ineligible for the welfare and Medicaid benefits that she needs so desperately.

Mrs. Nashif, a small, alert, 74-year-old woman, suffers badly from arthritis. Until now, her heavy medical bills have been paid fully by Medicaid. But when her monthly Social Security check rises from \$138.40 to \$166.10, it will surpass the \$147 figure that Colorado uses to divide those who are eligible from those who are not.

In exchange for her \$27.70 additional from Social Security, Mrs. Nashif will have to pay \$5.80 a month in medical insurance premiums, 20 per cent of all doctors bills, the first \$68 a year in hospital expenses, \$17 a day after 60 days in the hospital, and the total amount of prescription drugs.

Further, she will lose \$7 a month in welfare payments, she will probably become ineligible for food stamps, and her rent will rise, since she lives in Federally subsidized housing where rents are tied to income.

"When I take all this into consideration," she said, "I'll be a darn sight worse off than I am now."

Congressional action could eliminate such hardships, and several bills addressed to the problem are now pending. Last Friday, the Senate voted a solution for welfare recipients by passing a measure that would force states to raise the eligible income limits for welfare by the same dollar amount as the Social Security increases. Prospects for the bill in the House are uncertain.

Even if the bill becomes law, it will not help people who now collect Medicaid and are not welfare recipients, and there are thousands of those in New York City alone who risk losing their medical benefits. The bill addresses itself only to welfare recipients.

ACTION BY STATES

Some states have already taken action on their own. Gov. William T. Cahill of New Jersey has ordered Medicaid benefits continued for 4,000 elderly who would otherwise become ineligible.

Delaware has allocated \$1-million to raise the eligibility income maximums. Gov. Winfield Dunn of Tennessee has changed administrative regulations to keep 7,500 people on the welfare rolls. Nebraska, Missouri, Iowa, Florida and Wyoming are among the states that have increased the income levels that determine eligibility.

No action has been taken in New York. The state's Department of Social Services contends that it has no power to make the necessary changes without approval from the Legislature, whose regular session begins in January.

New York City has already sent letters informing 6,000 elderly people that their welfare benefits will be halted. This means that they will have to begin paying 20 per cent of their medical expenses.

In addition, many aged New Yorkers who are not on welfare and are not addressed by the Senate bill will be hurt by the Social Security increases.

The city's Office For the Aging estimated that 14,696 persons who now receive 80 per cent of their medical expenses from Medicaid will be cut off altogether. In addition, 22,434 who are not on welfare but are fully covered by Medicaid will have until they have spent all their income above the welfare maximum on medical bills. At that point Medicaid will pick up the full burden again. This totals about 43,000 elderly affected adversely in New York City alone.

The figures elsewhere are smaller, ranging from about 10,000 in California to 400 in Vermont. The United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare calculates that nationwide, 187,000 people will become ineligible for welfare and 93,000 will lose Medicaid.

Even many who do not lose will not gain from the Social Security increase, since some states apply Social Security income against welfare payments. As Social Security rises, welfare decreases; the beneficiary is not the individual, but the state.

"I'm all for the increase," said John Maros, administrator of the Wyoming Division of Public Assistance. "The more Social Security they get the less public assistance is needed." The State of Washington estimates that it will save \$2.3-million in welfare payments by next June 30.

"The average pensioner in Alabama won't gain a dime as a result of the increase," said Ruben K. King, Alabama director of pensions and security.

BAN UNDER SENATE BILL

"This is a form of psychological deceit practiced upon senior citizens," said C. Christopher Brown, head of the law reform unit of the Baltimore Legal Aid Bureau. "The government is giving with one hand and taking away with the other."

This cannot happen if the bill passed by the Senate is approved by the House and signed by President Nixon. Under the measure states would be prohibited from reducing welfare payments in response to the Social Security increase.

The bill would also cost the states additional money by requiring them to raise the income limits for eligibility, not merely for those welfare recipients who are on Social Security, but for all disabled, aged and blind. In New York, many in the disabled category are narcotics addicts.

In most states, elderly people on Social Security receive only small amounts of money from welfare, and their removal from the rolls is less of a hardship in terms of direct welfare payments than it is in terms of the services that are corollaries to welfare status.

In many states, for example, Medicaid—whose cost is shared by the Federal and state governments—is available only to those whose incomes are low enough to qualify them for welfare, even though the Federal guidelines allow Medicaid benefits for those with incomes up to 133 per cent of the welfare maximum.

Other benefits, such as food stamps, legal help and homemaking services, are also often tied directly to welfare.

BRONX WOMAN HIT

Mrs. Elisabeth Miles of 1365 Finley Avenue, the Bronx, for example, faces the loss of a valuable homemaker because the Social Security rise will make her ineligible for welfare. She is 62.

"The letter came last Wednesday," she said, "and now I have nothing. I have been a widow for 29 years and am completely blind in the right eye and partially blind in the left eye. My son is unable to take care of me because he has eight children of his own."

Her monthly Social Security check, to rise from \$133.10 to \$159.70, will have to cover her \$70.40 a month rent, as well as her food and other expenses.

"They say that they are giving me a 20 per cent increase, but they been taking everything back and all I get is nothing," Mrs. Miles said. "We worked hard to take care of ourselves and they just don't care if we live or die."

In a small, sad room on West 86th Street, Joseph Wolfson, 80, a frail, asthmatic man spoke with fear. "Most of the time I am in the hospital because of asthma," he said. "I feel all right now, but who knows what can happen next week? I just can't live with that little amount of money and no Medicaid."

Eva Estelle Jackson, 70, lives alone in Montgomery, Ala., and has suffered from tuberculosis and ulcers. She now receives \$132 a month in Social Security and \$24 in welfare, but she has been told that the Social

Security increase will raise her a few dollars above the welfare maximum she will therefore lose Medicaid, which paid several thousand dollars for three weeks she spent in hospitals last year.

"It's gonna hit me hard," Miss Jackson said. "If they'd just left me with a pension of \$1 or \$2, and Medicaid, I'd have been a lot better off. If I had some illness, I just don't know what I'd do. I'd just be in bad shape, because I've got nobody to fall back on."

Miss Jackson discovered that she will also have to pay a \$2-a-month garbage collection fee to the City of Montgomery. Only those on welfare are exempted from the fee.

Another Montgomery resident, Emily Shepherd, 75, is now in the hospital, being treated for emphysema. When her \$137-a-month Social Security check rises to \$164, she will lose \$66 in welfare from the state, ending up with \$39 less a month than now, and no Medicaid.

At that point, her choices will be "either to go into a convalescent home or just go back to my apartment and die," she says. "It's the most ridiculous thing I ever heard of. They should have had a little forethought. They're just a bunch of meatheads in Congress."

In Las Vegas, the Social Security check of Henrietta G. Oberg, 78, will rise from \$153 to \$183 a month, but her \$23 welfare payment will be eliminated as a result, leaving her \$7 ahead, but without Medicaid. She is being treated for cancer. "What am I going to do?" she asked.

In Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Mary Wright also lost Medicaid. "It will take it all away from me," she said of the Social Security increase. "I can't afford it. I'm having it all canceled. I got to pay my rent, clothes and feed myself. There's nobody else to do it for me. You can't get any glasses, can't get any teeth—anything you need you can't get."

The difficulties have also affected some younger people. Lennell Frison, 40, a father of 10 in Portland, Ore., is a former foundry worker whose arthritis put him out of a job two years ago. He and his wife, who has diabetes, were told recently that the Social Security rise would mean the end of welfare and the end of medical payments.

"Without that aid to the doctor, man, I don't know how we're going to make it." His wife, he says, works sometimes as a janitor at night, making about \$100 a week. They had planned to try to buy the six-room house they now rent, he said, "But we're probably gonna lose it."

Mr. Frison has considered sending his 17-year-old son to work, but he is torn by powerful doubts. "I hate to take my oldest boy out of school, because then he'd be where I am. I think I'd go back to work and punish myself instead. I can't stand up too long. My legs won't hold me. But it gets you. A man ain't nothing if he can't feed his children."

In Hazelwood, Mo., a suburb of St. Louis, Mr. and Mrs. Russell French face similar difficulties. Mr. French suffers from heart disease and diabetes, she from arthritis and rickets. Two of their children, Charles, 15, and Lorraine, 12, have rickets, and a third, Russell, is diabetic.

"It's the Medicaid that counts," said Mrs. French. "I figure it would cost us \$100 a month just to keep my husband supplied with medicine." Neither she nor her husband can work; their Social Security comes to \$400 a month.

The family's physician, who asked not to be identified, confirmed that the French family needed constant medical attention. "Of all my families, this is the one that is probably the most in need," he said.

When Mrs. French was 10 years old and living in Corning, Ark., she recalled, her mother died because she could not get medical help. "If anyone thinks things have changed, they haven't," she said, "because the same thing probably will happen to us."

POSTMASTER GENERAL POSTS
GUIDELINES IN SALT LAKE CITY
SPEECH

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, Salt Lake City recently had the honor of hosting the national convention of the National Association of Postmasters of the United States. One of the keynote speakers at the convention was Postmaster General E. T. Klassen. Klassen challenged the postmasters to take stock of themselves as managers and to accept the challenge of building a postal system that is uniformly efficient; that serves the precise needs of the customers; that gets mail delivered on time, all the time; and one that will stand as a model for managers who will follow.

I was particularly interested in the following declaration of the postmaster general:

We're going to get this system moving. We're going to improve mail service, cut costs, and provide better working conditions for our employees.

I submit the full text of Postmaster Klassen's remarks for the RECORD:

REMARKS BY E. J. KLASSEN

I have greatly enjoyed the opportunity to take part in your Convention here in Salt Lake.

I want you to know that I have appreciated the opportunity of meeting directly with Frank Miklozek and your other National officers on several occasions and I believe we have found a constructive way of exchanging our various points of view and I believe this exchange to be very important.

I appreciate the privilege of speaking to all of you tonight, not necessarily in the traditional banquet style, but frankly and directly—from the heart.

I want to do that because you and I are joined in a task that surely will be the most exciting and demanding challenge of our lives. That task is managing the United States Postal Service—managing it effectively and efficiently—with dedication and imagination.

I think it's time for us to take stock of ourselves as managers—to determine whether we are doing the job or not. Honest self-analysis is never an easy or pleasant experience. But it is a necessary function of good management. Good management is a prerequisite to good mail service. And good mail service is the only reason we're in business. There is a saying that he who cannot lead and will not follow should get the hell out of the way. I think that maxim applies with equal force to the Postal Service as it does with every other large organization in the country today.

We're going to get this system moving. We're going to improve mail service, cut costs, and provide better working conditions for our employees.

We are depending upon you to provide the leadership in this effort. We know that most of you are highly capable of providing that leadership—and we will give you all the support you need to exercise it.

This is no time for faint hearts or wavering resolve. We've got a job to do and we're going to get it done. As we go about the task, don't let anyone muddy the water and

waste your time with a lot of unfounded apprehensions. For example, I talked to a postmaster last week in a rather large city and found that he was very fearful that our job evaluation program would put him and many others out of a job. This only proves that we have done a poor job of explaining the benefits that will result from job evaluation.

In fact, yesterday—your friend and mine Don Ledbetter, President, National Association of Postal Supervisors, received a big hand from you when he suggested placing the whole job evaluation program in a deep freeze. Again, I want to say to you, once you learn and understand the benefits that will result from it, none of you would want to put it in a deep freeze.

The time has come when postmasters have got to stop "administering" their offices and start managing them. Many of you have taken a firm grip on your jobs and are managing with pride and professionalism. But, regrettably, we still have managers who are not managing. We still have managers who seem content to float along with the status quo. We still have managers who are unwilling to exercise the authority that is already theirs. We still have managers who seem reluctant to get down into the arena, where the action really is, and take command in clear and decisive fashion. We still have managers who pay no attention to tour one and tour three—in fact, I recently talked to a night-shift employee with twenty-six years of service in one of our large post offices who said she had never seen the postmaster. And, worst of all, we still have managers who run to their congressmen or local political leaders for moral support every time they are faced with an unpopular decision.

If you need moral support, we'll give it to you. You don't have to go outside to look for it. In far too many instances postmasters have either opposed new programs, or, at best, reluctantly agreed to "administer" them if directed to do so.

Now, don't misunderstand me. I have no quarrel with those who express honest opposition to a policy or program that they think will be detrimental to the Service. Each of us has a responsibility to speak up if he is convinced that what is proposed is not in the best interests of the Postal Service and our customers. But the proper way to influence policy is through the normal chain of command, and that's how your valid objections should be registered.

I have never contended nor do I contend now, that we in Headquarters or the Regions have a monopoly on brains. We welcome constructive criticism. But I have no patience with those who oppose for the sake of opposition. I have no patience with those who say, "It can't be done" because we've never done it that way before, or "We've got to do it this way" because that's the way we've always done it. I have no patience with those who are afraid to bite the bullet because they may not like the taste—who refuse to make an unpleasant management decision unless they are directed by higher authority to do so. In my book, these postmasters are not accepting the responsibility that goes along with their salaries.

Let me tell you something about the decision making process. The higher up the management ladder you ascend, the more difficult the decisions become. The easy decisions never reach the top, because someone below has already made them. It's only the tough ones that are passed up to the top.

As a postmaster, you're at the top of the management ladder in your office. So don't look for the easy decisions. Your subordinates should have already made them. The ones that you get are all going to be tough. Don't be afraid to make a decision because you

might make a mistake. Someone has said the man who never makes a mistake never made a decision. And we need decision makers.

We are in a period of trial and error. None of us is above making a mistake. That's no sin. The sin occurs when we permit the same mistakes to recur—when we don't have the guts to stand up and face reality—to admit our errors and try to correct them.

Too often we see policy frustrated or ignored and hear the manager say, "I didn't understand the policy." Well, I want to make you an absolute pledge right here and now. I will do everything in my power to see that policies and programs originating in Washington or the Regional Headquarters are fully explained to you. I will make every effort to promote a better understanding of what we are doing and why we are doing it. And I will ask you, now, to let us know if you do not fully understand a particular National or Regional program or policy or decision, so that we can adequately explain it.

Most of you are doing a hell of a good job, and that's why we were able to forgo that four hundred and fifty million dollar rate increase that was budgeted for next January.

We are making progress toward putting our financial house in order. We have begun to make progress toward fulfilling our mandate to improve service, but we still have a lot of soft spots that need attention. We have established firm service standards which we are meeting with increasing consistency, but we cannot be satisfied until we are meeting those standards, *all the time*, everywhere. We are making some progress in providing better working environments for our employees, but not enough progress, and not fast enough. We still have a long way to go.

We have increased salaries substantially. We have, and will continue to promote from within. We have taken appointments and promotions totally out of politics. To date, we have appointed more than six thousand postmasters solely on the basis of merit. We are going to spend close to a billion dollars on new bulk mail facilities, hundreds of millions on improvement of existing facilities, and we have on the drawing boards a four billion dollar plan for a system of preferential mail plants.

But none of these things will amount to a hill of beans if our managers fail to do their jobs. Collectively, local postmasters manage a business organization that has more employees than General Motors—more revenues than A T and T—more offices than Prudential.

You manage a business that directly touches the lives of every man, woman and child in this Nation of ours, every working day. So, yours is a big job. It's an important job. It's a job in which you can take justifiable pride when you do it well.

And I am counting on you to do just that. I am counting on you to contribute; to innovate; to motivate. I am counting on you to make decisions. I am counting on you to run your offices with ingenuity and with pride. That's what management is all about.

Ask yourself if you are doing a good job as a manager. Are you looking at incoming parcels to see if they've been damaged, and, if so, are you tracing the causes and correcting them? Are you spotchecking the postmarks on incoming mail to see if our service standards are being met? And when you see delays, are you insisting on corrective action from those responsible?

Is your star route driver living up to his contract with the Postal Service? If not, what are you going to do about it? How much help are you giving your customers to make sure they have the necessary ZIP Code information to properly address their mail? Do you

work with your local news media to keep editors fully informed about postal services and products? You can avoid a lot of unfair criticism that way.

Most importantly, are you tailoring your workforce to fit your workload?

Ask yourself how you can improve yourself as a manager. Because no matter how good a job you are doing, you've got to strive constantly to do better, for we have promises to keep. We have a commitment to the Congress to operate efficiently and to balance our costs against our revenues. We have a commitment to our employees to provide them good careers and a chance to grow. And we have a commitment to our customers to provide them with courteous, reliable mail service at reasonable postage rates.

We have, within our ranks, the demonstrated leadership qualities to get the job done. Behind that leadership, we have as talented and dedicated a work force as does any organization on earth.

But the degree of cooperation you get from your employees will depend upon the motivation that you give them. Your integrity as a leader will be gauged by the firmness, the fairness, and the straightforwardness with which you accept your managerial responsibilities.

You are the pace-setter, the quarterback. Everyone below you—your supervisors and your employees—will look to you for leadership. The quality of leadership that you provide is directly related to the respect that you will receive from your staff and the quality of service your office renders to the public.

Your employees and your customers will look to you to set the standards by which the Postal Service will be known and measured in your community. We are in a highly competitive business. And we are not ordained to remain in that business forever, unless we can provide better service than our competitors.

High costs, breakage, failure to respond to customer needs, discourtesy, unreliable service—any of these can cost us business. When we lose business, we lose revenue. And when we lose revenue, we lose postal jobs, because other service agencies will take over work that we are supposed to do.

And don't think for a minute they won't take it over, if we sit idly by and let them. Our competitors have already absorbed half of the parcel post business that we used to handle. The only way we're going to get that business back, and avoid losing more business, is to perform better than our competitors do.

President Benjamin Harrison had a businessman as Postmaster General—John Wanamaker of Philadelphia—and he endeavored to apply sound business management principles to the old Post Office Department. He was not too successful, because he did not have the freedom to manage that we now have under Postal Reorganization. However, he did have some good advice for postmasters which I would like to pass on to you. "Gentlemen," he said, "You ought to run your post office as if there was another fellow across the street competing with you, and you were trying to get all the business. Keep the mail bag open to the latest possible minute. Then get it to its destination in the shortest possible time. And then get each separate piece of mail to the person for whom it was meant, in the quickest possible way." That was Mr. Wanamaker's advice.

Now let me add a bit of advice of my own. Today, there really is another fellow across the street competing with you, and he's after all the business. The sooner we all recognize that fact, and begin competing the way Mr. Wanamaker suggested, the sooner we will come into our own as superior postal managers, and the sooner we will be capable of providing our customers with the high-

quality mail service they have every right to expect.

With the full support of your organization, and with the personal commitment of each of you, I'm sure we'll be worthy of the challenge.

Working together, managing together, we have the magnificent opportunity to build a Postal System: That is uniformly efficient; that serves the precise needs of our customers; that gets the mail delivered on time—*All the Time*; and one that will stand as a model to those managers who follow in your footsteps.

Thank you.

POSTAL POLICE: LITTLE KNOWN, MOST EFFECTIVE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, when people talk about the U.S. mail service it is sometimes sprinkled with more grumbles than praises. Whether these complaints are justified remains debatable.

One little known section of the Postal Service is the Postal Inspection Service. The reputation of postal inspectors is high among professional investigators and their record of achievements were recently recorded in a Los Angeles Times story by Tom Foley.

I insert Mr. Foley's article in the RECORD for the perusal of our colleagues:

POSTAL POLICE: LITTLE KNOWN, MOST EFFECTIVE

(By Thomas J. Foley)

WASHINGTON.—"Anybody who robs a post office is an idiot, and I don't want idiots working for me."

Thus did Dutch Schultz, the notorious gangster of the '20s and '30s, extol the success of the oldest, smallest, least known and, some believe, most effective federal investigative agency—the Postal Inspection Service.

Down through the years, the service has had a hand in convicting a number of well-known individuals who apparently didn't take Dutch's advice, including Clifford Irving, author of the hoax autobiography of industrialist Howard Hughes.

GETS LITTLE CREDIT

It has pulled off these coups with a free-form style that contrasts with the highly organized FBI, Internal Revenue Service and other agencies. And it is characteristic of the postal service that it seldom gets as much credit for its work as its better known agency friends.

Moreover, while helping put mail fraud violators behind bars, it has succeeded in drastically cutting the postal theft rate at a time when most crime statistics are rising. Credit card security in the mails, a major problem in recent years, has improved so much that officials say their biggest problem now is complacency.

So old is the Postal Inspection Service that it can call 1972 its bicentennial anniversary. The first inspector (he was called a "surveyor") was appointed in 1772 because the Crown was concerned about colonial revolutionaries rifling the mail and disrupting the postal service.

ONLY 1,570 AGENTS

But despite its age, the postal agency today has only 1,570 inspectors, compared with

more than 2,000 agents in the rapidly growing Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs and 8,600 FBI agents.

What is more, no television or radio series has been built around its activities, such as the programs featuring FBI and Treasury agents.

"There were a couple of shows on the Armstrong Theater a few years ago based on the postal service, but that's all," said Charles Miller, chief of the service's criminal investigation section.

The anonymity is not deliberate. "We don't shun publicity, but we don't go out of our way to get it either," Miller said.

KEEPING IT SMALL

What is deliberate is instilling a high sense of professionalism in the service. According to William J. Cotter, the assistant postmaster general in charge of the agency, keeping the service small is part of this effort.

"We don't want to hire more agents than we can professionally train and work into the discipline we require," Cotter, a veteran of both the FBI and the Central Intelligence Agency.

Fewer than 4% of the postal agents leave the service for reasons other than retirement each year. They work a 55-hour week.

Miller is a 30-year veteran of the service. "It was my first job and the only one I've ever wanted."

While they profess no desire to cast aspirations on "our friends" in other investigatory agencies, the postal service chiefs take pride in their history.

They note, for instance, that when the Internal Revenue Service decided in 1919 to establish an intelligence unit, it asked the Postal Inspection Service to set it up for them.

Postal inspectors also established and headed the State Department's first investigative and security branch in the 1930s, coordinated all Treasury law enforcement branches at one time, and set up the Civil Aeronautics Board's first investigative branch.

IRVING-HUGHES SCRIPT

The service's professionalism brought the Clifford Irving case to a head. Postal inspectors were faced with a report by McGraw-Hill publishing company's handwriting experts, authenticating the script supposedly written by Hughes. The company believed it had paid \$750,000 to Hughes through Irving, to publish the disputed script.

John Tarpey, who headed the six-man team that did most of the work on the Irving-Hughes case, explains what happened:

"The McGraw-Hill experts had compared the letters and manuscript with some of Hughes' handwriting and said Hughes could have written it. We tried to approach it from the other side."

"We wanted to see whether someone else could have forged the documents and we picked Irving to begin with."

WINS COURT ORDER

When the Irvings refused to give them samples of their handwriting, the government team won a court order to force them to turn over such samples.

"The writing was different from the Hughes documents," Tarpey says, "But close examination showed some characteristics and habits were the same. The T's were crossed the same, the I's were dotted the same, and some letters were broken up alike. We took the samples to our own handwriting expert who studied them for two days and confirmed that they were the same."

Tarpey relates that at the time Irving finally gave the government a statement of his role, he sat down and was able to write in the Hughes style at full speed. While postal inspectors do not get shot at as often as

their FBI counterparts, their work is not without dramatic interest.

Last March, after four months of closely watching one of three suspects in a December post office robbery in Yonkers, N.Y., inspectors saw the suspect in a drunken rage, force his girl friend out of his apartment.

FIRST IN A CASE

The inspectors immediately went to her, and the angry woman not only supplied details of the burglary but agreed to testify against the suspects. Her testimony turned out to be unnecessary, because all three pleaded guilty.

The service's reputation is high among professional investigators.

William Hundley, a Washington attorney, who headed the Justice Department's organized crime division for several years, said, "Man for man, they were as good as any. The service is not as hidebound as the FBI nor as bureaucratic as the IRS. Traditionally, they're the first ones in a case."

A few years ago, a small country store, a section of which served as the local post office, was burglarized.

When the proprietor opened the next morning, he found a chalk line drawn between the store and the post office and the following inscription on the floor, "Inspectors, we didn't cross this line."

One former government investigator says the lack of supervision in the postal agency is a drawback to its efficiency. But others say the more free-swinging atmosphere is part of the reason for its success and high morale.

For example, the six-man team involved in the Irving case handled the investigation from beginning to end, regardless of where it took them or whose jurisdiction they entered. The service's supporters say this practice provides continuity and speed in an investigation.

Key weapons for the postal service are the broad federal statutes barring the use of the mails to defraud. Miller said the service has most recently used these laws to prosecute a widespread swindle he called the advance fee fraud.

This is an elaborate system for promising loans to small businessmen hard up for ready cash in exchange for an advance finders' fee, usually about 5% of the loan. The "lenders" keep stalling, and the loans are never actually made. When the heat gets too hot, the swindlers disappear.

SOME 69 INVESTIGATIONS

Miller said 69 advance-fee investigations are under way, with more than 100 indictments already handed down. These include 22 in Miami, 19 in Chicago and 11 in Kansas City.

The advance-fee swindle, according to Miller, is a variation of other types the agency has run into and shows, he said, that there is nothing really new in this field. "Our files show the same scheme working 100 years ago," Miller said.

The mail fraud laws are being used more and more as a weapon against organized crime. The method is similar to the use of federal income tax laws to put behind bars some criminals who escaped prosecution or conviction for more serious crimes under state laws.

Postal inspectors are part of the multi-agency "strike" forces operating against organized crime in major cities.

BLACK HAND INQUIRY

Going after this part of the underworld is nothing new for the service. It was the postal inspectors' investigation of the Black Hand letters in the early part of the century that broke the grip of the secret Sicilian society that extorted thousands of dollars from immigrant Italians under threat of death.

Hundreds were arrested and prosecuted on the basis of false representation made in the letters. Ironically, Miller noted, an appeal to

the Supreme Court resulted in the reversal of a conviction, the court ruling that it was not false representation because the Black Hand actually carried out its threats.

James F. Ahern, former New Haven police chief and now director of the Insurance Crime Prevention Institute, urges broader use of mail fraud laws as a weapon against white-collar crime.

Estimating annual losses of \$1.5 billion in fraudulent insurance claims alone, Ahern said: "Losses from white-collar crime, though usually hidden in company books, dwarfs the losses from the more visible street crimes."

The service's principal job still is to protect the mail. And while its methods are sophisticated and take advantage of the latest electronic technology, the job still involves riding shotgun just as it did 100 years ago with stagecoaches.

Mail truck hijacking around Kennedy International Airport in New York in recent years resulted in the loss of hundreds of millions in stolen stock securities. These were stopped by rigging the trucks with radios and electronics and sending out escort cars.

Much harder to control is the growing number of mail thefts by narcotics addicts looking for money and credit cards to finance their habits.

Nearly one of every four of those now arrested is an addict, according to the service.

However, the total number of postal burglaries has dropped sharply in recent years.

THE MEXICAN WATER TREATY AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO COLORADO RIVER WATER SUPPLIES

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, during the closing months of 1972, this Nation will be discussing with our neighbors to the south the problem of salinity of the Colorado River water being delivered to Mexico pursuant to the Mexican Water Treaty.

Former Attorney General Herbert Brownell has been designated as the President's special representative to seek a permanent solution to the problem. Since all of us will be hearing more about this problem I thought it appropriate that I share with you some of the background as to how this situation developed and what currently is being done in this area.

A statement prepared by Mr. Myron B. Holburt, chief engineer, Colorado River Board of California, sets forth these points in a very precise and clear manner. Therefore, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD these remarks so that my colleagues can share in this information and have it for reference as the negotiations unfold:

THE MEXICAN WATER TREATY AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO COLORADO RIVER WATER SUPPLIES

(By Myron B. Holburt)

The meetings in June between Presidents Nixon and Echeverria thrust the matter of the salinity of the Colorado River water delivered to Mexico pursuant to the Mexican Water Treaty on the front pages of our Nation's newspapers. While the press focused on salinity problems of the water delivered to Mexico, these problems and potential

solutions are intimately connected with the water supply used within the United States in the seven states of the Colorado River Basin.

In order to understand the current situation and future possibilities in connection with the Treaty, it is necessary to have some background information.

1944 MEXICAN WATER TREATY

This Treaty covers the waters of the Colorado, Rio Grande, and Tijuana Rivers. It was Mexico that insisted on having one agreement covering both the Colorado River and the Rio Grande, rather than having separate treaties. Since the United States is the basic source of water delivered to Mexico from the Colorado River, while Mexico is the source of a large part of the waters used by the United States in the Lower Rio Grande Valley, Mexico felt that they could obtain better terms on the Colorado by considering the two rivers together in one treaty. It was also significant that the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the 1940s was Senator Connally of Texas, which state would benefit greatly from an agreement with Mexico on the Rio Grande.

Negotiations between the United States and Mexico concerning the Colorado River commenced originally in 1929, but were broken off. They were reinstituted in the late thirties, but it was not until 1941 that the negotiations were undertaken which finally led to the 1944 agreement.

The initial United States position in 1929 was that Mexico should receive 750,000 acre-feet per year from the Colorado River, which was then the largest amount of water that Mexico had used in any one year. The 1928 Boulder Canyon Project Act had authorized construction of Hoover Dam with one of the stated purposes being the delivery of stored water for "... beneficial uses exclusively within the United States ...". The 750,000 acre-feet per year was also considered by engineers to be the largest practical supply that Mexico could use without regulation by upstream storage reservoirs. Mexico countered with a demand for 3.6 million acre-feet per year, and negotiations were abandoned.

In 1941, the United States offered 0.9 million acre-feet per year (maf/yr) of stored Colorado River water to be released on demand to Mexican users. Early in 1942, the United States' offer was amended to 1.15 maf/yr, but with the delivery to be from "any source whatsoever." Mexico countered with a demand for 2 maf/yr.

The Committee of Fourteen composed of two representatives from each of the seven Colorado River Basin states had been formed in 1938 to consider basinwide problems. As negotiations between the United States and Mexico developed in the early 1940s, this Committee became involved in advising the State Department on matters relating to the proposed treaty. Before signing the Treaty in February 1944, which called for delivery of a guaranteed annual quantity of 1.5 maf/yr, the State Department reported on the treaty to the Committee. The Department explained their agreement to deliver such a large quantity of water by pointing out that more than one-half of the 1.5 maf/yr would be irrigation return flows entering the river below Imperial Dam, which would go to Mexico under any circumstances. Thus, the State Department's position was that the United States' users would be better off agreeing to deliver a larger quantity of water to Mexico, which included return flows, than a smaller quantity which did not include return flows.

Five of the states agreed with the proposed treaty. However, California vigorously dissented, and Nevada abstained. Because of California's dissent and Nevada's nonconcurrence, the remaining five states joined with Texas in July, 1944 to form a new group called the Six State Committee, which ac-

tively supported ratification of the Mexican Water Treaty.

The Treaty which became effective on November 8, 1945 after ratification by the two Governments, does not specifically refer to water quality. However, State Department representatives and their consultants testifying before the United States Senate in support of the Treaty stated that water quality was extensively discussed, and that Mexico fully understood that the Treaty required them to take return flows. The specific provisions that were included in the Treaty to insure that Mexico must accept return flow and drainage water are in Article 10 and 11. Article 10 states that Mexico's allotment includes water from "any and all sources," and Article 11 states that "waters shall be made up of the waters of the said river whatever their origin."

WELLTON-MOHAWK DRAINAGE PROBLEM

Between 1945 and 1961, there were no particular problems with respect to quality, as the salinity of the water delivered to Mexico at the northerly international boundary was generally within 100 parts per million of the water at Imperial Dam, the last diversion point for users in the United States. However, in 1961, the Wellton-Mohawk Project in Arizona commenced operation of its drainage system and discharged its drainage water into the Colorado. Initially, the drainage water included a substantial proportion of highly saline groundwater that had been concentrated through reuse during the previous half-century. This groundwater averaged around 6,000 parts per million. There was a sharp increase in the salinity of the water delivered to Mexico which resulted in strenuous objections being raised by Mexico.

Although the Wellton-Mohawk drainage was the primary cause of the increase in salinity, another factor also had a significant impact. Beginning in 1961, releases into Mexico were sharply reduced in anticipation of storage in Lake Powell behind the newly constructed Glen Canyon Dam. This loss of dilution water can be emphasized by two figures; for the 10-year period from 1951 to 1960, the average delivery to Mexico at the northerly international boundary was 4.24 million acre-feet per year, while for the succeeding 10-year period from 1961 to 1970 the flow averaged only 1.5 million acre-feet per year. The Wellton-Mohawk drainage water and the decreased flows caused the average salinity of the waters delivered to Mexico to increase from 800 parts per million in 1960 to 1500 parts per million in 1962.

Although, as previously indicated, the United States intended that Mexico must receive return flows below Imperial Dam under the Treaty, no one had anticipated return flows as high in salinity as the Wellton-Mohawk drainage or that there would be such a precipitous rise in the salinity of the waters delivered to Mexico. Consequently, after the winter of 1961-62, the United States undertook certain provisional measures to minimize the impact of the high salinity drainage returns from Wellton-Mohawk. The United States also entered into negotiations with Mexico to arrive at a practical solution. The State Department asked the governors of the seven Colorado River Basin states to appoint two members to a reconstituted Committee of Fourteen in order to advise the State Department in connection with the Wellton-Mohawk problem. (The current members from California appointed by Governor Reagan are William Gianelli, Director of Water Resources, and myself.)

Extensive negotiations were conducted between 1962 and 1965 and in November 1965, with the concurrence of the Committee of Fourteen, a five-year agreement was incorporated in Minute 218 of the International Boundary and Water Commission. Under Minute 218, the United States agreed to take

several actions to alleviate the problem. First, the United States constructed an extension of the Wellton-Mohawk Drain so that water can either be bypassed around Morelos Dam or mixed with other Colorado River waters above Morelos Dam, at the option of Mexico. Second, the United States constructed additional drainage facilities in the Wellton-Mohawk project which allow selective pumping of the most saline waters at times when Mexico is bypassing Wellton-Mohawk drainage water, and allow the pumping of higher quality groundwater at times when Mexico is using Wellton-Mohawk water. Third, the United States agreed to replace a portion of the bypassed Wellton-Mohawk water which resulted in the release of approximately 40,000 acre-feet of mainstream water per year from Imperial Dam in excess of the 1.5 million acre-feet per year required by the Treaty.

Minute 218 was extended for one year in November 1970, and again extended in November 1971. Under the measures taken by the United States, at a cost of about \$12 million, the quality of the water delivered to Mexico was improved from about 1500 ppm in 1962 to 1240 ppm in 1971. Between November 1965 and November 1971, operation of the minute has resulted in delivery to Mexico of 232,000 acre-feet in addition to the amount guaranteed by the Treaty.

NEGOTIATIONS IN 1970-72

Prior to the first expiration date of Minute 218, November 1970, the United States and Mexico commenced negotiations with the purpose of arriving at another five-year agreement. Mexico had objections to operations under Minute 218, and they wanted changes in any new long term agreement. The United States made a proposal in order to meet Mexico's objections. The Diaz Ordaz Administration considered the proposal to be constructive, however, they did not want to enter into a new long-term agreement, since a new President would take office on December 1, 1970. This led to the first one-year extension of Minute 218.

Negotiation commenced in 1971 with the Echeverria Administration. The United States, supported by the Committee of Fourteen, proposed a new minute in which additional quantities of water would be substituted for Wellton-Mohawk drainage water. The quantities proposed to be substituted each year were estimated on the basis of what has been termed the "equivalent salt balance" approach.

In arriving at the equivalent salt balance concept, United States reasoned that (1) water users in the United States have a right to irrigate lands below Imperial Dam, (2) Mexico has to receive drainage water under the Treaty, (3) creating a situation of ideal return flow conditions below Imperial Dam with respect to salinity would be the best Mexico could expect, (4) the total deliveries should be water of a quality that would be usable for irrigation of the type of crops grown by Mexico, considering its soil conditions.

Salt balance in an irrigation system simply means that the amount of salt returned in drainage waters is equal to the amount of salt in the water applied to the land. An irrigation system that is in salt balance neither accumulates salt in the soil nor leaches salt from the soil. As proposed in this situation, the equivalent salt balance program would insure that water delivered to Mexico would have the same salt concentration as would exist if the projects in the United States which divert from Imperial Dam and have drainage returns to the river were in salt balance.

Equivalent salt balance would be obtained by bypassing some of the irrigation return flows from the Wellton-Mohawk Project and substituting therefor a combination of better quality groundwater from the Yuma Mesa, and additional releases from Imperial

Dam. Even with equivalent salt balance, there would be an increase in salinity concentration between Imperial and Morelos Dams caused by evaporation of a portion of the applied irrigation water on lands in Arizona and California, i.e., the tons of salt applied to, and returned from, the land are equal, but the amount of return flows are only a portion of the applied water.

The deliveries under the equivalent salt balance proposal for the first year would have been 130,000 acre-feet per year beyond the Treaty requirements. The source of the additional water would be releases of Colorado River water from storage above Imperial Dam and from wells on Yuma Mesa near Yuma, Arizona. In 1971 salinity of the Wellton-Mohawk drainage water was approximately 3700 ppm and it is anticipated that the amounts of substitute water would diminish in future years as salinity of the Wellton-Mohawk drainage water continues to decline.

The United States also informed Mexico that, for the long term future, a more serious problem for Mexico and for United States users in the Lower Colorado River Basin is the projected increase in the salinity of the river at Imperial Dam. Mexico was informed of the United States' plans to undertake a major basinwide salinity control program, and of feasibility studies being under way by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. The objective of this program is to keep the salinity at or below present levels. California has been working very closely with the federal government and the other basin states in developing the salinity control program.

Although the United States negotiators thought they were near agreement with Mexico in November 1971, Mexico finally rejected the American proposals and negotiations were discontinued. In the early part of 1972, there was a resumption of talks at different levels within the two governments, however no agreement was reached.

JOINT COMMUNIQUE BETWEEN PRESIDENT NIXON AND PRESIDENT ECHEVERRIA—JUNE 17, 1972

On June 15 and 16, President Nixon and President Echeverria met and following the meetings, issued a joint communique dated June 17, 1972. With respect to the Colorado River, President Echeverria gave the essence of the current Mexican position as wanting water under the 1944 Treaty to be the same quality as the water at Imperial Dam. President Nixon replied that "this was a highly complex problem and needed careful examination of all aspects." The President then outlined four points and said that the United States was prepared to:

- undertake certain actions immediately to improve the quality of water going to Mexico;
- designate a special representative to begin work immediately to find a permanent, definitive and just solution of this problem;
- instruct the special representative to submit a report to him by the end of the year; and
- submit this proposal, once it has the approval of this government, to President Echeverria for his consideration and approval.

The immediate action referred to by the President is the substitution of Colorado River water and Yuma Mesa water at an annual rate of 118,000 acre-feet for an equal quantity of Wellton-Mohawk water. The 118,000 af/yr was computed by the previously referred to equivalent-salt-balance concept. The substitution of the water by the United States will result in delivery of water to Mexico at the northerly international boundary with an average salinity of 1140 ppm as compared to 1240 ppm delivered to Mexico for the calendar year 1971.

At the request of Mexico, the United States will also bypass the balance of the Wellton-

Mohawk drainage water (approximately 100,000 af/yr) which results in Mexico delivering water into its Alamo Canal with a salinity of around 950 ppm. These actions are incorporated in Minute 241, which became effective on July 14, 1972, and are to remain in effect until December 31, 1972. Minute 218 was terminated when Minute 241 became effective.

It is worth examining for a moment the Mexican position that they should receive the same quality of water as that at Imperial Dam. Presently, more than 500,000 af/yr of the water delivered to Mexico under the 1944 Treaty is derived from return flows below Imperial Dam. The Wellton-Mohawk Project furnishes approximately 220,000 af/yr, and the balance comes from other United States projects, including the delivery of drainage water at the southerly international boundary. All Colorado River water above the 1.5 maf/yr Treaty obligation to Mexico is committed to use within the United States. To provide Mexico water of Imperial Dam quality would either require the conveyance of all return flows below Imperial Dam to the Gulf of California and the substitution thereof of Colorado River water (to the detriment of United States users), or would require a major augmentation of the river or a massive desalting effort. Desalting of 500,000 af/yr is estimated to cost in the order of \$25 to \$50 million a year. Desalting would leave a brine disposal problem of at least 50,000 af/yr.

MAJOR OUTSTANDING ISSUES WITH MEXICO

There are two basic issues with Mexico:
(1) Does Mexico have to receive return flows below Imperial Dam under the 1944 treaty?
(2) Is the water usable?

With respect to the return flow issue, the history of the negotiations, the legislative history leading to ratification and the Treaty language itself make it clear that return flows delivered to Mexico are to be counted in meeting the 1.5 maf/yr. obligation to Mexico. Return flows have been included since operations commenced under the Treaty in 1945. Had return flows and other miscellaneous waters not been included, United States negotiators could not have agreed to a guaranteed quantity of more than twice the water which Mexico used prior to construction of storage reservoirs in the United States.

With respect to the usability issue, deliveries under the equivalent-salt-balance concept will result in Mexico receiving water with an average salinity of 1140 ppm during the ensuing year. That Mexico has used and now does use waters with a higher salinity to grow crops is indicated by the following items:

1. Up until July 14, 1972, when Minute 241 became effective, the Mexicans, based on their own scientific studies, accepted Wellton-Mohawk drainage water along with other water to the extent that it did not result in overall salinities in excess of 1230 ppm.

2. The approximately 140,000 acre-feet per year of Colorado River drainage water delivered to Mexico at the southerly international boundary near San Luis in the State of Sonora averages between 1400 to 1500 ppm, and Mexico has been satisfactorily growing crops with this water without complaints to date.

3. In the eastern Mexicali Valley, Mexico irrigates with water from wells that have a salinity of 1300 to 1400 ppm. The pumping apparently helps the drainage situation, and there are no complaints concerning the use of this water for their crops.

4. It is only in the western Mexicali Valley, where the soils are of a similar nature to those of Imperial Valley, that the Mexicans have complained about the water. However, Imperial Valley has installed approximately 17,000 miles of underground tile drains at a cost to the farmers of over \$40 million to carry away the drainage water,

while Mexico has not installed any drainage tiling.

Certainly, Mexico should receive usable water to support its agricultural economy which relies on Colorado River water. The United States, the Colorado River Basin states, and Colorado River water users have been concerned that Mexico does receive usable water. To this end, the United States has expended considerable funds, and to date the states have agreed to giving Mexico Colorado River water above the Treaty requirements. Further, the states are willing to continue to give additional water for a limited number of years.

SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF PRESIDENT NIXON

It is apparent from the above that the special representative of the President has quite a formidable task before him in arriving at a permanent solution to this problem in 4½ months. He will have to consider many items and complex issues which have been discussed for over a decade and solved to date by various temporary but practical solutions. His analyses will have to include:

- a. the legal aspects of the Treaty,
- b. the usability of waters of various salinities,
- c. the return flow issue,
- d. international relations with Mexico, and
- e. the various alternatives that will be proposed.

In summary, it looks like we have a very interesting time in the next few months in connection with the Mexican Water Treaty.

NIXON GETS CREDIT FOR TRYING

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would suppose that President Nixon has experienced about every political accident that could happen in politics.

In spite of any setbacks, one quality he has that stands out—and that is that he keeps trying. For this gift, he gets credit by the American people this year for a job well done.

Haynes Johnson, Washington Post staff writer, in an article in today's Post titled "Nixon Gets Credit for Trying," shows that basically the American people are fair. The surprising thing to all of us this year is the number of Democrats who are switching to Nixon. In the Haynes Johnson poll, 54 percent were Democrats and 22 percent Republicans with another 22 percent Independent. These voters favored Mr. Nixon by a 59-to-31-percent margin. It shows that even the Democrats have had time to think about the comparative qualities of the candidates and even though the Democrats have a great respect for their own candidate, they just feel that on the basis of the last 4 years President Nixon has given an all-out effort. One thing stands out. Haynes Johnson and David Broder, another reporter for the Post, made a nationwide survey for the Post a year ago. The important part of this article shows that the President has made a terrific increase in popular opinion and confidence among the electorate at large. Only 8 percent thought the President was doing a poor job and I think all of us will admit that in Democratic precincts that is a pretty good standing.

A year ago the writers concluded:

Because dozens of voters in this survey have a similarly vague or negative reading on the Democratic contenders, Mr. Nixon stands a chance of continuing his "average and mysterious" presidency for four more years.

Haynes Johnson winds up his article with these words:

Now, we would only change that to say Richard Nixon has a much better chance to be in office for four more years.

I attach herewith also a part of what the electorate said to Washington Post reporters in reply to the question, "When you think of Richard Nixon, what is the first thing that comes to your mind?" This article is titled "Electorate Assesses Nixon":

NIXON GETS CREDIT FOR TRYING

(By Haynes Johnson)

For Richard Nixon, our most persevering politician, these autumn days should be the most satisfying of his long public career.

He came to office, unloved, having been stamped in the past as history's loser, a minority President of a minority party. It was his fate to preside over an America more bitterly divided than at any time since the Civil War. Not for 120 years had another President occupied the White House without his party controlling either house of Congress.

Now, four years later, the country is calm if not contented; the war is ending, if only for Americans; the stock market and corporate profits are rising, if only to the benefit of the more favored; the President is being hailed as a creative statesman, if all the old problems of international tensions, rivalries and acts of savagery still remain.

And then there are the polls. They all show Richard Milhous Nixon heading for one of the most glorious—indeed, perhaps the single greatest—presidential victory in American history.

Our own survey of voters in the critical 10 largest states confirms these findings. Across the country, Americans give Mr. Nixon a more positive rating than in the past. He is attracting to his banner citizens who never have voted for a Republican President in their lives. In their ranks are the kinds of voters Republicans have long dreamed of capturing: blue-collar workers, union members, older, poorer citizens, Catholics, Jews, independents, and even a respectable proportion of the young.

And yet we return from our trip with a paradoxical impression. Mr. Nixon's high vulnerability is the most striking. When placed alongside all the statistical evidence of his overwhelming lead, his political weakness is perhaps the most ironic factor in this most unpredictable of political years.

Consider the evidence.

Of our sample of 443 voters in 50 selected precincts, 54 per cent were Democrats and 22 per cent Republicans with another 22 per cent independents. Although these voters said they favored Mr. Nixon by a 50-to-31-per cent margin, a closer look at their responses gives a different perspective.

Approximately one-third of all voters interviewed express reservations and doubts about their Nixon support. The picture becomes worse for the Republicans when you examine another finding. Of the Nixon voters, only 32 per cent say they intend to vote for Republican candidates for Congress. By contrast, 62 per cent of George McGovern's voters plan to vote for Democratic congressional candidates.

By nearly 2 to 1, our blue-collar workers think it would be worse for the Republicans to control both the White House and the Congress. More than half of the blue-collar workers expressing an opinion think it would

be better for the Democrats to control both the White House and Congress.

Young voters between the ages of 18 and 24 particularly don't want a Nixon White House and a Republican Congress. Six out of every eight young voters questioned felt that way, whereas five out of every eight favored a McGovern presidency coupled with a Democratic Congress.

As we have already reported in these articles, the Democrats are still regarded as being the best party in such things as helping the poor, the blacks, the workingman, cutting down unemployment, offering a chance for a more equitable tax system, and appealing to the nation's youth. The Republicans are still solidly identified in the public mind with being business oriented.

Added to these feelings is an even more negative indication: what citizens think about the state of the country itself. Only 36 per cent of all voters surveyed think conditions in America are better today than they were four years ago when Mr. Nixon last ran for office. Of the Democrats, only 27 per cent believe things have improved during the Nixon presidency.

That general feeling about America's problems cuts across virtually every segment of the electorate.

Then look at the over-all rating our voters give Mr. Nixon. Nearly half of all voters questioned characterize him as an "average" President.

Another 32 per cent call him a "good" President, while 5 per cent place him in the "great" category. On the other side of the scale, 9 per cent label him a "poor" President and 2 per cent "bad." The remaining voters have no opinion.

Those figures do represent an improvement over Mr. Nixon's standing a year ago when David S. Broder and this reporter made a similar nationwide political survey for The Post. At that time, in response to the same questions, the voters gave a Nixon rating this way:

	Percent
Great	1
Good	30
Average	42
Poor	16
Bad	8
Don't Know	3

But neither then nor now are these responses the kind that would give a practical politician much cause for comfort. They are certainly not the type of favorable personal reactions that the public gave a Roosevelt or a Kennedy or a Johnson at their peaks.

In an attempt to measure the Nixon popularity another way, we asked voters to rate how well they thought the President was performing his job, thus eliminating the historical comparison with other chief executives. The tally came out this way: 10 per cent give him an excellent rating, 45 per cent good, 35 per cent fair, and 8 per cent poor, with the rest no opinion.

Again, while more favorable, it is not a massive testament to the President's popularity. And among Democrats who remain the key to this election, if only because they outnumber the Republicans by nearly 2 to 1, the lack of confidence in Mr. Nixon's performance is notable.

Fifty-two per cent of all Democrats give the President only a fair or poor rating, while 46 per cent think he has done a good or excellent job.

When you put all these factors together, it would seem that the President's support is quite soft; that, in fact, he can be beaten. In normal presidential election years these elements would be working for the Democrats. It hardly has to be said, however, that this is not a normal political year; it is a year when people are voting for personalities rather than parties or even, it seems, issues—and when they are approaching the election in a negative mood.

Aside from the public perception of George McGovern that we have already explored, the President has been helped by a number of specific moves. Voters credit him most strongly with his handling of foreign policy. His trips to China and Russia, his bringing back American troops from Vietnam, his stated goal of a generation of peace—all are applauded.

His weakness lies in domestic affairs. Yet even there voters now view him more favorably. They generally approve of his actions to control inflation, and a number of older citizens praised him for increasing Social Security payments by 20 per cent.

The operative word, today even more than a year ago, is that Richard Nixon is trying.

His performance holds a special frustration for the Democrats. Richard Nixon, the former hardline fighter against communism, the erstwhile advocate of invading North Vietnam in the 1950's, the candidate who called for cutting back the size of the federal government, not operating with a massive budget deficit, flatly rejecting any government wage and price controls, has changed his positions. He has moved to the left and usurped traditional Democratic liberal positions—and the public approves.

It is significant that 52 per cent of the Democrats we interviewed say they have changed their minds about Mr. Nixon. A substantial number now regard him more positively.

But if the President gets a better response today for the way he is handling his job, the personal doubts about him still linger.

In other trips across the country we found voters who thought of Mr. Nixon as "mysterious" and contradictory. Today, you hear people talk about his calculating qualities, his aloofness coldness or stiffness and sometimes his insensitivity to people. It's common to meet voters who express surprise that he's done as well as he has. They do not seem to have expected much from him.

As David S. Broder reports on his survey work: "The strongest feeling you get about Richard Nixon is that he is a President who is dealing with the questions that people think a President should be working on."

In other words, Mr. Nixon is a known quantity, the country has not disintegrated, and he is doing the best he can in a difficult job.

Listen, for a moment, to just eight of our voters as they talk about the President. These voters live in states from Massachusetts to California, and while they differ in education, outlook and occupation, politically they have several things in common. They are all Democrats, they all express deep reservations about George McGovern and all but one plan to vote for Mr. Nixon.

In Woburn, Mass., Bill Surette is tentatively leaning toward McGovern. Surette, in his 30s, a quality control manager in an aerospace firm, thinks the President has done an excellent job in dealing with the Russians and Chinese. "No one could have done better," he says. But the main problem facing the country is in domestic affairs, Surette thinks, particularly inflation and a recession both at the same time. Beyond that, he still holds a distinctly unfavorable view of the President personally.

"I can't believe what he says," Surette remarks. "He was elected because he had a plan for ending the war. If we'd have known it was going to take him five or six years he never would have won. When he attempts to make things perfectly clear, I don't understand it."

The rest are all Nixon voters who have switched.

"I don't think he's what you'd call an honorable man," says a retired long shoreman who lives in the Greenpoint section of Brooklyn. "That's why they call him 'Tricky Dick.' Most of the young people are for McGovern, like my kids. They figure under him

there'll be more jobs, which will be a lots of bulls . . . He bulls . . . you so much you can't believe him."

"But Nixon is a great politician. He knows foreign affairs. I think he tried to do a job with labor, he tried to keep prices down. Maybe the first time he had so much to buck, the second term he might do better. And I say that even though in my life when the Republicans are in things are always worse. The Democrats are more liberal for the poor people."

A housewife, in Great Neck, Long Island, who says she really wants to vote Democratic this year, but is going for Mr. Nixon—"I've made that decision only with great reluctance. I can't abide those people around Nixon. That whole Republican show at the convention—I'd rather take the diversity and whatever that brings at the Democratic convention. But Nixon comes through to me in clearer terms now. I didn't think he came through in these strong colors four years ago. A major thing are his summit trips. I don't think any one of us (Democrats) could have done this."

"Maybe he's very necessary at this time, maybe it's right to have such a person in there. I don't dislike him, whereas I did dislike him. I didn't trust him, whereas I now feel I can trust him."

Patsy Blair, who works in a real estate office in Edgeworth, Pa., and who thinks of Mr. Nixon as a "cold, uninterested person."—"I certainly don't think I could talk to him and come away feeling that he was interested in my problems. He has a lot of movie star friends, but that doesn't do anything for me, a divorced woman trying to raise two kids. Nixon has done his best job in pulling men out of Vietnam and trying to stop that war. The worst job is that poor people have been left out in the cold. Something drastic has to be done to help us."

She is voting more against McGovern, than for Nixon.

Also in Edgeworth is Jack L. Budkey, 39, a Catholic steelworker whose ancestors came from Poland—"As a steelworker, I lean to the Democrats because labor has always backed the Democrats until this year. Nixon has surprised me. I didn't think he'd do as well as he has. He's done a pretty fair job. He's tried to improve world relationships, and that's a step forward. He tried to do something about inflation; it hasn't worked, but you can't blame him for not trying. The worse thing about Nixon is the unemployment. As for McGovern, he's not the man to be President."

A housewife in Royal Oak, Mich.—"I felt like crying when he got in, but he hasn't been that bad. Still there are times when I feel like saying, 'Will the real Richard Nixon please stand up.'"

G. D. Moore, 46, a construction worker in Houston—"I'm beginning to think Nixon is honest. He doesn't follow the old-line Republican ways. He has some ideas that would work if he was in control long enough. I have more respect for him now. I think he has tried like hell on Vietnam and the work is there if a man wants to find a job. I think more of Nixon now than I ever did of a Republican."

Adele Berryhill, a voluble ex-New Yorker in her late 40s, a New Deal liberal who has hated Mr. Nixon from the days of Jerry Voorhis and Helen Gahagan Douglas, and who now lives in Hollywood, Calif.—"I can't believe what I'm hearing myself say, but I must vote for Nixon as an alternative to McGovern."

As all these comments strongly suggest, Richard Nixon remains far from a universally popular President. He is weakest in one area that could still hurt him between now and November—the overwhelming belief that he and his administration stand more for wealth and special privileges than for the common man.

We will explore that subject more fully in a later article, but for the moment we came back to Washington with much the same general impression as on our trip of one year ago. At that time we concluded:

"Because dozens of voters in this survey have a similarly vague or negative reading on the Democratic contenders, Mr. Nixon stands a chance of continuing his 'average' and 'mysterious' presidency for four more years."

Now, we would only change that to say Richard Nixon has a much better chance to be in office for four more years.

ELECTORATE ASSESSES NIXON

Here is the way voters responded when asked by Washington Post reporters, "When you think of Richard Nixon, what is the first thing that comes to your mind?"

He's a known factor. He's been there four years and I haven't died or starved yet.

A really intelligent man. One of the smartest men in the country. I think he's done an outstanding job through some crucial times. I believe if he had his druthers, he would just pull the troops out.

The way he's handled the war. The way he promised a secret peace plan. It's continued to escalate. He lacks credibility as far as I'm concerned. He's too middle of the road on so many issues.

If Nixon had the power and the Congress would go along with him, he'd do a lot better—especially for the poor and elderly people. I believe he's a good man at heart.

Bah. He doesn't impress me in the least. Whatever the big problem is he'll do a little something about it—to bolster popularity—and then nothing. A politician's a politician.

He's a level-headed leader. A good President. I think he has America foremost in his mind. He's like Eisenhower, but he's got henchmen running it. Deals have been made, but basically I think he's doing the best he can for America. If you're running the store, you can't see every transaction that's made.

I can't believe what he says. He was elected because he had a way of ending the war; if we had known it was taking five or six years, he wouldn't have won. When he attempts to make things perfectly clear, I don't understand it.

Truthful. I don't particularly care for him too much, but I don't think McGovern is any better.

I don't think he's done too bad—considering the poor condition the country is in. He's a pretty good diplomat. Hopefully, he's honest with the people.

I don't trust him. He's made so many promises—like other politicians—and never came through. So much hidden from the public. I was off work five months.

He is trying to win the confidence of the people and do what they want. I have to vote for Nixon because I can't stand the thought of McGovern getting in. But I don't think he's the best.

A good man, but he represents the wealthy class. I happen to be a working man.

I think he's made a good President. He's done as good or better than anyone could have. Our son was one of the first 25 troops to come home from Vietnam.

Vietnam. He said he was going to pull everybody out. He's starting to do it now so he'll get re-elected.

A very good politician. He makes the President's office what it should be. I couldn't see having Wallace. Nixon has dignity.

"King"—that's what he considers himself—at least by '76 he will be. We're almost in a monarchy now.

I believe he's an honest man. He's trying to get things done right. I don't like Kissinger and the cabinet. They're too hush-hush. I'll say sincerely. He's trying his best to keep the country together.

He's misguided. He feels he's doing the right thing. But he isn't sensitive about

seeing things as they really are. The war, for instance. He's thinking more about our problems with the war—than the suffering of the people in Vietnam.

He's doing pretty good. He went to China and Russia. He wants to keep peace.

He was going to do a hell of a lot. Why are we fighting now?

To me he's a brilliant President. He just goofed over that wage-price freeze.

Two things come to my mind; big business and the poster saying would you buy a used car from this man?

He's a wonderful man. He's well qualified, intelligent and honest. He's not wishy-washy.

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER ADDRESSES SUMMERFIELD GRANGE IN GUILFORD COUNTY, N.C.

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on Citizenship Day, September 18, 1972, Congressman L. RICHARDSON PREYER, Democrat of North Carolina, delivered an address at a meeting of the Summerfield Grange in Guilford County, N.C. His remarks were timely and challenging, and I recommend them to my colleagues:

REMARKS BY HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

We honor tonight the achievement of the Founding Fathers of our country. Through our Constitution, they solved the problem of imperial organization (a problem which brought the British Empire down); they constructed a federal system which became a model for the world; and they reconciled liberty and order. No mean achievement.

Our Constitution was born in the steaming Philadelphia summer of 1787—the most fateful year in the history of the United States: Clinton Rossiter, the historian, has said that "If the future of the world rests largely on the way in which the U.S. wields its power and responds to the challenge of glory, the year in which the people of the U.S. chose to be one nation—rather than a confederacy or a league, or a parcel of independent sovereignties—ought to be recognized as one of the handful of dates all men everywhere should remember." Fifty-five delegates met from twelve of the thirteen states of the new nation. The delegates included men like George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin, James Madison—a group from which we could expect some sound work. They met from May to September, with a "cheerful sense of duty and calm temper," (not always the case in our present-day Congress), and hammered out the document on which our government and institutions rest.

In London, John Adams—and in Paris, Thomas Jefferson—awaited results with interest (they were absent as our Ambassadors), while representatives of twelve of our thirteen states (Rhode Island would not send one) laid the political foundations for a unique form of nationhood.

What was our country like in this fateful year of 1787?

The U.S. in 1787 was a good country in which to live, work, and aspire.

It did not have the English pomp and culture, but it had resources and a brave and hardy people.

Its huge size was something that staggered the minds of Europeans. But its population was a little less than four million. Philadelphia was our largest city with 45,000 people, New York had 33,000, Boston had 18,000, Charleston 16,000. These cities were mostly

unreachable by the great majority of our population. For the majority it was back-breaking toil of plow and hoe (eight of ten people were dirt farmers).

In the South, Virginia was the king. Its delegation included leaders like George Washington, Patrick Henry, James Madison, and George Mason.

North Carolina at that time was a poorly governed state, with less than one-half of Virginia's population. We could not match Virginia in political talent. Our most outstanding leader, Governor Caswell, was unable to attend. Another leader, James Iredell, was too poor at the time to go. But North Carolina performed better at the Convention than was expected. Our delegation consisted of Hugh Williamson of Edenton as the senior member. He had witnessed the Boston Tea Party while waiting for a ship. Also, there was Alexander Martin, of Stokes County; William R. Davie, of Halifax County (who mainly persuaded the delegation to take the long journey to Philadelphia); William Blount of Pitt County; and Richard Dobbs Spaight, from Newbern. He was one of the youngest members of the Convention at age 29.

Incidentally, in the large painting in the Capital of the signing of the Constitution, it is Spaight who is the man depicted in the actual act of signing.

The Founding Fathers saw Democracy in America as resting upon two major pillars. The first was the "new science of government" which made popular government possible in a large and heterogeneous republic. To support this pillar they designed a machinery of self government that has to be considered as one of the most remarkable political inventions of Western man. The machinery is by now familiar to us—with its separation of powers between the executive, legislative, and judicial, its checks and balances.

The second pillar was of a spiritual order. To designate this pillar they used such phrases as "republican morality" or "civic virtue."

As Irving Kristol has recently pointed out, the Founding Fathers took a suspicious view of big cities and wondered whether, in the end, they could be compatible with a free and popular government. In this suspicion and wonder they were anything but original. The entire literature of classical political philosophy—from Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero on to Montesquieu—exhibits a similar skepticism, to put it mildly, concerning the quality of life that people lead in big cities, and expresses doubt whether the habits of mind generated there—what we might call "the urban mentality: irreverent, speculative, pleasure-loving, self-serving, belligerent toward all conventional pieties," as Kristol puts it,—are compatible with republican survival.

That small cities could be soberly and democratically governed, the Founding Fathers understood well enough—Geneva and Athens and the towns of New England testified to that. But they believed that self-government means the willingness of people to permit their baser selves to be directed by their better selves, and they feared that this precondition of self government was less likely to be present among the turbulent and impassioned masses of big cities. They spoke of the "mobs" of London (a city of one million at the time), and Paris, (a city of about 650,000).

If the Founding Fathers were worried about the effects of a few large cities upon the American capacity for self-government, what—one wonders—would they make of our country today? Kristol says, "One is reasonably certain they would regard it as an utterly impossible state of affairs." Whether they would be correct in this is a fateful question which will be up to us to answer.

Kristol says, "The American people are more and more behaving in a way that would have alarmed the Founding Fathers even as

it would have astonished them. To put it bluntly, they are more and more behaving like a collection of mobs." He is saying that the second pillar on which our government was founded is beginning to crumble under the assault of our urban culture. (And this urban, avant-garde culture is everywhere in our country today, not just in the large cities. It is the culture of our schools, our television, our movies.) Our permissive culture would probably seem to the Founding Fathers the very opposite of a democratic citizenry: a citizenry self-reliant, self-determining, and infused with republican morality: steadiness of character, deliberativeness of mind, and a willingness to subordinate one's own special interests to the public interest. As we become an urban culture, will we lose our civic virtue? The challenge to our urban democracy is to evolve a set of values and a conception of democracy that can function as the equivalent of the "republican morality" of yesteryear. This is the fundamental problem of America today.

Let me make one comment about the first pillar of our government—the machinery. The great strength of our Founding Fathers was their common sense. They did not draw up some ideal theoretical blue-print. They drew up a system that would work. The perfect example of their common sense and practicalness is in the way they handled the question of proportioned representation.

There is something very persuasive in the arguments in favor of proportional representation. It definitely results in a legislative assembly that is a more exact image of the divisions of popular opinion than can otherwise be obtained. And it seems just that the assembly should mirror the country as a whole.

But Justice, no matter how important, is not the only consideration that must be taken into account when setting up governmental machinery. A government must also be able to govern efficiently and for this it requires a considerable measure of stability. A good government must strike a balance between the demands of justice and those of stability. It must not let the search for justice paralyze it into inaction; nor must it, for the sake of efficiency and stability, fall into the injustice of dictatorship or tyranny.

Proportional representation seems to encourage unstable governments, though of course it is not the only cause of them. We can illustrate this with an example. Compare the stable governments that exist in the United States and Great Britain with the weak and ever-changing governments in France before and after World War II. Neither the United States nor Great Britain follow the method of proportional representation, whereas the Third and Fourth Republics of France did.

The correlation between proportional representation and unstable governments is more than accidental. For example, the governmental instability in postwar France was in large part due to the numerous parties that were represented in the Legislative Assembly. Many of them had only a few seats in the Assembly and could not hope to accomplish anything positive. Yet together these small splinter parties commanded enough votes so that there either was no majority party at all or else there was a party whose majority was so slim that it could hope to govern only by allying itself with one or more of the other parties. This in turn resulted in compromises and an unwillingness on the part of the government to take strong action even when it was necessary, since each of the various parties was afraid of alienating its much needed allies.

The nonproportional method of voting in the United States and Great Britain tends to maintain only two appreciably strong parties. If a third party in the United States is to be taken seriously, its Presidential candidate would probably be expected to receive

some electoral votes. Thus he would be required to obtain the majority of all the votes cast in at least one state—a much less likely result than simply getting a small percentage of the popular vote throughout the nation.

An ideal, theoretical blue-print of a government would probably have opted for the principle of proportional representation. But the hard common sense and practical judgment of the Founding Fathers ignored the temptation of the ideal for something that has worked soundly and effectively.

The last of the fifty-five delegates to the Constitutional Convention to die was James Madison, in 1836 when he was 86 years old. Since he left the Presidency in 1817, he had entertained distinguished visitors from all over the world, with the celebrated Dolley as hostess, at his home in Virginia. He only published his invaluable notes of the Convention several years after his death. He did not want to offend any of the delegates that might be still living. There is quite a difference from our day when every participant in a significant event rushes into print the next week.

The framers of a Constitution die; their Constitution, if well-framed, lives on. Our Constitution will live until the Republic is no more—because it is the best framed of any fundamental law in history. It has held up under pressure of tremendous geographical growth and great population explosion.

Its greatest strain was the resolution of the ambiguity of "a nation partly federal, partly national" through the tragic Civil War. The Constitution itself was not attacked in that war but the ambiguity had to be resolved.

On some of the great issues of Constitutional law that agitate our time, the framers had no specific intent—we must generate our own.

There is one clear intent: that each generation of Americans should pursue its destiny as a community of free men. We honor them most faithfully by cherishing the same spirit of constitutionalism that carried them through, and by doing our best to make certain that other generations that will come after do the same.

Near the end of the Constitutional Convention, Dr. Benjamin Franklin, looking toward the President's chair, at the back of which a rising sun happened to be painted, observed to a few members near him, that painters had found it difficult to distinguish between a rising sun and a setting sun in their art. "I have often looked at it in the course of our session, amidst the contingencies of our hopes and fears, without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting. But now at length I have the happiness to know that it is a rising and not a setting sun."

ANTI-HIJACKING ACT OF 1972 NECESSARY TO DETER HARBORING OF AIRLINE HIJACK CRIMINALS

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I supported and voted for the Antihijacking Act of 1972. This legislation is absolutely necessary if the United States is going to protect its citizens, its aircrews and its airlines from the terrorist aircraft hijackers.

This bill is designed to implement for the United States the Hague Convention, which, in turn, was designed to strengthen the Tokyo Convention which applies to the criminal acts aboard aircraft. The

Tokyo Convention provided that inflight aircraft in international air transportation would be governed by the law of the state of the flag of such aircraft.

In the case of a hijacked aircraft, states under the Tokyo Convention must restore control of the aircraft to its lawful commander and must allow passengers and crew to continue their journey as soon as practicable and return the aircraft and its cargo to lawful possessors. The Tokyo Convention, however, does not obligate any state to establish jurisdiction over hijacking to extradite or prosecute hijackers in its custody.

This legislation would close this gap since states under the Hague Convention are obligated to establish jurisdiction over hijackers, to agree to extradition, or to prosecute offenders. I feel that the United States is duty bound to exercise its authority as a nation to determine whether or not it is going to continue to allow airlines of other nations to come into this country when they continue to serve those nations who harbor aircraft hijackers.

As a means of curtailing aircraft hijacking, this bill allows the President to suspend air service to any foreign nation which he determines is encouraging hijacking through actions inconsistent with the Hague Treaty, sometimes referred to as the Hague Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, which came into effect on October 14, 1971.

The legislation also authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to withhold, revoke or limit the operating authority of any foreign air carrier whose government does not effectively maintain and administer security measures equal to or above the minimums established pursuant to the Hague Convention.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend Chairman STAGGERS of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, to Chairman JARMAN of the subcommittee which handled the bill, and to all of the members of the committee for their actions in bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor in this session of the Congress. As their committee report states so succinctly, the United States cannot tolerate the aircraft crimes which have been perpetrated on its citizens and its air carriers. This legislation is intended to be a necessary and useful deterrent.

FAIR INTERNATIONAL TRADE ACT

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a trade bill entitled the Fair International Trade Act of 1972.

This is not just another trade bill. It is designed to meet the needs of our current international trade position by seeking to correct some of our principal competitive disadvantages.

As we all know our world trade position has badly deteriorated in recent

years, and especially during the past 3 or 4 years. This is not an accident nor should there be any mystery about the occurrence of our rising trade deficits.

Foreign production costs are distinctly below our own, also for reasons that are readily understood. So long as this situation continues without import limitations just so long will a large number of our industries and agricultural products be at the mercy of imports, and we cannot hope to achieve full employment.

Very simply stated, foreign productivity, because of the great technological progress in the industrial countries, has risen rapidly, and faster than ours. To a great extent this is because the foreign countries began from a much lower base than those we enjoyed. Modern machinery, largely supplied by this country, displaced backward equipment in the other areas of the world and this naturally meant a much higher output per man-hour than the previous level. Those countries were playing catch-up ball, so to speak. They started from a low base so that their productivity rise was often phenomenal by our standards. Once they catch up the progress will be less sensational.

Meantime foreign wages also went up, but not so sensationally. In terms of percentage they often exceeded our wage increases, but, again, the low base from which they were measured did not mean that they were catching up with us. For example, a 25-percent increase in a wage of 25 cents per hour raises the level to only 31¼ cents, whereas a like increase on a base of \$2 per hour means a 50 cent increase. The difference is over 42 cents. Today our average hourly industrial wage is over \$3.80 per hour. That is 10 times as high as the wages in some of the countries that compete with us. It is more than twice as high as the highest European wages and 2½ to 3 times as high as in other leading European countries.

With foreign productivity coming closer alongside of our level, and with wages still far behind, I say, to repeat, there is no mystery at all about our competitive handicap.

We are therefore urged to become more productive, and I agree that this is desirable, but that inevitably means displacing men by machines. Even this would be acceptable if we could expect the higher resulting productivity to lower costs sufficiently to lead to substantially higher consumption. Unfortunately higher productivity today does well simply to keep prices from rising more rapidly. It does not achieve lower overall costs. Therefore consumption does not increase beyond the rate of population growth.

Unfortunately, too, and this is the important point to keep in mind, when lower costs do result from the introduction of new and more productive machinery or from new processes, these are soon disseminated to lower-wage countries. The result is that the higher employment that we looked forward to with confidence in years gone by now takes place abroad rather than here. We are then left with net unemployment as a reward for our efforts.

Mr. Speaker, this trend toward higher foreign investment has robbed us of

much employment that we would achieve if the investment climate were improved at home. In other words, if risk capital could be assured that when new products are developed or if obsolescent or obsolete machinery or even modern machinery were replaced with more highly productive equipment—if, I say, there were assurance that the domestic producer could supply that market, capital would not feel pressed to move abroad. Greater employment would then take place here, and not as now, in foreign plants.

This consideration goes to the heart of the bill I am introducing. First, it would put an import quota on goods that had already captured at least 10 percent of our market and were still on an upward trend. It would not impose quotas on goods that are on the free list, nor on those that are already under a quota or similar import limitation. This proviso would of itself leave over a half of our imports outside of the scope of the bill. Probably not over a quarter of our total imports would be affected.

Imports subject to a quota would be permitted to rise in proportion to the increase in domestic consumption. They would not be allowed to run wild to disrupt our production and increase unemployment.

The heart of the bill, however, is the provision that goods that are produced under an American-owned patent cannot be brought in without limit, such as is possible today. During the first 5 years under a patent imports could not rise higher than 5 percent of our domestic consumption; not over 10 percent during the second 5-year period, and not over 15 percent during the third 5-year period. Thereafter they could grow in proportion to the growth of domestic consumption.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is moderate but would be very effective toward restoration of the climate of our economy to a condition most conducive to more investment of developmental capital and higher employment. In a few years of normal activity our competitive weakness would be overcome, and if foreign wages should close the gap that separates us we could resume trade liberalization.

GAETANO J. MANGANO,
OUTSTANDING CITIZEN

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I was honored recently to be a dinner guest of the Sons of Italy Lodge named after our own distinguished master artist Constantino Brumidi. The dinner was a testimonial to one of my constituents, Gaetano J. Mangano, a man of great personal courage, community dedication, and love for fellow man. I am pleased to do him honor by repeating for the Record a brief biographical tribute to Guy which appeared in the dinner journal:

GAETANO J. MANGANO, OUTSTANDING
CITIZEN

Gaetano J. Mangano, known to all of us as Guy, was born, raised and educated in Brook-

lyn. In 1965 he chose to make his home and establish his business in Deer Park. The spirit of dedicated personal service in conducting his business and the way He, Eleanor and Barbara involved themselves in all aspects of community life soon made us all aware of their presence among us.

A Lodge Brother, Guy is also a 4th Degree Knight of Columbus, Our Lady of The Rosary Council, member of Deer Park Post V.F.W., Sts. Cyril & Methodius Holy Name Society, Deer Park Lions Club as well as the Metropolitan, N.Y. State and National Funeral Directors Association.

He comes from a unique and respected family, each an achiever and each with a sense of public service and belief in assuming community responsibility. His Father Gaetano Sr., began by helping the poor Italians in his community during the Depression. His Mother, a registered Nurse, served in W.W. I. His Brother James V., widely known for his outstanding political career, is one of the most respected public servants in the State. His Nephew Guy James Mangano is regarded as one of the most able Justices in the N.Y. State Supreme Court. His Sister Antonia, an Attorney and professionally trained Social Worker is presently serving as Consult Commissioner in Brooklyn and Staten Island. These accomplishments by the Manganos is because Guy's Father, who died in 1961, was a great human being, for he was the tree and they the branches. He left Italy at an early age to come to America. He spoke no English, had no money, but he was a man of character and in the best of all that is good in the Italian heritage, planted seeds that took hold and have done him honor.

Guy is a modest man, but those of us who know him, know of his many fine qualities. If we were to select 4 of these to best describe him they would be: Pride in his heritage, hope in the future, faith in his fellow man and charitableness toward all.

LAST OF HIS KIND

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most colorful and at the same time one of the most effective newspaper editors I have ever known died a few days ago in California. He was George A. Dawley, editor and publisher of the Biggs News in Biggs, Calif.

He is the last of a breed of newspapermen. His comments, his news reports, and his editorial opinions could be witty, penetrating, and on occasion stinging. With his agile mind he wrote and published what he liked to call the most "passed around newspaper in Butte County."

George Dawley and his wife to whom he always referred as John landed in Biggs in 1932 with a few dollars in their pocket, and Dawley's desire to publish a newspaper. Not only has he accomplished this desire but for the past 22 years he has been judge of the Biggs judicial district. "Mr. Biggs," as he was known, will be missed and I would like to pay tribute to this great man by inserting in the Record at this point the editorial published by the Chico Enterprise Record shortly after his passing.

The editorial follows:

GEORGE A. DAWLEY

It seems safe to say that the worlds of journalism and law will not again see the likes of George A. Dawley. Rather, when the Biggs publisher-jurist died Tuesday, he truly was "the last of his kind."

Dawley was a newspaperman (he chuckled disdainfully at the high-falutin term "journalist" assumed by some in the profession) for most of his 70 years, the last 40 years as "editor and publisher" of the Biggs News.

To refer to Dawley as "editor and publisher" was, of course, to grossly understate his activities at the Biggs News. This is because he also was the newspaper's reporting staff, advertising department, composing room crew and pressman. In other words, George Dawley was the Biggs News, and vice versa (except for the help provided him by his wife Muriel, better known to all as "John").

Under those circumstances of multiple capacity, Dawley was one of the few newsmen left who not only covered the news and wrote the stories, but also set them in type, made them up into pages and then put them into print. He moved at such a pace that he seldom bothered to do his news stories first on a typewriter—he merely sat down at the Linotype machine and composed them in type right off the top of his head. In grand and flowing style—bothering little with punctuation and proofreading—Dawley sped the lines of type out of his machine, running most of the news together in lengthy reports.

What contributed most to the interest and value of Dawley's news columns was that he sprinkled them liberally with his own personal evaluations and his own editorial criticisms and comments. A quick thinker with a sharp wit and an unbounded eagerness to keep his spoon stirring in the public stew, Dawley prided himself on the fact that most of his readers agreed with his masthead motto identifying the News as "the most passed around newspaper in Butte County."

Needless to say, Dawley was equally unique as a jurist, serving as judge of the Biggs District Court for more than 20 years. He ruled the roost in that domain as he did in the newspaper realm of his community, often combining editorial campaigns against speeders, for example, with appropriate stiff fines for violators who happened to find themselves before his bench.

In the bargain, it is likely that Dawley was one of the few judges in the country—perhaps the only one—who not only conducted his court proceedings but also covered them for the local press at the same time. We imagine many judges have envied Dawley that happy circumstance over the years, eh?

It might be said that Dawley was also happily unique in another way—in that he was able to be present in person at an honor affair of the type which all too often isn't held until after a man has passed along. This occurred in July of last year when federal, state and local officials joined the residents of Biggs in sponsoring a major affair entitled, "George Dawley, Mr. Biggs, Day."

Citizens in charge of that program had solicited comments from dignitaries and newspapers far and wide who had come to know Dawley over the years. The Enterprise-Record was one of the newspapers asked to send a statement. We believe it is appropriate to repeat that statement here today in tribute:

We at The Enterprise-Record have long known George Dawley as a colleague, as a competitor and as a man.

Viewing George Dawley as a colleague, we often have cheered him on as he waged battle against evils in government on all levels. On many occasions, we have fought alongside him and relished his journalistic companionship.

Viewing George Dawley as a competitor, we sometimes have felt the sting of his Linotype last. Needless to say, this has

taught us to blend our affection for him with a deep sense of respect.

Viewing George Dawley as a man, we often have marveled at his ability to forge ahead against strong odds, both in sickness and in health, and we have marveled at his courage, his sense of humor and his dedication. He is a good man.

As such, we at The Enterprise-Record are very proud to join his many friends in paying special tribute to him on George Dawley Day, July 1, 1971.—(A. W. Branwell, Editor and Publisher of Chico Enterprise-Record)

And today we join the countless friends and admirers of George A. Dawley in expressing our sorrow at his death. He was indeed "the last of his kind."

A MORE BALANCED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will have an opportunity to strike a blow for a more balanced transportation system in our Nation's urban areas. I am a cosponsor of an amendment to the Federal-Aid Highway Act which will open up a portion of the highway trust funds to purchase mass transit systems, as well as construct highways. President Nixon has publicly stated his strong support for the amendment.

My amendment, which is similar to the Cooper-Muskie amendment already adopted by the Senate, permits State and local officials to use up to \$700 million in highway trust funds on transportation systems which best meet local needs. The amendment will not force the cities or the States to build mass transit systems, but it does provide the mass transit option for the first time.

We can no longer tolerate the wasted time, wasted resources and air pollution which traffic congestion has created in our urban areas. We must provide attractive alternatives in fast, clean, and efficient public transportation. These highway trust funds together with increased capital grant funds will provide local officials with the flexibility they need to provide truly balanced transportation systems.

I am a believer in the need to continue upgrading our road network. The need for more and better highways will continue to require substantial Federal support in the years to come. The decision to open up a portion of the highway trust fund for possible mass transit usage was made only after it became clear that there is no other way to do the job for mass transit which needs to be done. The failure of the Housing Act of 1972 was a defeat also for capital funding of mass transit facilities.

Americans generally have a stake in our total transportation network. It is not unreasonable for motorists and non-motorists alike to share at least a portion of both road and mass transit costs. For example, user fees have never paid the total cost of constructing and maintaining our road network—nor should they be expected to do so. Transit riders help

to support roads at least indirectly through the added expenditures which accompany heavy traffic and the additional taxes that must be raised when urban expressways take millions of dollars of assessable properties off the tax rolls and displace businesses, jobs, and other taxpayers.

The use of some highway trust funds for mass transit purposes acknowledges the stake each of us has in the development of efficient means of moving goods and people, whether on highways or fixed guideway networks.

FOUR-LETTER WORDS

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, Mearl G. Hodgson, executive director of the Little Crow Community Council, Inc., in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District, writes a column in the council's publication, Little Crow Signals.

His October column was so worthy of wider readership that I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend Mr. Hodgson for his fine writing and the good commonsense he expressed. The article follows:

FOUR-LETTER WORDS

Many youth today find it fashionable to use four-letter words—presumably to shock their elders, but the supposed shock value has produced merely boredom.

I, personally, like four-letter words and, since dialogue seems to be the "in thing", I would like to suggest some significant four-letter words which I believe are worthy of consideration, not only by youth but by everyone.

I would start with *work* because this is the purpose of man—everything we accomplish comes from a lot of personal sweat and, through it, we shape our lives to a destiny above that of the animals.

The *home* is the basic unit of society. Urbanization has decreased the size of families, but it has increased the need for personal relationships. A *baby* requires as much tenderness today as yesterday. *Mama* and *papa* are still essential elements in nature's scheme of life—they sacrifice much and deserve a lifetime of respect from their children.

No one should be too disillusioned or embittered to honor the *flag* of his country—it is the symbol of all the people—it stands for citizens collectively. To salute it is to declare allegiance to a *free* people working for a *just* society. Our *duty* to our country is to defend it in times of danger and improve it in times of peace. We try to make peaceful change with our *vote*, and we settle disputes by *jury*.

I see people as individuals and groups working effectively for brotherhood and I am reminded of the *good* in all of us. To *know* is to *hope* and *hope* is the sparkplug of civilization's engine.

Finally, I would recommend some four-letter words that give special meaning to all the rest. Be *kind* to one another, those older—those younger—those of different color or creed. Be *glad* of our differences and avoid stereotypes. *Care* for the problems of others and *give* of yourself to all worthy causes. When we learn to *help*, we build a quality of character that makes cooperation possible.

Put it all together and you have true brotherly *love*.

FULFILLING THE PROMISE OF THE
WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON
AGING

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, it is now estimated that one American in 10, or 20 million of our citizens, are over the age of 65. A quarter of those Americans live below the poverty level. Many feel that they have been discarded by society. Many senior citizens live in inadequate housing. They are faced with inadequate income sources to live out their retirement years with self-respect and with a sense of purpose. In the 1930's when we first set up the social security system it was envisaged as a retirement system that would guarantee that all our older Americans could live out their lives in dignity. The promise of the original Social Security Act has yet to be realized.

The White House Conference on Aging last December created a great deal of optimism. Some of the finest minds in the country were brought together to discuss the many problems of aging. Those promises can only be fulfilled, however with a three stage Federal strategy. First, it can provide a realistic income strategy. Second, it can provide an equitable tax system which recognizes the unique situation of those living on fixed incomes. Finally, Federal concern for improving the quality of life for our senior citizens can alleviate many of the problems facing many of our Nation's elderly. Not all of these strategies can be implemented by legislation, but Congress can play an important role in initiating action.

INCOME STRATEGIES

The recent 20-percent increase in social security benefits passed by the House will give our social security recipients badly needed additional funds. However, it does not solve the long-range problem. The social security system needs some basic reforms. At the head of the list is elimination of the earnings limitation. There is nothing magic about the age of retirement. Many of our seniors have the energy and the interest to work after retirement. They can surely contribute a great deal to our Nation. The earnings limitation limits the possible contribution by these Americans. In essence it says that people who accept social security are second-class citizens, hence they can only work for \$2,000 a year before they lose benefits. This seems absurd. This week the Senate began to consider an increase of the ceiling to \$3,000. This step can be called progress, but not a solution; that solution will only come with elimination of the earnings limitation.

Elimination of the earnings limitation will not be a total reform unless we make sure that senior citizens will not be discriminated against because of their age. Earlier this year I sponsored the Age Discrimination in Employment Act. Basically what this act stipulates is that an employer cannot discriminate on the

basis of age. Moreover, employers must be encouraged to hire senior citizens who want to work. Hopefully, the act will be able to break down the barriers of discrimination so that our senior citizens who have contributed a great deal to this country may continue to lead productive and involved lives.

A second problem in our present income strategy is the differentiation made between spouses of social security recipients and main beneficiaries. At the present time, if a social security recipient dies his or her spouse will receive only 80 percent of the benefits allowable for a single person. Does the social security system assume that the expenses of these people automatically are 20-percent less than other single social security retirees? The question is similar for those who decide to retire at an early age. A few years ago the social security age requirements were lowered. Many cheered this decision. I questioned it. In lowering the age of benefits we also lowered the amounts of benefits available. To me this seems like another false promise.

A third problem in urgent need of resolution is the treatment of pensions from Federal agencies. Many senior citizens receiving benefits from both the veterans and Social Security Administrations find that when one is raised, the other is lowered an equal amount making the raise only illusory.

Despite these problems, the House record on social security benefits has been impressive. With this latest increase of 20 percent and the increase of 15 percent in 1970 and 10 percent in 1971, the average monthly benefit check will jump from \$134 to \$161 monthly. An average married couple retiring this year will receive \$389 monthly which means an additional \$780 a year of spendable income. For the first time in history, benefit increases will automatically occur if the consumer price index rises 3 percent in any year after 1975. To the 28 million Americans who are retired, disabled, or drawing survivor benefits this \$8.5 billion increase will help them to get along.

PROPERTY TAXES

A second area which might be handled on the State level or be subject to Federal legislation is the area of property taxes. Many Americans find that after they retire they are forced to leave the houses which they have lived in all their lives because of the unbearable burden of the property tax. Legislators on both the State and national level have talked about a new concept called the circuit breaker for property tax. The basic principle is to make sure that the property tax does not do gross violence to equity concepts. This is accomplished by equipping the property tax with a safety mechanism—a circuit breaker, if you will—that automatically works when the property tax becomes excessive in relation to income. Statutes in this regard have been enacted in 12 States. Others are seriously considering this idea. Last November the Senate considered an amendment using the circuit breaker. The proposal was a modest plan which allowed a \$300 tax credit to couples over 65 whose incomes were below \$6,500 or

\$3,250 per single individual. This was dropped in conference, but I will press for similar legislation in the next session.

HOUSING

The property tax is only one of the hazards facing older Americans in the housing area. The housing problems confronting our Nation's senior citizens are similar to those facing the rest of the Nation with three important differences. First, design of housing for older Americans must take into account the special physical and mobility problems which many older Americans are faced with. This means that hallways and all interior areas must be better lighted. Hallways may require guiderails and other mobility assistance items. These kinds of requirements must be written into the housing codes.

Second, in planning senior citizens' housing complexes, location must be taken into account. Too many of our senior citizens' housing projects have been constructed on the outskirts of cities or away from vital services with the end result being increased isolation for the persons in the projects.

Third, most of our senior citizens live on fixed incomes yet because of the way that our moderate income housing statutes are drawn they are excluded. Many of these citizens are forced to sell their houses because of the burden of the property tax, yet they cannot qualify for moderate income housing. This vicious circle must be stopped. It can only be stopped by redrawing the regulations covering moderate income housing which will recognize the unique position of the senior citizen.

IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF LIFE

Obviously, an income strategy is at the base of any of our efforts to improve senior citizens opportunities to live fulfilled and golden years. However, income alone will not solve the problems of our Nation's elderly. We must insure that our Nation's senior citizens can be guaranteed adequate medical care, adequate nutrition and adequate opportunities to express themselves.

The medicare and medicaid programs have grown to provide an increased level of medical care for those in our population who are most susceptible to continuous care illnesses. These programs must be continued and strengthened. The field of aging research could use additional resources to great advantage to study the effects of aging on physical and mental capabilities and to find alternatives which will help reduce these crippling effects.

The Older Americans Act, of which I was a cosponsor, attempts to set up programs such as these and to coordinate services to our senior citizens. Programs for involvement should continue to be increased and wherever possible should be decategorized so that local groups of senior citizens can propose ways in which they can become involved. Last year the retired senior volunteers project involved 11,500 senior citizens and 23,000 children at a cost of \$25 million. I am sure that the rewards to our country are well in excess of these funds.

It seems only logical and fitting that

this Nation not rest its commitment to older Americans. The President in his state of the Union address categorized a worthy goal for senior citizens succinctly:

The best thing our country can give its older citizens is a chance to be a part of it. The chance to play a continuing role in the great American adventure.

Our senior citizens do not want a hand-out. What they need and want is encouragement to stay involved.

U.N. FOOLISHNESS CONTINUES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, once again the Red Bloc which is manipulated by the Communists to control the United Nations Organization is attempting to use that body to invalidate the actions of the Congress of the United States in lifting the U.N. imposed ban against the purchase of nickel and chrome from Rhodesia.

According to news reports:

African nations have demanded that the United States stop buying nickel and chrome from Rhodesia in defiance of Security Council sanctions and have asked that the U.N. Security Council to "be ready to apply enforcement measures to make economic sanctions binding on all states."

Interestingly, these Red Bloc nations are themselves in violation of the provisions of the U.N. Charter by attempting to impose sanctions against the duly constituted governments of member nations who refuse to obey the dictates of the U.N. Body which interfere in their internal affairs.

One can only wonder if these same African Red Bloc nations would support a motion to apply enforcement measures to make all punitive or censoring actions of the U.N. Security Council binding on all member states, including, of course, the Nations of Red China and Israel?

The supremacy of a people acting through their elected representatives is at once the cornerstone and heart of the American system of government. It must be preserved; the integrity, the very right of the American people to choose their own form of government and direct their own destiny, is at stake.

I include a related news clipping:

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
Oct. 3, 1972]

AFRICANS TELL U.S.: STOP BUYING RHODESIAN METALS

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—African nations have demanded that the United States stop buying nickel and chrome from Rhodesia in defiance of Security Council sanctions against that nation's white minority regime.

Foreign Minister Shridath S. Ramphal of Guyana backed the African appeal at a session of the 15-nation Council. He insisted that the Council be ready to apply enforcement measures to make economic sanctions binding on all states.

Sanctions were imposed against Rhodesia after it declared independence unilaterally from Britain in 1965.

The United States banned the import of

CXVIII—2115—Part 25

Rhodesian chrome in accordance with the sanctions and bought the metal from the Soviet Union. Last November, however, Congress lifted the ban on importation of any strategic material that also was being purchased from a Communist country.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS OF CAMPBELL, OHIO, HONOR LT. ALBERT M. MASI

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 24, 1972, I had the privilege of attending a testimonial dinner and dance in honor of Lt. Albert M. Masi, of 37 Bright Avenue, Campbell, Ohio. Albert Masi was born in Campbell and educated in the Campbell school system. He was employed by the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. until he volunteered for the U.S. Marines on April 15, 1942. He served in the South Pacific for 26 months and is holder of the Good Conduct Medal and the Purple Heart. He served in three campaigns—Roi-Naumer, Saigon-Taiwan, and Iwo Jima, and was discharged on January 4, 1946, from Great Lakes, Ill.

In 1947, he married the former Lucy P. Rossi of Campbell, owner-operator of Masi Cleaners in Campbell. They are the parents of three children: Gabriel, 25, a teacher at Holy Trinity Catholic School in Struthers, who is married to the former Mary Ann Swantek of Campbell; Rita, 21, and Patricia, 19, both of whom are employed as beauticians at the Campbell Hair Fashions Beauty Salon.

Mr. Masi is a member of the following organizations: American Legion, FDR Post No. 560 of Campbell; life member of the Italian-American War Veterans of Campbell Post No. 10, of which he has served as post commander, State commander, and national commander in 1961-62; VFW, since 1947; life member of Amvets Post No. 44 of Youngstown; Italian-American League; Italian-American Political Club; Knights of Columbus No. 3813 of Campbell, and Fourth Degree Father Gallagher General Assembly of Youngstown.

Lieutenant Masi has been an outstanding service officer of the veterans organizations and has been working for the past 15 years to help all veterans receive hospital care, pensions, and other benefits to which they are entitled.

In 1969, the late Congressman Michael J. Kirwan named Mr. Masi "Campbell's Good Will Ambassador" for the efforts he has made to help members of the various service organizations. This year in my capacity as U.S. Representative from the 19th Ohio District, which includes the city of Campbell, I named Lieutenant Albert Masi "Campbell's Champion of Veterans' Affairs" for his outstanding service in behalf of veterans.

Lieutenant Masi was appointed a patrolman for the city of Campbell by Mayor Anthony F. Pacella on January 12, 1949. On March 1, 1967, he was ap-

pointed sergeant by Mayor Joseph A. Vrabel. He was appointed lieutenant on March 1, 1972, by Mayor Rocco Mico.

On August 21, 1972, Mr. Masi was cited as the outstanding member of the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., at their national convention, for all his efforts in helping U.S. veterans and their widows.

Officials who participated in the program honoring Lieutenant Masi were: the Reverend Joseph Palermo, invocation; Steve Sofocleous, chairman; Attorney Joseph Witoli, toastmaster; Mayor Rocco Mico, welcome and presentation; U.S. Representative CHARLES J. CARNEY; Anthony J. Volpe, director of Veterans' Affairs for the State of New Jersey, principal speaker; State Senator Harry V. Meshe; Anthony Ross, national commander of the Italian-American War Veterans; John DeMart, commander of American Legion Post 560, Campbell; Commander Robert Hedrick, school superintendent; and the Reverend George Pappas of Archangel Michael Church, benediction.

RUSSIAN RANSOM DECREE POLICY

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I recently received an incisive statement concerning the odious practice of ransoming Russian Jews prior to permitting their emigration. It is from Irwin Daniels, president of the Jewish Centers Association, Los Angeles, Calif. In it Mr. Irwin expresses the opposition of the board of trustees of the Jewish Centers Association to the granting of the most favored nations' status to the Soviet Union, as long as the Soviet Union continues its practices of ransoming the Soviet Jews. It is only one of the many outrages against the most favored nations policy toward the Soviet Union that we have heard recently, and it deserves our immediate concern and action.

I include Mr. Daniels' statement:

JEWISH CENTERS ASSOCIATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., September 22, 1972.
MEMORANDUM

From: Irwin Daniels, President.

To: California Congressional Delegation.

The Board of Trustees of the Jewish Centers Association of Los Angeles in its concern for equity and justice asks that you consider its position on matters which are now before the Congress.

Although we are in favor of easing of tensions between East and West through economic ties and export trade, we are strongly opposed to the granting of most favored nations' status to the Soviet Union as long as that country maintains its policy of ransom decree which is inhumane, immoral, and punitive.

We agree with Senator Ribicoff's statement on this regard, "I do not see how any Senator or Congressman could vote for new trade concessions for the Soviet Union at a time when the Russians are trading in human lives. Ransoming of Soviet Jews is one Soviet export all decent men must absolutely refuse to accept."

We urge your strong support to deny the Soviet Union the trade terms it desires from the United States until and unless it changes its ransom decree which imposes exorbitant exit fees on Jews who wish to emigrate.

CHIEF JUDGE ANDREW M. HOOD

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, this summer Chief Judge Andrew McCaughrin Hood retired from the District of Co-

lumbia Court of Appeals. His retirement marked the end of a 30-year career on the city's appellate court that began when the court was created in 1942 to review the work of the District's police, municipal, and juvenile courts.

Judge Hood was appointed to the bench by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and reappointed or promoted by Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. He was designated chief judge in 1962, and was on the court as it grew from a lower level, three-man body, to a nine-judge panel whose decisions can be appealed only to the U.S. Supreme Court.

It was my pleasure to have served Judge Hood as a law clerk in 1954-55 and watch his contribution to the growth of the court as it matured from a very limited appeals court to the highest court in the jurisdiction following the implementation of the 1970 Court Reorganization Act.

Judge Hood has earned the respect of the judicial and legal professions and his wisdom and guidance has indeed inspired many people and citizens who have come in contact with him. He will be missed, but his years of service on the bench have left an imprint that will never be forgotten.

SENATE—Wednesday, October 4, 1972

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, a Senator from the State of South Carolina.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, in whose will is the destiny of the Nation, rekindle our faith in the ultimate triumph of Thy plan for the world Thou hast made. In spite of difficulties, disappointments, and fears, reassure us Thou art still in control and that in the end victory belongs to truth and justice. When we must accept less than the perfect program, or agree to partial solutions, or must yield to postponements, help us never to give up, knowing that Thou dost never give us up. Grant us patience, endurance, strength, and wisdom for today, knowing that all things work together for good to them that love Thee.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The second assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., October 4, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, a Senator from the State of South Carolina, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HOLLINGS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 3, 1972, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER) is now recognized for a period not to exceed 15 minutes.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR AND GENERAL AMNESTY FOR DRAFT DODGERS

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, in recent days, Americans have been involuntary participants in a cruel spectacle. The North Vietnamese, by attaching cunning and patently amoral conditions to the release of three American prisoners of war, succeeded in blackmailing our country into either accepting these humiliating conditions or jeopardizing the release of those prisoners—and the future release of prisoners. This was terrorism by government—terrorism in the same mold as practiced by individuals who threaten and kill the innocent. Yet while our Government struggled to respond according to convention, though allowing compassion to predominate, the Democratic candidate for President continued to play the politics of ambition at any price.

At the height of negotiating the prisoners' release, candidate McGOVERN accused the administration of "playing politics with the three prisoners of war that Hanoi already has offered to release." He called on the President to "let these three men come home just as quickly as possible," thereby insinuating that the President's intention was something less than that goal.

Coming on the heels of his persistent advocacy of a general amnesty for all draft dodgers, this latest action is more deserving of a national flushing than believing.

The blind defense of Hanoi's exploiting the prisoner release and the promise of total amnesty to those who have broken the law denotes to me that the most patriotic of men, like GEORGE McGOVERN, can become the most foolish of candidates.

American prisoners of war and their release are the responsibility of all Americans. No man—not GEORGE McGOVERN, not Richard Nixon; and no party—not

the Republican Party and not the Democratic Party, is or would be more representative of a nation yearning to have its sons home.

The draft dodger, too, is the responsibility of the American people. However, in this instance, national debate does not suffer the disadvantage of terrorism directed against the helpless.

Logic does not have to be muted and that is why Senator McGOVERN loses on this issue. He keeps on saying that there is strong precedent for a general amnesty. In fact, there is none.

He claims President Coolidge provided amnesty after World War I and President Truman after World War II. He also cites President Lincoln as a proponent of unconditional amnesty. All are untrue.

None of the Presidents supported general amnesty and none granted it. Lincoln, in fact, insisted on a hard-line amnesty policy. Deserters returning to duty would have to finish out the unfilled portion of their term and, in addition, a period equivalent to their original term of enlistment.

Candidate McGOVERN opposes any conditions on his amnesty promise. This is the same candidate who told the Veterans of Foreign Wars' convention:

A good Democrat doesn't run away from his party, any more than a good soldier runs away from his country.

How can we reconcile that statement with his apologia for the draft evaders?

Those who choose of their own volition to break the law, for whatever reason, must be ready to accept the consequences of their act.

There is an honorable tactic known as civil disobedience. Through the years, a few notable men of high purpose have employed it to advance their beliefs.

I do not recall Martin Luther King or Mahatma Gandhi ever whining for special consideration of their actions. They stood tall in defiance and in punishment. The essence of genuine civil disobedience is the deliberate invitation of society's penalty. If the provoker feels this is an unjust system, one of his purposes is to dramatize that injustice by undergoing its consequences.

Thus did such men as Gandhi and Dr. King help bring about monumental