

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DAILY CALIFORNIAN—A UNIQUE
CAMPUS PAPER

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, one of the great university papers of this country assuredly must be the Daily Californian serving the Berkeley campus of the University of California. It is and has been a fiercely independent newspaper and it accurately portrays student and university concerns. It is now only 2 years old in the sense that it has been totally independent from university funds and hence university control for that period of time.

I enclose a thoughtful article on this unique campus paper from the San Francisco Chronicle:

DAILY CAL MARKS FIRST YEAR OF
INDEPENDENCE

(By Nancy Dooley)

When The Daily Californian hits the streets of Berkeley Tuesday, it will mark the beginning of the student newspaper's second year of independence from the university.

With financial help from the student government and the administration, the paper ended its first year off campus \$6,000 in the black. It survived the dilemmas of paying rent, salaries, printing costs and taxes.

And it survived a few turbulent events, including charges of racism from Third World students. In the words of Editor Christine Welcher, 21, "We were learning what we weren't the hard way."

CORPORATION

Miss Welcher, a journalism and dramatic arts major from San Rafael, describes her editorship as "being the president of a corporation." That's literally true, the corporation in this case being the Independent Berkeley Students Publishing Co., Inc.

It has a formal, 10 year contract with the university, which permits the paper to retain the name The Daily Californian, in return for a written promise the newspaper and the corporation will be student-run.

LESS RADICAL

The paper has become far less radical than it was during the days of upheaval; in fact, some students complain it is now too moderate. One former staffer calls it "absolutely establishment. Who needs that? Especially in a student newspaper."

Establishment or not, The Daily Cal has become more responsible, its reporting more objective.

Edwin R. Bayley, dean of the school of journalism, feels this trend is a result of independence. "I think the students realized they had to sell papers and couldn't offend their advertisers," said Bayley. "You can't step on everyone's toes and still make it."

Editor Welcher agrees, but also attributes the paper's modified tone to a relatively non-controversial year. "We've received a lot of compliments on the paper being more fair, but I still think we have a long way to go."

MONEY PROBLEM

The most severe problem will be money. About 90 percent of the \$275,000 budget will be met through advertising. The gap will have to be filled with \$12 a year subscriptions.

The corporation is still negotiating with the chancellor's office over bulk subscriptions. Last year the administration agreed to a one-time purchase with registration fee funds of 2500 subscriptions for the faculty and staff.

If the deal falls through this year, Editor Welcher says, "We'll have to solicit the departments. We'll also be starting a general subscription drive, and try to pick up some of the nonstudent community."

She makes clear, however, that the paper should remain free to students.

The staff plans to focus more on significant campus news, such as research development. "We're writing for a highly specialized audience," Miss Welcher says, "so we need articles with high intellectual content written in journalistic style."

Plans also include increasing the number of feature stories, heavier emphasis on analysis, and introduction of a world news wire.

"And I want to research the corporate structure of the university," Miss Welcher adds. "It's a major corporate and political force, often at the expense of students' education."

Dean Bayley agrees. "The paper needs to be livelier. It could cause some trouble with good investigative reporting," he says. "They haven't done a good job of embarrassing university officials."

Bayley also feels the staff needs to be more professional.

In an attempt to be just that, the editor has set up strict hiring requirements. Gone are the days when an interested student wandered into the campus newspaper office and became a cub reporter.

Prospective staffers at The Daily Cal have a tryout period, when their stories are reviewed by an editorial board on the basis of meeting deadlines, news content, fairness and writing ability.

If hired, they receive \$45 a month and are required to produce at least two stories a week.

The Daily Cal's future?

"My guess is it'll get better," says Bayley. "The paper fulfills a very necessary function here. It's the only consistent line of communication on campus."

STRENGTH OF FAMILY—VISION
OF THE FUTURE

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the strength of the family as a vital and valued institution of society has been the benchmark in determining the values and direction of civilization. The home, which is the heart of the family, is also the heart of the world. From the sturdy base the direction and form of principle and purpose is established as parents and children fulfill their role and give expression to the vision of the future.

One family, especially blessed with strength of spirit and unswerving dedication to ideals, has been portrayed in a recent article by four sons in praise of their parents. This article, which originally appeared in the Lutheran Witness, has been reproduced by the Bristol Press, the hometown newspaper of Al-

bert and Lydia Jabs who have been subjects of a profile "Our Parents" by sons Max, Albert, Robert, and Ernest Jabs.

The article follows:

FOUR JABS SONS PAY TRIBUTE TO PARENTS

"Our Parents," written by Max, Albert, Robert and Ernest Jabs appeared in a recent issue of "The Lutheran Witness," a periodical by the Lutheran Church. The Jabs brothers wrote the tribute to their parents, Albert and Lydia Jabs of 335 East Road.

The four sons credit their parents and their upbringing for helping them to become better individuals. The sons have also brought pride to their parents by attaining successful positions. Max has his PhD and is dean of San Antonio College in San Antonio, Texas; Albert Jr. is assistant professor at Voorhees College in Denmark, South Carolina; Robert is an industrial sales manager at Agnew Higgins Inc. in Riverside, Calif., and Ernest is principal of an elementary school in Denver, Colorado.

Mr. and Mrs. Jabs have lived in Bristol since 1941 when Jabs began working for New Departure Hyatt. In 1970 he received the General Motors award for excellence in community activities.

Jabs has been active in community affairs including those related to the Republican Town Committee and the Emmanuel Lutheran Church where he has served for 13 years as a deacon and 20 years as an usher. He is also a trustee and was an usher in the Holy Trinity Church of Terryville.

Both Jabs and his wife have been active in the rehabilitation of displaced European immigrants, the aiding of Hungarian refugees and the registering of voters. Jabs, who at one time served as a justice of the peace, also ran for City Council in 1967. Now retired, both he and his wife enjoy traveling. Following is the article by their four sons.

This article is a testimonial to our parents. They happen to live in Bristol, Conn., a highly industrialized town, but they may well be parents in any part of the country.

Our parents were poor in material things but wealthy in spiritual things. They did not have a chance to attend high school, yet their four sons share 11 college degrees and presently hold positions as marketing manager, college dean, college professor, and public school principal.

These contrasts could go on and on—the important point is that our parents inspired us to a high level of service and achievement. The debt owed them is now being paid to the many people we now serve in education, business, the church, and the community.

One continuing theme of the past 40 years was the hope and faith that our parents projected into the future. Remember, marriage contracted in the dark depression days of 1932 by two penniless persons was anything but a hopeful venture. Yet the marriage endured.

Two of the four sons were to be afflicted with many operations. This, of course, taxed the financial and emotional resources of the struggling family to near breaking point, but life somehow went on.

The years of our childhood and youth were, in general, happy and good years. In the lovely Berkshire slopes of central Connecticut our parents hewed a family unit of toughest fiber and strong cohesion.

Mother and Dad reflected the Biblical dynamic that the family unit is the cement of society. They understood clearly that a strong and healthy family life is needed for any society.

In this age and hour the sanctity of the family is under assault from various quar-

ters. Despite all of today's genetic and sociological theorizing, let it be unequivocally stated here and now by four sons of Connecticut that there is no substitute for good family environment.

Our parents may not get any mother-of-the-year awards, but it should be stated that their service extended far beyond the immediate family. Many people were the recipients of their magnanimity and generosity. Countless numbers of displaced persons were assisted in this great nation of ours by our father, who came to the new world from Europe in 1929 at the age of 19.

Father and Mother possess exceptional qualities of leadership, character, and wisdom: Their example and inspiration have made a significant impact on the children.

One of the strongest of God's moral laws is the commandment: "Honor thy father and thy mother." As children we were taught to love, respect, and obey our parents. Parents are God's stewards of children on earth, and we are grateful to have had excellent stewards.

Dad established high standards of moral conduct within the home. The children were expected to respect and obey the parents. Dad had a way of enforcing moral standards with his sharp bright eyes without exercising force to gain compliance, although corporal punishment was used when necessary. Bad language, fighting, stealing, lying, or mischievous vandalism—the norm in the neighborhood peer environment—were not tolerated in our home.

Together with high ethical standards, Dad placed a vital emphasis on educational values and self improvement. His keen intellect was evident from his avid interest in world affairs, and his comprehensive knowledge of history and current events provided a stimulating intellectual environment in the home.

The inculcation of religious and moral ideals was important. The family attended church every Sunday and frequently listened to The Lutheran Hour. The children went to Immanuel Lutheran School, where religious and moral values were vigorously taught.

Hard work was a way of life in the struggle for economic survival. For many years Dad simultaneously held two factory jobs to support the growing family.

In addition to all his pressing family responsibilities and arduous work Dad was actively engaged in service to others as evidenced by community and church leadership. For many years he served on the board of deacons at Immanuel Lutheran Church.

Mother had the responsibility for management of the home and the children. She had a natural gift of handling children without being unpleasant or disagreeable. Her talents as a mother and abundant faith in her children inspired the healthy personality development of the children in the home.

Mom's cheerful and optimistic spirit created a stable, happy home. She had the unique ability to bring out the best in others by emphasizing their positive qualities. The children responding by respecting her and never acting "sassy" toward her.

Mother shared many of the values and attributes exemplified by Dad—service to others, strong character, and capable leadership. She was always in demand to serve as an officer of church organizations and to develop programs because of her abundant creativity and imagination.

Father showed expert talent in cultivating immaculate lawns, beautiful landscaping, and productive fruit trees. He augmented the family food supply with apples, cherries, plums, and currants. Fresh tomatoes, cucumbers, beans, potatoes, and cabbage from his garden helped the family to maintain adequate nutrition.

Our parents envisioned a better life for the children. They felt that education and athletics were a means to achieve that goal. In our early formative years we were given or earned baseball gloves, basketballs, boys club

membership and the like, to develop athletic skills. Collectively we garnered numerous high school athletic awards.

Mental development was not neglected, however. To nourish the life of the mind, current issues were vigorously debated at home. Family discussion frequently centered around the necessity for all four sons to go to college no matter what the cost or sacrifice. Ultimately the educational institution chosen was Valparaiso University, where all four of us were enrolled at the same time during the years 1956 to 1958. This unique experience of family unity and solidarity still continues despite geographical limitations.

Sharing responsibilities was instilled in us at a very early age. We helped to ease the financial burden for our parents by delivering the Bristol Press for many years. In some cases the Press bag was larger than the carrier. Heavy New England snows offered an opportunity to earn extra money by shoveling neighborhood walks and driveways. In later years during summer vacations we picked tobacco in the hot fields of the Connecticut River Valley.

At home Mother developed a creative skill in meal preparation and home management. Her delicious soups were frequently prepared from leftovers, and her pumpkin soup had a superb taste.

Mom had an insatiable love for music. She played the piano and sang with great feeling and gusto.

It is our hope that this story manifests our appreciation, love, and respect for our parents. They have given much to us. They have enriched the home, church, community, and nation. We salute Bristol and two of its outstanding citizens, Albert and Lydia Jabs.

HANOI USES POW'S AS PAWNS

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. 1, 1972]
CRUELTY WITH A SMILE—HANOI USES POW'S AS PAWNS

The pictures of released American prisoners of war meeting with their loved ones in Hanoi, sped around the world via communications satellite, were heartwarming ones to the people of the United States of America—as North Vietnam was fully aware that they would be.

As a well-organized and skillfully orchestrated propaganda effort, the release of Lt. Norris Charles, Lt. Markham Gartley and Maj. Edward Elias was propaganda theater that should win rave reviews of this art's technicians.

By playing upon the emotions of the prisoners and their loved ones, Hanoi artfully turned attention away from the fact that it has completely ignored the Geneva treaties for humane treatment of prisoners of war which it signed. The release of captives is a government to government matter. If international assistance is needed it should be supplied by the Red Cross, not by anti-war activists.

Hanoi deliberately circumvented the legitimate government of the United States, seeking to embarrass the President and to influence American opinion during the presidential election.

The staging and sound effects of the prisoner release were brilliant. Simply by sounding an air alert while the wives of prisoners were in Hanoi, the Communists received international publicity against bombing of military targets by the United

States in North Vietnam. By offering hair-dresser services to the women and tailor-made suits to the men, Communists put on the mask of benign forgiveness.

However, there is nothing benign about their daily killing of hundreds of innocent civilians in South Vietnam. There is nothing humane in their ignoring of basic international codes relating to the other hundreds of American prisoners of war that they are holding under unknown conditions because they will not permit required inspection of camps. Nor is there anything kindly about their refusal to repatriate sick and wounded prisoners.

When the moment of truth arrives, Lieutenants Charles and Gartley and Major Elias will realize that they still are in military service and have certain inescapable obligations. The longer that they delay their required rendezvous with military authorities, the more they undermine their own careers. Moreover, their immediate debriefing by proper experts might be of assistance to the other Americans being held as prisoners of war.

Typically, the North Vietnamese Communists again have exhibited cruelty with a smile on their faces. By their willingness to use prisoners ruthlessly as pawns the Communists again have given us an inkling of how they may use the remaining 1,600 captives and persons missing in action if the war is settled on their terms.

ROLE OF FREE PRESS IN BRINGING PLIGHT OF FORT WORTH FIVE TO THE PUBLIC'S ATTENTION

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the story of the Fort Worth Five, the five young Irishmen—two of whom are American citizens—who were lodged in a Texas jail without trial or bail for 12 weeks, is a lesson to all of us on the importance of informed public opinion to the preservation of our basic constitutional rights. One of the five, Thomas Laffey, is a resident of Williston Park, a community in my district. Today, thanks to the power of public opinion, Tom Laffey and his four companions are home with their friends and families. They are home because a free press made certain that their story was told and commented on to the people of Williston Park and the Nation.

One of the weekly newspaper which told Tom Laffey's story to his friends and neighbors was the New Hyde Park Pennysaver group. In his column "West Nassau Whisperings," Mr. William N. Mairs, Jr., set out the facts and articulated a demand that Tom Laffey be allowed to come home to Williston Park. In my opinion, this article played a significant role in the release of the Fort Worth Five by personalizing the consequences of arbitrary government restraints on individual liberty for the residents of Tom Laffey's hometown. I commend this article to my colleagues and include it in the RECORD immediately following:

WEST NASSAU WHISPERINGS

(By William N. Mairs, Jr.)

For some time now, we've been reading pieces in the paper about a young man from Williston Park named Thomas Laffey. Tom Laffey should be home with his wife and chil-

dren, and tending to the family, social and civic projects that are the delight of every or almost every, active happy suburban husband and father.

But Tom Laffey's not at home in Williston Park. He's in a jail in Fort Worth, Texas and, we read recently, the Federal Government could keep him in that jail for the rest of his days by using the same law that was passed in 1970 to make it easier to run in the dope pusher, the shylock, the labor racketeer and all the other assorted vermin loosely classified by knowledgeable law enforcement men as "organized crime."

And why is Tom Laffey in jail? He's there because he's an Irishman and a man of compassion, which is, as many who know will tell you, one and the same thing. Tom Laffey belongs to an organization that tries to raise money to buy food and shelter, clothes and fuel and medicine for the poor in Northern Ireland. A while ago, someone got into their heads that Tom Laffey's organization was also buying guns and bullets to arm those champions of Ireland's poor, the I.R.A. boys. So they grabbed poor Tom Laffey and put him before a grand jury and said, Tell us about the guns.

Now, the trouble here is that, guns or butter, conditions being what they are in Northern Ireland, what you and I might call an act of charity is called a crime by the British Crown. And all the immunity in the world from a U.S. judge or a U.S. grand jury might not keep Tom Laffey and his friends from extradition to face charges in a British court. And fair and impartial as British law and justice is reputed to be, it's been known to have its weak moments when those whom it treats and classifies as colonial people have the misfortune to fall into its hands. And that means Irishmen today as it meant Americans 196 years ago.

Now, we've not written a word about the Irish trouble since it started. And while we still classify the I.R.A. as the champions of Ireland's persecuted poor, we're the first to say that they've done some terrible things, though God knows no worse than have the Orangemen, the R.U.C. and the British Army. But that's not the question here.

The only question here is why isn't Tom Laffey at home in Williston Park instead of in a Fort Worth jail? To our minds, he's done nothing but try to help the less fortunate and when he was brought to book for that, he's stood on his constitutional right to remain silent about something that he believes and has been advised by his lawyers might put him in a jail cell.

Congressman Lester Wolff has gone to see Tom in jail and has promised to do what he can to help him. For this he deserves a lot of credit and we give it freely and gladly. But it troubles us that the judicial power of our great nation can be put to so unworthy a use as to be made the lobby gob of Britain in its efforts to keep the Irish people from breaking the yoke of London. And it angers us when the lobbygobbing is done at the expense of a free Irish American who must languish in prison because he answered the question, "Am I my brother's keeper" with a resounding "Yes".

We think Tom Laffey should come home. If you think so, too, send this column to President Nixon at the White House, Washington, D.C., today.

WILLIAM F. RYAN

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, all of us are saddened by the death of our colleague, William Fitts Ryan.

As has been mentioned by many Members, Bill Ryan was a man of vision, a man who continually espoused causes long before they were popular. In 1969 Bill and I worked together on one of these issues, the National Living Income Program Act. Later, the family assistance program, which has passed the House on two occasions, incorporated the basic idea of our plan.

For those of us who shared Bill's deep commitment to ending our country's involvement in the Vietnam war, his determination to participate in the vote on section 13 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1972 last August, despite his illness, was, and will be, a source of encouragement until we reach that goal.

Mr. Speaker, our recent action to rename the Gateway National Recreation Area in Bill's memory recognizes only in a very small way the debt owed him by his constituents and by all our people. The future certainly will expand this recognition as many more of Bill's proposals become programs which enrich the life of this Nation.

Mrs. Whalen joins me in extending our sympathy to the Ryan family.

May Bill rest in peace.

A MESSAGE FROM THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE U.S. CAPITOL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, at the annual meeting of the membership of the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, it has been a custom to engage a well-known and prestigious speaker in the field of history, and thereby add to the historical literature of the society and to cultivate the objective of the society, which is "to encourage in the most comprehensive and enlightened manner an understanding by the people of the founding, growth, and significance of the Capitol of the United States of America as the tangible symbol of their representative form of government; to undertake research into the history of the Congress and the Capitol and to promote the discussion, publication, and dissemination of the results of such studies; to foster and increase an informed patriotism—by the study of this living memorial to the Founders of this Nation and the continuing thread of principles as exemplified by their successors."

Mr. Speaker, this year Dr. Louis Booker Wright, a well-known historian and Shakespearean scholar, gave a speech entitled, "These Troublesome Commonwealths." Dr. Wright is a respected and prolific writer. He has received honorary degrees from 23 universities and colleges since 1941. Dr. Wright was also director of the Folger Shakespeare Library from 1948 to 1968, and he is a trustee of the National Geographic Society. Some of his better-known works are *The First Gentleman of Virginia*; *The Atlantic Frontier*; *Colonial American Civilization, 1607-1763*; *The*

Cultural Life of The American Colonies; and *The Secret Diary of William Byrd of Westover, 1709-1712*.

Mr. Speaker, the dissertation "These Troublesome Commonwealths," that he presented so clearly and effectively, and at times eloquently, presents some pertinent observations that are well for us to think on and to learn from as we deal with the problems of our time. Because they are worthwhile, pertinent, and valuable for Members of Congress and for those who may read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am happy to place them in the RECORD so they may become part of the permanent record and, hopefully, many more thousands of people will read it. The article follows:

THESE TROUBLESOME COMMONWEALTHS (By Dr. Louis Booker Wright)

Today we hear constant lamentations over the divisiveness of American society, fractured among antagonistic groups. This divisiveness is attributed to ethnic differences, economic inequality, or regional separatism. Concomitant with the wallings over our divided social structure are calls for unity. One would think that we are facing a new crisis about to wreck the nation. Perhaps we should take comfort in looking back at our history. For we have always suffered from social tensions. Since these shores were first settled every generation has complained of factions and conflicts of interest that threatened the peace of local communities as well as the good of larger political units. Dissension is the price we pay for democracy. Our system of government is very imperfect, but no one has managed to contrive a better one. The Greeks invented democracy and coined the word, but they never managed to achieve either harmony or unity under the system. We have actually come a long way since the days of Pericles and we need not despair. Perfection, like infinity, can only be approached.

On August 24, 1972, the Wall Street Journal called attention to a current concept that is causing a certain amount of social unrest, the doctrine that we can achieve perfection in our governance if we have enough good will, or conversely, that failure to solve the ills of society results from underlying corruption. Politicians have promised to end poverty, and we still have millions on welfare; we continue to be plagued with crime, social evils, and war. Ergo, the Establishment must be callous, stupid, or wicked.

The dream of Utopia, of the perfect state, has attracted the imaginative over the centuries, but it has always eluded mankind. No reformer has ever been successful in remodeling human nature. The Puritans practiced an ethic that emphasized diligence, sobriety, and thrift; but their constables had everlastingly to pursue the errant. Scriptural authority insists that the poor we shall always have with us, and the swelling welfare rolls attest to that Biblical truth. These are old conditions that go back to the beginning of history, our history and the history of everyone else.

Someone has explained the contemporary bitterness over our social ills by saying that what troubles youth (and others) is that now we have the resources for curing evil and yet we do not utilize the means at hand. But that thesis is questionable. It is debatable whether we have adequate ways of solving our problems. And the argument ignores the invincible perversity of human nature. The Calvinists evolved a doctrine of man's innate depravity; but even the eighteenth-century belief in the perfectibility of man did not entirely erase a lingering suspicion in many minds that maybe the Calvinists had hit on a truth. Lately, however, we have returned to the philosophy of Jean Jacques Rousseau and his concept of the noble savage. If only

we are permissive, kind, gentle, soft-spoken, and free with our tax dollars, all will be right with the world, however red in tooth and claw. That belief of course has a discouraging history of frustration.

When we consider our historical background it is miraculous that we have succeeded in creating a relatively homogeneous society and a viable government. Indeed, when Catherine Drinker Bowen came to write the story of the Constitutional Convention of 1787—and the instrument of government that it produced—she entitled her narrative *Miracle at Philadelphia*. And miracle it was, for the colonies were all suspicious of one another, fearful of losing their individual sovereignty, and determined not to fall victims to a powerful central authority. Rhode Island was so disinterested that it refused to send a representative to the Convention, although thirteen merchants of Providence wrote expressing a hope that the "Sister States" would not retaliate against Rhode Island for its lack of participation.

The moving spirits behind the Convention did not dare assert that it was called to create a new form of government. Such news would have meant defeat before an opportunity arose for debating the issues. The Congress sitting in New York had authorized a "Federal Convention" for the sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation. The states were asked to send delegates to Philadelphia for that purpose. But many suspected that more was afoot, and they were skeptical about any good that would come from such a gathering. The remarkable fact is that, between May and September, the delegates to this Convention managed to hammer out a Constitution that the states would eventually ratify, an instrument of government—with its subsequent amendments—under which we still live. This result is a tribute to the spirit of compromise that a group of wise men induced. The result also marks the culmination of one hundred and eighty years of struggle to establish effective governance for English-speaking peoples on the North American continent. As Mrs. Bowen succinctly stated, it was a "Miracle at Philadelphia." Even yet, we wonder how these men, differing so often in their backgrounds and points of view, suffering the tortures of a long hot Philadelphia summer, were brought to agree on so durable a document.

At no earlier time had representatives of the various regions been able to agree on anything approaching unity. From the earliest days, even the smallest communities frequently had fallen to quarreling. From time to time the Board of Trade in London (which had authority over the colonies) or colonial statesmen themselves had suggested unity of action against outside forces or against Indian attacks, but rarely had colonies cooperated with each other. Jealousy or greed too often prevented any effective collaboration.

Quarrels that rent the little settlement of Jamestown during its first few years were symbolic of the rows that would break out in all the colonies. Captain John Smith, whose strong hand saved Jamestown in several crises, barely escaped hanging at the hands of his colleagues. Three generations later, after surviving constant internal friction and disastrous Indian attacks, Virginia had a civil war; Nathaniel Bacon in 1676 rebelled against the government of Sir William Berkeley but died at the height of the uproar, and his forces melted away. Governor Berkeley wreaked such terrible vengeance on his enemies that King Charles II grumbled that "the old fool has hanged more men in that naked country than I have for the murder of my father."

Across the Potomac, Maryland suffered an even more tempestuous sequence of disturbances than Virginia. Established as a proprietary colony granted to George Calvert,

Lord Baltimore, and his family forever, it started as a haven for persecuted Catholics. Cecil Calvert wisely provided for religious toleration of all sects. This did not prevent Protestants from stirring up trouble. In 1654 a Puritan group, finding themselves strong enough, forced the Maryland Assembly to repeal an earlier and tolerant Act Concerning Religion and replace it with one forbidding freedom of worship to anyone believing in "popery or prelacy." Thus Maryland was beset with factionalism that continued for years.

The Puritan colonies to the North, for all their devotion to religion, even because of it, were all constantly racked by dissension. The pious brethren of Plymouth could not abide the pollution of their region by Thomas Morton, an Anglican who set up a maypole at Merry Mount (now Quincy, Mass.), invited Indian squaws to a dance, and otherwise profaned the place. To end these revels, Miles Standish (called by Morton "Captain Shrimp") marched to Merry Mount, arrested Morton, and shipped him off to England. This comic opera episode, however, was only a minor incident among many greater quarrels that disturbed the New England colonies. Massachusetts Bay exiled Roger Williams in the dead of winter for his religious views. Making his way through the snow to Narragansett Bay, Williams set up a colony in Rhode Island that sought to provide for religious freedom for all sects. His hope of avoiding faction was in vain, for human nature prevailed and the settlements of Rhode Island were constantly squabbling over land titles, boundaries, or something or other. It was said that "in the beginning Massachusetts had law but not liberty and Rhode Island had liberty but not law."

Massachusetts Bay, of course, dominated New England but could not achieve peace within her own borders or with her neighbors. This colony's golden age was the period before the reign of Charles II, when the Puritan saints, led by such stalwarts as the Mathers, were virtually independent of authority from London. But in 1676 the Lords of Trade sent over an investigator, a conscientious and irascible fellow named Edward Randolph, a communicant of the Church of England, who made a report that found little good in Massachusetts Bay's Puritan regime. In 1684 the London authorities cancelled Massachusetts' charter and made it a royal colony. Two years later a royal governor, Sir Edmund Andros, arrived with instructions to unify New England and extend his authority over the whole region. In the face of protracted war with the French and Indians, he was ordered in 1688 to add New York and New Jersey to his dominion. Thus the north had the appearance of a union that could face French power in Canada. Actually, unity existed only on paper. When the news reached the colonies of the Glorious Revolution of 1688 and the accession of William and Mary, New England rebelled against Andros and returned to its old independence and individuality.

The new government in England, however, still wanted unity in the northern colonies. In 1691 Richard Coote, first Earl of Bellomont, came over as governor of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and New York and military commander in time of war of Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New Jersey. Although Bellomont tried to bring about cooperation between the colonies, he failed. Quarreling groups feuded with each other and with the governor. Bellomont was unable to collect money or supplies needed for military protection against the Indians and the French. Like George Washington in a later day, he complained bitterly about the government's inability to raise money, to recruit troops, or to requisition even food for the fighting men.

One might think that greater harmony and

a more Christian spirit of charity would have existed in Pennsylvania, founded by William Penn, a gentle, just, and fair-minded Quaker. But peace even in Pennsylvania proved a delusion, and that colony was the scene of constant bickering down to the Revolution and later. The fact that it was the most polyglot of the colonies may help to explain its problems, for its population consisted of English, Welsh, Scottish, Swiss, French, and German settlers of various religious beliefs. The Quakers and the early-arriving German Mennonites and related sects were pacifists; the Ulster Scots, who moved out to the frontier, were pugnacious and contentious. They incessantly complained about the failure of the Quaker government back in Philadelphia to give them any help in fighting the Indians in the back country. The refusal of the pacifists, who for many years controlled the Pennsylvania Assembly, to do anything to protect the borderlands against the attacks of the French and Indians was regarded by others as a scandal.

By 1688 Pennsylvania had become so torn by disputes that Penn as proprietor and nominal governor sent over a former Cromwellian soldier, Captain John Blackwell, to serve as a deputy governor; Penn himself had to remain in England. The pacifists were bitter at having a soldier placed over them and made a great clamor, refused to cooperate with the deputy, and generally thwarted him at every point. Penn, upset by the contentions, urged his deputy to show tact, and wrote that he was "sorry at heart for your animosities . . . for the love of God, me, and the poor country, be not so governmentish, so noisy, and open in your dissatisfactions." After a year Blackwell begged to be relieved and shook the dust of Pennsylvania from his feet. On his departure he declared that the Philadelphia Quaker was a person who "prays for his neighbor on First Days and then preys upon him the other six."

Penn himself had realized that the future success of the colonies required unification, and in 1697 he drew up "A Plan of Union for the Colonies." This was one of many such suggestions made by men on both sides of the Atlantic in the period before the War of Independence, none of which ever succeeded. Penn the idealist in 1693 had also dreamed of universal peace, and during a stretch in Fleet Prison had written an "Essay Toward the Present and Future Peace of Europe by the establishment of a European Dyet, Parliament, or Estates." Colonial unity remained almost as elusive as peace in Europe.

Not only did Pennsylvanians quarrel among themselves, but the colony did not get on well with its neighbors. Penn had a long and bitter quarrel with Lord Baltimore over the boundary between Pennsylvania and Maryland. This dispute did not end until two English astronomers, Charles Mason and Jeremiah Dixon, between the years 1763 and 1767 surveyed and established the boundary between the two colonies, a boundary that became known, with larger implications, as the Mason and Dixon line. The ruling Quakers in Philadelphia showed no brotherly love for their neighbors in the "Three Lower Counties," a region that after Independence became the state of Delaware. The Philadelphians declared the people of future Delaware obnoxious and scorned "that Frenchified, Scotchified, Dutchified place," a scorn which the Scots, French, Dutch, and others of the Three Lower Counties bountifully returned. Amity was not a quality often discovered in colonial America.

Greed for land and greed for the advantages of trade, along with religious differences, accounted for much of the animosity. In South Carolina, for example, the Low-country Anglicans showed little consideration for the Up-country Scotch Presbyterians, who in turn despised the Low Countrymen. South Carolina Indian traders made long forays into the back country to deal

with the Indians for deerskins and furs. This aroused the hostility of rival traders from Virginia. During Indian wars on the southern frontier, colonial governments had difficulty getting support from each other. The South Carolinians claimed that Virginia was glad to see them in trouble with the Indians, or the Spaniards, or with anybody else who might diminish their competition for the lucrative Indian trade. During the savage Yamasee War (1715-1718) South Carolinians charged that Governor Spotswood of Virginia, instead of sending aid to help his southern neighbor, was using the crisis to cement friendship with the Cherokees and other Indian tribes in order to steal trade away from South Carolina.

For some time the authorities in London had been aware that collaboration between the colonies was needed for mutual defense against the Indians, the French, or the Spaniards, as the case might be. Various proposals had been made, frequently by theorists who did not know colonial conditions at first hand.

In 1701 there was published in London "An Essay Upon The Government Of The English Plantations On The Continent of America . . . By an American," a very rare but significant tract that I edited and published in 1945. The name of the "American" who wrote the tract remains unknown but it may have been Robert Beverley or William Byrd of Virginia. From internal evidence it was certainly written by a Virginian who held views that Beverley and Byrd shared. An important portion of the *Essay* recommends a plan of union for the colonies that may have influenced later proposals for unification.

Needless to say, nothing immediately came of the "American's" suggestions for unity and reform, though his views may have helped others later to mature their own ideas.

The most explicit effort to unify the colonies came in 1754 at the famous Albany Congress where Benjamin Franklin set forth his celebrated Plan of Union. The colonies were facing a crisis that threatened colossal disaster. The French and Indian War (known in Europe as the Seven Years War) was beginning. France had succeeded in enlisting as allies powerful Indian nations; even the Iroquois, upon whom the English had depended for years, were being won over by French forest diplomats. In the light of news of deteriorating relations with the Indians, the Board of Trade in London had ordered the governor of New York to hold a council of Iroquois chiefs, to frame new treaties of friendship, and to call upon the other colonies to subscribe to these new treaties. This was the initial purpose of the Albany Congress of 1754.

Governor James de Lancey of New York expanded the purpose of the Congress to include discussion of unified action of the colonies to insure adequate defense and mutual cooperation. Benjamin Franklin, a representative from Pennsylvania, applied his fertile mind to the problem and came up with a proposal for unity. After lengthy debate the commissioners agreed that unification was necessary, and they recommended a provision for a Congress in which the several colonies would be represented in proportion to population and importance. Only Massachusetts, however, had authority to sign any agreement at Albany; other delegates were not empowered to commit their respective provinces.

Some colonies had not even bothered to send commissioners. Because Governor Dinwiddie of Virginia had called a conference of chiefs of the Six Nations at Winchester, he did not think it necessary to participate in the meeting at Albany; Virginia preferred to go it alone. New Jersey replied that, because she had never had any treaties with the Iroquois, the Albany meeting did not concern

her. When the plan for joining into an effective union came up for consideration in the respective colonial assemblies, not one would agree to sacrifice a jot of sovereignty for the sake of union, even for mutual defense.

The idea of union was exceedingly slow in maturation. Franklin's suggestions at Albany may have helped to induce the states, once independence had been declared, to consider Articles of Confederation. But even then individual states were too jealous of their sovereignty to surrender essential powers to a central government. With the former colonies at war with the mother country, it should have been abundantly clear to everyone that unity of action was necessary. Preceding the Albany Congress, Benjamin Franklin had printed his famous cartoon of a snake cut in pieces with the caption, "Join or Die." It was now republished, for never was cooperation more necessary.

Yet the Articles, submitted to the Congress in a first draft by John Dickinson on July 12, 1776, were not adopted until November 1777 and not ratified until 1781 when the Revolution was nearly over! (Maryland for a long time had refused to ratify the Articles because her claims to western lands had not been settled satisfactorily. Other states were also disgruntled at various provisions.)

Although the Articles proclaimed a "Perpetual Union," and provisions gave the central government authority to make war and peace, conduct foreign affairs, borrow money, raise an army, run a post office, regulate weights and measures, manage Indian affairs, and call upon the states for revenue and soldiers, yet the states would not surrender any rights of taxation or permit any coercion for failure to obey the central government's requests. In short, the government could only beg and express pious hopes that the states would show sweet reasonableness, tax themselves for federal benefit, and comply with other provisions of the Articles. Human nature being what it is, either individually or collectively, the Articles proved a very weak reed of government. Indeed, strong governments were feared. Thomas Jefferson believed that the best government was one that governed least. More radical propagandists opposed authority *per se*. Had not Tom Paine trumpeted in *Common Sense* that all governments (read today "the Establishment") are suspect and that "government, even in its best state, is but a necessary evil; in its worst, an intolerable one." In short, men should be wary of authority. This doctrine, lately rediscovered by longhaired youth and the apostles of new permissiveness, has been bruited about as if it were something new.

The propagandists of the American Revolution, having picked King George III as arch villain and catalogued his tyrannies in the Declaration of Independence, were concerned to emphasize the despotism of monarchy and all authoritarian rule. They succeeded too well. They convinced a large proportion of the populace, which needed little persuading, that strong governments are wicked. That propaganda, plus the natural inclination of the states to reserve all real power to themselves, thwarted General Washington's struggle to fight a war.

The low point in Washington's efforts to procure support from a powerless Congress and recalcitrant states came at Valley Forge in the winter of 1778. The Commander in Chief had little money with which to buy supplies and no power to requisition them. The British, comfortably established in nearby Philadelphia, had plenty of hard money, and the farmers of Pennsylvania readily furnished them with beef, pork, wheat, poultry, eggs, butter, and produce of all sorts. In the meantime Washington's troops starved and froze. He wrote desperately to the governors of nearby states for help. To Governor George

Clinton of New York he described "the present dreadful situation of the army for want of provisions and the miserable prospects before us with respect to futurity . . . For some days past there has been little less than famine in camp. A part of the army has been a week without any kind of flesh, and the rest three or four days." A New York colonel wrote to the Governor: "I have upwards of seventy men unfit for duty only for want . . . of clothing, twenty of which have no breeches at all, so that they are obliged to take their blankets to cover their nakedness, and as many without a single shirt, stocking, or shoe, about thirty fit for duty, the rest sick or lame, and, God knows, it won't be long before they will all be laid up, as the poor fellows are obliged to fetch wood and water on their backs half a mile with bare legs in snow or mud." [Scheer and Rankin, *Rebels and Redcoats*, pp. 303-04.]

How Washington won the war remains a mystery; perhaps it was another miracle like that in 1787 at Philadelphia; and, though it must not be said in derogation of the Father of Our Country, perhaps it was in part the stupidity of the British high command. At any rate, Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown and the war was over. Then came the struggle to achieve a durable peace and to unify a country that only the threat of dire calamity had held together during the war. Once more the sections fell to quarreling.

When Chief Justice John Jay negotiated the Treaty of London in November 1794, it pleased nobody, for it made humiliating concessions to Great Britain. But on the whole it was better than a new outbreak of war. Washington used his influence to get it through the Senate and it was ratified on June 25, 1795. "Peace," wrote Washington in defense of his position, "has been the order of the day with me since the disturbances in Europe first commenced." Yet the ratification of Jay's Treaty (as it was called) nearly split the country. Someone wrote: "Damn John Jay! Damn everyone who won't damn John Jay! Damn everyone who won't put out lights in his windows and sit up all night damning John Jay." Yet Jay's Treaty staved off a renewal of the conflict with Britain.

The early years of the new nation were filled with peril, not only from outside enemies but from internal stresses. No European nation expected the republic to last. Although the Founding Fathers looked back to the supposed virtues of republican Rome for a precedent, not everyone believed that a democratic republic offered hope of stability or even justice. Alexander Hamilton in *The Federalist* (1788) remarked: "It is of great importance in a republic not only to guard against the oppression of its rulers but to guard one part of society against the injustice of the other part." Cynical Fisher Ames, contrasting monarchies and republics, commented: "A monarchy is a merchantman which sails well, but will sometimes strike a rock and go to the bottom; a republic is a raft which will never sink, but then your feet are always in the water." Not everyone agreed with Ames that the republic would never sink. Jefferson wrote gloomily to his former secretary, William Short, then in Paris, that some conservatives were predicting the end of the republic with the death of Washington.

The development of two political parties, the Republicans (later to become the Democrats) led by Jefferson and the Federalist (much later to evolve into Republicans) led by Hamilton and others, soon resulted in violent and corrosive animosities. The French Revolution, coming so soon after the American War of Independence, was at first regarded as another glorious attack on tyranny and was toasted throughout America by enthusiastic supporters. But the French abolition of religion and the wholesale executions during the Reign of Terror produced a violent reaction among American conservatives. Be-

cause Jefferson had been an outspoken apologist for the French Revolution and was known to have abetted the revolutionaries when minister to France, he was characterized as a "Jacobin," the equivalent today of calling him a Communist. The Jeffersonians retorted by accusing Hamilton and the Federalists, who condemned the actions of the French, with being at heart pro-English and monarchists. The Republicans even claimed that the Federalists wanted to create Washington King George I of the United States and fasten an aristocratic government upon the land. So the controversy raged, in pamphlets, newspapers, speeches, and in every tavern and public place. The hatred engendered nearly wrecked the republic, and few presidential campaigns have ever been so bitter as that of 1800 which ended in the election of Jefferson.

What conclusions can we draw from so brief a survey of the rows, contentions, factions, jealousies, and suspicions that divided the inhabitants of English North America from the beginning? First we can take comfort in the knowledge that we are a reasonably durable political organism and not likely to collapse overnight. We might remember, a comment by Montesquieu in *The Spirit of the Laws* (VIII, 1748): "Republics are brought to their ends by luxury; monarchies by poverty." Contemplation of that thought by social improvers might be fruitful.

Secondly, we can look back over history and remember that Utopias have ever been a delusion, that the millenium is only a vague hope of mankind, that we are not likely to be favored with perfection in individual or state, and that instant reform, instant social change, and instant solutions of our problems are merely a mirage seen by wishful thinkers.

Human nature remains relatively static and not political nostrums are likely to purge us of short-sightedness, improvidence, laziness, selfishness, and greed. The Puritans tried to improve us by demanding sobriety, thrift, and diligence but it is now fashionable to damn those qualities as bourgeois and benighted.

With mankind's previous efforts before us, we might maintain a cautious skepticism of the panaceas eagerly prescribed by professional sociologists. We might also seek to spare ourselves a flood of verbose advice from Academia, a deluge of words from persons whose naivete about the world around them is sometimes only equalled by their arrogance.

Thirdly, the contemplation of history should leave us with at least a modicum of faith in the innate common sense of the majority of the populace. After all, we have swum to the surface through oceans of nonsense and survived.

We do not need to embrace the multitude with the enthusiasm of Jefferson nor are we required to fear the judgment of the people with the doubts expressed by Alexander Hamilton. Lincoln's comment: "You can fool all the people some of the time, and some of the people all of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time" is still sound political philosophy.

No matter who promises what, we are not going to achieve perfection in our society or even approach it. That is reserved to the virtuous hereafter. Nevertheless, we must continue to struggle for the best that we have a right to hope for: that is, a balance in our political life between extremes. We should hope for wisdom to choose enough leaders with common sense to save us from the glittering dreams of well-intentioned idealists. Wise leadership in a republic is a rare quality. We would do well to pray for it and to remember the spirit of compromise that made possible the "miracle at Philadelphia" in 1787.

CUBAN-PANAMANIAN COLLABORATION AGAINST GUANTANAMO AND CANAL ZONE

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the columns of some of the larger newspapers of the United States have carried informative articles, among them one in the Los Angeles Times by Francis B. Kent, a staff member of the paper writing from Panama, R.P.

In this newsstory, Mr. Kent emphasizes the following significant points:

First. That the revolutionary Government of Panama is working closely with Castro Cuba and that both view the United States as their common enemy.

Second. That following the example of Cuba in rejecting the annuity paid by the United States for the Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba the Panama Government is rejecting the \$1,930,000 annuity paid by our country to Panama.

Third. That technical and cultural missions have traveled regularly between Cuba and Panama.

Fourth. That Escobar Betancourt, a onetime Communist who now heads Panama's National University, is one of the influential men closely associated with Panama's figurehead President Demetrio Lakas, and the commandant of its national guard, Omar Torrijos.

Fifth. That the foundation is being laid to appeal the Canal Zone sovereignty question to the United Nations organization.

Because the indicated newsstory by Mr. Kent should be of interest to the Congress and other agencies of our Government as regards what is transpiring in the Caribbean and the necessity to be alert to it, I quote the story as part of my remarks:

PANAMA GETS INTO CLOSE STEP WITH CUBA REGIME—COMMON ANTAGONISM TOWARD UNITED STATES POSSIBLY SPURS BOND BETWEEN TORRIJOS AND CASTRO

(By Francis B. Kent)

PANAMA CITY.—Slowly but surely, the revolutionary government of Panama is falling into step with the revolutionary government of Cuba.

To what end, no one outside the government professes to know, and those who may know are not saying. The signs are clear, however, and speculation is rife. Officials at the U.S. Embassy here are watching developments with mounting interest if not concern.

One theory has it that the two governments are being drawn together by a common problem, the presence of a common antagonist—the United States—firmly ensconced on their national territory.

In the case of Cuba, what irritates Premier Fidel Castro is the big naval base at Guantanamo. For the strong man of Panama, Gen. Omar Torrijos Herrera, it is the Panama Canal, the Canal Zone and military bases that abound in the zone.

REJECTED DEAL

The United States has long been bound by treaty to pay the Cuban government \$3,600 a year for the use of Guantanamo, Castro, however, rejected this deal soon after shooting his way to power in 1959.

Some \$40,000 has piled up in Washington over the years to Cuba's credit.

Under the Canal Zone treaties, the United States has agreed to pay Panama \$1.93 million annually as Panama's share of canal revenues, a sum which, incidentally, has been borrowed against for decades to come.

Now Gen. Torrijos has taken a leaf from Castro's notebook. The new "People's Assembly" voted last week to reject the annuity, a step that would seem to be little more than symbolic in view of the fact that Panama would not get the money in any case.

There is considerably more, however, to indicate that both Castro and Torrijos are listening to the same drummer.

PORTRAITS BLOSSOM

Like Havana, Panama City has blossomed with portraits of the leader and banners spelling out his revolutionary declarations. Last week the Assembly officially named him the nation's "Liber Maxims," a title long ago assumed by Castro.

Moreover, technical and cultural missions have traveled regularly between Cuba and Panama despite the absence of formal diplomatic recognition.

Following the 1968 military coup d'etat that brought Gen. Torrijos to power, Castro's attitude toward the new government here was anything but warm. He dismissed the coup as just one more military takeover in the ancient Latin American tradition.

The first sign of a thaw appeared last November at the close of Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin's official call on Castro. A joint statement referred to the Panamanian revolution in uncommonly warm tones.

BASIC POSITION

This led to speculation in diplomatic circles here that Moscow had dictated the change of heart. In view of developments since, however, most observers have become convinced that the closer relationship represents a basic position adopted by the Castro government, possibly at Torrijos' initiative.

Since then Cubans have been turning up here in growing numbers, including athletes, journalists and the promoters of a Cuban film festival. Traffic in the opposite direction has likewise expanded. Not long ago Romulo Escobar Betancourt, a one-time Communist who now heads Panama's National University, went to Havana at the head of a student delegation.

The Escobar Betancourt mission was warmly received by Castro himself and the visit was glowingly recounted on page one of Gramma, the Cuban Communist Party's newspaper.

Escobar Betancourt's role in Panama's affairs goes far beyond his university position. He is widely regarded as one of the principal ideological figures in the vaguely defined group of influential men behind Gen. Torrijos. Not long ago in Mexico when Escobar Betancourt accompanied Panama's figurehead president, Demetrio Lakas, on an official visit, the president referred all questions of a political nature to the man who is nominally no more than head of the university.

FORMAL TIES SEEN

Precisely where the Cuban-Panamanian relationship is headed can only be guessed at, although many here have no doubt that it will soon come to the reestablishment of formal diplomatic ties.

Gen. Torrijos has said repeatedly that, although Panama must reserve the right to "choose our own enemies," it must continue to adhere to the Organization of American States' 1964 resolution to isolate Cuba from the so-called American family of nations.

Still, the hemisphere's solidarity on the Cuban question has already been breached by Mexico, Chile, Jamaica and Peru, which have full diplomatic ties with Cuba. Gen. Tor-

rijos, moreover, has been known to change his mind.

More than one well-placed contact here is convinced that Gen. Torrijos will restore normal relations with Cuba soon after his inauguration on Oct. 11 as supreme director of civil and military affairs.

APPEAL FOR SUPPORT

Together, these sources feel, Castro and Torrijos will stand together in the United Nations and appeal to their Third World allies for support in ousting the United States from what they regard as its colonial position on their soil.

Yet other insist that Gen. Torrijos is simply moving toward a rapprochement with Cuba as one more means of irritating Washington.

These sources recall that when other nations followed the U.S. lead in abandoning the Chiang Kai-shek government in favor of mainland China, Gen. Torrijos remained firmly tied to the Nationalists.

His only apparent reason, these sources contend, was to display once more his independence of Washington.

POPULATION REPORT

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) DU PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, last month the Republican Task Force on Population Growth and Ecology released its report on population growth and Federal population research and family planning services programs.

I was honored to serve as chairman. Also serving were MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan; HAMILTON FISH, Jr., New York; RICHARD W. MALLARY, Vermont; and PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, Jr., California.

Mr. Speaker, a summary of our report has been prepared, and since it is of interest to all Members, I offer it for printing in the RECORD:

SUMMARY OF THE REPORT BY THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON POPULATION GROWTH AND ECOLOGY ON THE FEDERAL POPULATION RESEARCH AND FAMILY PLANNING SERVICES PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

One of the major accomplishments of President Nixon's administration has been the launching of a national program to provide family planning services to the more than six million medically indigent women who are estimated by HEW to be in need of subsidized family planning services. In his July 18, 1969 message to the Congress, the President proposed that in addition to the creation of the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare be given the means to

carry out increased research in contraceptive development and the sociology of population growth, and increased training of people to work in the population research and family planning services fields. Congress passed the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970 (PL 91-572) to implement the President's proposed program.

The unmistakable conclusion from the evidence presented today is that continuing increases in total population have intensified the whole spectrum of health, environmental, economic and social problems in all countries and that no substantial benefits would result from further growth of our nation's population. This Task Force by no means views the slowing of growth rates as a panacea for all such problems. However, we do think that the reduction or elimination of excess, unwanted fertility—through improved research efforts, the development of new technology, and increased availability of family planning services—would contribute significantly to the solution of some of our problems and to the alleviation of others. This Task Force firmly believes that all people, given the knowledge and the means to exercise freedom of choice with respect to their own fertility, will choose to act in a manner benefiting their own health and well-being and that of their families. Furthermore, the exercise of this freedom will ultimately contribute to the development of a better world.

Perhaps most alarming of population growth statistics is the high percentage of children born in this country who are unplanned or unwanted. The 1970 National Fertility Study prepared for the National Institutes of Health found that between 1966 and 1970, 44% of reported births were unplanned and 15% were unwanted at the time of conception. In addition, two-thirds of the children born to families with six or more children were reported as unwanted. While unwanted births are experienced by Americans of all income levels, the rate of unwanted births is highest among the uneducated and the poor. In addition, it has been estimated that there are between 10 and 13 million women in the United States who are practicing methods of fertility control which are inadequate to achieve their goals. These statistics are not surprising, given the present state of contraceptive technology.

By 1975, approximately 46.9 million women will be of childbearing age. These women, and as many men, want and need better methods to control their fertility. We know that involuntary childbearing is damaging to both families and children in terms of health and socio-economic conditions. The incidence of prematurity, infant and maternal deaths, birth defects, and mental retardation can be significantly reduced by the use of effective methods of family planning. Unwanted births can cause a family to cease to be self-supporting, and the continued incidence of unwanted fertility can trap a family in poverty and dependency. Families of all income levels have expressed a desire to avoid unwanted fertility, as evidenced by national studies and by the known rate of one million legal and illegal abortions performed annually. Our society has created, through education and technology, a desire for smaller families. Yet we have failed to produce the birth planning agent by which such aspirations may be satisfied, and American women must continue to bear the burden of making amends for contraceptive failures. Similarly, we have not developed the means by which American men and women may overcome infertility problems. America's scientific community has failed to mobilize

the resources necessary to help people exercise one of their most basic human rights—the right to bear and beget truly wanted children.

POPULATION RESEARCH

Biomedical research

Population research in the biological sciences is focused on the basic processes of human reproduction, the development of new contraceptive technology, and the ongoing evaluation of present methods of fertility regulation. Its goal is the development of new and improved methods of dealing with problems of birth planning and infertility.

The advent of the oral contraceptive and the intrauterine device (IUD) revolutionized the practice of contraception; yet, there are increasing signs that neither of these two contraceptive methods is living up to initial expectations. While the pill is the most popular method of contraception, more and more women abandon its use for a variety of reasons. The use of the pill is relatively expensive since it requires, besides continuous medication, periodic medical examinations and monitoring. Some women discontinue use for economic reasons. Women have also been discouraged because of the well-publicized evidence concerning the potentially dangerous or distressing side-effects of the drugs. Some women experience minor but disagreeable side-effects, such as nausea or weight-gain. In addition, approximately 10-15 contraindications and possible side-effects are associated with the oral contraceptive, some of which, such as thromboembolism, may be very serious. For all of these reasons, it has been found that 36%-58% of women who begin using the pill discontinue use within 18 months or must shift to another method.

The IUD was thought to be the perfect form of contraception when introduced for general use. It was inexpensive and there was no problem of continuing application. Unfortunately, the IUD has proved disappointing. Problems with the IUD include inability to tolerate the device, resulting in spontaneous and sometimes undetected rejection, and excessive vaginal bleeding. Women with existing medical problems related to the cervix or uterus often are advised that they cannot use this device. In total, 20%-35% of users abandon the IUD after 18 months of use and must look for an alternate method of contraception.

There are other problems associated with the pill and the IUD. Modern methods to be effective and safe require that patients be under continual medical supervision. They require that patients be carefully examined by the physician and in many cases undergo a number of laboratory tests to detect contraindication or significant anatomical or biological changes. The patient must be followed-up over extensive periods of time, and a considerable amount of attention and time must be devoted to patient education. All these professional medical and educational services are costly.

In foreign countries both governments and people are often frustrated in their efforts to operate successful family planning programs due to the lack of education and the complexity of utilizing modern contraceptive techniques. Yet, it is in these underdeveloped countries that family planning services may be the most needed. Inadequate nutrition, too closely-spaced births, too large families given economic circumstances, and inadequate pregnancy-related services, including family planning, all contribute to infant death rates which are double and quadruple those of the United States and other developed countries. In many developed countries, such as Sweden and Great Britain, where all pregnancy-related services, including family planning services, are provided to

¹ In 1970, Congress established, at the request of the President, the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future to study and make recommendations to the President and the nation on a broad range of questions associated with U.S. population growth. The Commission, headed by John D. Rockefeller III, issued its report shortly before hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Population Growth of the Task Force on Population Growth and Ecology. Because of the complexity and scope of the Commission's report, we are not attempting to take specific positions on the various recommendations.

the people, the infant death rates are lower than the U.S. rate, which HEW has attributed in part to the lack of a well-established system of health care delivery providing all pregnancy-related services to the American people.

What this means is that millions of people in the world—including 42 million American women and as many men—are in need of a better form of contraception, one which would be ideally safe, inexpensive, easily and infrequently applied, and requiring minimal medical supervision. The evidence which the Task Force gathered, however, overwhelmingly indicates that such an advance is at least five to ten years in the future, given present research efforts. It has been sixteen years since the last major contraceptive development occurred. Even if there were a new development, there would probably be considerable lag time before the method could be made generally available to the public.

Until very recently, all of the research and developments in this field were supported by private foundations and drug companies. The private philanthropic foundations are unable to increase their present level of support, which is currently estimated at \$25 million annually. The efforts of the pharmaceutical companies, estimated at a cost of \$15 million annually, are not being greatly expanded. There are a high number of risks for industry compared to the magnitude of investments and possible profits involved. As regulation of drugs becomes more exacting, extensive and more lengthy testing is required by the government for mass marketing. In addition to the cost involved, it is estimated that given the need for the basic theoretical research and testing, it could take from ten to eighteen years and \$18 million dollars to develop a new product, such as an oral contraceptive for males.

The Population Commission has stated that \$200 million is needed annually for basic and applied contraceptive research and that the federal government must provide the major portion of these funds. As many of our witnesses stated, we simply have not invested the resources necessary for the development of a breakthrough in technology. These resources involve both funds and personnel. We also have not applied the very limited resources available in a focused, targeted manner. As a result, we do not even have the theoretical basis necessary to develop entirely new contraceptives at this time. It is imperative that we make up for these long years of procrastination. Failure to do so will result in a compounded setback as the world's human and environmental problems continue to accrue and reach drastic proportions.

Social science research

Social science research in this field is concentrated mainly on demography, the study of human reproductive behavior, and the motivation for such behavior. One of its goals is the development of new knowledge in human reproductive behavior and how this relates to population growth and distribution. Such insight would increase our knowledge of the effects of population changes on the many factors that determine the quality of life in the United States, such as economic growth, resources, environmental quality, and government services, and would provide valuable tools for program planning and policy development in this country and in many nations of the world.

Witnesses testified that research is needed on the consequences of population change in relation to population dynamics such as childbearing patterns (as reflected in ages at marriage and parenthood, and in lengths of intervals between births), changing age composition, shifting geographic distributions, changing patterns of metropolitan and nonmetropolitan residence, and increasing scales of social organization and density.

Studies are also needed to explore the consequences, both immediate and long-term, of births to unmarried women, the consequences of various migration patterns and, particularly, the effectiveness of governmental programs and policies that affect and are affected by population change.

An illustration of how pitifully inadequate our knowledge is concerning population trends is our ignorance about the current decline in the birth rate in the United States. The birth rate has been declining for 13 straight months yet we cannot accurately describe why this trend has occurred nor can we predict how much longer this decline will be sustained. Conversely, we do not know conclusively the basic underlying reasons for the baby boom of the 1940's and 1950's. Therefore, we are unable to predict such radical changes in population. Such shifts have tremendous consequences; an average two-child family would yield a U.S. population of 271 million by the year 2000, while an average three-child family would result in a U.S. population of 322 million in that year. At our current rate of increase, 2.25 million people are added every year, or, as the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future has pointed out, enough people to fill a city the size of Philadelphia each year. Clearly we are at a critical juncture in terms of what the country will be like in the future.

Many scientists believe that while we search for new technology we must also seek to understand all of the motivational factors behind the reproductive behavior of men and women and be able to prepare adequate informational and educational materials for their needs. Our lack of understanding about this and broad demographic trends should be remedied by an increased emphasis on social science and demographic research. Social science research is also closely related to the problems of operational research and delivery of family planning services. If we had insights concerning the motivation of reproductive activity of men and women, we would be able to tailor services, including family planning facilities, to their needs.

Training of researchers

The population research field still does not have a sufficient number of highly qualified scientists. Manpower development is vital to the rapid achievement of research goals, and high caliber researchers must be encouraged and enlisted to devote long-term research efforts in this area. Funds for the training of population research scientists have been held to an annual ceiling of approximately \$2.6 million for the past several years, and today represent less than one-fifth of all NICHD training funds, or fourth out of the five NICHD categories for training and fellowship. In FY 1971, NICHD had the lowest percent of approved training grant applications funded of any other NIH institute. Of 106 approved training grants, NICHD will be able to fund only 20 competing grants in FY 1973, or approximately 19 percent. It is estimated that the Center for Population Research is able to fund only 26 percent of new training grant applications each year. The HEW Five-Year plan indicated that, for FY 1973, its goal was to train 705 population researchers from all disciplines, compared to 240 researchers presently receiving support. Yet, the funds requested for training remain exactly the same for FY 1973 as for FY 1972 and, with inflation, must be viewed as a diminution of the actual level of support.

If research scientists and those who are interested in either institutional or individual training grants find that, over a two or three year period, there are so little funds that their applications will almost certainly remain unfunded, they look to research in other, better supported fields. This has been the case, certainly, regarding training grant

applications to the Center for Population Research, illustrated by the large decrease in such applications in the past two years. Such drops in financial support, and the concomitant decline in interest, are extremely detrimental to the long-range conduct of research and seriously inhibit advances in this long-neglected area of scientific inquiry.

University population research centers

The universities have been the primary locus of fundamental biomedical research, yet this is too often a part-time effort by faculty. Other than the Population Council's Biomedical Division, there is no major free-standing research institute exclusively devoted to advances in this area. Indeed, the HEW Five-Year Plan pointed out that most research in human reproduction has traditionally resided in departments of obstetrics which have been notoriously understaffed and poorly supported. Planning for real achievement in the field must acknowledge these factors.

The Task Force believes that an adequate overall strategy of biomedical and social research in population matters must take into consideration the wide and complex range of scientific variables and, in many areas, the lack of a substantial base of relevant knowledge. The population research field will greatly benefit by the establishment and continued support of multidisciplinary research centers at universities and other non-profit institutions.

The HEW Five-Year Plan calls for the establishment of "at least ten excellent major population research centers" in the United States. Administration witnesses testified that their plans, in fact, include the eventual support of fifteen such centers. Yet, in FY 1972 only \$1.5 million was available for limited support to five population research centers, while approved unfunded applications for center core support totaled \$3.5 million. The HEW Five-Year Plan for population research centers calls for \$5.5 million in FY 1973, while the Administration FY 1973 budget request is less than 50% of that amount. Advances in the field are discouraged by the lack of such funds, which serves to intensify the difficulty of attracting and assembling skilled research teams and other full-time staff. Without assurance of a base of support, talented scientists will devote their energies to more promising and stable areas. This situation can only be remedied by strengthening federal support so as to stabilize university-based research and attract outstanding researchers to this field.

Intramural research

NICHD's in-house research in population has focused primarily on fundamental research in reproduction. Intramural population research has been greatly impeded by a shortage of both laboratory space and scientific personnel. As a result, this program has not been fully implemented. Research capability has not been sufficiently exploited, and no intramural research has been undertaken in any of the social sciences. Adequate organization of intramural research in this field should encompass both biomedical and social science research in a focused and complementary effort.

With regard to facilities, the FY 1973 HEW appropriation bill includes \$20.9 million for the construction of a research facility for NICHD. Planning funds for this facility were appropriated as far back as FY 1966; lack of adequate space and facilities is now seriously hampering the orderly growth of intramural research efforts. The Task Force believes this long delayed construction project must proceed forthwith.

Organizational structure and resources

The Center for Population Research was created in 1968 and was an important beginning in the government's work in this field; however, it is increasingly apparent that the

demands of the field have outgrown the institutional framework to the point that the structure has become ineffective and inefficient. The Director of the Center for Population Research reports to the Director of NICHD, who in turn reports on all the various programs of his agency to the Director of NIH. The Director of the Center for Population Research reports to the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population Affairs. However, both policy and budget requests for the Center of Population Research are monitored and determined by the Director of NIH. The Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population Affairs does take part in these discussions; however, he cannot be expected to play a significant role in the overall information of the budget for NIH.

Most of the witnesses before this Task Force indicated that progress in biological, contraceptive development and social science research relating to population was impeded not by a lack of scientific interest in the field, but rather by a lack of funds and status. The requested \$44 million population research budget for fiscal year 1973 contains less than a 10 percent increase. Given the fact that health research expenses experience a documented inflation of eight to ten percent each year, this budget request level means that population research will be at a standstill, unless remedied by Congress.

In addition, the submerging of the population research program within NICHD must lead to restrictive budgeting since any agency normally seeks to maintain equity among the programs falling under its administration. As a result, the population research program probably cannot continue to grow on its own without some commensurate growth in the other institute programs. The \$44 million request for population research for FY 1973 ignores the recommendations of the HEW Five-Year Plan, formulated and coordinated under the auspices of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population Affairs of HEW. This plan calls for an expenditure of \$75 million in FY 1973, \$100 million in FY 1974 and \$125 million in FY 1975 for population research. However, the budget increases for NICHD have been parceled out with no reflection of the HEW Five-Year Plan. This Task Force believes that at least \$60 million must be appropriated for population research this year. We believe that this figure represents a realistic assessment of the funds that the field can absorb and that are needed to stimulate further research and to promote the development of a more effective form of contraception.

The two major proposals to emerge for improving and strengthening these programs were the creation of a new and separate population sciences research institute within NIH and the establishment of a new agency within HEW that would combine both population research and family planning services.

While the Task Force believes that administrative reorganization is not a panacea for inadequate programs, we do feel, however, that some measures must be instituted to insure adequate growth and development of these programs if we are to meet our national health goals. While the Task Force and the Congress may want to review these alternatives in greater depth, it is clear that the present institutional framework for the federal population research program is inappropriate and inadequate.

Family planning services

Although ideally family planning services should be an integral part of comprehensive health care, this country has not achieved full integration of its health services. The lack of comprehensive health care has led to the establishment of specific family planning services programs sponsored by the government. Pending the achievement of this long-range goal, we must depend upon freestanding family services in this country. This Task

Force is pleased to see that more and more related health services are being added to the range of services offered by these family programs. In addition, we are hopeful that family planning services will be fully included in any general health care financing systems that may be proposed. The federal government must also continue to devote its energies to fulfilling the commitment made by the President in July 1969, when he vowed that by fiscal year 1975 the government should be providing family planning assistance to all those who desire such aid but are unable to afford it.

Special project grants for family planning services are administered by the National Center for Family Planning Services of HSMHA. The latest HEW reports indicate that by 1973, when this Act expires, less than one-half of the 6.6 million women in need of subsidized family planning services will be served. Although the Task Force commends HEW on the progress that has been made, we must point out that funding levels have not kept up with projections and service levels have lagged accordingly. The Task Force believes, therefore, that this program must be renewed and that the special project grant authority must be continued for another three years in order to reach the President's goal of services to all women in need of them. Without renewal and expansion of the project grant program, the rest of the women in need of services may never be reached, given our present health care system. We cannot condemn these women to the suffering and poverty often associated with unwanted fertility.

The HEW Five-Year Plan called for federal government expenditures of \$268 million in FY 1974 and \$327 in FY 1975 for family planning services. The expert witnesses called by this Task Force have indicated that these funding levels are both realistic and necessary for continued progress in this field. We support these funding levels and will work to see that the legislation is extended and improved.

Two developments could greatly increase the effectiveness and the efficiency of family planning services programs: the development of a range of inexpensive, easily administered, medically safe contraceptives, and the advancement of operational, management research.

The present delivery of contraceptive services is limited by the number of personnel needed for information, education, and follow-up activities and the constant medical supervision needed due to the possibility of harmful side-effects. In the average clinic 40% to 50% of the costs incurred are for patient education and follow-up, 20% to 30% is the actual cost for contraceptive supplies. Because ultimate substantial improvement in the cost-effectiveness of our national health care delivery system would result from new contraceptive technology, which would require less medical supervision and sustained educational efforts, this Task Force wishes to underscore the added need for biomedical research and contraceptive developments.

In addition, there is the question of administration. To strengthen the direction and administration of the program, the HEW Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population Affairs was given line authority, through the HEW Office of Population Affairs, for both the HSMHA family planning services program, NIH population research program, the HEW population education program, and the FDA contraceptive testing program. The administrators of the services and research programs, therefore, have dual line responsibilities—one to the Deputy Assistant Secretary and one either to the NIH Director or to the HSMHA Director. This new authority was to be exercised through the appointments of an Assistant Administrator of HSMHA for Family Planning Services and an Assistant Director of NIH for Population

Research, both of whom would serve as special assistants to the Deputy Assistant Secretary. However, to date neither of these appointments has been made nor has adequate staff for the Office of Population Affairs been hired to enable the Deputy Assistant Secretary to carry out the duties mandated by the legislation. This creates a less than clear administrative organization, poor program stability, and inadequate coordination and liaison. It results in insufficient and fluctuating staff levels in both services and research which can contribute to lack of continuity in these programs.

Services delivery research

The HEW Five-Year Plan for family planning services recognizes that for a program of this scale, operational research is imperative to improve program design, improve methods of delivery, and solve some special delivery problems. Increased operational research efforts would be one of the most cost-effective investments at the present. A substantial investment in operational research would be more than offset by improved program efficiency, more economical and optimal utilization of resources at the federal, state and local levels. This research could be utilized additionally to improve delivery of other preventive health care services on a national basis. In order to carry out the research and evaluation studies required, it will be necessary to develop a number of institutions and a cadre of investigators which are committed to long-range research. Failure to undertake this complex research will retard equitable and efficient health services delivery and ultimately increase the cost of the national family planning services program.

Population education

In addition to increased accessibility of family planning information and services, the dissemination of demographic information will enable people to make informed reproductive choices in full awareness of the ultimate private and public consequences of their individual decisions. There are two sources of legislative authority for such information and education activities. The Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970 contains a mandate for the nationwide dissemination of population growth information. Authority for implementing this legislative directive lies in the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of HEW for Population Affairs. To date only minimal activity has been initiated in this area. Staff has yet to be recruited to implement this program. A second vehicle for population education exists in the Environmental Education Act of 1970. Environmental education is defined in the Act to include the relationship of population as well as other factors to the total human environment. While the Task Force recognizes that this is a relatively new federal activity, the population education aspect of the program has not been fully implemented. The Task Force believes that the population education aspect of this program should be vigorously implemented as soon as possible.

RECOMPUTATION FOR MILITARY RETIREES IS LONG OVERDUE

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the following are remarks which I submitted to the House Armed Services' Subcommittee on Retirement in support of legislation I have introduced, H.R. 1198,

which calls for the equalization of retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service:

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE
C. W. BILL YOUNG

Mr. Chairman, I am honored to have this opportunity to testify in favor of my bill, H.R. 1198, the Uniformed Services Retirement Pay Equalization Act, which calls for the equalization of retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service.

As you know, when the military procurement bill was before the Senate for its consideration recently, an amendment was offered and adopted which gave Congress the opportunity to restore a portion of the pension plan which military personnel have long been led to expect. Unfortunately, the Conference Committee on this legislation did not accept this amendment.

One must delve into the history of retirement pay to understand why this legislation is so needed. From 1861 to 1958, with one short break from 1922 to 1926, the law clearly provided that retired pay would be computed as a percentage of rates being paid to active duty forces and be recomputed each time those rates were changed.

Since this policy had been followed for over 90 years, people entering the service during that time had every right to expect that the law would be followed and retired pay would be adjusted to keep pace with the paid active force.

Yet in 1958, the recomputation policy was suspended by Congress, and the law repealed in 1963, and replaced with a plan that supposedly was tied to increases in the cost of living. This substitute plan, which has been in effect since 1963, has no provisions to protect the equitable rights of those already retired or committed to a service career.

Unfortunately, the new approach just has not worked out. The cost of living has soared; yet, the retirement pay has not kept pace. The gap between active duty and retirement pay has grown wider and wider. Like many others on fixed incomes, our military retirees have been hard hit by inflation, and, as the Congressional representative of many thousands of military retirees, I am acutely aware of their plight. Many of these men and their families are forced to live a very marginal existence and, in their letters to me, they express their confusion and dismay over the fact that other military men who have retired recently with the same rank and number of years in service are receiving much more for their retirement benefits. The fact is, a colonel who has just recently retired with 30 years of service makes approximately 33 per cent more in retirement benefits than the colonel who retired with 30 years of service before 1958. Certainly, the government would not have these older retirees believe it is assigning a higher value to this more recent service as compared to that service rendered just as loyally many years ago. We must also keep in mind the fact that these older retirees are not in a position to obtain income from other employment like younger men are.

For these reasons, I have introduced H.R. 1198, to return the former system and equalize the retirement pay with that of active duty military personnel of equal rank and years of service. The current policy of unfair discrimination is contrary to the long-established principle of equalizing retired pay with active duty for the same grade and rank.

I personally feel it is a breach of faith for those hundreds of thousands of American patriots who have devoted a lifetime career of service to their country and who, when they entered the service, relied upon the laws insuring equal benefits for all. The time is at hand to do simple justice and to recognize the great contribution to our nation by those who have served their country with

honor and distinction. Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the favorable consideration of legislation calling for the recomputation of military retirees' pay.

COUNT CASIMIR PULASKI

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, October 11 marks the anniversary of that day in 1779 when Count Casimir Pulaski, the father of the American Cavalry, died in the struggle for American Independence. His name is known to Americans, and to all who value freedom, as a person whose selfless contributions and sacrifices personified the ideals which gave birth to our great Nation. Casimir Pulaski's love of liberty was the hallmark of a life of dedication and devotion to the ideals of freedom. Born in Podolia in 1748, Pulaski realized early in life that freedom could only be maintained through struggle. As a young man, he actively participated in the ill-fated Confederation of Bar—an attempt by patriotic Poles to actively oppose Russian domination. While obtaining valuable military experience and distinguishing himself as a cavalry commander, the young Count could not prevent the defeat of the Polish forces. Stripped of his land by his foes, Pulaski was forced to leave Poland and spend his life in exile.

Pulaski eventually journeyed to France where he met Benjamin Franklin and became interested in the American fight for independence. With Franklin's encouragement and his own love of liberty and national independence as inspiration, Pulaski came to America. His decision to join the American revolutionaries is explained in his own words:

I would rather live free, or die for liberty. I suffer more because I cannot avenge myself against the tyranny of those who seek to oppress humanity. That is why I want to go to America.

Pulaski's feats were not unknown to the American cause. Franklin had written to Washington that the young Pole was "an officer famous throughout Europe for his bravery and conduct in defense of the liberties of his country." In the summer of 1777, Pulaski volunteered as a private in Washington's Army and distinguished himself at the Battle of Brandywine. The Continental Congress then granted him a commission as a brigadier general and placed him in charge of the fledgling American cavalry.

Following additional military action, Pulaski organized an independent corps of cavalry and light infantry—the Pulaski Legion—and contributed to the successes of the American military cause throughout 1778. His aggressive and daring action inspired his men and intimidated the enemy as he moved into the South in 1779. His courage and determination helped save Charleston, S.C., from a superior British force. During the fierce siege of Savannah, Pulaski displayed undaunted courage in the face of fierce enemy resistance as he bravely led his cavalry into the thick of the battle.

Mortally wounded, he was removed to the American brig *Wasp* where he died on October 11, 1779.

Casimir Pulaski, a Polish aristocrat, fought and died for an American democracy. While he never lived to see a free America, he has become by virtue of his dedication and devotion a true American hero and patriot.

The banner of freedom Pulaski so dearly cherished and defended was passed on to other Poles who searched for personal liberty in a new world. Throughout this country, and in every walk of life, Polish-Americans have contributed to the growth and progress of this Nation. Whenever the rallying call, freedom, has been shouted forth, the sons of Polonia have answered eagerly and without hesitation. The heroic honor rolls of America's fallen sons during this century alone contain the names of Polish-Americans—just as the list of dead from the War of Independence contains the name of Count Casimir Pulaski and others who joined in the cause.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent a district which contains many Polish-Americans. Like their ancestors and kinsmen throughout this Nation, these citizens have exhibited the boundless energy, industry, love of family and country, and devotion to duty which have added significant dimensions to the success of this great land. On this Pulaski Day I salute a proud and gracious people.

RATIFICATION OF GENOCIDE TREATY THREATENS AGAIN

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, ratification of the Genocide Treaty, which is pending before the Senate of the United States, would be a crippling blow to the constitutional system which has served America so well.

Unfortunately, too many Americans have accepted the popular notion that this treaty will outlaw the revolting crime of genocide. In reality, the treaty does not cover genocide based on political reasons; therefore, the only genocide being practiced in the world today—in those nations held captive by the Communist governments of the world—is not covered by the treaty. The only genocide proscribed by the treaty is on racial, religious, or nationalistic grounds.

The treaty goes much farther than simply outlawing the killing of a nation or people; in fact, it would outlaw any injuring or attempt or conspiracy to injure an individual on racial or religious grounds. Who can tell how far the interpretation of "war crimes" could be extended?

Since this crime will be supranational and created by treaty it will transcend our Constitution. A defendant, if he is a U.S. citizen, will not be protected by our precious Bill of Rights of the U.S. Constitution.

Ratification of the Genocide Treaty would clearly annul the existing Connally

reservation which is the last remaining bulwark of protection to the individual American citizen from the collective actions of the United Nations.

Finally, the treaty is explicit in saying that the final arbiter of the applicability of the provisions of the treaty will not be the Supreme Court of the United States but the International Court of Justice in Geneva. It goes on to provide for mandatory extradition upon serving of a writ against an individual.

In essence, then, Mr. Speaker, the so-called Genocide Treaty is antagonistic to our constitutional system of government and our personal liberties. It is but another tool of the one-worlders who would push the American people into a system of "international justice" controlled by those who are dedicated to destroying our way of life.

I include an article by the noted attorney and educator, Robert Morris, and a news clipping reminding us that the World Court awaits ratification of the Genocide Treaty following my remarks: GENOCIDE, THE MOST MISUNDERSTOOD CRIME

(By Robert Morris)

TREATIES SUPERSEDE OUR CONSTITUTION

The news has reached me that the advocates of ratification of the Genocide Treaty have prevailed and have opportuned the leadership of the Senate into a vote for early September. This portends a most hazardous constitutional crisis.

The popular notion prevailing, sparked by the President, who I know, knows better, is that this treaty will outlaw the revolting crime of genocide. Genocide means the killing of a race, a people or a tribe. Of course this particular treaty will not affect the only type of genocide the world has known—the Baltic countries, Tibet, Hungary and Biafra.

POLITICAL GENOCIDE NOT COVERED

That brand of genocide, and it was real, was "political" in motivation, and the Russian lawyers at the United Nations Convention saw to it that "political" was excised from the grounds on which genocide could be perpetrated. The only "genocide" that is proscribed by the Treaty is on racial, religious or nationalistic grounds. All the current genocide is political and hence outside the scope of this Treaty.

But it is not only actual killing of a nation or a people that is outlawed. Any injuring an individual or attempt or conspiracy to injure or—mind you—"attempted" "mental harm" to an individual on racial or religious grounds is genocide!

"What is attempted mental harm?" The Black Panthers, before the Treaty has been ratified, have charged in Geneva, that the District Attorney of San Francisco has been guilty of genocide for bringing some of their members to trial for their acts of violence.

This sounds preposterous but you must measure the hydra headed charges that will be brought once this becomes the law of the world, by the standards of the tribunals where the trials will be held.

In the first place, since this crime will be supra-national and created by treaty it will transcend our Constitution. A defendant, if he is a United States citizen, will not be protected by our precious Bill of Rights. Unfortunately, because the Bricker Amendment was defeated in 1954, a Treaty, properly ratified, supersedes our Constitution.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee sought to ward off the weakness of the Treaty—the vagueness of the wording "attempted" "mental harm" and the denial of constitutional rights to our citizens—by attaching reservations to the Treaty. But the Treaty explicitly says that the final arbiter

of the applicability of reservations will be, not the United States Senate, but the International Court of Justice in Geneva.

ANNULS CONNALLY RESERVATION

The Treaty, among other things, annuls the Connally Reservation as far as the "crime" is concerned. It also makes extradition mandatory if a foreign nation such as Red China, Yugoslavia or North Vietnam serves a writ on a United States citizen for genocide committed in its jurisdiction. And of course the hapless defendant, tried in such kangaroo courts, will have no right whatever except something as vague as an assurance of "a fair trial."

What American soldier would be fatuous enough to serve in a foreign country—such as Vietnam—if he were exposing himself to a groundless charge of "genocide" by the North Vietnamese? Under the Treaty the United States would have to extradite its citizens, whether they be Presidents, Chiefs of Staff, Generals or Corporals. It would have to extradite its editors who might write disparagingly of some foreigners because of their race, religion, or nationality, if they are so charged in some foreign court.

Who needs this constitutional monstrosity at this time when we are being consumed by factional charges relating to race, religion and nationality?

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 11, 1972]

THE WORLD COURT: IT STILL FUNCTIONS

THE HAGUE.—In a strife-torn world, an imposing edifice in the Netherlands' capital embodies many of the hopes of mankind for settling conflicts by reason and law.

It is known locally as the "Peace Palace" and is the home of the International Court of Justice—the World Court, as it is called for short.

Built of gray Norwegian granite, pale German sandstone and red Dutch brick, the palace was designed by the French architect, Louis Cordonier, and its beautiful gardens are the work of English landscape gardener H. Marston.

Andrew Carnegie, the Scottish-born American millionaire, dedicated the building to universal peace more than 50 years ago.

The World Court is a United Nations body and only deals with disputes between states.

It has a bench of 15 judges from different nations elected by the U.N. General Assembly and Security Council. They serve for nine years, one-third of the total changing every three years.

The U.N. charter provides that all members of the international body are also parties to the statute of the International Court of Justice. Countries that are not members of the United Nations may also become parties to the court statute on conditions determined in each case by the U.N. General Assembly on the recommendation of the Security Council.

The court can also hear the cases involving states not parties to its statute provided that such a country deposits with the court a declaration accepting its jurisdiction.

The court has no powers to police its decisions.

Members of the court enjoy diplomatic privileges when on duty, either in Holland or abroad. These include exemption from tax.

The Peace Palace was opened on Sept. 4, 1913. Ironically World War I broke out only a year later.

At the conclusion of World War II, when the work of the old League of Nations was taken over by the United Nations, the work of the old permanent Court of International Justice was taken over by the present World Court.

The Peace Palace also houses the permanent Court of Arbitration and the best equipped international law library in the world.

FHA PHASEOUT?

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks I have repeatedly called to the attention of the House the reasons behind the growing criticism of the FHA operation. As a result of over-bureaucratization, a program designed to get people into homeowner status is becoming a barrier to homeownership. As a result, private mortgage insurance is replacing the noncompetitive FHA program.

I am enclosing the following article from the Mortgage Banker, which I think will make clear to my colleagues the problems besetting the FHA program:

PRIVATE MORTGAGE INSURANCE WILL SAVE TIME AND MONEY

There are increasing indications that the Federal Housing Administration is being phased out of the moderate- and middle-income housing market. Nonsubsidized properties will, for all practical purposes, be financed through privately insured conventional loans. Relatively new in concept—having come onto the scene within the last decade—private insurance companies are FHA's greatest competition.

Private mortgage insurance allows a builder to save money and time in the sale of new houses. With the high cost of points to the builder (four to five, depending on the deal and area), plus one point to the purchaser and one-half point for the processing of the loan, and the ever-increasing time intervals to approve the site and houses—six to ten weeks—and another six to ten weeks to process the application, more and more builders are turning to private insurance companies to ease their problems.

For example, consider the proposed sale of a \$25,000 home in Loudoun County, Virginia, and compare the costs and time involved in processing the permanent loan, whether it be FHA or conventionally insured. The current interest rate for FHA is 7 percent plus a .5 percent insurance premium for the life of the loan.

In dealing with a new subdivision of 50 to 100 houses, it would be possible to obtain a blanket commitment of 7.75 percent, plus one point for 95 percent insured loans. The same commitment would allow some 90 percent, as well as 80 percent loans, to give a complete financing package to the builder from the same source.

We will cite the premium rates of Investors Mortgage Insurance Company, Boston, as the private insurance company insuring the conventional loans. The following tables illustrate the money saved by the builder and the purchaser with a privately insured conventional loan, as opposed to FHA financing.

| | FHA | IMIC |
|----------------------------------|----------|----------|
| Construction loan..... | \$20,000 | \$20,000 |
| Interest rate (percent)..... | 8 | 8 |
| Points (percent)..... | 2 | 2 |
| Sales price..... | \$25,000 | \$25,000 |
| Maximum loan..... | \$23,550 | \$23,750 |
| Term (years)..... | 30 | 30 |
| Interest rate (percent)..... | 7 | 7.75 |
| Insurance premium (percent)..... | 0.50 | 0.25 |
| Points (percent)..... | 4-1 | 1 |
| Processing fee (percent)..... | 0.50 | (1) |
| Monthly payment..... | \$156.84 | \$169.58 |
| Principal and interest..... | 25.24 | 25.55 |
| Homeowners' insurance..... | 6.00 | 6.00 |
| Insurance premium..... | 9.82 | 4.87 |
| Total..... | 198.00 | 206.00 |

* \$20 plus 0.75 percent.

The \$8 larger monthly payment on the IMIC-insured loan is partially due to the higher loan amount. The insurance premium for the IMIC-insured loan would remain in the monthly payment for only the first 11 years, at which time the loan would be amortized below the 80 percent category. The FHA insurance premium would remain in force for the life of the loan.

Total costs to the builder (seller) and purchaser in comparison between FHA and private mortgage insurance may be examined in the following way:

| | Percent | Amount |
|-----------------------|---------|------------|
| FHA: | | |
| Builder (seller)..... | 4.0 | \$1,342.00 |
| Processing fee..... | .5 | 117.75 |
| Purchaser..... | 1.0 | 235.50 |
| Total points..... | | 1,695.25 |
| Cash downpayment..... | | 1,450.00 |
| Total costs..... | | 3,145.25 |
| IMIC: | | |
| Builder (seller)..... | 1.0 | \$237.50 |
| Purchaser..... | .75 | 178.13 |
| Total points..... | | 415.63 |
| Cash downpayment..... | | 1,250.00 |
| Total costs..... | | 1,665.63 |

The builder saves \$1,222.25 and the purchaser saves \$57.37 in points. In addition, the purchaser saves another \$200 in downpayment by using private insurance rather than FHA. In the long run, the purchaser will save much more by not having to pay the insurance premium for the life of the loan—which he would have to do if he bought the home through FHA.

Another factor to consider is the time saved in processing applications. IMIC can approve an application within 24 hours after it has been approved by the lender. The purchaser could very easily sign a contract on Saturday, close the loan, and move into the property within four to five days.

Finally, IMIC does not have to approve the subdivision. As long as the lender approves the loan, chances are excellent the private insurer will approve it as well. There are no drawn-out, wasted time intervals and other headaches of trying to meet FHA standards.

It is evident that a builder of nonsubsidized housing can save time and money which would enable him to market houses at a lower cost in the ever-increasing competitive market today. While the subsidized housing market will continue to be served by FHA, private mortgage insurance companies will provide increasing services in the nonsubsidized housing market.

BIGGER NEWS

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, as a long-time sponsor of the 18-year-old vote, it has been my firm belief that our young people are most capable of expressing their hope and desires for our country in a most responsible manner. Yet the press seems bent on insulting our responsible young people by ignoring their views and focusing on those who abuse, rather than use, their constitutional rights.

The following Knoxville Journal editorial is a good example of how members of the press often trip over each other in a rush to point out the negative in-

stead of the positive contributions our young people are making in this Nation:

BIGGER NEWS

President Richard Nixon, who found it necessary to redirect television cameras Tuesday, has touched on what we believe to be his basic truism of current American life.

His stint at directorship came during a speech at the Statue of Liberty when television cameras panned to cover the actions of a handful of antiwar demonstrators who were interrupting the President.

"In addition to showing the six there, let's show the thousands over here," Nixon said, gesturing to his left where other young people were standing and shouting, "Four more years!"

Later Tuesday night the President told the gathering at a fund-raising dinner that it is "news" when a few young Americans try to disrupt or obstruct a meeting such as this. But, he added, it is "bigger news" when millions of young Americans peacefully join in the electoral process by supporting the candidate of their choice.

Amen to that.

CHILDHOOD AUTISM

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the least discussed forms of mental illness is childhood autism. Although this tragic disease has recently become more well recognized, there are still many questions and uncertainties which need to be answered. Presently, the prognosis for these children is very poor. For autistic children with a low IQ, and who have no speech by age 5, the prognosis is almost certainly chronic institutionalization. These children urgently need the proper, necessary care and attention.

As Congress prepares to adjourn, I urge my colleagues to become aware of the problems and suffering which these children and their parents must bear, and to give careful consideration to proposed legislation which would help to provide adequate care and training for the victims of autism.

Certain specialized programs have been established to provide education for autistic children. One such center has been formed at the Pontiac State Hospital in Michigan. The following article, which appeared in the "Report on 1972 Annual Meeting and Conference of the National Society for Autistic Children," describes the function of this program.

The article follows:

THE STATE HOSPITAL CAN HELP

The state hospital is not the port of no return for an autistic child—not in Michigan. This was the message received by those who heard Dr. James M. Johnson, Director of the Child Psychiatry Division at Pontiac State Hospital, and visited the \$2,000,000 Fairlawn Center where 200 children, 160 of them residential, are served. Twenty are severely autistic. Younger children live in the Center, which has the facilities and attractive appearance of a fine school; teenagers reside in a separate section of the hospital itself but come to the Center by day. Emphasis is on parent involvement. Parents are not confined to visiting days, but come as often as they can to work with the children. A child may be hospitalized; he is not "put away." In Maplewood Hall, the unit for autistic children, there is one staff member per

child, necessary since so much attention must go to teaching basic self-care and techniques of daily living. Of the 40 autistic children who have been treated at Fairlawn, 16 have been discharged into the community, 2 into sheltered workshops. Three-quarters of them had no speech on admittance; now two-thirds have some degree of speech. The school attempts to provide some form of education for all the youngsters, gearing the program to the child's ability to perform. Teachers are young and resourceful, but experienced. They talk about their work with enthusiasm, and they stick with it; perhaps the most significant measure of educational quality is the fact that the teachers stay on. One has been there for 7 years, one for 6, one for 3.

The support of an active volunteer group affords extras that make classrooms and units attractive and the companionship for the children of people who care. Rooms for woodworking are equipped with power machinery. There is scope for cooking, sewing, gardening, arts and crafts; in the Day Center for teenagers the emphasis is on vocational skills. Now that children reach the hospital at an earlier age, there are more discharges than in the past; early treatment helps in recovery.

The minimum age for hospitalization is 6, and many parents do not wish to hospitalize so early. Fairlawn psychiatrists agree that a child should stay in his family where possible, so they have developed a Pre-Care Clinic, where children from 2 to 7 selected according to the criteria of Kanner, Rimland, and others, are treated in a pre-school day program. Here too the emphasis is on parent involvement. The mother is seen as an important therapeutic agent; the information she can contribute about her child is taken seriously, and she can feel she has an active part in his improvement. One or two mothers are always present; though other variables change, the mother should be the constant. Therapy is eclectic; psychoanalytic insights are called upon in group and individual therapy. "Sensitivity" therapy may stimulate interaction by putting 3 children in one cardboard box. In group therapy autistic children may be mixed with non-autistic but emotionally disturbed. Operant conditioning is used, but with caution, for fear the requirement for absolute consistency might feed the pathology which insists on the preservation of sameness. (A novel use of operant conditioning is to reinforce positively behavior considered undesirable; when the reward is withdrawn, the behavior disappears.) With these young children, educational therapy is used but not heavily emphasized; the program director believes that autistic children can learn like others, but do not because they see no point, and that their learning will improve when they begin to relate more normally to others. Physical therapy is used to help such familiar conditions as toe-walking, rocking, and fear of high places. The After-Care Clinic also uses a variety of techniques to help youngsters stay within the community and reduce the need for hospitalization. After hearing the dedicated psychiatrists, social workers, teachers, and volunteers of the Fairlawn Center, parents need no longer believe that to send a child to the state hospital is necessarily to abandon hope.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF TEMPLE ISAIAH

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, 1972 marks the 25th anniversary of Temple Isaiah of West Los Angeles. Since its inception

Temple Isaiah has made substantial and meaningful contributions in many areas of religious and civic concern. For example, under the auspices of Temple Isaiah and at the instigation of its spiritual leader, Rabbi Albert M. Lewis, the Robert J. Green contact center was established for the treatment of emotionally disturbed youth and the elderly in the community.

It is with pride that I commend Rabbi Lewis and the congregation and officers of Temple Isaiah for their unselfish and untiring efforts which have benefited all people regardless of race, creed, color, or social status.

I take this opportunity, therefore, to thank Temple Isaiah for its quarter century of service and to wish it continuing success in all its future endeavors.

NATIONAL SENIOR CITIZENS LAW CENTER

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to learn that the legal services program of the Office of Economic Opportunity has recently funded a National Senior Citizens Law Center here in Washington. This new project will act as a backup center for legal services attorneys handling senior citizens' cases across the Nation and will also coordinate legal services advocacy on behalf of the elderly.

The current issue of "Clearinghouse Review," the publication which informs legal services attorneys of developments in the field of poverty law, is a special issue on the elderly. The excellent lead article, written by Elizabeth R. Johnson, discusses the new law center, and I include it here for the information of my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NATIONAL SENIOR CITIZENS LAW CENTER
(By Elizabeth R. Johnson, Acting Deputy Director)

I. THE NEED

Senior citizens account for 20% of the nation's poor, yet Legal Services offices report that only six percent of their clients are elderly. This discrepancy reflects the fact that senior citizens comprise one of the least visible and most neglected minority groups in the country. This lack of visibility stems from many factors including physical disabilities, lack of transportation, pride, lack of information and suspicion.

During the past 10 years this segment of the population has increased nearly twice as fast as all other age groups. Persons over 65 now number more than 20 million and constitute 10% of the country's population. With an additional 20 million Americans presently in the 55-64 age bracket, the trend appears likely to continue.

Fortunately, senior citizens have organizational strength at the national level. The National Council of Senior Citizens has over three million members and the American Association of Retired Persons has over two million members. These groups are beginning to speak out on behalf of the low-income elderly and to seek legal and political solutions to many of their unique problems. In

addition, local and regional groups around the country are increasing their efforts to make the wants of senior citizens known to legislators, administrators and fellow citizens. A Gray Panther Party has even been formed recently! Legal Services attorneys will be needed to represent many of these groups.

The NSCLC has been funded by OEO to develop the capacity to serve the presently unmet legal needs of the low-income elderly. Its goal is to insure the availability of quality Legal Services to the low-income elderly through legislative and administrative advocacy, law reform litigation, training, and provision to the extent possible of back-up services to Legal Services attorneys.

II. STRUCTURE

The National Senior Citizens Law Center is funded through the Western Center on Law and Poverty. The main office will be located in Los Angeles and branch offices will be established in Washington, D.C. and Sacramento, California. In addition, there will be affiliated programs in San Francisco (CRLA), Boston (Council of Elders) and New York City (Legal Services for the Elderly Poor). NSCLC will have a staff of approximately ten attorneys, six of whom will be in Los Angeles, three in Washington, D.C., and one in Sacramento. It is anticipated that the attorneys will develop expertise in target substantive areas.

III. LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE DRAFTING AND ADVOCACY

Through NSCLC's branch offices in Washington, D.C. and Sacramento, attorneys will be drafting legislation and appearing before administrative bodies on behalf of the elderly.

The attorneys in the Washington office, for example, will monitor the activities and proposed rules of federal agencies affecting the elderly to provide early warning of possible adverse actions and to inform interested groups concerning proposals of possible benefit to the elderly. This office will also maintain a continuing presence with federal officials to assure their sensitivity to the needs of the elderly. In addition, the Washington office will initiate proposals for change in agency policies and practices in cooperation with senior citizens' organizations.

The major goal of the Sacramento office will be to provide legislative and administrative models for use in other states. In addition, this office will work intensively at the administrative level to monitor agency actions and to initiate proposals for change. In this capacity, the staff will work closely with senior citizen organizations in California such as the Older Americans Social Action Council. These offices will also prepare materials for distribution to other Legal Services attorneys outlining their experiences and suggestions for strategies in legislative advocacy and in negotiating with governmental agencies. NSCLC hopes to interest Legal Services attorneys in advocacy as a means to solve many of the problems of elderly clients.

Legal Services offices with clients needing assistance with matters that lend themselves well to resolution by legislative or administrative advocacy should notify NSCLC of all efforts along these lines. NSCLC will attempt to provide back-up services in the form of administrative or legislative models. In addition, NSCLC wants to become familiar with the kinds of problems you face so we can take them into consideration in establishing our work program.

IV. LAW REFORM LITIGATION

Although many problems can be resolved through the legislative process and through negotiations at the administrative level, it is obvious that others will yield only to litigation. Since NSCLC's staff will be small, it will be unable to provide back-up services to every Legal Services office with an elderly client and possible law reform case. However, the staff attorneys will be expected to de-

velop expertise in fields of law of particular concern to the elderly (see discussion of substantive areas below). They will endeavor to fill all requests from Legal Services attorneys for information and pleadings in these areas.

During the first year of operation, NSCLC tentatively plans to emphasize income adequacy and maintenance problems in law reform litigation. This focus stems from the recommendations of the White House Conference on Aging, the results of Project FIND carried out by the National Council on Aging and the experiences of previous senior citizen projects. It is subject to conformation by the governing board. The foregoing studies indicate that lack of money is probably the most important single problem of low-income elderly persons. Therefore, the NSCLC expects to work at all levels including litigation where appropriate to improve the quality of life for senior citizens by helping them secure moneys to which they are entitled but have been denied and through reexamination and interpretation of the various private and governmental income maintenance programs. The NSCLC staff would like to work with Legal Services attorneys on cases in this area.

The staff would also like to hear from Legal Services attorneys concerning law reform cases involving elderly clients for the purpose of coordinating efforts, serving as an information clearinghouse and establishing future law reform litigation priorities. NSCLC plans to publish a periodic newsletter reporting matters of concern to those interested in elderly law.

V. TRAINING MATERIALS AND CONFERENCES

Lack of representation of the elderly by Legal Services is in part due to senior citizens' reticence and in part of the lack of training and sensitization of Legal Services attorneys. A major goal of NSCLC will be to ensure that methods are developed to get this neglected client group and Legal Services attorneys together, e.g., through outreach programs including Legal Services offices sending staff to senior citizen centers and by providing Legal Services attorneys with materials on elderly law.

NSCLC's attorneys will develop expertise in the following areas: (1) housing (home ownership problems, federal programs, relocation problems, and open space); (2) health and nutrition; (3) income adequacy and maintenance (private and public pension plans, social security and public assistance); (4) institutionalization (nursing homes, board and care homes and mental hospitals); (5) public services (transportation, utilities, etc.); (6) probate and estate planning; (7) tax problems (including income and property tax); (8) consumer problems; and (9) guardianship and conservatorship problems. Since many of these topics overlap with areas of concern to other backup centers, every effort will be made to coordinate our efforts and work jointly when possible.

Eventually training materials will be prepared for Legal Services attorneys, paraprofessionals and senior citizens groups covering administrative, legislative and litigative approaches to problems in the above areas. The use of these materials will be further explained at seminars and training conferences held throughout the country on a regional basis. The conferences will also provide a mechanism to secure input from the attorneys in the field and provide a forum for informal exchanges of information.

VI. PRIVATE BAR

The Center hopes to establish a nationwide program to utilize the services of attorneys from the private bar in solving the problems of low-income senior citizens. The areas of probate, estate planning, and guardianship seems particularly suitable for this kind of a program. Judicare services in these subject areas might eventually be developed in cooperation with the various bar associations and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

VII. CONCLUSION

The staff hopes NSCLC will be responsive to both the client community and Legal Services attorneys' needs. To do so we will have to hear from you concerning problem areas and approaches you have taken. Please keep us abreast of your activities and we will endeavor to do likewise through articles in the *Clearinghouse* and the preparation of training and other materials.

THE NORWEGIAN LADY OBSERVES HER 10TH BIRTHDAY

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, a very special lady at Virginia Beach observed her 10th birthday. The people of Moss, Norway, gave the people of Virginia Beach a bronze statue of the Norwegian Lady in memory of the men of the Norwegian bark *Diktator*.

I had the great privilege of being in Moss, Norway, for the unveiling of the sister statue there, and I would like to take this opportunity to share the story with my colleagues. The article and the editorial appeared in the September 21, 1972, edition of the *Virginia Beach Sun*, and I would like to commend the editor for his fine suggestion that an oceanfront park be provided by the people of the beach in honor of this anniversary:

HER LONELY VIGIL HITS DECADE MARK

(By Ruby Jean Phillips)

There won't be much activity at 25th Street and Oceanfront this week-end. The season has subsided and the resort part of Virginia Beach is gradually slipping into its winter wraps. But it was a different story 10 years ago. The strip was a hub of excitement: bands were playing, officials of various nationalities were blase in beribboned uniforms, their ladies gala in their fanciest best, cameras whirled and clicked, flags waved majestically in the ocean breeze.

The occasion? The unveiling of the Norwegian Lady. A day long awaited. A day long to be remembered.

Those who visit the site now cannot possibly envision it. Even those who were there that day have difficulty seeing it as it really was. So much has changed. The old gabled, whitestone Princess Anne Hotel stood to the north where her modern offspring, the Princess Anne Inn now stands. The traditional resort-type frame motel, the Breakers, stood on the south side, on a site eventually occupied by the Holiday Inn.

Certainly the stores were there that day: Eric Bye, the Norwegian radio personality who brought the demise of the original Norwegian Lady to the attention of his fellow countrymen; Thomas Baptist a descendant of a French seaman who played a role in the by-gone drama that brought the Lady into being; Anna Herland, a Norwegian opera star, selected by her people as their true-to-life Lady; consuls and admirals and mayors, and city and state and national officials. They were all there. And in the background, ever conscientious of her tremendous responsibility as co-ordinator, was the well organized Laura Lambe.

The day had been in the making for several months. It had, in fact, started the summer of 1961, when Baptist, a State Department employee who spent his summers at Virginia Beach, submitted a story on a wooden figurehead that once stood as a memorial to the

1891 sinking of the Norwegian bark *Diktator*, for the Sons of Norway publication.

The story of how the wooden figurehead gradually succumbed to the elements came to the attention of Bye.

His story told of the tragic sinking off the beach, at the Cavalier Hotel site, in a violent storm, of how the people of this city fought to save those aboard, of how Captain Jorgensen sent most of his crew to safety only to find that he had no way to save his own wife and infant son and some of the crewmen, of how the sea spared the captain but took the lives of the others, of how the people here erected the ship's figurehead when it washed ashore as a memorial to those lost, and of how the captain returned each year on the anniversary of the sinking to cast a wreath of flowers upon the water as his own memorial.

The story, in all its tragedy, was nevertheless a beautiful story of the sea and of men and women on both sides of the ocean who challenged the forces of nature. Even the wooden figurehead, found by the wife of this city's first mayor at 25th Street the day after the storm and eventually moved to 16th Street in a permanent foundation—had deteriorated under these forces of nature.

Eric Bye saw the story, was intrigued by the emotional bond that, though yet unpublished, must surely exist between the people of Moss, Norway, where the *Diktator* had been built and crewed, and the people of Virginia Beach, where the bark and many of her own had come to final rest. He brought it to the attention of the mayor of Moss, who in turn carried it to his council and to the people.

Norwegians, ever tied to the traditions of the sea, picked up the standard of the *Diktator* and by urging their officials and digging into their own pockets, commissioned a prominent sculptor to create two identical statues: one to stand at Virginia Beach, at the site where the original figurehead first stood, the other at Moss, Norway, facing her twin across the ocean.

And so it was that the people of Moss gave to the people of Virginia Beach a most treasured gift, a towering bronze lady that looks forever across the Atlantic, a lady of tranquil beauty who stands as a memorial to all men lost at sea, and as a reminder of the affection and dedication a common tragedy can generate between two peoples separated only by geographical distance, not by human compassion.

When the shroud dropped from the Norwegian Lady that day 10 years ago, a hush came over the audience. Her description had been a closely guarded secret. Now she was unveiled. And at the exact moment in Norway, Virginia Beach City Manager Russell Hatchett pulled the cord that unveiled her twin. It is easy to imagine that a similar hush fell over the Norwegian audience, for it was they who had sacrificed to make the "sisters" possible. And, on both sides of the Atlantic, the beauty of the bronze faces, and the beauty of all they represented, was almost too much to bear.

The elements have attacked The Lady, as they did her wooden ancestor, but he has merely weathered the attacks and has grown more beautiful with each passing year. She is visited by thousands, the curious who wonder why she is there, the loved ones who know her story and reach out affectionately to touch her base.

It will be quiet at the Norwegian Lady site this week-end. But the beauty and excitement of that day 10 years ago will ring in the memories of those who were there. And they will sigh a silent "thank you" to all who worked to bring to these shores the tranquil amazon who will look forever toward her sister in Moss, Norway, across the sea.

SHE'S WAITING

I am The Norwegian Lady; I stand here as my sister before me to wish all men of the sea safe return home.

It's been ten years since the Norwegian Lady statue first peeped from behind the shroud that kept her beauty a surprise to her new "family", the people of Virginia Beach. Ten Years. It doesn't seem possible. But, then, time flies so swiftly.

The Lady is a very precious gift, a very sentimental reminder that the sharing of a tragedy can bring together peoples of different environments in the common bond of compassion for fellow man.

But recipients of this gift seem to have forgotten that plans originally called for a park to complete the statue site, a park for meditation, a park of Sunday afternoon band concerts, a park to enhance the beauty of the lovely Lady and to honor the Norwegians who gave generously so that Virginia Beach might have a bronze twin sister to their own Lady in Moss, Norway.

Several months ago the Sun brought before the people here the need for funds to complete this plan and suggested that such a park could be constructed if each family would contribute but two dollars. How much more fitting it would be if the people of Virginia Beach were to give of themselves so that this park might be possible rather than expect the City to provide the funds... a public show of appreciation for all that the Norwegian people did in providing the beloved Lady memorial.

The Sun's appeal for funds for the Norwegian Lady Park fell on unsympathetic ears. The people did not respond. Not even with one or two dollars per family. How sad that the American people cannot equal the generosity of their Norwegian friends. For it will be those who live in, and visit, Virginia Beach who truly benefit from the beauty of an oceanfront park at 25th Street.

The Norwegian Lady is very dear to Virginia Beach. Perhaps her tenth anniversary here will sufficiently inspire those who love her most to remember her with a long-awaited park.

SCHALLER'S BAKERY

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following letter which I recently addressed to Chairman POAGE and the letter from my constituents, Schaller's Bakery, which prompted it. I feel sure that there is hardly one among us who does not have such a bakery in his or her district. And, therefore, does not share the responsibility of trying to relieve the plight of these hard-pressed people. The independent, small businessman is part of our American heritage, and to put him out of operation through unconscionable, cavalier acts by our own administration is disgraceful. We would be eschewing our responsibilities as Members of Congress if we do not take immediate steps to help these people:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., October 3, 1972.

HON. W. R. POAGE,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Recently at the very fine affair that we both attended in honor of our mutual friend Wat Abbitt, I discussed with you the problem of Schaller's; the only remaining bakery of any size in our whole western end of the State of Pennsylvania. You will note from their let-

ter to me that they employ sixty people, which is not a small payroll in the bakery business. I discussed with you the human consumption tax and how it unintentionally places the Congress in a position of taxing those least able to pay—the large family, lower-income bread consumers—and, in effect, subsidized the higher-income families who could be termed the meat-eating group.

I don't know whether anything can be done; but, if some hope can be given to the Schaller folks, I am sure that they would reconsider their determination to close their bakery.

You will note that the tax on this small bakery amounts to 10% of their gross business before any costs, wages, raw materials and other expenses are deducted. I know of no other industry in the United States that carries such an exorbitant burden. This is especially burdensome to this type of bakery whose only customers are individuals. Their delivery costs must necessarily be higher than chain operations, who in most cases have their own bakery and deliver bakery products in the course of normal deliveries of other commodities. They also have to cater to the many tastes and demands of individuals rather than the single item production of chain store outlets.

I sincerely believe this to be a very unfair arrangement and one that I am sure will come up for very serious discussion when the next Agriculture Bill comes up for consideration. There are so few outlets left where family type operations can survive that to continue such a one sided exorbitant tax on this group is both uneconomical, unwise and eminently unfair. While it is late in the session, and perhaps this is too big an issue to try to put through this session, in the name of fair play an effort is justified.

Recently, overnight, after the fiasco of the Russian Wheat Deal, which has triggered this crisis for the Schallers and thousands of other bakeries, the export subsidy was removed; and, I believe that proper urging by your Committee would make Congress follow your leadership in removing this bread price increase through taxes with or without hearings. I am convinced that the criticisms leveled at Congress for avoiding many of our Constitutional rights and duties are well deserved. In all the years that the Schallers have run their bakery, I have known of no time that they ever appealed for consideration or condemned governmental policies.

I am joined in this appeal, I am sure, by my two U.S. Senators and cooperation from that side should be forthcoming. I have taken the liberty of sending this letter to all of the Members of Congress in the hope that others will feel as disturbed as I do over this whole situation.

With kindest personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

SCHALLER'S FINE BAKERS,
Greensburg, Pa., September 22, 1972.

Hon. JOHN H. DENT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DENT: Thank you for your prompt reply to our telegram of September 20th. In response to your request for a follow-up letter on our crisis, we submit the following:

The recent skyrocketing wheat prices and the resultant increase in flour costs will effectively terminate the operations of a great many wholesale bakery operations in the United States, including Schaller's Bakery.

We do not contest the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union, but we do contest the United States Department of Agriculture Wheat Subsidy Program that in effect brought about the flour price crisis when incorporated with the catalyst of the wheat sales to the Soviet Union.

The current USDA Wheat Subsidy Program amounts to a grossly unfair tax upon the flour product consumer. Those people who can least afford additional taxes . . . the people who use bread, macaroni, and other wheat flour products in lieu of the more expensive wheat proteins . . . pay a disproportionate share of tax via the Wheat Milling Certificate. A certificate of \$.75 per bushel of wheat or \$1.75 per cwt. of flour.

Our bakery alone has unwittingly passed on approximately \$75,000.00 of this tax on this year's sales of \$750,000.00! Multiply this modest sum by the annual wheat flour product sales in the United States and you arrive at an amount that staggers the mind! Certainly this money or any part of it was never intended to be what amounts to a subsidy for marginal farming, an inefficient marketing system, or the citizens of the Soviet Union.

We propose the elimination of the wheat milling certificate. The elimination of this inequitable tax would result in not only immediate price relief for the flour purchaser, but would also return the right of the power of taxation to the legislative bodies of government.

Prompt cancellation of the milling certificate tax would grant us the urgently needed price relief we must have and would negate the necessity of a price increase for wheat flour products, and would quite possibly lower the prices of such products to the consumer.

We anxiously await some positive action from the halls of government that will allow us to continue in business to a 71st anniversary, to carry on as a responsible, tax paying community institution, and to save the jobs of our 40 employees and 20 route-men.

Will you please advise us of any progress in the solution of this crisis . . . as it directly affects our survival within the next 58 days?

Thank you again for your time and attention?

Sincerely yours,
WEDDELL G. SCHALLER,
President.

ROBERT E. BASKIN

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recently one of the old time faces in the news world departed Washington to return to his native State. I am speaking of Bob Baskin, Washington bureau chief of the Dallas Morning News.

I had the pleasure of knowing Bob for his entire tenure of service here in Washington and found him to be one of the most sincere and honest reporters in the business. Our relationship was most cordial and I was indeed sorry to see Bob depart the Washington scene. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include an article which appeared in the September 20 edition of the Dallas Morning News relative to Bob which I believe certainly speaks well of his endeavors.

The article follows:

ROBERT BASKIN—WASHINGTON BUREAU CHIEF RETURNS HOME TO TEXAS

(By Paul Crume)

After 14 years of trailing presidents over four continents, covering the comings and

goings of the earth's heads of states and recording an era of legislative and judicial change in Washington, Robert E. Baskin is back home in Texas.

This month Baskin turned over his duties as chief of the Washington bureau of The News to John Geddie with few regrets. He says he has just had enough. He enjoyed the turbulent and often violent years of the 60s when Washington was capital of the world, but the enjoyment eroded under the difficulties of living in the nation's capital.

And even in the beginning, he says, he never liked the Washington winters.

Baskin will operate on a roving assignment from the Dallas office of The News, concentrating mostly on national politics.

Actually, Baskin could probably cover the national scene at the moment by telephone, so vast in his acquaintanceship with politicians and their satellites. His friends among Senators, Representatives, administrative officials, state politicians, lobbyists, lawyers and the nation's newspapermen run into the thousands.

Baskin does not seem to be a mixer. Normally, he exudes an air of polite caution. He is reticent, even a little reserved. Now fiftyish, he is a neatly built man though his waistline has grown a little, and there is something old fashioned and faintly patrician about his manner. The typical Baskin laugh is a gentle, puff-jawed snort. The glint in his eyes tells of his enjoyment.

But he is a companionable person. He was active in the National Press Club, though he never held office. He carried on the tradition, begun by the late Walter Hornady, of holding a yearly blackeye pea dinner at his home where the Texas colony in Washington gathered to eat peas, turnips and turnip greens and hush puppies.

He was one of the Washington stalwarts of the Chili Appreciation Society International and prides himself with a part in reforming to chili standards of the national capital.

He was born in Seymour, the son of a banker who had been a small town editor and who wrote for the Wichita Falls newspapers even after he became a banker. Bob took a degree in journalism at the University of Texas in 1938 and then spent two and half years on the Wichita Falls News-Record.

The Army got him in 1941. He entered the Army in the 36th Division, but after officer's training at Fort Benning, he was assigned to 85th Division at Camp Shelby, Miss. Arriving there, he found himself not an infantry officer but, because of his newspaper training, the intelligence officer of a regiment.

He went to Europe with the 85th Division, serving as an intelligence officer during the Italian campaign. The Division one night captured the intelligence officer of the Hermann Goering Division. Baskin was duty officer that night, and the two talked for three hours. Mostly, the German officer talked apprehensively about what was likely to happen to him.

Baskin went to work for the Fort Worth Star-Telegram in 1945 and joined The News in September, 1947.

He worked first on the copy desk where he earned a reputation as a meticulous editor and an exacting copy-desk chief. A reporter by inclination, he left the desk in 1952 and spent six years covering Texas politics. In 1958, he was transferred to the bureau which The News has maintained in Washington since 1889.

At the time, Baskin was an aide to Hornaday. Though they covered the White House and the courts, the two concentrated their attention on Congress. That is where the action was in the last years of the Eisenhower administration.

Hornaday preferred the common touch of the House and was not overly impressed by the grandeur of the Senate. Baskin thus drew the job of covering the Senate during the years when Lyndon B. Johnson was

being what he called "the best damn majority leader" in history.

Baskin became bureau chief when Hornaday retired in 1960. At the time, public attention was shifting from Congress to the presidency.

Baskin continued the old routine. He kept up with the day-to-day minutiae of politics across the nation. He and his staff covered Congressional sessions which, in accumulation, all but revolutionized American society. He made every national convention.

Of necessity, however, he concentrated more on the president. Baskin was often pool reporter on presidential trips across the nation and abroad. He went with President Kennedy to South America. He trailed President Johnson to Mexico and was in the press party that accompanied Johnson on his 21-day tour of Australia, the Philippines and Indo-China. During those years, Baskin made two trips to South Vietnam.

On his last trip, he went with President Nixon to the Moscow Summit.

But Baskin says that is all over. Texas is better.

WEEKLY REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT CONSTITUENTS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I include the text of my last weekly report, "An Assessment of the Vietnam war." The report follows:

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE VIETNAM WAR (By Congressman Lee Hamilton)

Although American ground troops no longer fight there, the Vietnam war continues to require the presence of some 120,000 U.S. servicemen in Southeast Asia, and to drain our resources (about \$12 billion this year). After eight years of involvement in an issue which rates as the most important for most Americans, another assessment of the war is appropriate.

THE WAR

The current military situation in South Vietnam can best be described as a stalemate. Both North and South Vietnam have been badly mauled in the North's six-month-long offensive and neither side has been able to achieve a significant victory, and no end to the fighting is in sight. South Vietnamese troops, which have taken over all ground combat missions, have fought heroically in some instances, badly in others.

The massive American bombing of military and supply targets in both the North and South (600,000 tons a month, twice the 1971 rate), and the mining of North Vietnamese ports, have hampered the North's operations, but have not created critical shortages of food, fuel, and arms. American intelligence agencies believe that Hanoi is able to sustain the present rate of fighting for two years.

Hanoi still controls large portions of the five northern provinces in South Vietnam, remains entrenched in the central highlands and the Mekong River Delta, and is still capable of launching rocket attacks on Saigon. The enemy controls, or has influence over about one-fifth of the South Vietnamese population, which has seriously hampered, if not destroyed, pacification efforts.

THE ECONOMY

South Vietnam is suffering from its worst recession, an inflation rate which exceeds 15

percent a year, nearly-stagnant economic growth, and high unemployment—largely because of the American cutback and the collapse of those businesses which had been dependent upon American customers.

The fighting has wreaked havoc among the country's rubber plantations, producers of the country's largest export commodity. Despite a record rice crop, the South Vietnamese will have to import up to 200,000 tons. The flood of refugees, estimated at nearly a million since the spring offensive, now requires more than \$200,000 each day in survival aid. All this points to continued, extensive American assistance if the country is going to survive.

POLITICS

South Vietnamese President Thieu continues to concentrate government power in his own hands, to the point where he now rules by decree. His most recent political power plays, carried out in the name of national security, include (1) abolishing free elections of village officials, and (2) imposing censorship bonds on all newspapers, putting many publishers critical to his regime out of business.

PEACE NEGOTIATIONS

The Paris Peace Talks, which will soon enter their fifth year, are stymied, but both sides continue to meet, in public and in secret. Henry Kissinger, the President's foreign policy adviser, has met 18 times with Hanoi's negotiators since 1969, but there has been little evidence of movement on either side. The tempo of the private meetings has increased, however, and there is increasing speculation of a break in the impasse.

The fundamental issue continues to be: "Who is going to control South Vietnam?"

The American position is (1) the withdrawal of troops within six months of an overall settlement, (2) release of prisoners concurrently with U.S. troop withdrawal, (3) a cease-fire throughout Indochina at the time of overall settlement, (4) a free, democratic presidential election in South Vietnam within 6 months of an overall agreement. South Vietnam's President and Vice-President would resign one month before the election.

Hanoi has refused to discuss the U.S. approach, demanding total, unconditional U.S. withdrawal by a fixed date, and the replacement of the Saigon government by a coalition regime. U.S. prisoners would be released when the withdrawal is completed. The negotiators continue to insist upon the immediate resignation of President Thieu and the establishment of a coalition government as a prerequisite to elections in the South.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 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?

GENERAL PERSHING'S LETTER TO RETURNING SOLDIERS

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD a recent letter to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff along with an enclosure I sent to him. The letters explain themselves, I believe, and should be rather thought provoking to anyone concerned about our country and its destiny.

The letter follows:

OCTOBER 4, 1972.

Adm. THOMAS H. MOORER, USN
Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ADMIRAL MOORER: During a recent visit to the Second District of Indiana I enjoyed a visit with a distinguished senior citizen, Mr. Arthur J. Slont of Chesterton, Indiana. Mr. Slont is 83-years-young, an unabashed patriot, and a veteran of the American Expeditionary Force of World War I.

He shared with me an aging document that he quite obviously cherished. It was a letter sent by General John J. "Blackjack" Pershing to each of his soldiers as they returned to the States from their victorious service in France.

As I read the letter and reflected upon the historic events of some 54 years ago, I, too, was filled with poignant inspiration.

It was inescapable to draw some comparisons with events of this decade. Many contrasts in circumstances are starkly self-evident.

However, I am most curious as to whether or not our men returning from the battles of Southeast Asia receive a similar communication from their commander, and, if so, what does it say? Could you send a copy to me?

Would that we could refer to such "resolute purpose", such "willing sacrifice" in the cause of liberty, and such "overwhelming victories" to leave as a legacy of our stewardship to be read by an admiring generation 54 years from now.

I will attach a copy of Pvt. 1cl. Arthur J. Slont's letter from General Pershing for your interest.

Sincerely,

EARL F. LANDGREBE.

GHQ AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY

FORCES,

FRANCE, February 28, 1919.

General Orders, No. 38-A

MY FELLOW SOLDIERS: Now that your service with the American Expeditionary Forces is about to terminate, I can not let you go without a personal word. At the call to arms, the patriotic young manhood of America eagerly responded and became the formidable army whose decisive victories testify to its efficiency and its valor. With the support of the nation firmly united to defend the cause of liberty, our army has executed the will of the people with resolute purpose. Our democracy has been tested, and the forces of autocracy have been defeated. To the glory of the citizen-soldier, our troops have faithfully fulfilled their trust, and in a succession of brilliant offensives have overcome the menace to our civilization.

As an individual, your part in the world war has been an important one in the sum total of our achievements. Whether keeping lonely vigil in the trenches, or gallantly storming the enemy's stronghold; whether enduring monotonous drudgery at the rear, or sustaining the fighting line at the front,

each has bravely and efficiently played his part. By willing sacrifice of personal rights; by cheerful endurance of hardship and privation; by vigor, strength and indomitable will, made effective by thorough organization and cordial co-operation you inspired the war-worn Allies with new life and turned the tide of threatened defeat into overwhelming victory.

With a consecrated devotion to duty and a will to conquer, you have loyally served your country. By your exemplary conduct a standard has been established and maintained never before attained by any army. With mind and body as clean and strong as the decisive blows you delivered against the foe you are soon to return to the pursuits of peace. In leaving the scenes of your victories, may I ask that you carry home your high ideals and continue to live as you have served—an honor to the principles for which you have fought and to the fallen comrades you leave behind.

It is with pride in our success that I extend to you my sincere thanks for your splendid service to the army and to the nation.

Faithfully,

JOHN J. PERSHING,
Commander in Chief.

Official: Robert C. Davis, Adjutant General.
Copy furnished to Pvt. 1st. Arthur J. Slont, Company "C" 309th Engineers, (Capt. H. E. Taylor), Commanding.

PARK CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, last month we celebrated the anniversary of the opening of the first national park. In the century since the park opened, the political, social, and economic values of the American people have changed as we have gone from a rural to an urban society. We are now looking for more ways and places in which to spend our leisure time and the national parks and seashore parks provide the most perfect outlet.

Our colleague, JOE SKUBITZ, of Kansas, spoke eloquently of this "outlet" in a speech he delivered before a "Conference on the National Parks in Their Regional, State, and Local Environments." His remarks dealt with a problem that is becoming ever more troublesome: the overcrowding of our parks and shore areas. The fact is that there are no longer enough places where people can go to escape the fast pace of urban life. The masses of the cities clog the superhighways on weekends and holidays as they seek to "commune with nature." Their escape is short lived, however, for when they arrive at a park or beach they are confronted with countless others who had sought the same solitude.

There may come a time when we will be forced to have parks within parks so that everyone can be served. The urban dweller is looking more and more for an escape from the "rat race." He is becoming less concerned about traveling for several hours to find the solitude offered by forests or beaches. At the same time, however, the less privileged city dweller does not have the means to drive

a distance or stay overnight; his needs for recreation and peace must be met.

Still another whose needs must be met are those who live in areas that because of their beauty and serenity have become too popular. Such is the case with Cape Cod and its offshore islands, particularly those of Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket. The enlightened comments Mr. SKUBITZ makes concerning the problems confronting national parks are particularly timely in this regard.

Senator KENNEDY has introduced a bill in the Senate—the Nantucket Sound Islands trust bill—that deals with those problems mentioned above. The Senator's proposal provides for a cooperative effort between the Federal Government and the local governments and is aimed at conserving the land on the islands. The bill provides for three types of areas: Lands forever wild, scenic preservation, and those planned for town development. This proposal attempts to create a balance between the needs of the towns and their residents on Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket and for visitors from all across the Nation who journey there for recreation and relaxation.

We have vast expanses of land that offer solitude and inspiration to our citizens. More and more of those citizens are taking advantage of our mobile society to visit national parks. The parks are becoming overcrowded and polluted. We must begin to use our land wisely and the land use bill, currently before the Congress, will undoubtedly help us in our plans for the future. There must be a joint effort on the part of the Federal Government, State governments, and local governments to plan for land use; not only for the benefit of our industrial economy, but for the men and women who work for those industries and who buy the products they manufacture.

Mr. SKUBITZ' remarks, then, are timely and important. As we begin to get ready to rush out of the city on this holiday weekend, I recommend that my colleagues pause for a moment and read his statement:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOE SKUBITZ

Mr. Chairman, Delegates to the Conference, Ladies and Gentlemen, I am most grateful to my friend, Nathaniel Reed, for his complimentary references. I am, after all, a rather humble worker in the vineyard, a Member of Congress from a state and a region that is not blessed with the wild beauty that we witness about us here in Yellowstone or in neighboring Grand Teton.

Nevertheless, in my service on the National Parks Subcommittee I have come to have some familiarity with the National Parks of the United States, and indeed, with a few of the Parks in the lands of our distinguished visitors. I hope, before I leave this earth, to have the pleasure of visiting many more of the wonderlands that man has preserved, and in some cases helped create. So I consider it an honor to share this platform with the Governors of Wyoming and Idaho, the Land Director of Montana, and my colleagues of the House Interior Committee. Those who have preceded me have dealt, in part at least, with aspects of our Panel 3 subject matter that I too may touch upon. Since the subject of regional, state, and local environments, in their effect on the establishment and maintenance of National Parks and monuments, is by its very nature an overlapping proposition.

We must begin, I suppose by asking ourselves, as did the ancient Romans: Quo vadis; whither are we going; what is next.

We who are gathered here this week to celebrate the 100th Anniversary of the establishment of the first National Park in the world might well ask ourselves the same question. With an ever-expanding population; with parks jammed with almost unmanageable crowds; with inadequate funds for development and maintenance; we too must face the questions—Where are we going, what is next?

We cannot, in my judgment, answer the questions unless we first know how it all began and where we are now. Unless we know the past and where it has brought us, we shall not know the correct direction into the future.

To those who are here today, it is scarcely necessary to point out that it all began in 1872, 100 years ago. That was not a year of great affluence for this Nation. In fact, the reverse might better describe the period. The Civil War had ended seven years before and America was suffering from the social and economic stress that follows every war. The nation's people were interested in the pressing problem of earning a living, not in setting aside vast western acreages for future generations to enjoy.

Fortunately there were those who also looked into the future; those who believed that man did not live by bread alone; that he had moral and spiritual needs.

To them we owe much for it was they who introduced and brought into being the law which preserved for eternity this Yellowstone National Park, this magnificent wonderland that astonishes us all with the bounty of nature.

In the Yellowstone legislation, Congress first laid down the criteria for selecting areas that should be set aside as national parks. They should, said the law, be large, spacious, and they should contain scenic values, scientific values, national values.

But 34 years later, in 1906, Congress recognized that areas existed which did not meet all the Yellowstone criteria for a national park, but should be preserved. Thus, under the Antiquities Act the Congress gave to the President the authority to set aside, by proclamation, lands owned by the Federal Government and to declare them national monuments.

And ten years later in 1916 Congress created the National Park Service. Just as Justice Marshall breathed life into the Constitution, so has the National Park Service breathed new life and new goals into our federal national park system.

In the half century since then, many new parks have come into being. They are, in some respects, a far cry from the original Yellowstone concept. For example, the Historical Sites Act of 1935 preserved for public use historical sites and buildings of national significance. Other acts established national seashores, national areas, innumerable parkways, riverways and wilderness areas. All were an outgrowth of the nation's awakened interest in outdoor recreation.

Now, a new category of parks has recently emerged. These are the cultural parks, exemplified by the Wolf Trap Farm for the Performing Arts near Washington. It combines nature and culture, a melding of nature's art and man's art in a unique and lovely manner.

Today, our people, through their Congress, have set aside 36 national parks, 84 national monuments, 8 national seashores, scores of national historical sites and historical parks, and the list continues to grow.

A good record, but not good enough to meet the demands of a burgeoning and mobile population with time, energy, and a desire to see their land.

The automobile, good roads, the improvement of the economic status of our people,

coupled with more leisure time, have had a shattering impact on our parks and recreation areas.

The Park Service now finds itself in a dilemma as it attempts to carry out a dual and frequently conflicting responsibility: on the one hand, to protect natural and historical areas and preserve them pristine for future generations, and on the other hand, to provide, even encourage, access and visitation "that will not impair values."

All of us, I believe, are acutely sensitive to the problems of excessive use of existing parks and how it should be managed. Already those of us in Congress have felt the wrath of campers who protest shortened stays in the parks. Nevertheless, in my view, we can no longer afford to temporize, to hope that the problem will go away.

We know that excessive visitation endangers the environment and the ecological balance of park areas.

To relieve the pressures on the parks, many suggestions have been proposed. It has been suggested that (1) we establish limited "time stays" within the parks; (2) eliminate all automobile traffic and in its stead, provide sight-seeing buses to transport people within the parks; (3) that lodging facilities, commercial establishments, campsites and parking areas be eliminated, and such services be provided outside the parks.

There is nothing new or novel about these suggestions. They have been kicked around for years. If the Associated Press releases are correct, the Conservation Foundation has just released its report in which it has recommended that all of these proposals be put into effect by the National Park Service.

Certainly, the recommendation, at first glance, seems reasonable, but if lodging accommodations, camping areas, parking facilities and commercial services are to be removed from the parks—do we not deny to every person the right to camp in the great open space, and to enjoy the great outdoors away from the hustle and bustle of the city? Do we not force those who come to the parks to seek accommodations into the "honky-tonks" that are springing up near every park entrance—the very thing from which they are seeking to escape?

Thousands of our elder citizens who are now living on Social Security and fixed incomes are beginning for the first time to visit our parks and enjoying the wonders of nature.

Recently Congress, recognizing the pressures they encounter trying to make ends meet, enacted legislation granting them a Golden Eagle passport and the privilege of using campsites at a drastically reduced rate.

Do we now make a mockery of this legislative action by eliminating the campsites and forcing these elder citizens into privately owned camping areas where the daily rates in many instances will exceed their daily Social Security allowance?

If we stop people from driving through the parks—deny them the right to stop for a brief moment to enjoy the beauty and grandeur of the parks; if we insist that they ride the bus and see those things which the bus driver thinks they should see; if we mark "off limit" the most interesting parts of the park and permit only those who have the youth and energy to hike to see such areas, our parks are no longer for the people but become the property of the privileged few.

Parks are for people—all the people—they must never become totally commercialized—neither should they be locked up under the guise that they can only be preserved by so doing.

Secretary Morton has stated that less than three percent of Yellowstone has been dedicated for use as lodging accommodations, commercial services, parking, camping sites and roads. I have been told that less than seven hundred and fifty acres of the 2½ mil-

lion acres that comprise Yellowstone is for uses other than roads. Must every inch be preserved, and people forced into "honky-tonks" cities to protect the environment? Are the needs and desires of people expendable? If our parks are being threatened by use—can we not find the answer by appropriating more funds for more supervision, improved maintenance and development?

I cannot predict what action Congress will take. But if it should approve the recommendations that have been proposed, we immediately face the problem of gateway cities and the problems relating to them—sanitation, roads, zoning, policing, adequate services at reasonable costs. Today we have some semblance of control—if the facilities are located in the park. If we move them out, the problem then becomes the problem of the local area. What happens then when profits are at stake? If people are denied the right to use their automobiles and required to use some sort of bus transportation within the park—who is to provide the service? Should the government provide free service? Is this a federal responsibility? We are already providing free transportation in one of our parks. Will the taxpayers be willing to extend it to all parks? In Washington, D.C., we have instituted a "Summer in the Park" program. We pay the transportation cost to transport children of our Capitol City to the near-by park. One might well ask, if its good for Washington, why not extend it to New York, Chicago, St. Louis? Where does it end?

These and scores of other proposals to alleviate the conditions within the national parks have been discussed and weighed but to remove the pressures is only a part of the problem.

Times have changed and people have changed. If we are to meet the needs of people our concepts must also change. Urbanization in the United States in the past 100 years has been phenomenal. A century ago four out of five Americans lived in rural areas. Today 70% of our population lives in urban areas.

The economic, political and social consequences of such a vast population shift are staggering. This shift in population makes it necessary for us to re-examine the entire concept of our park system. And, in so doing, it is imperative that the role of the cities, states and federal agencies be also re-examined.

Establishment of more parks is a laudable objective but the emphasis must be on bringing the parks to the people. Yellowstone is fine for the city dweller who may visit here once or perhaps twice in a life time. But what does he do with the remainder of his free time during the year. Seashores are fine for those who live near the coasts but they are only names as far as the people in the mid-west are concerned. And what about that group of city dwellers who cannot afford a trip through Yellowstone?

What is needed is a whole new layer of regional parks, oriented to the needs of city dwellers. We need parks that can be enjoyed daily or at least weekly.

What is needed first is a "master plan" that catalogues all of our resources on the city, state and federal levels. Only with such a catalogue can we hope to plan well for the future.

This does not mean that the federal government should control all the resources. It does mean that it should have the authority to coordinate and prepare a master plan. It does mean that for planning purposes, all national, state and city resources should be considered as a part of an overall park system.

On the federal level, national forest, parks and recreation areas should not be treated as isolated preserves but rather as integral elements of the complex ecological, social and economic relationship of the region.

Allow me to divert for a moment to outline

what I regard may be the basis of that new mission. In this vast land there are millions of acres of magnificent forests and lakes and rivers. And in these areas are to be found man-made projects that lend themselves peculiarly well to recreation and relaxation.

The Corps of Engineers now has under its jurisdiction 350 reservoirs with 27,000 miles of shoreline. All of these are idyllic recreation areas. Many are currently in use for that purpose by thousands of our people but the full potential of these projects has not been developed. Their park and recreational use is incidental to their principal function as originally conceived.

Where today they lure thousands to fish, or boat, or camp, they could and should provide a mecca for millions of families who seek the great outdoors. Moreover, their convenience to urban centers of population make them natural goals for the less affluent in society who may never have the funds to travel across the continent to see Glacier or the Grand Canyon.

Historically, the Corps of Engineers has been concerned with flood control, water storage and navigation.

Historically, the Bureau of Reclamation has dealt with dams and reservoirs for irrigation and power production.

Historically, the Soil Conservation Service is mandated to land conservation through the erection of small dams and other erosion-preventing techniques.

Historically, the Forest Service's mission is to protect and preserve the woodlands of the Nation and to dispose of timber.

Each wears its own blinders, as it must under the law. Each is concerned with its own primary responsibility. And yet, strangely enough, except for the Forest Service, all of their projects are funded on the basis that recreation use is given a capital value. In other words, the Congress and the agency had to weigh, consider and include the dollar value of recreation in approving a project.

I imply no criticism of these agencies to now say that recreation use is not a major factor in the great majority of these projects. But my point is that we must now undertake sensible planning that will integrate all of these potential and existing park areas into a nationally administered and supervised system.

I am not suggesting that the cognizant government agencies should give up their fundamental responsibilities. I am suggesting that we must have sensible planning that will integrate all of those potential recreational resources.

Frankly, it is time to consider whether it is appropriate that a shoreline of a lake should be allowed to become a muddy flat because, forsooth, water must be drawn off for navigation down river, or because the pool size was established by law years ago.

A balancing of values is in order. I do not want to be misunderstood. Congress must take its share of the blame. What is now lacking is a legislative statement of national goals and priorities.

Such a congressional statement would provide an umbrella under which more explicit declarations of land policy and land use could be developed. The present overlapping of agency goals would be clarified.

National goals and priorities would involve and include regional goals and priorities. Today little regional planning takes place. What I visualize is a planning program that will have as its objective the creation of a series of federal, state, regional parks in perhaps all of the fifty states.

All this will take courage and initiative. It will require consideration of the viewpoints of state and local planning agencies. It will require recognition of the appropriate responsibilities of the federal administrative entities. It will entail short range planning to save the existing parks from further ecologi-

cal damage and at the same time prevent the growth of neon-lighted honky-tonks adjacent to park areas. It will require a careful balancing of taking over and establishing new recreational areas before sharply limiting excessive use of already endangered parks. It may take some knocking together of heads, but I believe the Congress stands ready in this respect to do its duty.

LABOR

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, the problems which face the working man and the entire labor market are directly related to the fluid state of the economy and the rapid advances in technology which have thrown so many segments of society into flux. Labor legislation over the past 3 decades has done much to improve the lot of the working man—to improve his wage and working conditions and to guarantee the right to bargain collectively.

In the future it seems probable to me that Congress will address itself to qualitative rather than quantitative goals as far as labor is concerned. I believe the average American worker will press for three types of rights in future legislation:

I. TRAINING

I believe the American worker will press for guarantees of his right to receive adequate levels of education both for acquiring his first job and for periodic upgrading and retraining so that he can keep pace with changes in the economy and technology.

II. PARTICIPATION

I believe the American worker will press for greater participation in the decisions affecting his job and the policies of his union. Although his contributions could be substantial, the concerns of the worker have often been ignored. In some unions it has become clear that the union leadership expresses its own views rather than those of the workers. Many jobs show little concern for the production worker's sense of accomplishment—they do little to relieve the frustration built up by repetitive tasks.

III. COMPENSATION

I believe the American worker will press for compensation commensurate with his contribution. This will include not only his wages but adequate levels of security in the retirement years.

I would like to review the actions and considerations of the 92d Congress as they relate to these three broad goals.

MANPOWER

In the 10 years since passage of the original Manpower Development and Training Act our country's commitment to the support of manpower training programs has gone from millions to billions of dollars. The Manpower Administration estimates that upward of 7 million persons have received training from Federal manpower programs since 1962.

While the program has been impressive it still has some significant problems.

First, many in public life have viewed manpower programs solely as a strategy for helping the poor become employable. President Kennedy justified the original bill as "rehabilitation rather than relief." President Nixon spoke of "workfare rather than welfare." This viewpoint, however, fails to comprehend that training alone does not help those public assistance recipients who have a complex range of social, education and economic problems which job training alone does not solve. Clearly, for manpower training to be effective in solving problems of poverty its impact and purposes must be expanded to the other problems such individuals have.

The manpower training program has failed to recognize that while training improves the hirability of the trainee, it does not create new job slots for him to fill. If we do not recognize that our manpower strategy must be an integral part of the comprehensive employment and economic strategy, our results still fall far short of an adequate level of performance. The ultimate success indicator of any training program is this: will the trainee have a job opportunity at the end of the training program?

Finally, the manpower program has, for the most part, failed to make use of alternative methods to reach the goals. When we were reviewing manpower programs in the Select Labor Subcommittee over the last year we found that some privately sponsored programs were able to train more people at a lower cost and with a greater measure of success than Government programs. Perhaps their methods should be adapted or perhaps the Government should assist them in reaching a greater portion of those who need training.

During our hearings we attempted to discern just what it was that made for a successful manpower program. Two specific ingredients to success soon became clear. First, the programs which were successful were designed to fit the specific needs of those enrolled. The criticism of all too many of the Federal programs which have failed is that too often they attempt to fit the trainee to a program rather than vice versa. Second, we found that those programs which were most successful operated to meet the local needs of the communities in which they serve.

It seems clear to me that the Federal Government must decategorize and decentralize its manpower efforts. While it is obviously essential for the Federal Government to undertake long range national planning, the success of the manpower program can only be insured if the local areas have the responsibility to meet the varied needs of their specific trainees in the specific job market which exists in that area.

In October of last year I proposed H.R. 11688 which decategorizes Federal manpower funds and allows local areas—governments or groups of governments—of 100,000 to apply for funds to carry out locally designed training programs. In order to insure that these efforts do not

get unnecessarily fragmented, the proposal offers an incentive for areas to coordinate their efforts with neighboring jurisdictions and among the various community groups who are involved in teaching the manpower skills. H.R. 11688 creates the National Institute for Manpower Policy to research long range employment trends and practices and to serve as a clearing house for information on job availability.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

One of the least adequate features of our employment and training system is the unemployment compensation system. Created under the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1935, unemployment compensation can be called "prewelfare payment."

The distribution system for unemployment benefits is such that many who need it the most are not adequately covered. For example, in Michigan over the last year there have been a number of pockets of high unemployment where individuals were desperately in need of extended benefits. However, because the unemployment level in the State was within the "normal range," no area of the State was eligible for the extended benefits. Additionally, the disparity in unemployment rates in various areas of the Nation have left some States' unemployment funds almost bankrupt, while the system as a whole has a large nationwide surplus.

The requirements for job registration also seems inadequate. If you are an unemployed tool and die maker and you live in an area where the demand for tool and die makers is diminishing, it will not assist you merely to register for work in your profession. The present system has no real method of finding out where vacancies for your skills might be available.

Most importantly, the unemployment compensation system provides no assistance for those workers who feel the need to upgrade or modernize their skills before their jobs become obsolete. In the fast changing job market, this lack of flexibility can slow the economic growth rate drastically.

Some have proposed federalization of the unemployment system to improve its ability to serve the unemployed. Although this idea was debunked by the National Unemployment Compensation Study Commission, it may still have some merit and should be considered. However, this would work in contrast to our efforts to decentralize other manpower programs and any further centralization should only take place if there is no other way to handle the problem. Changes in the program may not necessitate a Federal takeover.

Another more promising alternative is a revision of the goals and delivery system of the Wagner-Peyser Act to emphasize the necessity for job upgrading. One such possibility was enacted last year by the French Government. Their system uses unemployment compensation funds for initial skills acquisition and job skills upgrading. Up to 2 percent of the work force can use the funds in the system for additional training in any 1 year. Workers are granted a stipend,

much like a sabbatical granted to professors, to go back to school for training. While this French system will not fit our model exactly, we should examine the basic goals of the system which encourages workers to upgrade their skills.

A problem which plagues many workers is boredom on the job. Many workers feel trapped because they see that their level of skills limits their possibilities for advancement. They find themselves in the unenviable position of wanting to go back to school either to gain new skills or to upgrade their old ones and yet they lack the resources to be able to accomplish this goal. The genuine opportunity to upgrade skills with relative ease may have the added benefit of encouraging workers to look toward alternatives for accomplishing their tasks which may be less tedious and at the same time more efficient. It seems a more positive role for unemployment funds to make such opportunities available.

SPECIAL CONCERNS

Our job training system has had special problems in meeting the needs of several groups in our society—including the minorities, youth and inmates in our prison system. During the last decade we have been successful in consistently finding jobs for between 93 and 96 percent of our labor force. However, those groups hardest hit by unemployment have consistently had an unemployment rate 3 to 4 times the average for society as a whole. Our system is not doing its job when young people in the inner city area of Detroit are unemployed at a rate of 30 to 35 percent.

Jobs can be a key to many of our other social problems today. For instance, several studies, including one at Milan Prison, have shown that inmates who receive job training and counseling have a significantly lower rate of recidivism than those who do not. Our prisons have been criticized as schools for crime rather than correctional institutions. Last fall Senator JAVITS and I examined the possibility of providing training opportunities for inmates in our correctional institutions. We introduced the first version of our proposal in December. This winter the chairman of my Manpower Subcommittee and I reworked the bill so that it now includes upgrading of training opportunities for correctional personnel as well as inmates. H.R. 13690 which we reintroduced with 33 cosponsors in March is a \$500 million proposal which should make significant strides forward in presenting new rehabilitation opportunities for inmates in our correctional institutions.

THE EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT

Last year when unemployment was at its height and many units of local government had been forced into laying off staff positions for lack of funds, Congress passed the Emergency Employment Act. The public employment program, or PEP, has had a phenomenal success. By March of this year PEP accomplished the remarkable feat of placing 144,000 people in jobs. Unfortunately, most of those placed under the PEP program were not the chronically unemployed.

In the next several months the \$2.25 billion PEP program will be discussed in light of several considerations. First, should the program be temporary or permanent? It is now authorized for 2 years. Second, should the jobs created be permanent or transitional in nature? I personally feel that a massive permanent program of public service jobs paid for by the Federal Government will not serve the needs of the unemployed or the communities who would employ them because the program attacks a symptom rather than the cause of cyclical job fluctuations. An alternative to the approach of creating a permanent program would be the creation of a counter-cyclical trigger mechanism which would come into effect only in periods of high unemployment. Title II of H.R. 11688, my comprehensive manpower bill, embodies such a proposal. It calls for increases in manpower funds contingent upon increases in the unemployment rate. At 4.5 percent the trigger would be activated to increase manpower funds by 15 percent. If unemployment continues to rise, the funding also rises to a maximum additional allotment of 60 percent at 6 percent. The counter-cyclical nature of my formula would help to create jobs when we need them most. Consideration of the PEP program and any possible successors should be included in any discussion of comprehensive manpower reform.

MINIMUM WAGE LEGISLATION

It has become almost a sign of the season that every 2 years we consider additions to the Fair Labor Standards Act which governs minimum wages. The key issues in this year's consideration relate to rate and exemptions. The House passed a minimum wage bill which would establish a minimum hourly wage of \$2 per hour. I believe that this rate will bring low income wage earners more in line with the cost of living without fanning the fires of inflation. The Senate bill proposes a wage rate of \$2.25.

We must be careful on this issue not to get caught in the trap of overinflated rhetoric. While minimum wage increases do help to raise the standards of low-income workers, a significant raise, such as is proposed in the Senate bill, can have the effect of decreasing marginal employment opportunities. This has the effect of reducing jobs for the very people we are trying to help. The relationship between minimum wage increases and marginal job decreases is not in a clear one-to-one relationship. However, studies after the two most recent increases have shown there is a relationship and it is one that must be kept in mind during debate of any increase.

Another basic argument in consideration of the minimum wage bill this year related to the inclusion of workers not previously covered. In the original committee bill in the House a student differential was created which would allow employers to pay students, of any age, at a rate lower than the established minimum. The substitute bill, passed by the House, provides for a youth differential to age 18. This provision is aimed at encouraging employment opportunities for first-time wage earners who are not sup-

porting a family. The original House bill would have discriminated against the young person who wanted to continue school and hold down a part-time job. I supported the substitute bill in the belief that we should make a differentiation between the first-time wage earner and the young head of household. The youth differential in the House bill recognizes that these two types of workers should be treated differently. It also recognizes that an incentive to employers may encourage employment of these young wage earners.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY

Passage of the Occupational Safety and Health Act and the Federal Metallic and Nonmetallic Safety Act—Mine Safety—are indicative of Federal efforts to protect the safety of the worker. After 1 year of operation of the Occupational Safety Act, it is clear that it is in need of revision. Several amendments have been proposed. After 6 months of negotiations with the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, we were able to schedule oversight hearings on the implementation of the act. However, substantive revisions are unlikely this year.

The recent Sunshine Mine disaster and our subsequent review of the Federal Mine Safety Act has shown me that merely passing legislation will not insure that the goals established will be implemented. We must make sure that we can make both workers and managers safety conscious so that safety regulations will really work. We can never employ enough inspectors to find all the possible violations unless workers and their employers are on the lookout for safety hazards.

IMPROVEMENTS TO OUR PENSION SYSTEM

Probably the most compelling issue facing the Labor Committee is the pension issue. The Department of Labor estimates that one-third of those supposedly covered under pension plans will not draw benefits. Of 26 million workers who are now under plans, fewer than 9 million will be eligible for retirement benefits. In a committee review of 87 pension plans across the country it was estimated of the 9.8 million workers covered under the plans only 1 million will draw benefits.

Numerous tragic human examples of this problem can be cited. One boiler-maker after 31 years of work and contribution of thousands of dollars to pension plans found he was not eligible for a pension because he had paid into differing jurisdictions and at different job locations. A second example comes from the thousands of workers from the Studebaker Co. These workers had the misfortune to work for a company who had planned its pension plan to be workable only if it continued in business. When the company failed, many found that they could not collect from the insufficient funds available in the fund.

Our economic system has produced a mobile working population. Where it was common 20 years ago for workers to stay with the same company in the same location for most of their job career, this permanence can no longer be counted upon. Mobility is a reality not only in the professional occupations like teach-

ing, but also in skilled jobs such as mechanics and production workers. Some kind of protection needs to be afforded to those who change jobs through a form of vesting, the right to change jobs without losing benefits. This would recognize the mobility of our work force and would at the same time provide security for those in our fluid job market.

If we are to make our pensioning system equitable, we must make sure that the plans are established on sound fiduciary principles. We require fiscally sound policies for other kinds of savings plans—in banks, in the stock market and in savings associations—so why should we not expect the same of pension plans?

The volume of constituent interest in the pension issue has been at one of the greatest levels for a long time. The Education and Labor Committee's pension study task force has held hearings and made extensive studies. Consideration of legislative alternatives should begin next year.

EMPLOYEE RELATIONS

In 1847 Abraham Lincoln said:

No good thing has been or can be enjoyed by us without having first cost labor . . . to secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor or as nearly as possible is a worthy object of any good government.

Federal regulation of labor began soon after Lincoln's statement. The heyday for labor legislation came in the 1930's, 1940's and 1950's. The National Labor Relations Board was established to assist labor and management in working out their differences.

When the Board was established several classes of workers were excluded. The most notable exceptions to coverage under the Wagner Act and other labor measures were public employees and agricultural workers. There is good rationale for excluding these workers from coverage under the present National Labor Relations Act. Their employment problems and job situations are different from most of the workers covered under the act. A good example of this is the problem of placing agricultural workers under the Wagner Act and under its later additions like the Taft-Hartley law. If these workers were brought under the acts then several problems would develop. For instance, the "cooling-off period" would be too long to effectively control agricultural producers. If agricultural workers were covered under the Taft-Hartley Act every time a strike was called the farmer could call a "cooling-off period" which would delay settlement of the dispute until after the workers had lost their only effective bargaining tool; the loss of crops by a work stoppage.

In public employee disputes the crux of the problem centers on the vital nature of some of our public employees' services. The protection of the public interest must be balanced against by protection of the rights of those employed by the public. The balance can be struck by the implementation of effective collective bargaining legislation.

Although these workers are not covered under the National Labor Relations Board, it does not follow that they should

be denied the benefits which derive from it. One solution would be the creation of separate labor relations boards for public employees and agricultural workers. A separate board would be able to consider the unique problems of the workers covered and recognize the competing interests present in a labor-management dispute.

Another problem which is certain to be debated during the 93d Congress is the settlement of transportation disputes. Discussions in Congress have centered on the limits of a strike where the overriding public interest is being hurt by the strike. A great deal of thought must be done in defining both the public interest and employee rights. Any legislation passed should provide a balance between those interests.

The American worker and the economic system have both benefited from Federal regulation in labor problems. As our economic system has grown more complex the problems facing our work force have become less soluble to simplistic answers or inflated rhetoric.

PENSION AND EMPLOYEE BENEFIT ACT

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will agree with me that the need for pension reform is obvious. The sheer number of pension reform bills before the Congress attests to that need.

I have always been in favor of effective legislation which would shore up the many deficiencies which exist in the private pension system. Federal authority over pension plans is fragmented and ineffective in securing adequate protection of retirement benefits. Deficient and inadequate provisions contained in a number of plans are directly responsible for hardships experienced by many of our older citizens. Benefits are extended to only 15 percent of the covered workers. Termination of plans beyond the control of employees, without the necessary and adequate funding for benefit payments, has deprived employees and their dependents of earned benefits. Approximately 500 pension plans are discontinued each year. Moreover, the lack of uniform minimum standards of conduct required of fiduciaries, administrators, and trustees has jeopardized the security of employee benefits.

On May 8 of this year, I introduced legislation I believe provides the best means to correct the inequities which now exist in our present system. H.R. 14829, the Pension and Employee Benefit Act, would give additional protection for the rights of participants in employee pension and profit-sharing retirement plans. It would determine minimum standards for vesting and funding, establish a pension plan reinsurance program, and provide for the regulation of the

administration of pension and other benefit plans.

My bill is similar to a proposal embodied in S. 2, legislation introduced by one of the pioneers in pension reform, Senator JACOB JAVITS. S. 2 was the foundation of S. 3598 which was ultimately reported out of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee by a unanimous vote. S. 3598 is known as the Retirement Income Security for Employees Act.

Mr. Speaker, the reporting out of a pension reform bill by any committee in Congress is certainly a major and monumental achievement. Over the past decade, a flood of bills have been introduced on pension reform, but none have managed to reach the floor of either chamber. Now it appears that there are enough forces converging on the issue of pensions that a showdown can be foreseen—if not this session, at least in the 93d Congress.

At this point, I would like to mention some of the basic differences between my bill—the Pension and Employee Benefit Act—and S. 3598—the Retirement Income Security for Employees Act, as it was originally reported on September 15.

If enacted, my proposal will establish a reasonable and fair basis for making pension credits nonforfeitable. Under it, pension credits will vest at 10 percent a year starting with the sixth year of service. Thus, after an individual has worked 15 years, he will be entitled to a 100-percent vested right in the benefits earned over that period of time.

Under S. 3598, vesting would start at 30 percent after 8 years of service and increase by at least 10 percent each year thereafter. Thus, after 15 years, a worker would also have a 100 percent vested right. However, a worker having 6 or 7 years of service would not be guaranteed anything under S. 3598. Under my proposal, he would be assured of at least a 10 to 20 percent vested right in a pension.

My proposed Pension and Employee Benefit Plan would also set up a U.S. Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission to administer the provisions of the act. The proposal reported out of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee would only create a post of Assistant Secretary of Labor in charge of an Office of Pension and Welfare Plans Administration.

The bill reported out by that committee would also establish a voluntary pension portability program to facilitate the transfer of vested credits between pension and profit-sharing plans. While I endorse this concept, I believe it is a very complex area, requiring exhaustive consideration. In my bill, therefore, I called for a pension portability study.

Mr. Speaker, it is most important that we commit ourselves to correcting the inequities which now exist in the private pension system. Any mandate we pass on pension plans will be a long overdue start.

However, it now appears that S. 3598 is not the best vehicle to give assistance to the working man. On September 19,

the legislation was referred to the Finance Committee. That committee contended the Labor and Public Welfare Committee had infringed upon its jurisdiction, and therefore members of the Finance Committee reconsidered S. 3598. On September 28, it was re-reported with major provisions on vesting, funding, and portability eliminated.

I, therefore, hope that the Congress will now look more closely at my bill, H.R. 14928, as the best alternative on pension reform. Should this bill not receive favorable consideration yet this year, I will reintroduce it very early in the 93d Congress. Action is needed.

SAN FRANCISCO HEARINGS OF THE HOUSE CRIME COMMITTEE

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the House Crime Committee completed 3 days of hearings in San Francisco, the testimony of which was devoted primarily toward exposing the operation of the drug traffic menace to the people in northern California. The startling evidence recorded was revealed by numerous witnesses, including many from the younger generation. The hearings revealed the necessity for combined local, State, and Federal action to curb the operations of organized crime who are reaping fortunes in the dope traffic.

The news media, including television and radio, broadcast the hearings throughout California and areas in the Far West.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks two articles—one from the San Francisco Examiner, and the other from the Oakland Tribune—which was a small fraction of the publicity given to the House Crime Committee under the chairmanship of our colleague, Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Sept. 28, 1972]

CONGRESS QUIZ HERE TOLD OF DRUG TRAFFIC (By Jim Wood)

Both boys and girls are selling drugs at Lincoln and Mission High Schools, undercover police told a congressional committee here today.

And committee chairman Rep. Claude Pepper noted that California's high schools lead the nation in drug abuse.

Officer Joseph Kirley said he had been offered a chance to buy LSD at Lincoln by a student who had a large quantity to unload. The price was \$45 per 100 tabs and Kirley was assured he could get all he wanted.

Officer Thomas Griffin said the girls selling drugs at Mission usually work for a male and if the order is big the buyer is told that the girl "will have to go check my man and then I will let you know."

HOT WATER

Griffin said the teachers at Mission lack authority and some are afraid "if they touch a kid they are in hot water."

The trouble-makers could be groups coming to see the principal about the teachers' actions.

Griffin praised the performance of two

black belt karate experts who are hall monitors at Mission. If they catch somebody smoking pot they walk up and take away the joint. He reported wide use of "reds, bennies" and marijuana at Mission.

Kirley said students at Lincoln told him drug use made it "a pleasure to go to school instead of a bore."

IGNORE CONDUCT

He told the members of the Select Committee on Crime that when students appeared under the influence of drugs some teachers simply ignored their conduct while others would report the students to the dean's office.

"Some teachers were interested and some were not," he said.

He reported that truancy was high at Lincoln and that he attended one civics class where only eight of 32 students were present.

"You could get a card game anywhere," he said, adding that there was customarily a dice game in school stairway.

He said that periodically hall guards would make a "sweep" to clear outsiders from the school, but that students generally knew ahead of time that the sweeps were coming.

He said they would hide in the park for 15 to 20 minutes, then return to school and "that would be it for the day."

Opening hearings in San Francisco, Pepper said drug abuse in Bay Area schools is "extremely serious, widespread and growing worse."

"One Government official has advised us that large amounts of any type of drugs are readily accessible in practically all high schools in this area," he said.

The Florida lawmaker said that when incipient signs of drug abuse are ignored many high school students accelerate their drug use and become truants or dropouts and ultimately drug addicts.

He estimated on the basis of investigations by his committee there already are between 4500 and 7200 hard core heroin addicts in San Francisco. He said there addicts require between \$50 and \$250 a day to support their habit.

"The heroin addict obtains the money to support his habit by stealing, by committing robberies and burglaries and by selling drugs to others," Pepper said.

He said that in San Francisco there are some 13,000 drug abusers who are strung out or in advanced stages of habituation. He said these figures included users of amphetamines, barbiturates and hallucinogenics, but not marijuana smokers or experimenters.

He said that in Alameda County it is estimated there are 10,000 heroin addicts. Joseph Phillips, counsel for the committee, said his estimate was based on figures obtained from the Alameda County Health Department.

NUMBERS GAME

But Dr. Joel Fort, a nationally recognized authority on drug abuse and the founder-leader of the National Center for Solving Health Problems, said before the hearing he believed the 10,000 figure was "way high."

"That's the numbers game," he said. "The higher the number, the more money you can get for methadone programs, the more status, the more publicity."

Pepper said that more than 650 school-age children died of drug overdoses in California in the past three years.

On the basis of evidence produced in other hearings, Pepper said it appears efforts by national, state and local governments are desperately needed "if this crisis is to be abated."

FIRST STEP

"The federal government must take active and prominent role in the fight against drug abuse, especially at our schools," he said.

"We cannot let these young children's lives turn to crime, degradation and death."

"It is my hope that these hearings will be the first step in an effort which will result in the reclamation of these young drug users. We hope it will be the beginning of a national commitment to assure drug-free schools."

The committee's appearance in San Francisco came at the invitation of Congressman Jerome Waldie of Antioch.

[From the Oakland Tribune, Sept. 30, 1972]

YOUTHS TALK IN DRUG QUIZ

(By Bev Mitchell)

A former Oakland student told the House Committee on Crime yesterday that he was involved in some 1,000 breaking and entering crimes to support his drug habit.

The congressmen, here to investigate drug abuse in Bay Area schools, also heard a Palo Alto youth say he could have easily sold more than \$1,000 worth of cocaine in a day at his high school if he'd had the capital (his largest single investment was \$400).

Another youngster testified she became involved in drugs because her mother was a user, and still another because his father became a heroin pusher.

They were members of a panel of young people who testified in the second day of the hearing, which concludes tomorrow in the San Francisco federal building.

William, 19, described a long history of juvenile delinquency preceding his involvement in drugs while a student at St. Elizabeth's High School in Oakland.

He said that about 60 per cent of the students were users, mostly of marijuana. Only about 10 per cent at the most were using heroin or cocaine, the youth guessed, "but it's coming in fast."

He said he started with marijuana out of curiosity and because he wanted to be accepted. He also tried LSD, heroin (which he didn't enjoy) and other drugs, and turned to PCP (a tranquilizer, sometimes called a peace pill) which he "liked a lot" and gave him problems.

As a child, the youth said, he was rebellious, sniffed glue, "caused lots of commotion wherever I went" and probably contributed to his parents' divorce. Recently, he has had "a religious experience, and since then . . . I've been born again, I'm a different person."

Jim, 18, of Palo Alto, said he first got involved with drugs when he was about 13 years old and had lost interest in "school connected things."

A strikingly clean-cut young man, he said he had kept up both his appearance and grades in school because he could see long-haired, mod-dressed youngsters "getting hassled by the cops" as possible drug users.

He tried various kinds of drugs and became both a cocaine addict and dealer. He said his contact indicated that friends brought it in from Peru, concealed in candy boxes and covered with chocolate.

Jim estimated that as much as 90 per cent of his classmates had used drugs, and that as much as 60-70 per cent of junior high students had experimented. Both he and William said they knew of teachers who had used marijuana.

Laura, 16, has attended three high schools in Marin County, and used a variety of drugs after she first got involved when she was about 12 years old.

Her mother got her involved initially, she testified. Eventually she was "using speed a lot, ended up getting busted and going to the hospital, and was committed to a program." She was also taken away from her mother's custody.

Paul, 17, was 14 when he first became a heavy drinker and was put into continuation high school where there were "a lot of reds and weed." He traced the beginning of his problems to the time when his father "became a junkie," and like most drug users

sometimes resorted to crime to support the habit.

Susan, 18, began smoking marijuana in her junior high school, and turned to a stronger drug as a student in San Mateo's Hillsdale High School.

She was transferred to a continuation school, which she rarely attended. Susan began her crime career with forgery and got caught. She and a boyfriend, who had a larger heroin habit than hers (together, they needed \$40 a day) formed a team to steal television sets, typewriters, wheelchairs and other saleable items.

Hospitals were a favorite target for thefts, and there were some shops and some individual buyers for the items. A stolen typewriter would bring about \$40, "but after we sold a lot the price would go down."

Again, like the others, she "got busted," and now regards the experiences as a closed chapter.

The youngsters, for the most part, had had little or no education concerning drugs, and weren't sure it would have helped. Paul, in particular, wished someone had remanded him to an institution earlier, rather than enrolling him in programs which never worked.

Another witness, Mrs. Marsha Scott, was one of a panel representing the San Francisco Police Department Youth Program. She works with officers in school programs telling students what their future will be like if they misuse drugs.

Marsha, who had no information about drugs, married a heroin addict who in turn addicted her. She developed a \$100 to \$150 habit a day, which was supported by burglary, till-tapping and robbery.

Her now ex-husband was sent to prison and she turned to prostitution to support her habit.

In Marsha's time "on the street," the youngest girl she worked with was 12 years old and had been turned on to heroin by her brother, an addict. Marsha eventually served a prison term for prostitution and turned to the methadone program (a synthetic drug) to break her heroin addiction, but the young girl is "still out there working."

Marsha also lost custody of her young son. Lack of drug education and lack of parental and school recognition of the problem were among difficulties cited by the committee, headed by Rep. Claude Pepper, D-Fla., which included the Bay Area in its series of meetings at the request of another Member, Rep. Jerome Waldie, D-Antioch.

They have complained about the reluctance of many school districts to cooperate with police, and yesterday praised Oakland Supt. Marcus Foster for both cooperation and a program to prevent drug abuse.

Foster described a program in which 500 teachers have received in-service training to help teach about drugs and drug abuse on all grade levels, but emphasized that a good basic education is the best preventive of all.

In talking about eliminating boredom and a negative self-image, in giving children an opportunity to succeed and an exciting curriculum, Foster said, he was talking about basic program aims that would all be enhanced with more funds. "It is impossible to separate the need for quality education from drug abuse," he said.

He also said he didn't think drug abuse was at the crisis stage in Oakland. "In a school system of 60,000 people you can't hide it, it would manifest itself."

The need for funds was also noted by Mrs. Richard Bailey, president of District 28 of the California Congress of Parents and Teachers, which encompasses Oakland, San Leandro and Emeryville.

Rep. Pepper challenged the PTA to pressure Congress to help, saying that to his knowledge there has been little demand for legislation in the field.

CXVIII—2131—Part 25

F-111 STAYS IN COMBAT

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a very much needed news story from the October 4 New York Times.

Mr. Speaker, the F-111's that recently went to Vietnam are in combat status and were removed from mission flying only in normal fashion—and very temporarily, news stories to the contrary notwithstanding.

Within hours after the many thousand mile trip to Asia the F-111's made their first strike; low-level, all alone, and in foul weather, they went after the toughest, most highly defended targets in the combat area. This is the kind of mission they were designed for, and they are the only aircraft in our inventory that can do this job.

I hope every Member reads this accurate and extremely important story by William Beecher.

The story follows:

F-111 IS HELD OUT OF ACTION BRIEFLY—PENTAGON SOURCES SAY LOSS OF ONE SPURRED REVIEW

(By William Beecher)

WASHINGTON, Oct. 3.—American F-111 tactical bombers were withheld from combat missions for a few days, Pentagon sources said today, following the loss last Thursday of one of the advanced planes during its first mission over North Vietnam.

But officials insisted that the swing-wing aircraft were back on combat status and would have conducted scheduled raids over the North today were it not for unusually bad weather caused by a typhoon.

Six F-111's had their brief combat test in Indochina in the spring of 1968. They were withdrawn after three were lost, two from unknown causes. In the case of the third, which crashed near its base at Ta Khli, Thailand, it was found that a tube of sealing compound had been left in the plane, probably at the time of manufacture, causing a mechanical malfunction.

In the life of the F-111 have been crashes of 23 of the planes. Six of the losses were blamed on pilot errors—as in the case of the pilot who moved his wings backward rather than forward on landing—and six on malfunction. The causes of the other 11 losses have never been determined. Pentagon sources say.

SPECIAL BRIEFINGS REPORTED

Pentagon officials said that they were far from certain whether the plane that was lost Thursday—one of three that conducted lone, separate missions over the area northeast of Hanoi that day—was shot down, or crashed as a result either of pilot error or mechanical trouble.

But as an act of "simple prudence" the source said, the planes were temporarily withheld from combat while a review was conducted to insure that the pilots received sufficient briefings on the special conditions in the heavily defended combat theater before resuming missions there.

The planes were not grounded, however, even during this "procedural review," one officer said. They flew "orientation" missions over mountains in Thailand from their base at Ta Khli, he said.

Pentagon officials were at pains today to reaffirm their confidence in the F-111 and predicted that it would prove itself once it

had been in combat for an extended period of time.

Two squadrons of F-111's, totaling 48 aircraft, were ordered to Thailand recently to replace four squadrons of F-4 phantom fighter-bombers, comprising 72 planes that had been in combat in some cases more than five months.

Pentagon spokesman said last week that the ability of the F-111's to fly and bomb entirely on instruments would enable the planes to do a more effective job in night operations and in monsoon weather.

But the missions that had been scheduled today were postponed, one official said, because of severe thunderstorms in the target area. "The fact that the planes are designed for night and bad weather operations does not mean that we fly them into the heart of big thunderheads," one official declared.

The first of the new group of F-111's arrived in Thailand last week. Some of the pilots had preceded the planes and the first three missions were run within 24 hours of the planes' arrival, the sources said.

There are about two two-man crews for each of the planes. On arriving in the new theater, they get detailed briefings on weather, enemy air defense and anti-aircraft weapons and techniques, the characteristics of different targets on the radar and other sensors, and special treetop-level flight paths that are supposed to get each lone plane into its target area beneath enemy radar view.

However, one of the planes disappeared from radar about 40 to 50 miles from Udorn airbase in Thailand, sources said. It was not clear whether the plane encountered trouble at that point, or merely dipped very low to avoid enemy radar. Informants said that there was no radio call from the pilot to indicate trouble and no beeping signals from the survival beacons on the aircraft.

The F-111's normally fly alone in order to increase their chances of slipping into the target area undetected. All of the missions, to date, have been flown during darkness.

Air Force officials said that despite the losses, in more than 200,000 hours of flight operations in the United States, Indochina and Western Europe, the F-111 had had fewer problems than any other major United States combat aircraft at a similar stage in its life.

TAXING HUMAN LIVES

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge support of legislation which would remove those countries who discriminate against the emigration of their citizens from the various U.S. trade programs which give them a special status. I feel that this is a very appropriate vehicle for conveying the concern and disapproval of the American people for this kind of callous deprivation of liberty.

The plight of Jewish citizens in the Soviet Union has deeply troubled the conscience of the world. The recent actions by the Soviet Government to impose impossible "head taxes" on Jews who desire to leave the U.S.S.R. is another appalling example of the suppression to which these people are being subjected behind the Iron Curtain. Many of us have expressed our indignation in this very Chamber, and the House has even passed

a resolution which called on the President to take every step at his disposal to end this injustice.

However, by adopting the legislation introduced today, we will be able to do more than merely condemn or request the executive branch to act. We can remove nations which perpetuate these injustices from the "Most Favored Nation" status or other trading assistance programs. I urge that we act now in such a way so as to demonstrate America's moral concern about the rights of Soviet Jews.

I am especially concerned about this problem in light of new evidence of religious repression in the Soviet Union. For several months, the Soviet press has been emphasizing the new climate of religious freedom that supposedly prevails in the U.S.S.R. However, earlier this week, it was learned that the celebration of Simchat-Torah, the last day of the high holy days, had been marred by the presence of large numbers of Soviet police around the synagogues in Moscow and other large Soviet cities. These new signs of repression only serve to heighten my desire to see Congress take some substantive action against those nations who would violate basic religious freedom.

There should be no trade advantage given by the United States to the Soviet Union or to any country which denies the right or opportunity of its citizens to emigrate. The language of the bill is very clear, and its impact would help bring about the desired result—an end to the taxing of human lives as a means for stifling religious beliefs and freedom.

HOUSE REJECTS BILL PROHIBITING FOREIGN TRAVEL

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, as epilog to Monday's vote on the House Internal Security Committee's bill prohibiting Americans from unauthorized travel to nations involved in armed conflict with the United States. I would like to insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the San Jose Mercury of October 4, 1972:

THIS BILL'S LOSS NO LOSS AT ALL

Legislation put together in the heat of passion seldom proves to be wise law. When Jane Fonda and assorted other antiwar activists traveled to North Vietnam and criticized U.S. involvement in the war, a lot of us raised our eyebrows. Some of us got mad. Some even yelled.

Then when the North Vietnamese released three American prisoners of war and invited their families to Hanoi for the release, more doubts were expressed about the use of American travelers for propaganda purposes.

The result, in a clear fit of anger, was the drafting of a bill that would prohibit Americans from making unauthorized travel to nations involved in armed conflict with the United States. The clear intent of the House Internal Security Committee-drafted bill was to block travel to Hanoi by antiwar activists.

Regardless of one's views on the war or

the actions of individual antiwar activists, he should give serious pause before embracing such legislation. That's precisely what the House did this week. It rejected the bill.

The bill's loss is no loss at all. In the name of protecting freedom, it sought to restrict vital freedoms of the American people. Hawks, doves, newsmen—everyone would have been barred from traveling to North Vietnam without presidential approval under the bill.

In the absence of a declaration of war, it is difficult to make a case that travel to a nation involved in armed conflict with the United States represents a clear and present danger. Individual criminal acts against the nation during such travel are sufficiently covered by existing legislation.

The Supreme Court has held that the freedom of travel is a constitutional liberty closely related to the rights of free speech and association. We agree. Fortunately, so does a sizable majority of the House of Representatives.

REPEAL SAN ANTONIO FREEWAY SECTION 113 AND DRASTIC MINIMIZATION SECTION 109 IN PENDING HIGHWAY BILL

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on September 27 I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from the Acting Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, Dr. Gordon J. MacDonald, dated September 27, 1972. The full text of the letter and my comments are printed on page 32629 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

Dr. MacDonald, speaking on behalf of the administration, scored the San Antonio expressway termination provision in section 113 of H.R. 16656—Federal-Aid Highway Act Amendments of 1972—as being an environmental retreat. He said that the provision represents a bad precedent and an unfortunate retreat from the national commitment to environmental concerns as expressed in such provisions as the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966. Dr. MacDonald then expressed total opposition to this provision of the Highway bill.

Today, Congressman ECKHARDT and I received a letter dated October 3 from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, Mr. William D. Ruckelshaus. Mr. Ruckelshaus stated that enactment of section 113 would constitute a legislative exemption from the procedural requirements of NEPA and section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act. Moreover, he said this section would:

Establish a dangerous precedent for invoking such legislation in behalf of similar Federal-aid highway projects * * * which may not be acceptable from an environmental standpoint.

Mr. Ruckelshaus quite rightly said that such a legislative pattern would inevitably undermine and defeat the purpose and protections that NEPA affords to the citizens of this Nation.

Finally, he said:

The National Environmental Policy Act provides an opportunity for Federal agencies to review and assess proposed Federal actions which have an impact on the environment. The Act clearly is not intended to retard progress but rather to insure that progress be identified as the protection of the Nation's heritage in the broadest sense.

In summary, enactment of section 113 would needlessly hazard the laws that have carried forward the national commitment to protect and enhance the Nation's environment. The Environmental Protection Agency consequently is opposed to the enactment of section 113 of H.R. 16656.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily agree with Mr. Ruckelshaus' statement. The San Antonio freeway provision in section 113 of the Federal-Aid Highway bill, like a similar provision in section 139 of the highway bill concerned with the Three Sisters Bridge, is an affront to the citizens of this Nation. Both measures should be roundly defeated by the Members of the House when they come to the floor later this week.

The amendment which we will offer with regard to the San Antonio expressway provision in section 113 of H.R. 16656 is printed in the RECORD of September 27, 1972, on page 32629. Additional comments regarding this amendment are printed in the RECORD of September 21, 1972, at page 31872.

The text of Mr. Ruckelshaus' letter to us follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., October 3, 1972.

HON. JOHN DINGELL,
HON. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MESSRS. DINGELL AND ECKHARDT: I am pleased to respond to your letter of September 22, 1972 in which you requested the Environmental Protection Agency's views on section 113 of H.R. 16656, the "Federal Aid Highway Act of 1972." Section 113 would terminate Federal involvement in all portions of the San Antonio North Expressway as a Federal aid highway project.

Enactment of section 113 would constitute a legislative exemption from the procedural requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act. In this context the Department of Transportation would be exempted from evaluating the impact which the proposed expressway would have on environmental values.

In a wider context, enactment of section 113 would establish a dangerous precedent for invoking special legislation in behalf of similar Federal-aid highway projects, and, by extension, other Federal projects which may not be acceptable from an environmental standpoint. Such special legislation or a pattern of such legislation would inevitably undermine and defeat the purpose and protections of the National Environmental Policy Act.

The National Environmental Policy Act provides an opportunity for Federal agencies to review and assess proposed Federal actions which have an impact on the environment. The Act clearly is not intended to retard progress but rather to insure that progress be identified as the protection of the Nation's heritage in the broadest sense.

In summary, enactment of section 113 would needlessly hazard the laws that have carried forward the national commitment to protect and enhance the Nation's environment. The Environmental Protection Agency consequently is opposed to the enactment of section 113 of H.R. 16656.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM D. RUCKELSHAUS, Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the San Antonio provision, there is buried in H.R. 16656—the Federal-Aid Highway Act Amendments of 1972—an obscure and seemingly innocuous paragraph entitled “minimization of redtape.”

This high-sounding paragraph, which is in section 109 of the bill, states:

It is the national policy that [to] the maximum extent possible the procedures to be utilized by the Secretary and all other affected heads of Federal departments, agencies, and instrumentalities for carrying out this title and any other provision of law relating to the Federal highway programs shall encourage the drastic minimization of paperwork and interagency decision procedures and the best use of available manpower and funds so as to prevent needless duplication and unnecessary delays at all levels of government.

Hear! Hear! Let us all shout for joy—if this bill is enacted, Congress, in its great wisdom, will have declared a sacred national policy against redtape in Government. No more lengthy memorandums between agencies, offices, bureaus, or even between floors in buildings. No more documentation or support data for the decision-makers, like those who negotiated the recent wheat deals. Shredders, like those used by ITT and others, will no longer be in vogue. They will not be necessary.

But wait, is that really what this paragraph says?

The answer to that question is not found in the section-by-section analysis of the bill in the committee's report—House Report 92-1443; September 25, 1972. The report merely restates, but does not analyze, the sweeping language of the bill.

A glimmer of light as to the true meaning and intent of this hortatory paragraph, however, can be found in a few lines on page 3 of the report which states:

“The nationwide debate about public transportation and what relationship it should bear to the highway program has intensified. The concern for preservation of a quality environment, as reflected in increased litigation in the Federal courts, and the problem of ‘red-tape’ delays in the execution of the Federal-aid highway program have obscured some of the basic philosophical concepts of Federal grant-in-aid. This Committee believes it is important that these concepts be reasserted and this is reflected in provisions on the declaration of policy, minimization of ‘red-tape’ and Federal-State relationships.”

It appears that the highway interests have found an old cliché—redtape—and are seeking to discredit citizen concern for the environment as merely redtape. Somehow they equate the efforts of Congress, the public, and the courts to require that the highway interests protect and enhance our environment, with redtape.

Having made this great leap, they conclude that this redtape causes delays in execution of the Federal-aid highway program—or, to put it more bluntly, it delays the paving of our rural areas and parklands and the installation of formidable concrete and asphalt barriers in our urban areas. These delays, they contend, have obscured—and here one can only marvel at their imagination—some of the basic philosophical concepts of Federal grant-in-aid. They do not refer to just Federal highway grant-in-aid. They

refer to all Federal grant-in-aid, including hospital, education, housing, pollution control, poverty, health and safety, mineral exploration, anticrime, agriculture, fish and wildlife, and numerous other grant-in-aid programs. Possibly, this is to obscure the meaning of this new policy even further.

What are these so-called philosophical concepts referred to in the committee's report which the committee believes should be reasserted? They are not explained or identified in the report. How are they reflected and reasserted in this declaration of national policy on redtape? The committee report leaves us in the dark.

But we need not dwell on the report, which sheds so little light on the meaning of this paragraph. There is no doubt as to the intent behind this paragraph—namely, to thwart citizen efforts to enforce our environmental quality laws against the highway interests.

But the bill goes far beyond this, as noted by my colleague and cosponsor of the San Antonio Freeway amendment which I will offer tomorrow, Congressman JOHN E. MOSS of California. Congressman MOSS in a letter of September 29, 1972, to the chairman of the House Public Works Committee, discussed this provision in detail and quite accurately pointed out its failings as well as listing some of the many laws which would be affected. His letter follows:

SEPTEMBER 29, 1972.

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: Section 109 of H.R. 16656—the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1972—would add a new provision to 23 U.S.C. concerning “minimization of Red Tape”, as follows:

“It is the national policy that [to] the maximum extent possible the procedures to be utilized by the Secretary and all other affected heads of Federal departments, agencies, and instrumentalities for carrying out this title and any other provision of law relating to the Federal highway programs shall encourage the drastic minimization of paperwork and interagency decision procedures and the best use of available manpower and funds so as to prevent needless duplication and unnecessary delays at all levels of government.”

This provision contains several phrases which are extraordinarily vague and unlimited in scope, and has broad and unpredictable potential for harmful impact on numerous governmental actions.

It states that “to the maximum extent possible” the “procedures” used by the Secretary of Transportation and “all other” Federal agencies to carry out any part of title 23 of the United States Code “and any other provision of law relating to the Federal highway programs shall encourage the drastic minimization of paperwork” and “interagency decision procedures”. (Emphasis supplied.)

The phrase “to the maximum extent possible” could be used to justify virtual cessation of documentation of contracts, decisions, analysis or any other activity by any agency if it has any relation to the highway program.

Furthermore, this policy will apply not only to the Secretary of Transportation, but also to “all other” Federal “departments, agencies and instrumentalities” on any and all matters “relating to the Federal highway program”. It will apply “at all levels of government”. It will apply not only to their agency operations, but also to “interagency decision procedures”.

This sort of wild-swinging language will

enable the agencies to achieve the acme of irresponsibility. No longer will they have to demonstrate in writing the basis for their actions so long as they “relate” to the highway program.

This obscure, one-sentence paragraph, by specifically encompassing innumerable other laws in no way identified in this bill, will require a “drastic minimization” of “paperwork” and decision-making in applying to the highway program such laws as:

Civil Rights Laws
Davis-Bacon Law
Fair Labor Standards Law, including minimum wage provisions
Occupational Health and Safety Law
Convict Labor Law
Anti-Kickback Law
Relocation Assistance Act
Criminal Laws in title 18 of the U.S. Code
Rural assistance and economic development laws

These are just a few of the many non-environmentally oriented Federal laws “relating to the Federal highway programs” that would be affected in some unspecified way by this paragraph. Such environmental laws as the Clean Air Act, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the laws governing national parks, and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 would also be affected in some unspecified way.

This one sentence paragraph is a lawyer's dream, and a lawmaker's nightmare. It says much, but tells nothing. It could turn back the clock on the environmental and social achievements in law and policy which this Nation has legislated during the last forty years.

I am aware that a somewhat similar provision on minimization of paperwork is in section 101(f) of S. 2770, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, which has recently been reported by the Conference Committee (H. Rept. 92-1465). However, the language of the latter section is far less sweeping in its coverage, since it lacks the phrase “all other . . . Federal departments, agencies, and instrumentalities” and the phrase “any other provision of law”. Moreover, the latter bill's provision is preceded by another policy statement (sec. 101(e)) requiring public participation in the water pollution control program.

I feel certain that your Committee would not want to endorse the drastic consequences that can flow from section 109. I therefore strongly urge that your Committee voluntarily strike section 109 from H.R. 16656 when the bill comes to the floor next week.

I would be pleased to discuss this with you, may I?

With warm regard,

JOHN E. MOSS,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, while we still hope that the Committee on Public Works will offer an amendment to strike this vague, ambiguous and dangerous paragraph from the bill, we have not received assurances that they will do so. Accordingly, it is our plan to offer later this week an amendment to H.R. 16656 which will read as follows:

Strike all of section 109, beginning on line 16, page 68, through line 4 on page 69, inclusive.

A “DAY OF BREAD”

HON. FRANK E. DENHOLM

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, the “Day of Bread,” observed on Tuesday of the

first full week of October, known as Harvest Festival Week, is the revival of an ancient custom in celebration of the annual bounty of agriculture.

Wheat is the major substance of bread. Bread is the "staff of life." Wheat is the most widely cultivated plant in the world. It is grown in the "bread basket" of the United States, including my home State of South Dakota. It was the golden grain of the prairies—the hope of pioneers—the doe of the Homesteaders, that made them stick to the land in times of adversity. Those pioneers of the prairies that held to faith and hope in wheat on the upturned sod wept in despair when the wheat harvests failed. Wheat was the hardest of all plants in the wind-swept prairies of the last frontiers. Wheat was then as it is now the foundation of a new beginning. It was flour. It was bread. It was life. Mr. Speaker, today in our wisdom and wealth may we not forget those earthly people and stewards of the soil that care, grow and harvest the golden grain on the fruited plains. They are farmers—they are food makers, they are the peaceful peacemakers. They are my friends and the friends of God and America. May they never be forsaken or forgotten lest we all stand naked at the fate of famine and national failure. This "Day of Bread" is a modest but honest recognition of those of the golden harvests—living and dead. And may it ever be so.

HOUSE REFORM

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican Conference has appointed a task force which is currently holding hearings on reform of the Rules of the House and the Rules of the Republican Conference. On October 3, 1972, I testified before this task force and proposed certain reforms which I feel are long overdue. I insert my testimony at this point for the benefit of my colleagues and the general public.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE GILBERT GUDE BEFORE THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE TO STUDY THE RULES OF THE HOUSE AND THE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE—OCTOBER 3, 1972

Mr. Chairman: I appreciate very much the opportunity to testify today before this distinguished Task Force. It is commendable that the House Republican Conference has undertaken this study of the Rules of the House and the Conference. Certainly, both have withstood the test of time but there is always room for thoughtful change as new needs become apparent.

I would like to recommend three proposals today which I feel have long been overdue. First, I would urge that the rule of the House concerning financial disclosure be broadened to include the Member's full financial status in dollars and cents. I am a co-sponsor of legislation that would accomplish this by law, but it could be accomplished by a rule change as well.

Second, I would urge that a study be made to entirely overhaul the page system. Naturally, I feel that the minority party should

receive its proportionate share of pages but I would prefer to go a few steps further and make the entire system non-partisan. More care should be taken in selecting pages and more attention should be paid to their education, health and safety while they are in Washington.

Third, I would urge that changes be made in the conference committee system in order to provide a mechanism whereby the position of the House can be assured of adequate representation among the conferees.

These are three directions in which the Task Force could go, Mr. Chairman, and I feel that each would be worthwhile. I shall discuss each proposal in more detail below:

FULL FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

The time has come for the House of Representatives to require a full disclosure of the financial position of its Members. The House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct currently requires a partial disclosure of the financial holdings of the members, but I consider this inadequate.

I feel that each Member should make a dollar and cent disclosure of his entire financial status. Only with such a full disclosure statement can citizens assure themselves that officials are not subject to conflicts of interest which would prevent or deter them from performing their official duties in an objective manner. I have made it a practice in the past to periodically disclose my entire financial situation and publish it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I recently did so on April 27 of this year.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that proposals such as this are met with such opposition within the Halls of Congress. Public trust in our institutions has declined in recent years because the average citizen feels that his Government pays more attention to special interests than it does to him.

I believe that if the Republican Conference would go on record supporting such a rules change it would reflect most favorably on our party. The Republican Platform again this year promised more open government and more accountability. This would be a good way for Republican Congressmen to further this pledge.

PAGE SCHOOL REFORM

The present system of selecting and supervising the House pages is sadly outdated. I feel that more attention should be paid to their education so that a year in Washington as a page can turn out to be a valuable experience rather than a possible liability. As high school students pages should, for example, receive the same number of hours of instruction as their peers in the public schools.

To do this it may be necessary to employ more pages and work them in shifts. Costs could be kept down by supplying the pages with room, board, books and a small allowance rather than paying them the presently outrageous salary of over \$7,000 a year.

By removing the page system from politics and by supplying the pages with adequate and safe housing, the year in Washington could be a rich worthwhile educational experience for both young men and young women alike. I propose that an independent Blue Ribbon Commission of Distinguished Scholars and Educators be established to select pages in the future. There should also be an independent board of trustees composed of prominent, public-spirited citizens.

CONFERENCE COMMITTEE REFORM

The conference committee system is an essential and necessary part of Congress. The value of a system whereby both bodies can meet and compromise their differences is clear and indisputable.

Yet today a number of Members of Congress, as well as other experts, feel that the conference committee procedure too often works against the wishes of both houses.

Senator George Norris (R-Neb.) told us in 1934 that:

"The members of the 'house' are not elected by the people. The people have no voice as to who these members shall be. . . This conference committee is many times, in very important matters of legislation, the most important branch of our legislature. There is no record kept of the workings of conference committees. Its work is performed, in the main, in secret. No constituent has any definite knowledge as to how members of this conference committee vote, and there is no record to prove the attitude of any member of the conference committee. As a practical proposition, we have legislation, then, not by the voice of the members of the Senate, not by the members of the House of Representatives, but we have legislation by the voice of five or six men. And for practical purposes, in most cases, it is impossible to defeat the legislation proposed by this conference committee. Every experienced legislator knows that it is the hardest thing in the world to defeat a conference report."

Since that time one would expect that the situation has changed. Yet in any of the reorganization or modernization acts very little was mentioned about conference committees.

One method of controlling the conference committee from the House side is the motion to instruct. In Cannon precedents 3230 (p. 720) it is stated that:

"Conference having been agreed to, the motion to instruct conferees is preferential. While it is unusual to instruct conferees before a conference is had, it is in order to move instructions for a first conference as for any subsequent conference."

In other words, if the body desires to instruct its members on how to act in conference with the other body, it may. The rationale behind this is simple—that of representation of one body when meeting with the other.

Theoretically, the conferees support the position of their respective houses. Obviously, however, one side or the other, or both, must alter its position. But the personal views of conferees often make their support of the views of their own house ineffective; indeed, given the personal sympathies of the conferees one can usually, though not always, correctly forecast the shape of the agreement to be reached by the conference committee.

In fact many times during committee mark-up sessions and on the floor, amendments may be accepted or deleted, with the idea that changes can be made later in the quiet of a conference. Thus it is very possible for the members of the House representing the body in the conference not to be representative in reality.

On most measures absolute representation is not possible and in fact is not wise. Sending members to represent the body in a session where there must be give and take implies a need for some flexibility.

There are and have been some cases though where the majority of the House felt that it would be necessary and advantageous to instruct the members in regard to a specific bill or a specific section of a bill.

While many times these instructions are followed conscientiously by members of the House representing that body in conference it is possible and indeed it has happened that the conferees do not follow the instructions.

One would think that the instructions by the House to the conferees would be binding upon them. Yet this is not the case. Cannon precedents again bear out this fact. On September 15, 1922 the precedents (3247) tell us that "a conference report is not subject to the point of order that it is in violation of instructions given the managers." The only alternative open to the House if the report does not adequately represent their viewpoints is to turn the report down.

So it seems that the House has only one choice when a report is returned without the issues it stipulated must be in it there, and that is to vote the whole report down.

It would seem that a method such as this could be both expensive and ineffective. Most bills today cannot be defeated once they come out of conference, for they concern themselves with many separate issues and to vote down, say, a report on the Higher Education Bill because it does not contain the busing clause results in more harm than good.

I feel that the Task Force should address itself to the crying need for reform in the Conference Committee system. It will require careful study since an overreaction could produce negative results.

One possible method of reform would be to make instructions to the conferees binding upon a two-thirds vote of the House. There are other possible solutions, however, and I would urge the Republican Conference

to carefully study this matter and make its recommendations a matter of priority for the 93d Congress.

PHIL CRANE REPORTS FROM CONGRESS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, early last month I sent my annual questionnaire to my constituents in Illinois and I was pleased to receive replies from almost 40,000 of them.

Because I believe the results will be

of interest to my colleagues, I include them in the RECORD at this point:

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS SHOW WIDE AGREEMENTS ON MAJOR ISSUES

Results of my 1972 constituent questionnaire have now been tabulated and, perhaps surprisingly, they indicate that the generation gap may not be as wide as we have been led to believe.

On all but two of the 13 issues involved in the questionnaire, the "under 21" and "over 21" respondents agreed, although the degree of approval or disapproval did vary substantially on some other issues.

Almost 40,000 completed questionnaires have been returned to my office in Washington and several hundred arrive in the mail each day. However, the new arrivals generally follow the same pattern as those already tabulated and I do not think the percentages shown below will change very substantially.

The questionnaire results are as follows:

| | Under 21 | | Over 21 | | | Under 21 | | Over 21 | |
|---|----------|----|---------|----|---|----------|----|---------|----|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No | | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| 1. Do you favor forced busing of students solely to achieve racial balance in schools? | 6 | 94 | 5 | 95 | 8. Do you believe mandatory union dues should be used for political purposes? | 4 | 96 | 6 | 94 |
| 2. Do you think punishments for pushers of hard drugs should be increased? | 86 | 14 | 97 | 3 | 9. Do you think Federal food stamps should be made available to strikers? | 35 | 65 | 12 | 88 |
| 3. Do you favor granting amnesty to draft resisters who have left the United States? | 53 | 47 | 18 | 82 | 10. Do you favor low-cost subsidized housing in your community without prior local consent? | 25 | 75 | 7 | 93 |
| 4. Do you think wage and price controls have lowered your cost of living? | 14 | 86 | 17 | 83 | 11. Do you favor lower taxes if Government services also would be reduced? | 52 | 48 | 75 | 25 |
| 5. Do you believe the Federal Government should assume total responsibility for the health care of Americans? | 40 | 60 | 28 | 72 | 12. Do you believe the removal of Soviet involvement in the Middle East should be a major priority issue in future United States-Soviet negotiations? | 47 | 53 | 58 | 42 |
| 6. Do you approve of President Nixon's handling of the Vietnam war? | 57 | 43 | 78 | 22 | 13. Do you believe President Nixon has done a good job during the past 3½ years? | 63 | 37 | 85 | 15 |
| 7. Do you think antitrust laws should apply to labor unions as they do to business? | 84 | 16 | 89 | 11 | | | | | |

National priorities were ranked as follows:

UNDER 21

1. Pollution control.
2. Inflation control.
3. Crime control.
4. Education.
5. Welfare reform.
6. Tax reduction.
7. Urban renewal.
8. Defense Improvement.

OVER 21

1. Inflation control.
2. Crime control.
3. Tax reduction.
4. Welfare reform.
5. Pollution control.
6. Education.
7. Defense Improvement.
8. Urban renewal.

AND WHAT HAVE I DONE OF THESE KEY ISSUES

Many constituents who participated in this annual questionnaire have asked me for my views on these same issues. Since it is impossible for me to respond personally to the thousands of requests, I would like to offer brief summaries of my record in Congress.

BUSING

My bill to eliminate court jurisdiction in the assignment of school children is still pending Judiciary Committee action . . . the Equal Educational Opportunity Act passed the House with restrictions on busing but, in my judgment, the prohibitions are insufficient and inadequate . . . I have joined with more than 160 colleagues in support of Constitutional amendment approach to resolve the question of busing.

DRUGS

My recently introduced bill with mandatory punishments for hard drug pushers is awaiting committee hearings.

AMNESTY

I am totally opposed to granting amnesty to those draft resisters who have fled the U.S. They have a right to leave if they desire but I

think they should do it the honest way, by giving up their citizenship.

NATIONALIZED HEALTH CARE

No legislation in support is expected this session . . . my testimony in opposition before the Ways and Means Committee is available upon request.

UNION ABUSES

Organized labor's influence upon Congress is still overwhelming and working at cross purposes to the interests of rank-and-file members and the public interest . . . my bill to prohibit use of involuntarily raised union dues for political purposes was adopted in Committee, then deleted on the House floor . . . my bill to deny food stamps to strikers was offered by Congressman Michel as an amendment to Agricultural Appropriations Act and defeated by a vote of 180-199.

SUBSIDIZED HOUSING

Housing bill now appears likely to come up before adjournment . . . a bi-partisan coalition on our committee included requirement of prior consent of local government before subsidized housing permissible in local communities.

MIDDLE EAST

Soviet penetration of Middle East continues unabated notwithstanding removal from Egypt . . . Syria and Iraq the focus of greatest attention today . . . Olympic murderers used Soviet-made Kalashnikov automatic rifles . . . Damascus radio described terrorists as "martyrs."

CONSERVATION

I joined with 351 colleagues to pass Bald Eagle Protection Act in an effort to preserve this endangered national symbol . . . joined with a majority to pass Cedar Keys National Wildlife Refuge (Florida) preserving this natural wilderness area . . . also, Lincoln Back Country Wilderness Area (Montana) to preserve another precious natural endowment . . . joined with 361 colleagues to pass Ocean Mammal Protection Act, designed to

protect all endangered mammals, but particularly whales . . . Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge which I supported passed unanimously.

NO-FAULT INSURANCE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, it would be a mistake to close the arguments on no-fault insurance without considering the following article from the September/October 1972, Trial magazine:

WHERE I STAND

(By Justice E. M. "Al" Gunderson, Nevada Supreme Court)

With so many journalists expounding learnedly on "no-fault insurance," a judge discussing it must fear the press will deem him a poacher. Still I assume even a judge may choose a legal subject like "no-fault insurance." Although I might prefer a topic outside the area of my training, I lack the courage of the Fourth Estate.

Speaking generally, our current laws allows you to sue when you believe you have been injured through another's fault. At present, if you show you have been injured through the other party's fault and not through your own, you may recover a judgment—against the manufacturer of a defective product, against a contractor whose workmen drop a scaffold on your head, against a driver who runs a red light. The judge will instruct the jury to award you full damages for your loss of earnings, property damage, medical expense, and pain and suffering.

To protect you and themselves, in the event a jury finds for you in an auto accident case, prudent drivers carry liability insurance.

While some states require this, in Nevada auto insurance companies have forestalled introduction of compulsory insurance laws, for they do not wish to insure drivers most dangerous to your safety against responsibility for their misconduct.

Now, the auto insurance companies seek legislation not only eliminating your right to full recovery for injuries caused by careless drivers, but compelling you to insure yourselves with a type of limited insurance they desire to sell.

Self-interest and frequently blind opposition to reform has characterized their conduct. Why should we accept them on faith now, in their unaccustomed role of consumer advocates? Should we not ask what the insurance industry seeks to take from us? what it wants us to accept instead? what assurance we have of actually receiving even the restricted benefits "no-fault insurance" supposedly would provide? Let us briefly consider these questions.

First, while there are numerous "no-fault" proposals, the American Insurance Association plan would totally eliminate your right to sue a driver who negligently injures you with an automobile. Thus, the AIA proposes to handle wrongs done with automobiles on a totally different basis than wrongs performed with other instrumentalities. By itself, this aspect of AIA "no-fault" suggests enough problems to cause deep concern in any detached, legally trained analyst.

Second, the AIA wants our legislators to compel you to purchase "no-fault insurance," for premiums not yet announced and subject to change. (Reliable actuaries believe your premiums would increase substantially under no-fault). Supposedly, no-fault insurance would provide limited coverage to persons injured in automobiles, whether at fault or not. You would be entitled to medical expenses, but to nothing for damage to your car if you had not purchased special coverage at additional cost, and nothing for your pain and suffering. Funeral expense would be limited to \$1,000; wage and other economic loss, to a maximum of \$750 per month. Thus, if you earn more than \$9,000 per year, you could recover but a portion of your economic losses.

Of course, the AIA's compulsory "no-fault" plan would require you to duplicate first-party insurance you already probably have, such as hospitalization, medical, and income protection insurance. You would need to keep paying premiums on those policies, however, for no-fault offers no protection outside the area of auto accidents.

On the other hand, if you are retired, under no-fault you may be crippled almost with impunity; for pain and suffering is not compensable, you will have no wage loss, and medicare will discharge your medical bills. So the insurance companies may pocket your premiums, really providing nothing in return. Of course, the premium of any person with a low personal income will likewise be "gravy" to the insurance companies—unless they grant special concessions to the poor, which they have not committed to do.

Third, the industry claims, in substance, that if it can just sell no-fault insurance, it can mend its ways, and discharge its obligations without compelling the public to resort to litigation. If true, of course, this would be a plus for no-fault. When traffic victims are forced to take legal action to obtain their rights, they necessarily incur court costs and attorneys' fees they must pay from compensation that should be theirs alone. The question is whether "no-fault" insurance is an adequate cure for such ills in our present system, to which the insurance industry has lavishly contributed.

In deciding this, we should first consider reforming the legal system that now governs all accidents, instead of treating auto accidents in the unique and piecemeal way the insurance industry proposes. Responsible

legal scholars believe such reforms (e.g. comparative negligence) are available. However, the insurance industry has fought them, with all its massive might.

We should also consider what we may really expect from the industry, if our legislators surrender our existing rights, and compel us to buy no-fault insurance. Will the industry really deal fairly with auto accident victims, rendering litigation unnecessary, so more of our premium dollars can go for benefits?

While only the future can answer that, the past may give some indication. After all, the industry's past performance is questionable not only in the auto insurance area. It is equally dubious where fault is not concerned in the question of coverage—as with property damage, hospitalization, medical, income protection, fire, life, and even burial insurance. This country's insurance law has evolved in litigation to force insurance companies to honor their policies.

You may be sure of this: The insurance companies promoting no-fault have their own interests clearly in view.

Those companies have laid their plans well. With the aid of harried columnists in need of an idea for the next edition, they have made protests from the country's finest lawyers seem like the maunderings of shy-sters. They have wrapped no-fault in the trappings of consumer protection—an alluring package to busy legislators. More than anyone else, those two groups—journalists and legislators—must share the responsibility, if "no-fault" is hastily adopted and proves to be a public disaster.

BENITO JUAREZ

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, further emphasizing the centennial of Benito Juarez, one of Mexico's and the Western Hemisphere's great patriots, was today's presentation of his portrait to the Library of Congress.

It was my pleasure this morning, together with the majority leader of the U.S. Senate, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, to attend the presentation by Mexico's Ambassador to the United States—Dr. Jose Juan de Olloqui—in behalf of the President of Mexico, His Excellency Luis Echeverria.

Ambassador de Olloqui proudly presented the portrait from the people of Mexico. Accepting the gift for the Library of Congress was the Librarian, Mr. L. Quincy Mumford, who said the picture will be on display in the Hispanic Section.

Mr. Speaker, not enough can be said of the many exemplary qualities of the late Benito Juarez in this, the 100th anniversary of his death. While Mexico commemorates this great man's outstanding achievements as a leader and a patriot, it is appropriate for us here in the United States—and us here in Washington—to remember that now we have two reminders of his impact on the Mexican people—the statue of Benito Juarez located on Virginia Avenue near the Potomac, and now this portrait.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of you—my colleagues—to join with me in extending our appreciation to the President and

the people of Mexico for this excellent manner of further strengthening the ties which exist between our two peoples and our two countries. The remarks made this morning by His Excellency Ambassador de Olloqui, will appear in another part of this RECORD—but it is my pleasure to repeat what Senator MIKE MANSFIELD said at the presentation:

Mr. Ambassador, Congressman de la Garza, Mr. Librarian, ladies and gentlemen, it gives me great pleasure to be here today to witness the presentation of this very fine portrait of Benito Juarez to the Library of Congress. The gift is an evidence of the warm relations the Government of the United States has with the Government of Mexico. It is especially timely in that 1972 marks the 100th anniversary of the death of President Juarez. I know of no more appropriate gesture of friendship which could have been made by the Mexican nation to the United States than to offer a portrait of Benito Juarez.

Benito Juarez was more than one of Mexico's outstanding patriots. He was more than the father of the great Mexican Reforma. The name, Benito Juarez, is inscribed on the select list of the world's distinguished champions of liberty. At a time when all governments confront vexing social problems, it is good to reflect on those individuals who have held to a relentless insistence on the freedom of the spirit in the search for solutions to the human condition.

I am delighted that the portrait of this great Mexican leader will hang in the Library of Congress. Here in this storehouse of human experience—itsself a monument to freedom—Juarez finds an appropriate setting. His presence here will be a reminder to us in the Congress of the United States of a colleague who gave of himself with whole heart to strengthen the foundations of liberty, justice, dignity and equality in his beloved country and in so doing, contributed to the furtherance of those ideals throughout the world.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REPORT GIVES MILITARY SPENDING FACTS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REPORT GIVES MILITARY SPENDING FACTS

(By Ruthven E. Libby)

The best things in life may be free, but most of its grim necessities aren't. National defense is definitely in this latter category.

Any taxpayer who wants to be bothered with the facts about his defense establishment will find a mine of information in the Defense Department report of July, 1972, called "The Economics of Defense Spending—A Look at the Realities."

This report demolishes the allegations we hear so often that defense spending is the root of all evil, the source of all our social, economic and psychological ills, the principal cause of inflation and the main contributor to our balance-of-payment problems.

It scotches the frequent assertions that the defense budget continues to grow unchecked and that defense spending dominates public spending, taking 60 per cent or more of the taxpayer's dollar.

It actually takes about 20 per cent of all public spending, the lowest portion in 20 years.

It shoots down those favorite straw men of the anti-defense forces that billions of dollars are squandered every year in weapon system "cost overruns," that defense contractors make exorbitant profits and that mismanagement, duplication and waste are the rule in the Defense Department.

One question frequently asked is, "What about all of the money we saved by winding down the war in Vietnam?"

Everybody knows that there have been drastic cuts in force levels (manpower). Military and Civil Service manpower has been cut by 1,440,000 people, or 30 per cent.

There has been a cut of 40 per cent (in real terms) in purchases from industry since the peak "war" year.

The result is that our military services are at their lowest strength in many years. At 1968 pay rates and price levels, these drastic reductions amounted to \$24 billion.

Where did this dividend go?

Well, pay raises for the remaining personnel plus the increased cost of military retirement ate up \$16.3 billion of it, and inflated costs of even the reduced purchases took another \$6.2 billion, so \$22.5 billion of the \$24 billion is up the spout.

The putative saving of \$24 billion turns out to be, in 1973 costs, only \$1.5 billion. It appears to be just as true in the Pentagon as it is in the supermarket, that more and more dollars buy less and less. But this does not negate the truth that defense is just as necessary as groceries.

In considering pay raises, 1963 is referred to in this report as the "prewar level."

For fiscal year 1973, military pay rates for the lowest enlisted grades will be more than four times the prewar level. For the lowest commissioned rank (second lieutenant—ensign) they will be about three times the 1963 level. For all other grades except generals and admirals, for which there is a statutory limitation, pay rates will have more than doubled.

The new military pay scales raise an interesting question not dealt with in this report or, so far as I know, faced up to anywhere else. The question is: how, at these pay scales, will the nation finance a general mobilization of the magnitude of World War II, should such a necessity eventuate?

Already we have reached the stage where the defense budget is dominated by pay costs. These, plus operating costs, now take a disproportionate share of the budget, leaving very little for the "investment area" such as the development and procurement of new weapons.

Nevertheless, defense critics have consistently described the defense budget for the last several years as "rising." This is grossly inaccurate.

In real terms, national defense outlays have been dropping sharply for the last five years; the drop from 1968 to 1973 has been on the order of 32 percent, or \$34.3 billion.

In real terms, defense procurement of weapons is somewhat below the levels of the late 1950s and significantly below those of the late 1960s.

As for the charge that defense contractors make exorbitant profits, this has been scotched pretty thoroughly by the General Accounting Office, a creature of Congress. One study made by the GAO in March, 1971, the Defense Industry Profit Study, is acknowledged even by critics of defense procurement processes as an authoritative inquiry.

It can be summed up by a sentence from the DOD report: "On the whole, those alleging that defense profits are too high find more comfort in adjectives than in data." The GAO study finds that in actuality, rates of return for contractors in defense work were 4.3 per cent of sales before taxes and 2.3 per cent of sales after taxes—significantly lower than on comparable commercial work.

Well, popular myths die hard, but this report by the comptroller of the Department of Defense should slay a lot of dragons.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

HON. J. KENNETH ROBINSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I regret that exigencies of the Federal budgetary situation require us now to consider a broad grant of authority to the Executive to make selective withholdings of appropriated funds.

I believe that the Congress—and this House in particular—has not faced up to its responsibilities in the matter of relating expenditures to anticipated revenue.

Through unilateral action of this House, or through a Joint Committee on the Budget, an annual limit on Federal expenditures should be set within the Congress, and the appropriations process should be controlled by such limit.

I hope that we may deal with this pressing, recurring problem in the early days of the 93d Congress.

In the meantime, I take leave to include in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on this date, as follows:

A TROUBLED CONGRESS

Now that the President's request for a \$250 billion spending ceiling has been steered cleanly through the House Ways and Means Committee by Chairman Mills, it has dawned on the opposition that the measure might actually pass. Those awakened to the ghastly possibility that the government might somehow get its budget under control are thus hastily erecting obstacles, if not to block the proposal entirely, at least to render it ineffective.

The call to arms was sounded by The Washington Post "Congress," said the Post, "is now taking the first slippery step in a historic retreat from legislative responsibility. . . . Under its Democratic leadership, Congress is now colluding with Mr. Nixon to conceal from the American people, until after the election, the full meaning of this bill."

So liberals in Congress now have a counter plan, supported by Senate and House Democratic leadership. The plan, to be offered on the House floor by Rep. Richard Bolling of Missouri, would give Congress the power to veto the spending cuts proposed by the President which it didn't like. The qualification would mean, naturally, that there is no spending ceiling.

If Congress had the political will and practical ability to hold government outlays to any manageable level, the problem wouldn't exist in the first place. Indeed, if it were not for the threat of conventional presidential vetoes, we have not the slightest doubt that Congress would spend itself into exhaustion. Does anyone believe it would suddenly find the resolve to accept budget cutbacks?

Liberals are worried that the President would cut their programs. And for eight months, all that would remain of the fiscal year, the pain would no doubt be excruciating. We trust that no agency of government would escape the knife, including the Pentagon. The President would have to turn away pleas for mercy by governors, mayors,

school, health, and housing administrators, generals, and admirals. For eight months, the President would surely be the most unpopular man in Washington.

But what is the alternative? Another dizzying surge of inflation followed by an induced recession, courtesy of the Federal Reserve Board. Governors, mayors, school, health, and housing administrators, admirals and generals would then discover that anticipated tax revenues at every level were nosediving. Their inability to make ends meet would get some of our sympathy, but most of it we will reserve for the poor, the elderly, the unemployed. They should not have to be put through the inflation-recession wringer again because Congress insists on its prerogatives. Avoiding that result, in fact, will do more for their welfare than any of the programs that would suffer cuts.

The other alternative, which the liberals are banking on, is a tax increase next year. At least they continue to argue to anyone willing to listen that the people of the United States are undertaxed. And the White House says the vote on the spending limit "is in a real sense a vote on whether there will be higher taxes next year." Yet Congress has amply demonstrated that as much as it dislikes spending restraint, it dislikes raising taxes even more. Our guess is that this option to pull the budget out of its hole is not realistic.

The problem, then, is that the federal budget is out of control and Congress is not equipped to deal with it. It has already abdicated its legislative responsibility, and the argument that it would be abdicating now by mandating the White House to do the job is preposterous. Congress has squandered its responsibility through the buy now, pay later plans of the Great Society, the bills for which are coming due. It has been creative in designing new ways of spending to skirt its own appropriations mechanism—open-ended commitments, broad grants of contractual authority, interest-subsidy schemes that commit the nation into the 21st Century to pay costs that rise geometrically.

The only way it can really recapture that responsibility is through internal structural reform, either by reassembling its entire committee system or by empowering a new committee of Congress to discipline the spending impulses of the whole. Happily, there is some stirrings on Capitol Hill in this direction and the 93rd Congress perhaps will come to grips with the problem. But what of the immediate issue? The budget crisis is real, it's now, and it can't await structural reforms. A firm spending ceiling is the only plausible solution.

Congress, though, is troubled, and it hesitates. Yet having methodically pushed most of a quarter-trillion dollar budget beyond the control of either itself or the White House, it takes quite an imagination for Congress to suspect it might now be on the brink of an historic leap into irresponsibility. It leaped long ago.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join with many of my fellow colleagues by commenting briefly on the accomplishments and the character of the man who has been a great friend of all of us throughout the years.

As the Members of this distinguished body know, TOM PELLY earlier made the decision not to seek reelection to the 93d Congress. In the 20 years that Tom has served, he has distinguished himself greatly in many areas. He has always represented his constituents and his country in the House of Representatives which has been clearly demonstrated by his continuous reelection throughout 10 terms.

I recall very fondly—more years ago than I truly care to remember—when I journeyed to the great State of Washington and had the privilege of making some speeches in Tom's district. Over these past years, his accomplishments have been many. As a matter of fact, they are so voluminous that it would probably fill the entire RECORD today. So, I believe that it can be summed up by saying that TOM PELLY is a great statesman and a great American.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. NETTIE B. ROGERS

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, from time to time, the accomplishments of our fellow Americans are noted in this body, and rightly so, that they may be an inspiration to us in our daily lives.

Such an inspiration is one of my constituents, Mrs. Nettie B. Rogers of Memphis. Mrs. Rogers is an activist in the finest sense of the word. She is not content to sit by and complain that the world is not to her liking; when she sees something wrong she tries to do something about it.

What she tries to do, she usually gets done. One thing she has tried to do, and has done successfully for the past 20 years, is to spearhead a movement to bring our children into an awareness of God and God's love.

For years Mrs. Rogers has walked the streets of Memphis gathering children up and carrying them to Sunday school and church.

Two years ago she began a more ambitious effort, a citywide "Back to Church School" crusade. During a short period of time 39 churches opened their doors to more than 2,000 young people who were not affiliated with any church before. Governor Winfield Dunn proclaimed the first Sunday in June as National Church School Day in Tennessee and publicly commended Mrs. Rogers for her efforts in this inspiring and vital movement. Since then it has become an annual event.

This is only one of her accomplishments. She has worked with our city's needy elderly citizens and is a member of the Tennessee Commission on Aging. She is active in the city and county school lunch programs, and she works with juveniles, prison inmates, orphans, the underprivileged, and anyone else who needs help.

Extending a hand in helpfulness is Mrs. Nettie Rogers' trademark. I think we should extend her ours, in gratitude.

McGOVERN IN HANOI

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I know of no Member of Congress, either in the House or the Senate, who does not want to see us make lasting peace a possibility. I want to make it clear that I do not in any way impugn the loyalty, the integrity or the good intentions of Senator McGOVERN, the Democratic candidate. I think all of us can be allowed leeway on these particular qualities of character.

I do believe, however, that we should discuss the issues and those should be presented in a rational and thoughtful way in order that the people of this country can make up their minds about which candidate they believe can contribute the most to give us peace in our time. I know of no one who has given this more thought, who is better acquainted with the possibility of a nuclear war than that reknown nuclear scientist, Dr. Edward Teller. Through the years I have known him, he has been imbued with a consuming passion for peace and realistic policies for achieving and maintaining that peace.

Dr. Teller, along with many of us, experienced Munich which led to World War II. Dr. Teller along with me and many others is convinced of the necessity now for a full pragmatic approach to the problem of American survival. In an article by Dr. Teller in "Survive," the American Journal of Civil Preparedness for September-October 1972, he relates this conviction to the 1972 presidential campaign. Dr. Teller, like so many of us in the Congress believes that the avoidance of world war III and a nuclear holocaust is the big issue of our times. Unless we can avoid this, all else fails. Having been one of those most closely associated with the atomic bomb in World War II, nobody knows more about the devastation that would occur if world war III became possible. This article, titled, "McGOVERN in Hanoi," sets forth vividly the problems we have and what we must do to meet it.

The important point made by Dr. Teller is that morality and survival are not independent and that somewhere we have to make a decision not only on moral issues but whether or not this country can survive.

Mr. Speaker, I attach this very thoughtful article by Dr. Teller in order that my colleagues may know what a dedicated American has to say about this very important point—survival:

McGOVERN IN HANOI

(By Edward Teller)

The choice is now clearly defined. Our next President will be either Richard Nixon or George McGovern.

The name of this publication is "Survive." It is from this point of view that I want to

think about the election: the survival of America and the American people.

The McGovern camp has chosen the issue of Vietnam as its battle cry. If McGovern shall be our next President, he will withdraw from Vietnam and then go to Hanoi to beg for the release of the American Prisoners of War. He has said it and he has repeated it.

What Richard Nixon accomplished was the successful Vietnamization of the War in Indo-China. The last massive Communist aggression spearheaded by hundreds of tanks, was not supported by the people in South Vietnam. This no longer can be called a civil war. The civil war of which McGovern keeps talking is over.

The invasion was successfully resisted by the Army of the South. In terms of achievements and of common sense, the war is nearing its successful ending. Now an American candidate for President is prepared to tear down the results of a defense of freedom by a gratuitous offer to surrender.

McGovern argues in terms of morality. True morality is on the opposite side. However, there are many who want to consider the issue not in terms of morality but in terms of practical politics. We have spent, they say, too much time on Vietnam and have neglected the main issue, the defense of the United States against Russia.

I cannot agree with this point of view. Morality and survival are not independent. In 1938 Neville Chamberlain acted on the assumption that Britons need not die for far away Czechoslovakia. The result was the most terrible war in our memory.

Those who today argue that Vietnam is far away, who would defend the United States but not freedom in a distant land, make the same mistake as Chamberlain. The result however may not be the same. The result may be bigger and worse with the sudden application of incomparably more powerful weapons than were available in 1938 or in the following years in which the Nazis were victorious.

Those bloody victories and horrible defeats were eventually stopped and the Nazis did not attain their original dreadful aim of world tyranny. A repetition in the 1970's which may take the form of Russian aggression and the establishment of a worldwide dictatorship would lead to results that are final and irreversible. The power of a modern state could establish a permanent pattern for the future of humanity.

Let us remember that freedom is a recent invention. It is unstable. Perhaps it is even self-contradictory. The war in Vietnam is the first war we fought without invoking censorship. The result has been that our most prestigious papers which now support McGovern have distorted the news and engaged in propaganda aimed at the victory of our opponents. One single and most unfortunate event in which our troops behaved in a terrible manner at My Lai did become by repetition and exaggeration common knowledge throughout the United States. Viet Cong terrorism resulting in the murder of thousands of distinguished leaders in South Vietnam that paved the way to the conflict in South Vietnam has not been publicized. The systematic massacres by the North Vietnamese committed in 1968 in Hue have been barely mentioned and then forgotten.

Of course it would have seemed more expedient on the part of President Nixon to withdraw from South Vietnam and to leave those whom Presidents Kennedy and Johnson have befriended to their fate. Should we not have accepted the possibility that a million of South Vietnamese would be killed and many millions enslaved? After all, so it is stated, we are not the policemen of the world. Fortunately, Nixon was too wise to accept this argument.

It is my firm conviction that a withdrawal from Vietnam would mean disaster for the United States in the near future. There is

no question in my mind that a withdrawal at the present time, as advocated by McGovern and the majority of the Democratic convention, would be indeed fatal not only to the Vietnamese but also to us.

In a technical sense the war in Vietnam has been won by our side. The decision was clinched by Nixon's courageous decision to blockade the ports and to bomb the supply lines in North Vietnam. It is obvious that a small additional effort is needed to bring about a favorable and probably stable conclusion. If we now submit to propaganda and behave in a manner that will appear in the eyes of the world as an extravagant caprice, as an "America first" policy exaggerated far beyond what existed in the 1930's, the credibility of any American alliance will vanish. Europe will no longer remain tenable. America will be isolated.

This world has become small and more interrelated. If isolationism was wrong, neo-isolationism is the most incredible mistake. In fact, the neo-isolationism of McGovern is more than a mistake. It is inexcusable folly.

In the minds of too many Americans a nuclear war is unthinkable. Most people believe that American retaliation would be sure and effective. McGovern boasts that if he is President there can be no Pearl Harbor. That American deterrents are potent continues to be believed in spite of accumulating evidence which points in a different and ominous direction. The readers of *Survive* know that Russia has made thorough preparations for the evacuation of its cities. McGovern opposes civil defense.

Our readers have heard that Russia has developed its arms far beyond parity. The possibility of a clear-cut Russian victory not accompanied by Russian losses is a terrible possibility unless the determined leadership offered presently by Richard Nixon is continued. Even today it is a certainty that Russia is safe against a repetition of the dreadful suffering that the Russians remember from the days of the Nazi invasion. Most unfortunately nuclear war is not unthinkable. But McGovern and his supporters prefer not to think.

In spite of these real and terrible dangers, I believe that President Nixon has established the right priorities. He knew that Vietnam had to be defended first. He knew that what we have started had to be finished. He has ended the paternalistic approach of the earlier Administrations and transferred the responsibility of Vietnamese defense to the Vietnamese people. In spite of the chorus of the doubters and the defeatists he has succeeded. Vietnam now is and should be Vietnamese.

Now we can turn to the question of our own defense and our own survival. The first step in that direction is a most serious and conscientious effort to eliminate tensions between the big powers. We are at peace with Peking and with Moscow. Trips by the President to these places were justified.

We are not at peace with Hanoi. For an American President to go hat in hand to a defeated enemy would be both egregious and, considering our responsibilities, wicked. This is a free country. Let McGovern go if he wishes, but let us make very sure that he shall never have a chance to represent, as President, the American people and perform the act of betraying our Allies.

According to the logic of the military situation Hanoi should stop its aggression. Because of political logic they should continue. Why should they give up while there is a chance that a whim of the American electorate could give them the victory which they could not achieve in South Vietnam? The blood that will be split in the next few months is on the head of McGovern.

But worse would follow if McGovern were elected. What is in the making is a new Munich. What is at stake is our own survival.

UNCLE SAM'S FEVERISH MEDICAL SPENDING

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of us in the Congress have been deeply interested in the health and welfare of every citizen of this country. For 8 years, I was a member of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment and for the past 3 years, I have been an ex officio member of that subcommittee with voting power. I think that our Subcommittee on Health and the Environment has considered and passed every piece of major health legislation now on the books in the last 20 years. The real problem is how much money shall be spent.

In the year 1965, the Federal outlay for Federal projects was \$5.2 billion. In the President's budget for 1973, there is a total of \$26.7 billion. This means that we have quintupled the health care outlay in this country in the fiscal years from 1965 through 1973.

All of us realize that there is not a committee in the Congress that does not have needed programs; the real problem is one of priorities. There simply is not enough money to go around for all the programs that every committee would like to bring before the Congress—unless there is a tax rise. In my opinion, the people of this country will not stand still for a tax rise. If I understand the people in Illinois correctly, this is the major fear among them. Taxes are rising at the local level—village, city, township, county, and State. People generally believe they cannot afford to pay any more taxes.

This then leaves the question of what we are to do with all programs before the Congress. I know the Appropriations Committee will be wrestling with this problem when the new Congress convenes in January. There will not be enough money to supply all of the programs everyone wants and that come from every committee in the Congress. It is the duty of the Appropriations Committee to set up priorities and to fund those in the order they believe are necessary to the public welfare.

I know of no Member of the Congress who has been more disturbed about the fiscal deficits of the past 15 years than the distinguished ranking Republican member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Health. Bob MICHEL has almost made a career of study of this field in trying to arrive at figures that are fair and adequate to the health needs of this country. He has written an excellent article in the October 1972 issue of *Nation's Business* titled, "Uncle Sam's Feverish Medical Spending," and points out how rapidly this has risen. He has not in any way been critical because he has been one of those who has attempted to fund the needed health programs for our people. He does raise the question of how much more can be done if we are to balance priorities. It is a thoughtful

article and I commend it to my colleagues for their reading:

UNCLE SAM'S FEVERISH MEDICAL SPENDING

(By Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL)

Washington is taking on a bigger and bigger share of the nation's burgeoning health bill; but are those billions of tax dollars being spent wisely?

From the way the highly emotional issue of medical care is being debated this election year, you'd get the impression the federal government is doing little or nothing in this field.

Proposals now before Congress would dramatically increase federal spending for health purposes. These costly plans include more than a dozen different suggestions for various kinds of health insurance.

Most assume, wrongly, that Washington has somehow shirked in this area.

So perhaps the most important thing is to obtain a proper perspective. Let's bring into focus the actual size of current federal spending on health care.

And, in doing so, let's bear in mind that the money to finance whatever we spend, now or in the future, can come from only one source—you, the taxpayer.

Money for a wide range of health programs is scattered through the budgets of many different federal agencies.

If you isolate all these programs and add them up, you'll find that an astounding \$26.7 billion is budgeted for federal health spending this fiscal year.

That represents an increase of \$5 billion in the last two years alone.

While the President has already vetoed one Congressional attempt to make the increases for this year even bigger, pressures remain strong on Capitol Hill for adding hefty sums to the health budget.

WHERE YOUR TAXES GO

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare will spend most of the federal health care money this year—\$21.3 billion. Big chunks will also go to the Veterans Administration, the Defense Department and the Civil Service Commission—for federal employees' health benefits—and to other agencies.

Three fourths of HEW's share, about \$16 billion, will be spent on Medicare, Medicaid and related federal health service programs.

This year more than 95 per cent of all Americans over 65 will be enrolled in Medicare. Washington will pay 45 per cent of all their out-of-pocket expenses for health care. It will cost HEW an estimated \$10.4 billion.

Another 24 million persons will receive the same kind of benefits through Medicaid. Low-income families and others who qualify as medically needy are eligible.

Washington will pay 55 per cent of the total cost of Medicaid—or about \$3.4 billion. States and localities pay the balance. And that's not the end.

In addition, about two thirds of all the money spent on health research in this country comes from Uncle Sam.

More than \$2 billion of federal money will go to the National Institutes of Health for medical research. It will be divided up among NIH's 10 individual institutes: allergy and infectious diseases, cancer, arthritis and metabolic diseases, eye disease, child health and human development, heart disease, dental research, environmental health sciences, general medical sciences, and neurological diseases and stroke.

Some of the money will also go to the National Library of Medicine, medical manpower programs and a division of biologics standards.

And some members of Congress are trying to add \$200 million or \$300 million to the \$2 billion President Nixon asked for NIH.

The budget lists \$1.5 billion for training and development of dentists, doctors, nurses and others in the health field.

In fact, more than half the total income of the nation's medical schools this year will come from federal grants and contracts. A dozen separate federal agencies will chip in to pay for training there.

Lots of federal money will also go to build and, in some cases, staff hospitals, nursing homes and community mental health centers, to combat drug abuse and alcoholism, to prevent poisoning from lead-based paint and to provide mental health services to children.

HIGH AND GOING HIGHER

Congress is spending record amounts on health programs—this year, in fact, more than 10 per cent of the entire federal budget.

That's a far cry from just a few years ago when federal health spending was less than 4.5 percent of a much smaller budget.

Washington is rapidly taking on a bigger and bigger share of the nation's health bill. In 1965, of every \$7.50 spent for health care \$1, or 13 percent, came from the federal government. By 1971, a mere six years later the federal share had nearly doubled to 26 per cent, or more than \$1 out of \$4.

During the same six years, the nation's spending on health shot up from \$38.9 billion to about \$75 billion. That's an increase of almost 100 per cent.

But federal spending for health went up 400 per cent.

Now, in 1972, Washington will spend 500 per cent more than it did just eight years ago.

No one who has seen a doctor or visited a hospital recently needs to be reminded that the cost of health care is going up.

From 1966 to 1971, the Consumer Price Index for all items rose 25 per cent. But hospital daily service charges increased an astonishing 91 per cent and physicians' fees, 39 per cent.

So as part of the economic stabilization program, the Price Commission last December set a 6 per cent limit on increases in hospital charges and 2.5 per cent on physicians' fees.

But, as we have seen, Congress is placing few limits on health spending by the federal government.

I do not mean to imply that Congress and the Administration should not give top priority to health care.

That has been done.

As ranking minority member of the House Appropriations subcommittee on health, I'm especially aware of the critical need to move forward in such areas as health research, disease prevention and control, health planning and delivery of services, as well as the training of medical personnel.

PUSHING UP HEALTH COSTS

But President Nixon has pointed out something of growing concern to those of us who have watched both federal and total national health spending increase at an explosive rate.

He said: "When the subject of health care improvements is mentioned, too many people and too many institutions think first and solely of money. . . . In health care as in so many other areas, the most expensive remedy is not necessarily the most effective one."

This concern has been underscored by our experience with the Medicare and Medicaid programs. The very real contributions they have made to meeting the health needs of the poor and the elderly have gone hand in hand with huge boosts in overall costs of medical care.

These increases have not only eroded the benefits under the programs themselves; they have also created additional financial hardships for all Americans.

What Washington did—with Medicare and Medicaid—was to vastly increase the demand for health care without increasing the supply.

Now it is trying to match the demand by spending more money to expand the health care system.

Washington is also trying to bring down medical costs by pushing preventive health care.

How well these costly new programs will work remains to be seen. It is too early to tell.

We still face the immediate problem of rapidly increasing medical costs, and the clamor to have Washington spend far more to meet them.

This approach is sometimes described as: "Dole out the dough and the problem will go away."

Who pays the bills for these free-spending schemes?

Sooner or later the money comes out of the taxpayer's own pocket, and that's the rub.

We tend to postpone the unpleasant. So it's not surprising that cost is barely mentioned in the current debate over Washington's role in the health field.

If Congress' past record of facing up to tax issues is any indication, a bare mention is all that cost will ever get. At least, until we reach a day of reckoning on our mounting federal debt.

One of the least expensive of the health insurance plans introduced in Congress would add \$2.6 billion a year—a 10 per cent increase—to the \$26.7 billion Washington is spending now.

The most expensive plan would provide national health insurance for virtually all Americans at a cost of more than \$60 billion a year! That plan means that, as early as July, 1973, \$4 of every \$5 spent on doctor bills, hospital bills and other health costs would be paid by the U.S. Treasury—out of the taxpayers' pockets.

Some suggest that we finance these schemes by cutting back on military spending once we get out of the Viet Nam War.

This so-called peace bonus, however, has already been committed to new or expanded domestic spending programs, as a Brookings Institution study has pointed out. It will be the source of few, if any, funds for costlier health plans.

Unlike tax credits, or other steps to stimulate the economy, federal spending for most social programs generates no new income to offset the tax burden it creates.

In addition, each new health service handed out by Washington tends to become a fixture. When new programs are introduced, the old are seldom phased out, no matter how ineffective they may be—especially if they serve a vocal constituency.

With the prospect of more federal spending on new and existing health programs, we must do two things:

Face up to the fiscal realities.

Evaluate the effectiveness of our present efforts.

WHAT MONEY WILL NOT BUY

We must recognize that it is counterproductive to pour massive amounts of federal dollars into programs—however popular they may be politically—which will further overload our existing health care system and stimulate the inflationary cycle we so desperately need to control.

Also, more research funds will accomplish nothing in fields where research technicians are not available. Just as additional money for disease control will achieve little, if the basic approaches being used are not effective.

It's not just a question of saying "spend" or "don't spend." We have pressing national health needs to meet and neither of those two extremes will solve the problem.

We have to know precisely what our federal dollars are buying. Is what we are buying really relevant to our needs? Is it contributing to better health care? Or is it bringing us higher costs and a less effective system?

We must answer these questions. And, finally, we must also try harder to look at

the total picture of social needs in this country.

Health care is only one of the domestic challenges we face. Our health needs are important, but they must be balanced with other priorities.

Unless we do this, we may never come to terms with our financial ability and our national will to meet those challenges.

HOW FEDERAL SPENDING FOR HEALTH CARE HAS GROWN

| [Total Federal outlays for health purposes] | |
|---|---------|
| Year: | Billion |
| 1965 | \$5.2 |
| 1967 | 10.8 |
| 1969 | 17 |
| 1970 | 18.5 |
| 1971 | 21 |
| 1972 | 24 |
| 1973 | 26.7 |

¹ Total of health items in President's budget for current fiscal year.

MEMORIAL SERVICES HONORING THE ISRAELI OLYMPIC TEAM KILLED AT MUNICH

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, 1 month ago we here in the Congress joined with all peoples throughout the world in deepest sorrow with the shocking senseless dastardly deed of terrorism at Munich, taking the lives of 11 members of the Israeli Olympic Team. In my congressional district, as in all others throughout our United States, our people congregated in mournful prayer and communion expressing the grief and horror striking at the heart of our Nation's conscience and weighing heavily upon the conscience of all civilized mankind throughout the world.

It is indeed a great privilege and honor to bring to your attention the interfaith memorial services conducted at Temple Emanuel, Paterson, N.J., in my congressional district, by Rabbi Dr. David H. Panitz, our most distinguished spiritual leader of the temple, and the highly esteemed Cantor David Lefkowitz. The outpouring of grief and the shock mirrored by the entire world were engrossed in these memorial services and intertwined in the words of the guest speakers of varied faiths who were introduced by Rabbi Panitz at the temple and addressed a congregation of all nationalities and creeds who were in attendance at the temple on Wednesday, September 6, 1972, as follows:

OPENING PRAYER

Oh mighty and eternal God, Thou are the author of life and of death, the heart of your children mourn with heaviness, with pain, and with grief. We seek Thy comfort in this difficult and tragic hour. Thou who are eternal and who art the creator, art the merciful father of old, your children gather together in Thy presence, bowed in grief, seeking Thy light to dispel the dark gloom which threatens to overwhelm all of us.

Be gracious, oh God, to each mournful heart, for we are in distress. The House of Israel is in mourning; the children of Jacob are in mourning; all of Thy children, oh God, are in mourning. We have come together not

only to express our shock and our pain; we have come together because our hearts are united.

Men of all faiths, and men of all colors stand as one united human family, to give voice to our feelings, and to seek that light which shall enable all of mankind to uproot the evil and the terror which surrounds all of us. For we who are Thy children, out of this very dark and grim hour, wish to find that way in which all men can live together as brothers.

Oh god, it is in Thee that we place our faith and through Thee we shall find comfort and solace, in this very difficult and painful hour. As one united heart, we acknowledge Thee as our father, and the source of our comfort.

Let us all say, amen.

DR. DAVID H. PANITZ, RABBI, TEMPLE EMANUEL

We have come together, friends, in a very tragic and difficult moment. There isn't a person anywhere who isn't fully aware of what has taken place. Many of us have literally not been able to sleep. The tragedy is not merely one for the State of Israel, nor only for the Jewish people. It is a difficult and painful moment for every child of God, and we, gathered together this evening, for this prayer of memorial, indeed constitute a very rainbow of members of this community. Regardless of faith or color, we have united; we stand together.

A great deal can be said about what leads up to such difficult hours. But one thing is clear to each of us, that acts which so destroy the dignity of man, which cut off the young, which obliterate the very faith which man has in his neighbor, which would even utilize the brotherhood of the Olympic games, for the destruction of human beings, truly undermines the very force of life which we, each of us, as humans seek.

As Officiating Rabbi, my words shall be very, very few, for the expressions of those who have gathered together, distinguished men, will speak to and for all of us.

HON. MORRIS MERKER, PRESIDENT,
TEMPLE EMANUEL

Much will be said this evening about what must be done as we approach the coming new year and rededicate ourselves to the fact that we mirror the world's conscience, and we must continue to stand up for justice. We shall fight the assassins and fix the responsibility of their acts with all the might at our command.

We must never again allow acts of cowardice to be thought of in terms of apology. We must serve notice once and for all that the Jews in Israel, yes, the Jews in all of this world, are here to stay, and will not be driven into the sea. Let us stand up and proclaim to the world, we are united as one. Where there is injustice to one Jew, it is injustice to all Jews.

HON. LEWIS WOLFF, PRESIDENT, JEWISH
FEDERATION OF NORTH JERSEY

Tonight, I speak for the 27,000 Jews who comprise the Jewish Federation of North Jersey. They are bitter and angry. Bitter and angry as Jews who have lost eleven beautiful young brothers. Bitter and angry as Americans who fear for the safety of all people, wherever they may be, or wherever they may be from.

But with bitterness and anger, come the questioning, a questioning whether this might not have been such a tragedy that the leaders of the world have had to stop and think; to think where the continuation of this senseless anarchism and butchery will lead us. Perhaps now world opinion will mobilize itself to demand justice. Perhaps those eleven Israelis did not die in vain. I certainly hope so.

HON. GERRARD BERMAN, PRESIDENT,
JEWISH AGENCY

This morning, at my breakfast table, as I opened the New York Times, I saw these ten beautiful men, men who had given their lives. I cried. I knew I was going to attend a memorial service tonight, but I didn't know that they were to attend two memorial services this week, one as a visitor to Zochor to remember their own mothers and fathers, who died at Zochor, and this morning, on their pine coffins, they also had a memorial service, and I said to myself, that we of the Jewish Agency will remember, Zochor will remember, that they are a part of the eternal victims of our people, and we are the survivors.

We will honor them, honor them by building a greater Israel, and through the help of my friends in Paterson, and northern New Jersey, and the Jews throughout the world, we will, in their names, and for the peace of the world, and for those who died, whether they be Jews or non-Jews, we will build a greater world, a world of peace and happiness, and for that, we say to them. "Your bright faces, your energies, will never be forgotten," because we are dedicating ourselves to build a better world and a more peaceful world in their name.

RT. REV. MSG. JOSEPH J. GALLO, PASTOR, OF
BLESSED-SACRAMENT ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

I speak to you this evening first in behalf of Bishop [Lawrence B.] Casey, the Shepherd of the See of Paterson, who, although he found it absolutely impossible to join us, wanted me to speak very personally for his concern and his sharing with all of you and with all the people of God, across the world at this moment of anguish and of sorrow, and also to express the sympathy and the prayerful concern of the Catholic community here in the City of Paterson and throughout the diocese.

I think that for all of us words come very "hard-ly" and with great difficulty. In the face of the tragedy that we have witnessed, I think most of all that we are made to turn back deep into our own souls and to make this a time of very earnest prayer, of a reaching out of our hands to our Heavenly Father to beg His forgiveness for this distillation of hatred, evil, and violence that mars not just the Olympic games, but mars human history and stains it.

And in our prayerfulness I am sure that all of us reach out to beg our Heavenly Father for the strength and the integrity to do more than just speak about this tragedy. To be conscious of our individual responsibility to our fellowmen. To be aware that where innocent blood is shed in whatever form, and under whatever guise, that all of us bleed and all of us die. We of this time have had to share in so much shedding of blood and so much violence, and so much hatred that we recognize these terrible individual instances as symptoms of a deeper abiding sickness that unfortunately touches so many of us, the deeper tragedy of the petty injustices, and the suspicions and the divisiveness that beset our society across the world, and the terrible lack of ability on the part of men of goodwill and the part of men who share so much of a common heritage and a common faith to be able to bridge the gap that separates us and to be able to mobilize our common concern and love and strength so that we can wipe out these stains.

It is in that prayerful sense of an awareness of our own shortcomings towards our brothers and a pleading from God for the strength to be not just a people of prayer and not just a people of words, but a people united in action at every level of our lives, to be messengers of peace, and to bring the life of God, our Father, into this world of ours, and to make "shalom" much more than just a by-word or a symbol.

We pray God, our Father, that this terrible tragedy might be turned into a moment when all of us together will resolve, as children of one father, to live and act and work together for justice and for peace, and we pray that the mourning and the sorrow that besets the sons of Israel might be shared deeply by all the sons of God. And that this mourning may become for all of us a source of new strength to bind ourselves together in reality, in deed, to work for peace and justice in our world.

REV. ROBERT F. KIRCHGESSNER, B.A., M.Div.,
RECTOR, TRINITY EPISCOPAL CHURCH

Truly this is a most solemn hour for us, all of us, regardless of our background, our heritage, our religion. Men of goodwill must be stunned at this tragic hour. And surely each of us, perhaps in our own way and our own words, have expressed our utter horror at what has taken place.

Really words, no matter how eloquent they may be, are not enough unless they are words that, in a mind that is united with our hearts, is dedicated to the principle that we are all children of God, and claim one father. The Psalmist said, 'Oh, Lord, what is man that Thou art mindful of him, and the son of man, that Thou considerest him? And yet Thou hast made him little less than the angels and crowned him with glory and honor.'

And so each of us apparently has such great potential, that we are held apparently in such great regard, and yet, we find again and again, depraved people who destroy this great ideal, this great image, this great potential for all of us. And so it is then that men of good will must rise up in righteous indignation at what has taken place. But we must, as men of goodwill, as Rabbi Panitz has mentioned previously, be united, one heart, dedicated to the glory of God, and the brotherhood of man.

And so I would suggest that while we pray surely for the bereaved that they may find comfort and pray for the souls of those eleven athletes, that had trained so hard to use that body that God had given them to the best of their ability, that they may find comfort in Abraham's bosom. And surely out of this we cannot go away feeling that we have expressed our sorrow and our indignation; we must go as children of God, hoping to take something out of this, that we might be motivated, that our attitudes may be changed, and this may be a living example to us of what He can really do.

Truly, the scene that we have beheld is a horrible one. So let us then recognize that each of us in our own way must do our share to do whatever possible that this may never happen again. We must dedicate ourselves again to the words of the Psalmist that it may become a reality: 'Behold how good and pleasant it is to see men dwell together in unity.' May this be our prayer, our belief. As out of this, something good may come.

HON. JAMES W. ROE, FORMER FREEHOLDER-
DIRECTOR, PASSAIC COUNTY

Last evening, as I watched on television and saw this dastardly drama unfold, I could not believe my eyes that again, again in my lifetime that we should have to go through something like this. It made me reflect, and I was thinking myself this morning as I was walking to the office, "How small one voice is; how humble one voice is; how almost useless it is, it seems, in this great world of ours."

I had occasion to talk to brother Bob, Congressman Bob Roe, this afternoon, and in the conversation, this item came up about the humility and the smallness of one voice. He suggested this evening, as I represent him, that I read to you a resolution that was unan-

imously passed today by the House of Representatives and the Senate, unanimous with all of those attending, and with your indulgence, I would like to read this:

"Whereas, with profound sorrow and deep alarm, the House is informed of the events surrounding the killing of eleven members of the Israel Olympic team participating in the Twentieth Olympiad at Munich, and

"Whereas, such actions are to be condemned as inimical to the interests and aspirations of the civilized world,

"Be it hereby resolved, That the United States joins with the world in mourning the loss of Israel's athletes and extends its deepest sympathy to the people of Israel and to the families of those so tragically lost, and

"Be it further resolved, That all means be sought by which the civilized world may cut off from contact with civilized mankind any peoples or any nation giving sanctuary, support, sympathy, aid, or comfort to acts of murder and barbarism such as those just witnessed at Munich and that the Clerk of the House be directed to communicate these sentiments and expressions to the Secretary of State for appropriate transmittal."

I respectfully translate this, that instead of one singular voice lost in the wilderness, 200 million Americans, through their Congress, are now speaking: "We will not tolerate any more."

HON. LAWRENCE F. KRAMER, NEW JERSEY STATE COMMISSIONER OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
(Excerpt of address)

Bigotry is another form of blindness. The Great Torch of the Olympiad has been turned into a flame of tragedy. The light from that flame must be utilized to cast away the shadows of the blindness. Thousands, yes, hundreds of thousands of words will be said and written of that tragic hour. But what words will comfort that family? What words can we say to a brave nation that sent her sons to compete, to bring glory again to a great nation? How difficult it is for all of us at such times to try to find a reason, an understanding. Somehow we must hope and pray, and work with that prayer, to eliminate these possibilities of such horrors as was just experienced.

It is my privilege to bear a message from the Governor of our State to this distinguished audience this evening:

"The shocking news out of Munich of the deaths of eleven Israeli athletes slain by a band of terrorists had a personally shocking impact on me. It was only a few short days ago that I sat in the beautiful Olympic setting to watch young men and women engage in friendly competition, for the prize of an Olympic medal. The years of training, self-denial, and dedication had brought them to the arena. I thought of the Olympics last week as a festival of peace. That eleven of these participants should die in such a senseless fashion is an act that must shock and outrage the decent people of the world. I join with all in this state, our nation, and the world in mourning the victims of a pointless deed.

"Hon. WILLIAM T. CAHILL,
"Governor of New Jersey."

The road of mankind does not lead to the pits, as these terrorists would have it. The road of mankind does not lead to perdition, as these terrorists would have it. The road of mankind does not lead to the destruction of mankind, as these terrorists would have it. The road of man lies in deeds, in the union of hearts, for the very solidarity of the human spirit, for the very furtherance of the impulse for brotherliness among men. When this is implanted further, not only will Israel, the state of Israel, be able to live in peace, but it shall also give a great and stirring advance to the very drive of all men, to fashion peace, "shalom," in this world.

HON. ARTHUR DWYER, MAYOR OF
PATERSON

It is difficult to talk on such an occasion as this. I have reflected a little bit, about what to say. What can I, whose heritage comes from a land, filled with a different faith, called the Christian, who tear each other apart upon issues that are hard to perceive. Yet, I think what the Rabbi has said is really the message that does come through.

I come from the generation that saw, literally, mankind rise up against the acts of the terrorists in order to give all people of the world the right to live in peace. The news late this evening shows that the world does have men of peace among all nations. It is true that Israel has withdrawn its athletes from the Olympics. But it is also true that a number of the Arab nations have equally withdrawn their athletes. And indeed, I think the movement seems to be that all nations will withdraw their athletes as a protest and as a lesson to the horror that has occurred.

We suffer within our own nation with the hijacking that goes on in aircraft, with the little thought and respect for life that is shown there. But again it is going to be the sacrifice of us all who travel who will wipe out the terrorists, for as Rabbi Panitz said, the natural instinct of man is not to knuckle under to the terror; perhaps we can feel sorry, perhaps we recognize it as a sick individual in certain circumstances. But we must not knuckle under. The drive of mankind for peace, no matter what our relationship to our creator is, is that, and I believe that it shall triumph, at least, I think that's what we, both in our individual lives, and collectively, must work for.

CLOSING MEMORIAL PRAYER

Oh merciful God, who dwellest on high and yet art full of compassion, keep in Thy divine presence among the holy and pure, whose light shineth as the brightness of the firmament, the souls of our dear and precious young athletes who have been butchered in Munich, and have now returned to their eternal home. Oh, may their souls be bound up in a bond of life, and their memories inspire us to serve Thee and our fellow-men in truth, kindness, and peace.

Let us all say, Amen.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to bring these memorial services to the attention of you and my colleagues here in the Congress as in deep reflection and resolve we recall the words inscribed at Dachau: "Never Again."

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

HON. CHARLES A. MOSHER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I have been doubly fortunate because of the fact that for several years I have had the privilege of working side by side with Tom Pelly in two different committees, Science and Astronautics and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

In my day-to-day association with Tom Pelly over those many years, as we work together on numerous important pieces of legislation concerned with national policy from the depths of the ocean to the farthest reaches of space, I have known his strength as a remarkable human being and an excellent leg-

islator, his integrity, his sound wisdom, his mature understanding of realities and the practicalities, his enlightened and compassionate attitudes, and his energetic, responsible willingness to work stubbornly for good goals.

Those are the essential strengths that make a superb human being and a very effective legislator and public servant. Tom Pelly is all of that.

It has been a joy and a privilege to know the friendship and to benefit from partnership with the gentleman from Washington. All of us on the Science and Astronautics Committee and on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee will miss him profoundly in the years ahead. But it is with gratitude in our hearts that we enthusiastically wish for him great happiness and long life as he retires from these troubled Halls.

We will often be thinking of you, Tom.

THE NATIONAL PEACE POLL: 500
VOTES FOR PEACE FROM ILLINOIS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the Gallup and Harris polls over the last few years have shown that a majority of the American people want an immediate end to the Vietnam war. Despite these poll results, American troops are still in Southeast Asia, U.S. bombs rain devastation down on the Vietnamese people daily, and failing any Presidential initiative to stop the conflagration the House of Representatives has yet to vote to end the war.

In an effort to provide irrefutable proof to the Congress that most Americans—not just a sampling of 1,500—want the war immediately halted, the National Peace Poll was launched several months ago by Peace Alert USA. Peace Alert USA, a bipartisan group of Members of Congress and private citizens, decided that every voter in this country should be given the opportunity to vote on one simple question: "Should Congress bring the war to an end by cutting off the funds?"

Ballots have appeared in newspapers around the country. Labor unions, church groups, trade and other organizations have printed the National Peace Poll ballot in their publications. Success so far can be measured by the number of ballots that have been steadily coming into the post office box in Washington, D.C. To date the results are running more than 20 to 1 in favor of congressional action to terminate the war.

At the end of my remarks I will insert in the RECORD a copy of the ballot and a list of the congressional sponsors and private citizen members of the national board of Peace Alert USA. Since the poll is a continuing effort to determine the will of the people, I invite those of my colleagues who are not yet congressional sponsors to become so.

Thousands of ballots have been received from my State of Illinois. Due to limitations of space, it is not possible to list everyone from Illinois who has voted in the National Peace Poll. I would therefore, like to at least list 500 of those conscientious citizens who let the Congress know that they want us to vote to cut off all funds for the war.

The material follows:

NATIONAL PEACE POLL

Should Congress bring the war to an end by cutting off the funds?

Yes ----- No -----
Name -----
Address -----
Telephone no. -----

Send this ballot to: National Peace Poll, Box 1621, Washington, D.C. 20013

Within the next few weeks, Congress must make a decision on whether to vote funds for the War in Vietnam. By setting a date to terminate the funds, it can legislate the withdrawal of our forces and insure the return of our prisoners. Or it can vote to continue the war. Your opinion will influence how they will vote.

PEACE ALERT USA

NATIONAL BOARD

National co-chairmen

Sen. Harold E. Hughes (D-Iowa).
Rep. Paul McCloskey, Jr. (R-Cal.).
Sen. Alan Cranston (D-Cal.).
Rep. Donald Riegle, Jr. (R-Mich.).

Congressional sponsors

House

Bella Abzug (NY).
Joseph Addabbo (NY).
Frank Annunzio (Ill).
Thomas Ashley (Ohio).
Les Aspin (Wisc).
Herman Badillo (NY).
N. J. Begich (Alaska).
Jonathan Bingham (NY).
Edward Boland (Mass).
Philip Burton (Calif).
Emanuel Celler (NY).
William Clay (Mo).
George Collins (Ill).
John Conyers (Mich).
Ronald Dellums (Calif).
Charles Diggs (Mich).
John Dow (NY).
Robert Drinan (Mass).
Don Edwards (Calif).
Joshua Eilberg (Pa).
Marvin Esch (Mich).
Walter Fauntroy (DC).
Donald Fraser (Minn).
Kenneth Gray (Ill).
William Green (Pa).
Michael Harrington (Mass).
Augustus Hawkins (Calif).
Ken Hechler (W. Va.).
Henry Helstoski (NJ).
William Hungate (Mo).
Joseph Karth (Minn).
Ed Koch (NY).
Robert Kastenmeier (Wisc).
Robert Leggett (Calif).
Ralph Metcalfe (Ill).
Abner Mikva (Ill).
Parren Mitchell (Md).
John E. Moss (Calif).
Robert Nix (Pa).
Bertram Podell, (NY).
Charles Rangel (NY).
Thomas Rees (Calif).
Ogden Reid (NY).
Henry Reuss (Wisc).
Peter Rodino (NJ).
Benjamin Rosenthal (NY).
Edward Roybal (Calif).
William F. Ryan (NY).
James Scheuer (NY).
John Seiberling (Ohio).

Frank Thompson (NJ).
Morris Udall (Ariz).
Charles Vanik (Ohio).
Jerome Waldie (Calif).
Lester Wolff (NY).
Sidney Yates (Ill).
Louis Stokes (Ohio).
Al Ullman (Ore).

Senate

Frank Church (Idaho).
Mike Gravel (Alaska).
Fred Harris (Okla).
Philip Hart (Mich).
Vance Hartke (Ind).
Daniel Inouye (Hawaii).
Walter Mondale (Minn).
Frank Moss (Utah).
William Proxmire (Wisc).
Adlai Stevenson III (Ill).
John Tunney (Calif).
Harrison Williams (NJ).

Other members

William Meyers, Chairman, Fund for New Priorities in America, National Coordinator.
Kingman Brewster—Connecticut.
Max Cleland—State Senator, Georgia.
William Doering—Chairman, Council for a Livable World.
Marriner S. Eccles—Chairman of Executive Committee, Utah International, Salt Lake City.
Governor Jack Gilligan—Ohio.
Elinor S. Gimbel—New York.
Al Gropis—Oil and Chemical Workers, Denver.
Pat Gorman—Amalgamated Meatcutters and Butcher Workmen of North America.
Father Theodore M. Hesburgh—President, University of Notre Dame.
Jesse Jackson—Operation Push, Chicago.
Rear Admiral Gene La Rocque, U.S. Navy (Ret.)—Director, Center for Defense Information.
Allard Lowenstein—New York.
Governor Pat Lucey—Wisconsin.
Louis Lundborg—Former Chairman of the Board, Bank of America.
Layton Olson—Exec. Director, National Student Lobby, D.C.
Donna Reed Owen—Co-chairman, Another Mother for Peace.
Maurice Paprin—Exec. Vice President, National Realty Committee.
Major Jubel R. Parten—Texas.
Bernard L. Schwarz—Business Executive, New York.
Bishop James Thomas—Methodist Bishop of Iowa.
Harold Willens—National Chairman, Business Education Fund.
Harris Wofford—President, Bryn Mawr.
Leonard Woodcock—President, United Auto Workers, Detroit.
Jerry Wurf—President, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, D.C.
Randolph P. Compton—Investment Banker, and Chairman, Fund for Peace, New York.

THE 500 ILLINOISANS WHO VOTED YES

Laylie Brown, Evanston.
John Stipp, Galisbury.
Doris Whitney, Chicago.
Charles Whitney, Chicago.
Patty Paterson, Evanston.
James Wylie, Prospect Hts.
Benjamin Solomon, Rockdale Place.
Molly Fabian, Skokie.
Michael Cleary, Chicago.
Barbary Cleary, Chicago.
Joyce Solomon, Rockdale Place.
James Hinely, Maywood.
Sandra Hinely, Maywood.
Eleanor Himmelfarb, Wheaton.
John Crissey, Oak Park.
Amanda Graffis, Northfield.
Warren Seyfert, Bensenville.
Kenneth Crouse, Elgin.
Mary Torimbo, Aurora.
Mrs. R. W. Ridenour, Bunker Hill.

R. W. Ridenour, Bunker Hill.
William Denille, Des Plaines.
Sidney Podolsky, Aurora.
Mrs. James Wendle, Moline.
James Wendle, Moline.
Helen Danforth, Winnetka.
T. Sleezer, Freeport.
Walter Shulruff, Wilmette.
Fred Shulruff, Wilmette.
Dr. Aaron Learner, Chicago.
Louis Lexi, Deerfield.
Margaret Learner, Chicago.
Carl Condit, Morton Grove.
Isabel Condit, Morton Grove.
Alan Miller, Kenilworth.
John Fitzgerald, Des Plaines.
Rosemary Fitzgerald, Des Plaines.
Mrs. Ed Mizel, Highland Park.
Ed Mizel, Highland Park.
George Mittelman, Highland Park.
Jan Wahlfeldt, Danville.
Leo Krakow, Chicago.
Tonia Svoboda, Chicago.
Charles Mishley, Bloomington.
Andrew Cohn, Winnetka.
Maryanne Cuba, Niles.
Frank Judge, Chicago.
Vickie Webster, Glendale Hts.
J. Kevin McCrea, Dolton.
David Aflajm, Maywood.
Mrs. James Moran, Evanston.
Larry Berg, Glencoe.
Kenneth Adams, Chicago.
G. S. Breitmayer, Barrington.
Kent Bayle, Evanston.
John Moran, Evanston.
Miriam Lyons, Evanston.
Martha Jacobson, Wilmette.
Constance Ratetunas, Chicago.
John Hammerman, Oak Forest.
Edith Anderson, Chicago.
Mrs. Barbara Balser, Winnetka.
Winifred Meeks, Evanston.
June Dyer, Chicago.
Helen Lira, Edgebrook.
Roy Olsen, Wabash.
Harry Kinser, Chicago.
Robert Schuler, Oak Park.
Angelique Schuler, Oak Park.
Gerald Froeming, Lombard.
Constance Pafetunas, Chicago.
Mrs. J. Berkson, Evanston.
Ronnie Sue Shadur, Evanston.
Hazel Carr, Cary.
Jeff Babcock, Glen Ellyn.
Thomas Adams, Calumet City.
Michael Harvey, Channahon.
Willbert Shea, Joliet.
Robert Mott, Marshall.
Coy Lentz, Kankakee.
Melvin Harness, McLeansboro.
Nancy Lyons, Evanston.
Wayne Tripton, Glendale.
John Bauman, Chicago.
Chris Clarck, Evanston.
Deborah Lyons, Evanston.
Robin Lester, Evanston.
Rev. David Myler, Chicago.
Stan Estka, Chicago.
Connie Bradley, Maywood.
L. G. Burris, Chicago.
Lyla Mayder, Highland.
Mrs. A. G. Peterson, Wavonda.
A. G. Peterson, Wavonda.
Thomas Snyder, Northbrook.
Mrs. Hugh King, Wilmette.
Hugh King, Wilmette.
Anne Tishler, Evanston.
Charles Flippo, Evanston.
Stan Weiner, Northbrook.
Ralph Kibler, Martinsville.
Wayne Tripton, Glendale Hgts.
Mrs. E. J. Toomey, Cary.
Devin Doherty, Flossmoor.
Suzanne Doherty, Flossmoor.
Michael Doherty, Flossmoor.
Lynn Williams, Wilmette.
Arnold Klein, Belleville.
Andrew Sahorak, Franklin Park.
Mary Eder, Lansing.
Lori Lippity, Evanston.

Erica Lippitz, Evanston.
 Janis Clamp, Hillside.
 Cleve Clamp, Hillside.
 Marie Peskor, Chicago.
 Joseph Sodora, Chicago.
 Majorie Lundy, Evanston.
 F. L. Lefkow, Wheaton.
 Carol Gibson, Evanston.
 Barbara Corbett, Evanston.
 Robert Blacker, Deerfield.
 John Bailey, Evanston.
 Karl Kropf, Lansing.
 George Milton, Chicago.
 Paul Carlson, Lansing.
 Sister Carol Jegen, Chicago.
 Sister Teresita Weir, Chicago.
 Sister Gloriana Bedrarski, Chicago.
 Gary Lenz, Evergreen Park.
 Ruth Levine, Deerfield.
 Mary Jane Schultz, Winnetka.
 Mrs. Beverly Padewill, Evanston.
 Floyd Sherman, Chicago.
 William Glowe, Chicago.
 Nancy Christiansen, Niles.
 Leonard Czash, Park Ridge.
 Mrs. Leonard Czash, Park Ridge.
 Brother Anthony Kalinowski, Chicago.
 Margie Rohde, Addison.
 John Satoloe, Skokie.
 John Blestek, Hamid.
 Mrs. John Blestek, Hamid.
 Mrs. R. E. Canvteson, Lake Villa.
 R. E. Canvteson, Lake Villa.
 Jay Bainett, Wilmette.
 Barb Charal, Morton Grove.
 Andy Ruttenberg, Skokie.
 A. E. Gabriel, Oak Lawn.
 Leonard Ruttenberg, Skokie.
 Dr. Evelyn Tyner, Glenview.
 Lynne Reyna, Evanston.
 Alvin Fish, Winnetka.
 Michael Miller, Skokie.
 Gary Nordmann, Libertyville.
 Mrs. J. Ammon, Glenview.
 James D. Fryman, Bensenville.
 Linda J. Anderson, Schaumburg.
 Grace Michaels, Evanston.
 Robert Klipper, Glenview.
 Paul Winniarski, Villa Park.
 Joe Golderberg, Wheeling.
 Jim Scharfer, Wilmette.
 E. K. Wood, Evanston.
 Maurice Katz, Skokie.
 Tom Matherly, Elmhurst.
 Richard Kittridge, Morton Grove.
 Dawn March, Highland Park.
 Paula Miller, Chicago.
 Mark Buttermann, Wilmette.
 S. Zelerer, Highland Park.
 Daniel Henz, Skokie.
 Sanford Perlman, Lincolnwood.
 Donna Scheoke, Waukegan.
 Richard Felt, Evanston.
 Kathryn Copeland, Rockford.
 Florence L. Deppe, Glen Ellyn.
 James L. Grevore, McHenry.
 Otto Geppers, Wilmette.
 F. R. Miller, Aurora.
 John Lewer, Chicago.
 Robert Johnson, La Grange.
 Joseph O. Howard, III, Skokie.
 Mrs. Elaine Pendester, La Grange.
 Mildred Farringer, Lena.
 Martha Scholz, Glenview.
 Christina Smith, Champaign.
 Verbal Dyer, Prospect.
 Cyrus C. DeCoster, Evanston.
 Mr. Robert Turk, Woodstock.
 Mrs. Robert Turk, Woodstock.
 H. E. Kraske, Joliet.
 M. Pepper, Westchester.
 Mr. G. B. Bush, Robinson.
 Mrs. G. B. Bush, Robinson.
 Dominick Rando, Cairo.
 William Comack, Clarendon.
 Jon Steinnetz, Park Forest.
 Jane Steinnetz, Park Forest.
 Mrs. R. D. Herbert, Elmwood.
 Mrs. Martin Ferland, Chicago.
 Mrs. Elvin Hume, Beardstown.
 Marian Harris, Glencoe.

Mr. L. Dean Miller, Freeport.
 Mrs. Evelyn Schiller, Oak Park.
 Edward Herring, Aurora.
 Vidi Johnson, Arlington.
 Lynn Hather, Rockford.
 Mercedia Palant, Berqyn.
 Andeline Brown, Oak Park.
 Mrs. Bernard Stone, Glen Ellyn.
 Mr. Bernard Stone, Glen Ellyn.
 Donna Stergerwald, Chicago.
 Joseph Maskala, Tinley.
 Naomi Delop, Broadview.
 Mrs. Margaret McGee, Cicero.
 Mrs. N. Goldring, Evanston.
 Camille Safflower, North Riverside.
 Christopher Joyce, Oak Park.
 D. Schwartz, Skokie.
 E. Graham, Morton Grove.
 John Oneill, Palos Park.
 K. Southwood, Urbana.
 Dow Kirkpatrick, Evanston.
 Tom Perun, Libertyville.
 Ginny Perun, Libertyville.
 Josephine Aulla, Skokie.
 Mary Jane Skahan, Evanston.
 Lula Rothblatt, Morton Grove.
 Elaine Mohn, Skokie.
 Ellen Aizuss, Morton Grove.
 Helen Strong, Chicago.
 Bernice E. Schendel, Hinsdale.
 Mrs. Charles Werngarten, Wilmette.
 Patricia Welherholt, Aurora.
 Lyle Lewis, Algonquin.
 Karen Margolis, Skokie.
 Ward Seidler, Calumet.
 Thomas Sheagren, Aurora.
 Jeffrey Mouzer, Highland Park.
 John W. McGrath, Evanston.
 Mr. Lester Yoder, Danver.
 Mrs. Lester Yoder, Danvers.
 John Owens, Waukegan.
 Mrs. Don Elckhorst, Carlock.
 Phillip Albrecht, Dolton.
 Edward Wach, Villa Park.
 Mrs. Esther Lebaultz, Northwood.
 A. Risieko, Wheeling.
 Marcie Shefren, Lincolnwood.
 Carol Dell Young, South Oak Lawn.
 Karen Ann Theis, Wheaton.
 Helen Buszta, Antioch.
 Richard Boryea, Prospect Heights.
 Eve Packer, Chicago.
 David Cororan, Niles.
 David Strohn, Woodstock.
 Robert Brown, Evanston.
 Bard L. Oak Park.
 Harry Schodrof, Clarendon Hills.
 The Sonne Family, Morton Grove.
 J. M. Clalious, Highland Park.
 Louise Templemeier, Belleville.
 Roy Kennel, Lombard.
 Becky Thompson, Evanston.
 Larry Barston, Chicago.
 Mrs. Harold Millard, Skokie.
 Clyde Duncan, Kankakee.
 Henry Leshner, Hoffman.
 James Sisoas, Niles.
 Marie Donahue, Downers Grove.
 A. C. Peterson, Itasca.
 E. C. Niederhafer, La Grange.
 Jane La Follette, Evanston.
 The Eric Welling Family, Glenview.
 Dorothy Vance, Wilmette.
 John Ligue, La Grange.
 Wayne Grensel, Streamwood.
 Dorothy Hackett, Sterling.
 W. B. McMullen, Glenview.
 Steve Abelman, Skokie.
 Lorraine Uguccioni, Berwyn.
 Joseph Lewin, Evanston.
 W. R. Barber, Glen Ellyn.
 Helen Krewra, Chicago.
 Bert Hill, Oak Lawn.
 Mrs. Bert Hill, Oak Lawn.
 Gerald Adler, Evanston.
 Mrs. M. Greco, Hazel Crest.
 Mr. M. Greco, Hazel Crest.
 Mrs. Plummer, Midlothian.
 Cecelia R. Noya, Melrose Park.
 Jacquelyn Berkan, Chicago.
 Dorothy Cantley, Winthrop Harper.

Calvin Morgan, Rock Falls.
 Kenneth Jakus, River Forest.
 Sylvia Little, Evanston.
 Daniel Levin, Wilmette.
 Denise Wain, Oglesby.
 John Zock, Westchester.
 Paul Manak, Berwyn.
 Barbara Corcaran, Niles.
 David Carpenter, Wilmette.
 Jeff Claus, Ottawa.
 Mary Sinclair, Lake Forest.
 John Robert Lee, Evanston.
 Robert L. Snyder, Evanston.
 Mrs. Pat Hockett, Glen Ellyn.
 Michael Steele, Champaign.
 Roger Jacobs, Caberney.
 Edward Downing, Elgin.
 Yvonne Downing, Rock Island.
 Barbara Downing, Milan.
 Dr. William Schewied, Peoria.
 Sister Hertzler, SSND, Caseyville.
 Mr. Sam Mogell, Stone Park.
 Mr. H. W. Berkeley, Wheaton.
 Emil L. Mueller, Zion.
 Robert Davis, Deerfield.
 Mrs. Hayes, Streamwood.
 H. F. Schwartz, Flossmoor.
 Pascall Ryslinger, River Forest.
 O. Edwards, Glencoe.
 Durl Kruse, Herscher.
 Anna G. Thompson, Des Plaines.
 Stanley Thompson, Des Plaines.
 Mr. Arnie Steinberg, Skokie.
 Dave Wagner, Belleville.
 Mrs. Elisabeth Chorlton, Belleville.
 Jim E. Lopp, La Grange.
 David E. Parker, Dieterich.
 Merrill B. VanLandt, Wheeling.
 Gillman Dunn, Fox River Grove.
 Earl Johnson, Berwyn.
 Cletus Hicks, Dundee.
 Judith Hicks, Dundee.
 Leo A. Prentice, Alsip.
 Ray Flint, Lockport.
 Constance Bennett, Westmont.
 Charles Johansen, Ridott.
 Mrs. William Yort, Riverdale.
 Mrs. Joseph Niemiec, Norridge.
 Mr. Joseph Niemiec, Norridge.
 Joel Bates, Lansing.
 Jo Ann Malina, Lyons.
 Mrs. Thomas De Lassus, Maywood.
 Lucy Rowe, Franklin Park.
 Mrs. Joseph Weber, McHenry.
 Cletus Knight, St. Charles.
 Judy Berns, Lansing.
 Mrs. Sayler, McHenry.
 Mr. R. P. Walson, Champaign.
 Mrs. R. P. Walson, Champaign.
 Mary Ziegler, LaGrange.
 Phyllis Miller, Hickory Hills.
 Thomas Tkusis, Beecher.
 Mary Jo Werdell, De Kalb.
 Ms. L. D. Rasplia, Dalton.
 Monica Cox, Park Forest.
 Ms. Sally Bruckner, Matteson.
 Michael Cohen, Skokie.
 Linda Stahl, Evanston.
 Russel Smith, Lombard.
 Roy Schneider, Jr., Naperville.
 D. Kaplan, Skokie.
 A. Brewer, Evanston.
 Pat Havlice, Batavia.
 Mr. W. J. Miller, Glenview.
 Emmett Burke, Ottawa.
 Arlen Gaywor, Schaumburg.
 H. J. Oethnger, Chicago.
 Donna Jensen, Des Plaines.
 Fred Schulman, Northbrook.
 Paul Sapp III, Normal.
 Charlene Stublman, Plainfield.
 Paul Vitsos, Oak Lawn.
 Patricia Hanrahan, Chicago.
 Elaine Ruth, Rock Island.
 J. Cicmanec, River Forest.
 Cindy Jankees, Cicero.
 Martin A. Kantor, Calumet City.
 Walter Maul, Elmwood Park.
 Jacob A. Yoder, Danvers.
 E. Hendrickson, Blue Island.
 Karl Halbil, Downers Grove.

Jenyie Hampton, Cahokia.
 Mrs. Jacqueline Wattenbsy, Oak Park.
 Mrs. Mario Pepitone, Skokie.
 Robert Torch, Morton Grove.
 Sindy Wein, Deerfield.
 Boris Brall, Skokie.
 James Young, Skokie.
 Bruce Scopel, Crestwood.
 W. N. Martin, New Lenox.
 Robert L. Ford, Wood River.
 Maria Cahet, Skokie.
 Dr. Emanuel, Lincolnwood.
 L. F. Presnail, Buffalo Grove.
 Margaret Deppe, Evanston.
 Edward J. Beirne, Naperville.
 Joseph Tricka, Western Springs.
 Rosalie Farwell, Evanston.
 J. William Hoban III, Aurora.
 Ruth Zierline, Newton.
 Ina R. Schectmunn, Skokie.
 Ray Still, Chicago.
 Mrs. C. V. Giddins, Oak Park.
 Eleanor Stoller, Decatur.
 Paul Beach, Atlanta.
 Eleanor M. Gains, Geneva.
 Janet K. Harris, Macomb.
 Peter Crane, Springfield.
 HYong Wan Cho, Chicago.
 Judith Yanaffa, Deerfield.
 William Greenough, Champaign.
 James Freemuth, Carthage.
 Michael Stoller, Decatur.
 Mrs. P. Crane, Springfield.
 John Nemec, Ellyn.
 Mrs. James Fremuth, Carthage.
 Edwin Johnson, Northlake.
 Betsy Levin, Evanston.
 Dennis Rintoul, Dolton.
 Kenneth Morre, E. Dubuque.
 Mark Halpern, Skokie.
 Hart Russell, Elgin.
 Susanne Wicks, Lebanon.
 Kenneth W. Seeman, Wilmette.
 Robert Dorting, Evanston.
 Mary Rontoul, Dolton.
 Martin Odell, E. Dubuque.
 B. Toivo Wick, Franklin Park.
 Jim Arnold, Elizabeth.
 Sue Wilbricht, Hanover.
 Patricia Cenassi, Metanone.
 Barb Dodge, Galena.
 John Mills, Highland Park.
 Donald Thomas, Mentor Grove.
 J. N. Jubycky, E. Dubuque.
 Carole Uppmann, Itasca.
 Earle Frane, Stockton.
 Michael Kass, Hanover.
 Norman Lasko, Elizabeth.
 Gary Bishop, Morton Grove.
 Sue Smith, Galera.
 Francis Rosemeyer, E. Dubuque.
 James Durkin, Flossmoor.
 Mrs. A. Ropchan, Oak Park.
 Mary Aileen Schmiel, Wilmette.
 Fred J. Nebgen, Belleville.
 Sara Zimmerman, Chicago.
 S. S. Brar, Westmont.
 Alexander Ropchan, Oak Park.
 D. R. Beston, Oak Park.
 Kay Ott, E. Alton.
 Cathy Beadie, Galena.
 Oscar Sturm, Staunton.
 Joseph L. Kleemann, Champaign.
 Ilene Lery, Morton Grove.
 Ruth Little, Blue Island.
 R. E. Keener, Elgin.
 Joseph Wozniczke, Crystal Lake.
 Mike Hodel, Lombard.
 Michael Gilman, Lincolnwood.
 Ronald Fiek, Skokie.
 Irene Smyxola, Evanston.
 Marie Hodel, Lombard.
 Barbara Allen, Wilmette.
 James Borowilz, Highland Park.
 Katrina Pfozenreitr, Wilmette.
 Ruth S. Wcklhouse, Glencoe.
 Mrs. Donald Goodman, Mt. Prospect.
 Thomas Kirby, Belleville.
 John Michaels, Chicago.
 Lynn Sperling, Evanston.
 Nadine Peterson, Skokie.

Suellen Meister, La Grange.
 Robert C. Sole, Wilmette.
 W. J. Harvey, Deerfield.
 Lawrence G. Kremer, Park Ridge.
 Lucille Crimmins, Elmwood Park.
 O. Russell Ballard, Elgin.
 Dolores Deitz, Timley Park.
 Horace L. Haward, Evanston.
 Clay Gillaspay, Skokie.
 Kathy Kaecken, Carpentersville.
 Sonia Goldberg, Morton Grove.
 Bill Collette, Clarendon Hills.
 John Scott, Plainfield.
 W. P. Kelly, Chicago.
 Blanche Stoteman, Bloomington.
 L. Kleppel, Evanston.
 Kenneth E. McDowell, Elgin.
 Mark Merle, Clarendon Hills.
 Mrs. J. Scott, Plainfields.
 Ruth Rehwaltd, Hinsdale.
 James Link, Northlake.
 Ruth Kwerclary, Schaumburg.
 Ronald Bearwald, Northbrook.
 Gordon Smith, Wilmette.
 Michael Kaplen, Highland Park.
 John Bather, Elgin.
 Barbara Boyd, Clarendon Hills.
 Mrs. R. Bearwald, Northbrook.
 Mrs. M. Kaplen, Highland Park.
 Edward Spring, Delavan.
 Will Bottie, Carbondale.
 Raymond Mostek, Lombard.
 Mrs. D. M. Staphenson, Galeray.
 Don Snider, Stockton.
 Michael Drane, Bradford.
 Mark Banko, Chicago.
 Merne Webb, E. Dubuque.
 Nancy Clerk, Clarendon Hills.

MR. JAMES C. MASON "OUTSTANDING APPRENTICE IN ORANGE COUNTY"

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, there are, in success stories, poignant examples of everyday American determination and resolve. I am most pleased to recognize the achievements of a young tool-and-die maker apprentice employed in my district. Mr. James C. Mason began his apprenticeship at Arnold Engineering Co., Pacific Division, 4 years ago, amid much fanfare, as the 20,000th apprentice to begin trade training in Orange County. Young Mason and his employer were honored by the Junior Chamber of Commerce, Fullerton City Council, Orange County Board of Supervisors, and by the State of California.

On June 19, 1972, James Mason finally completed his apprenticeship. His completion certification was based on his ability to make a precision grinding vise during his last year of training, holding tolerances calling for one ten-thousandth of an inch parallelism. His completed project was checked, along with the same project of other young competing apprentices and his near-perfect score earned him the right to first-place honors for 1972 as the "Outstanding Metalworking Apprentice in Orange County."

On October 21, 1972, Mr. Mason will be formally honored at an industry-sponsored dinner ceremony. He will thence-

forth take his rightful place among America's skilled craftsmen.

DREAMS OF AMERICA BY THE CLASS OF 1972

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, over the past few months I have dropped notes to the 1972 high school graduates in my district, congratulating them on this great milestone in their lives.

In order to understand more fully the dreams and goals of these young people for this country and its future, I asked each one if he or she would share those dreams with us.

It is absolutely vital that we understand the direction our young people want for our Nation, and Mr. Speaker, the beautiful and meaningful responses I received from these great young Americans has inspired and reinforced my own hopes for America more deeply than anything else since I have come to the Congress.

Their letters are hopeful, but not utopian; thoughtful, but not unattainable; and as they reach out with their dreams and their ideas for solution, one senses a strong current of religious feeling; and the patriotism we have so often felt is lacking in modern America is expressed deeply and sincerely, personal goals are outlined as at least one way to make the dreams come true.

All the dreams and goals voiced in their letters are not the same, but each is wonderful unto its self.

The full text of all the letters would be too long to print, but I am including an excerpt from each so everyone can share these goals and dreams. We plan to print additional letters as our responses continue to come in.

Mr. Speaker, I present to you and my colleagues the hopes and dreams for America by the class of 1972 from high schools all over the Fourth District of Florida:

EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS FROM THE CLASS OF 1972

I have a tremendous amount of respect and confidence in the form of government in America, and I really hope and pray that we as Americans, can redirect ourselves to higher goals and work together for national peace and set an example that will filtrate throughout the whole world.—Miss Dana Keasler, Neptune Beach.

Trust me as I you, so that we may live together as one for there is nothing greater than trust. This is not a dream—this is what I believe, for it is not the so-called Peace which everyone is speaking so loudly about, it's trust that has to come first and after we get this the rest will fall in place.—Miss Cynthia S. Davis, Atlantic Beach.

It is my dream, that someday, everyone in America will truly be equal to their fellow man or woman . . . I dream of an America that is not polluted . . . Lastly, I would like to see America playing the role of peacemaker. If people and countries would only take the time to know and understand each other, peace would be a much closer reality. Often countries react too quickly to the ac-

tions of others without trying to understand the motivations behind the action of the other party. Understanding and knowledge should be the basis for foreign policy, not the exportation of democracy which often fails to work in foreign countries because of lack of understanding on behalf of the people . . . These are by no means all of the things that I dream of for my country; but they are the main ones. America is in troubled waters now. But even so, despite her many, many problems, America today is beautiful.—Miss Marguerite A. Sognier, Ponte Vedra Beach.

I'm not very politically minded, but I want to do all I can to help my country and the world.—Miss Mary Lee Brothers, DeLand.

I wish for better understanding among the peoples of this world. I do not hope for a Utopia upon this earth either. A perfect nation, a perfect world, leaves nothing for its people to strive for, nor live for. What I wish for this nation and its people is maintenance of the strength it already has that it may endure.—Miss Lee Ann Scheuerman, Jacksonville Beach.

While the United States has very noble intentions it cannot bring about peace and happiness for all mankind. Neither this country or countries of the United Nations can do this, but only the Kingdom of God.—Mr. Alan Norris, Jacksonville Beach.

I hope that maybe there will be a Congress of the United States that will truly represent what the people of the United States really want.—Mr. Robert Morey, Edgewater.

It is my hope that Americans wise up and do not succumb to the same fate as other great nations before them; nations like Rome and Greece, whose cockiness, lack of moral values, wanton speeding, and laziness led to their downfalls. It appears that America is following that trend, but I will try my best to KEEP us a great nation.—Mr. Brad Bertram, Cape Canaveral.

To me if people really cared a lot about things, this country and the rest of the world would be better to live in.—Miss Irene Moffet, Deltona.

My first step toward one of the main objectives in my life is to serve my country and my fellowman. Consequently, my aim is to become a licensed practical nurse.—Miss Mary McDuffie, Daytona Beach.

It is my hope that one day we will live in a world of peace. Every individual in a position to contribute to this eventuality should engage themselves in every facet of life that will help in accomplishing this goal . . . I also dream of the day when there will no longer be people in America suffering from hunger and disease. To eradicate our world of these plagues will help bring about peace and happiness. This is my aspiration and hope for my country and my world . . . To contribute my part to the previously stated goal, I am enrolling in Cleveland State University in pursuit of a degree in physical therapy. This training will allow me to aid others in their handicaps.—Miss Shirley Crump, Warrensville Heights, Ohio.

My biggest hope for my country is that someday everyone will know a pride in their country.—Miss Susan Whitaki, Jacksonville.

I'm glad that I graduated from high school. That was a big moment in my life. The reason is I am handicapped and I graduated as the only senior to be born without any hands.

The United States has done a lot for many people—black, white and other races, but they haven't done much for those that were born with a handicap. There was one man who served the country with a handicap and that was Franklin Roosevelt—and he did a good job. I am not going to collect welfare . . . but could the Congress spend a few million in getting jobs for those that were born with a handicap?

I look for a great spiritual awakening . . . Some time ago a member of the British

Parliament said, "Let's try God and see if He won't solve our problems." That's my hope for our country that we try God before it is too late.—Mr. Russell V. McFall, Daytona Beach.

My hopes and dreams for America are to see this country in peace. The world has many problems, but I feel that the problems in our country here in the United States of America should be looked upon and settled first . . . We all have our job and responsibility to do to help our country, but if everyone should give a little to do their part this country will be much better . . . Too many people are talking and waiting for the government to do something. I feel it should not be all the government's job—the people should get involved with our problems and do something about it instead of just talking and expecting the government to do it all.—Miss Gwendolyn Blanche Arnett, Holly Hill.

I hope for peace for all and a clean world for all those younger than I.—Miss Gail Sigler, New Smyrna Beach.

One hope that I have for America is that one day that anyone that has the initiative to work will be able to and that people will be encouraged to get a job rather than collect welfare thus making our country stronger . . . I hope that one day the question of discrimination will be eliminated and everyone will be treated equally without question . . . Through science I hope that the environment will be clean of litter, smog and other pollutants that now endanger our environment . . . Lastly, I hope that one day America will live in peace without having to lose any integrity while attaining it.—Mr. John Snider, New Smyrna Beach.

I have many hopes for the future of America, but my main wish for our country is that it will become a Christian America . . . Realizing that this takes time and cannot be accomplished overnight, I hope that people will join together and work for a better America. An America where God is first, and where . . . trust, love, and understanding follow.—Miss Amy Berry, South Daytona.

I dream of the day when the word prejudice can be safely called obsolete . . . I dream of the day when all Americans, living either in huge cities or in sleepy little townships can be confident and without fear when they walk outside after dark . . . And finally, I dream of the day when all politicians, either Republican or Democrat, will work for the good of America instead of working for the good of their party . . . A house divided cannot stand.—Mr. Mark William Morgan, Orlando.

I hope someday that all peoples will live in peace. But until human kind changes that is only a dream of the future. You as you can do nothing about that . . . All people are equal, and yet Blacks . . . are not really equal. They are getting there, and I'm sure the government is aware of this . . . Realizing the hard job it is to work in the government, I believe that everyone would appreciate the government more if they knew the hours of hard work it took to keep this country going, then maybe they would not be so critical, or demanding. Remember, things can't be changed overnight. Patience is a virtue . . . Why must our government be spending so much money on the poor people in other countries? . . . We have poor here who need help . . . The government shouldn't forget it's own children while playing "Big Brother" to others . . . I thought you might like to know, I just turned 18 on the 12th of July and that same day became a registered voter.—Miss Cathy Trojahn, New Smyrna Beach.

My hopes and dreams of America, can not just be shared with America, but the world, for America is not separate, but a part of it. It seems that I did learn thru my 3 years of Varsity football that it takes team work for

a winning team . . . so that one day instead of passing mostly problems to our future generations, we can pass peace.—Mr. Gerald Donald Holland, USNS Mayport.

The time has come when all men must work to make this a better country . . . I hope for better jobs, schools and spiritualism. This country cannot succeed with poor leadership. I would like to see an end to poverty, war, crime, and poor education. I dream of peace and equal education and opportunity for every American.—Miss Betty Moore, Ormond Beach.

My wishes and aspirations for our country are hopes for happiness for all. I have dreams for better communications and brotherly love for people instead of prejudiced ways . . . I do believe in the "Impossible Dream" and part of my goals in life is to help people and try to show them the happiness in life . . . I will be attending the Medical University of South Carolina this fall in Charleston, S.C. . . . I love America and life. I hope if I can even help one human being in my life, life will be worth living for.—Miss Marsha Lear Miller, Ormond Beach.

My hopes and dreams for America would be to see the true meaning of the word human put back in humanity.—Miss Deborah Silva, Daytona Beach.

ED GORALEWSKI MAKES THE SYSTEM WORK

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, while many Americans are talking about the alleged lack of concern the American people are supposed to be showing about their Government, or bemoaning the "alienation" of people from politics, there are some Americans who are doing something about it.

One such American is Mr. Ed Goralewski of Caro, Mich. Ed Goralewski is a deputy registrar of voters in Indianfields Township, Tuscola County, Mich. And from day to day he goes from house to house, finding out if people are registered and if they are not, he registers them.

Ed Goralewski finds those who are alienated, and those who are indifferent, of course, but he also finds a great many of his fellow citizens who simply have not registered, and on whom, by registering them he can in a sense confer the greatest of our political rights—the right to hire and fire public officials.

Ed Goralewski is of my own political faith, but he does not restrict himself to registering Democrats. He believes, and I share his belief, that if enough people are registered, and enough people vote, the country will be safe, whatever their party affiliation.

Ed Goralewski, 72 years of age, is working at democracy on a full-time basis. He deserves the thanks of us all.

A related news article follows:

ONE-MAN CAMPAIGN NETS 500 VOTERS

"Good morning. Are you a registered voter in Indianfields Township?"

"Well then, would you care to sign these slips and I'll fill them out for you and that's all there is to it."

So it goes. From house to house, Ed Gora-

lewski performs his duty as a deputized registrar for voters in Indianfields Township. To date, the high-spirited citizen has said his lines successfully to over 500 people.

Goralewski makes no bones that he's a Democrat but quickly adds that registering people here in Caro is a lot different than it was in Detroit, where he lived until three years ago.

"Down there you could walk up to someone on the street and ask them if they were a Democrat or a Republican," he said with a heavy Polish accent. "You wouldn't dare do that here because people would be irritated."

Irritation comes into his face when asked about some of the people he has tried to register.

"I'm a senior citizen but I can't understand most of them. As of today, I've asked 154 and only 34 have wanted to register," he said. "I guess they just want to be left alone."

"Now the kids, they're really going to make a change. Out of the 500 people I've registered, 360 of them are between 18 and 21 years old. About only 1 out of 80 or 90 don't want to sign up," he added.

Both Goralewski and his wife are ardent Democrats and enjoy praising the party they have supported for over 40 years. However, they added that, "candidates should be elected by what they do."

"Besides," he added, "that's not really what I'm doing. I try and stay away from talking politics when I'm registering, but if they bring it up, I don't hesitate to tell them where I stand."

The job of registering people to vote isn't as easy as it sounds. Goralewski told about being chased by a fellow with a shovel. Smiling he added that, "I just walked away."

Regardless of the hazards, Goralewski intends to keep working his 30-hour-week right up to the deadline on Oct. 6. He is one of only a few deputized registrars in the state and the only one in Tuscola County. All other registering is done by township clerks.

So, if you're a resident of Indianfields township but are not yet registered, you can anticipate a call from Ed Goralewski. The 72-year-old activist intends to have everyone voting by November 7 and if you don't then there is one man who "just don't know what's wrong with you."

JOHN P. HARRIS HONORED BY NEWSPAPER HALL OF FAME

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday John P. Harris, the late editor and publisher of the Hutchinson News and chairman of Publishing Enterprises Inc., was named to the Kansas Newspaper Hall of Fame at the William Allen White School of Journalism at the University of Kansas. Mr. Harris became the 57th person honored by the Hall of Fame. It was most deserving recognition for a man whose name will long be identified with independent and aggressive journalism in Kansas.

The son of a newspaper family, Jack Harris became editor of the Hutchinson News in 1933. Although he once turned down the William Allen White Award given each year to a Kansas editor, he accepted the University of Minnesota

award for distinguished journalism in 1963, and the newspaper received the Pulitzer Prize in 1965.

He headed the Publishing Enterprises, Inc., which included the News and seven other daily papers in Kansas, Iowa, and California and six radio stations. Mr. Harris retired as editor and publisher of the Hutchinson paper at the end of 1961. He continued active, however, and died on April 13, 1969.

Stuart Awbrey, the editor of the Hutchinson News, has written an interesting column which candidly and eloquently discusses the qualities and character of Jack Harris. The column follows:

[From the Hutchinson (Kans.) News,
Oct. 2, 1972]

FIVE YEARS LATER

LAWRENCE.—They put j.p.h. in the Kansas Newspaper Hall of Fame here last weekend.

They framed a formal portrait and tacked it on the wall of a little room at the William Allen White School of Journalism. The professors and deans and others said proper and generous things, and as I sat here listening, I kept trying to sort my thoughts of how it was six or ten or twenty years ago, and somehow nothing much came.

Until, that is, I picked up a copy of what I had jotted when Jack died. It seemed valid then. It seems to say about what I would say now. So here it is, one more time:

August, 1938, William Allen White sat on the edge of my desk in The Emporia Gazette newsroom as I stuffed old clippings and scraps of notes in a briefcase.

"Where are you going?" he asked.

"To Columbia," I answered. "Graduate school. I thought you knew."

"Guess I did. In fact, I've been thinking about it. I just had a call from a young friend out in Hutchinson named Jack Harris. He needs a reporter. Why don't you join him? You'll learn more there in a couple of months than in a year at Columbia."

That was how it started.

Two days later, I checked into the Bisonte hotel and walked across the street to announce my presence to The News-Herald and a waiting world of journalism. Neither was much impressed.

"Do you think you can write?" Jack asked me after we had shaken hands.

"Yes," I replied.

"You'll have a chance to prove it," he said. "How much did Mr. White say the job pays?"

"\$18."

Jack grinned, "I told him to try for \$15, but go to \$20 if he had to. O.K. There's your desk."

I had learned three quick lessons in newspapering. 1—Never pay \$20 for something you can get for \$18. 2—The first requirement of a prospective reporter is writing. 3—Be brief.

Except for Uncle Sam, I have never known another boss. After 31 years, a man is entitled to set down his personal recollections of an editor like Jack Harris. Partly to share with others, but mostly so I won't forget them.

So, for this one time, Jack, brevity be hanging. Forgive me.

Money.

Some thought Jack had it made from the start.

"They didn't know," he said when I asked about this, "what a track race it was from bank to bank every week, to be sure we had enough cash to cover the payroll checks."

The thirties were good training grounds for frugality. In my early days on The Garden City Telegram, when I despaired of ever showing enough profit to get the paper paid for, he said:

"I'll give you the formula my father gave me. The way to make money is figure how to save \$5 instead of spend it."

It works. In his negotiations for newspaper and radio properties, Jack usually became more concerned about the \$5 than the \$50,000. (It cost him a deal on at least one occasion, but the deal turned out marginal anyway.)

Even cash was no problem, foolish expense exasperated him. Only a month ago, he became irritated at the late delivery of The New York Times to his office.

"Why are we paying \$50 a year for something that comes in three days late?" he asked me. The Times was canceled that afternoon.

That was the side of caution.

If Jack seldom erred there, he seldom erred on the side of generosity either. His gifts to build a hotel, to finance hospitals, to further cultural programs, to promote industrial growth, are well known and will remain through his creation of the foundation known as Kansas Philanthropies. What may not be so familiar were his many loans and gifts to aid students, his quiet contributions to individuals and causes to improve our lot. And of course, he paced the newspaper field and most other business in voluntarily creating employee benefits and profit-sharing within his family corporations.

I once suggested a \$500 company contribution to some civic project, and he gave me his wrinkled nose. "When did you get to be a penny-pincher?" he demanded. "I just looked at your balance sheet, and I think \$3,000 is more in line."

\$3,000 it was. Which was another of his convictions. If a newspaper doesn't lead, no one will.

He seldom gave policy advice to his editors. His worst criticism was a pencilled "Tsk tsk" when a story appeared with a split infinitive. However, his praise also was tempered. When my first product as an editor came off the press, he tapped the front page. "That's an excellent head," he said. "But on the other hand, what does this one mean?"

He insisted on the open office. I always felt he wilted a bit when he boosted himself to board chairman and retired to his own cubicle, "to stay out of the way" of his younger followers. This lack of privacy had its virtues, but it often brought despair to his secretary, Lillian Peterson.

"I just think that when a million-dollar contract is being discussed," she said, "a door should be closed."

These things, too, are part of my legacy from Jack Harris. The open door. Disaffection with split infinitives and the word "real" as an adverb. Mild criticism and mild praise. And devotion to a typewriter.

He was happiest with a project, building a new plant, buying a new property. He was not, on today's terms, a wheeler-dealer, but he admired their zest if not always their tactics.

I saw this capacity for intense living best during the war years. Jack served a brief stint as a captain in a mickey-mouse job in military control of occupied cities. ("I often wish I were where you are instead of where I am," he wrote me as we trained in Southampton, England.)

He had his chance. He became a major with the OSS, engaged in mysterious maneuvers involving clandestine radio and pamphlets and a captured general. I visited him often in London and Paris on those ETO days, and never saw him come so alive.

News readers are well aware of his peripatetic nature. But a night at a Parisian club which popped open a week after the liberation convinced me he never really left home.

Le Beaulieu, it was called, and it was plush. Complete with strong orchestra, Pol Roget champagne hauled from a Wehrmacht cellar,

and Marlene Dietrich in USO uniform. At the height of the gaiety, Jack leaned to me and said:

"Isn't this all just like the Brown Wheel at home?"

I was stunned. It was nothing like the Brown Wheel. After mulling the question, I posed another.

"With all your travel and acquaintance around the world, how is it you never left Hutchinson?"

"It's the only place I ever wanted to put down roots," he said simply.

Which brings me to final thoughts.

Jack was not a man of religion, but he was religious. Not only in his daily dealings with others, but in his search for answers.

Shortly after his return from a long sojourn in India, he asked: "When was the last time you looked at your hole card?" I told him I tried every Sunday, but that didn't satisfy him.

"Why do you believe what you believe?" he asked. I stumbled through that one but I knew he really was asking himself what he did believe, and why he believed it.

When I was able to put the title "Editor" after my name on the masthead, I attended a newspaper convention with him.

He introduced me to a long-time friend. "I want you to meet an associate of mine," he said.

I think it was the proudest moment of my life. An associate of J.P.H. Thanks, Jack. For everything.

MISSISSIPPI ROAD PROPOSED FROM CANADA TO LOUISIANA

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I found the following article which appeared in the San Jose Mercury in my district of great interest and believe all of the Members may find it of interest before voting on the Highway Act of 1972.

The article follows:

1972 HIGHWAY ACT PROVISION—MISSISSIPPI ROAD PROPOSED FROM CANADA TO LOUISIANA
(By Gil Bailey)

WASHINGTON.—A multi-billion dollar program to pave both banks of the Mississippi River from Canada to New Orleans has been slipped into the House version of the Highway Act of 1972, the Mercury-News has learned.

The House will probably vote Thursday on the bill but few of its members know of the provision for the "Great River Road" stretching along both banks of the Mississippi from Canada, through Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois, Missouri, Arkansas, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi and Louisiana.

The only estimate of the total cost of the project is \$1.5 billion. That cost estimate was made 15 to 20 years ago, according to a staff member of the House Public Works Committee.

The pending legislation authorizes an expenditure of \$60 million over the next two years, an amount which the aide said was "but a drop in the bucket."

"It is incredible and outrageous," said Linda Katz of the Highway action coalition when shown the section of the bill by a reporter.

Conservationists have been closely watching the highway legislation because of their attempt to allow diversion of some highway

funds for rapid and mass transit. Even so they failed to spot the Great River Road section which was inserted into the bill on Sept. 25.

"It would get it off the ground in the sense of separate new money for just that project," the Public Works Committee aide, Lloyd Rivard, added.

... the secretary (of transportation) shall establish criteria for the location and construction or reconstruction of the Great River Road by the ten states bordering the Mississippi River in order to carry out the purpose of this section.

Officially, the Great River Road is designated a "national scenic and recreational highway."

In the Great River Road section of the bill, there is a finding which says, "There is a deficiency in the number of quality of scenic roads, parkways, and highways available to the motoring public." The bill then states that the Great River Road shall serve as a "prototype of a national scenic and recreation highway program."

However, a separate section of the bill sets up a national scenic highway system study, ordering the secretary of transportation to make "a full and complete investigation and study to determine the feasibility of a national system of scenic highways." It then appropriates \$250,000 for the study which is to be completed not later than Jan. 1, 1975.

Chances of the passage of the Great River Road appear good.

There will be a floor fight in the House on the question of diversion of Highway Trust funds to mass or rapid transit. Major conservationist efforts have been focused on lining up votes in favor of the diversion.

As a result no one expects the sponsors of the Great River Road are as of yet aware of that section in the bill. Even a congressman on the Public Works Committee did not know of the project.

No provision is made for the Great River Road in the Senate version of the bill but with Blatnik's power Senate agreement is likely unless the same controversy is raised over the project, according to House and Senate sources.

A brief three to four paragraph section of the report on the bill outlines some of the history of the "Great River Road."

The project was first proposed in 1936 and between 1954 and 1962 some \$250 million of federal funds were spent on Mississippi River highways.

However, the House Public Works Committee could not estimate the number of miles of road which still need to be constructed along both sides of the 2,000 mile long Mississippi River. In addition the committee had no estimate of the overall cost except for the \$1.5 billion figure which "dates back 15 to 20 years."

While the Great River Road is designated as a scenic and recreational highway it will be connected with interstate freeways wherever possible. In addition the roads will be built as close as possible to the river.

A special priority is given "to construction and improvement of the Great River Road in the proximity of the confluence of the Mississippi River and the Wisconsin River," according to the bill.

Under the provisions of the bill the federal government will pay 80 per cent of the cost of construction while the usual breakdown of federal payments is 70 per cent. While some \$40 million of the \$60 million comes from Highway Trust funds another \$20 million is authorized from the General Fund "for construction and reconstruction of roads not on a federal-aid highway system."

On federal lands—and the federal government has extensive holdings along the Mississippi—all of the costs of construction will be federal.

No public hearings were held on the bill although the states will hold hearings on individual sections of the highway, according to the House Public Works Committee.

Blatnik and Culver did outline their plans in a series of little noted press releases earlier this year.

Both men stressed that the project would tie in with the celebration of the tricentennial of the discovery of the Mississippi River and the national bicentennial celebration in 1976.

"The central part of the United States has a great story to tell," Blatnik told members of the Legislative Committee of the Mississippi River Parkway Commission in June. "This history of our area goes back 300 years. Countless Americans, seeking expanded recreational opportunities, will find a wealth of tradition and contribution to the American Way of Life along this Great River Road."

However one conservationist had a view different from that of Blatnik.

"They want to build a bridge across the Mississippi," he said. "But this bridge is lengthwise."

The Mississippi road project is the dream of Rep. John Blatnik (D-Miss) powerful chairman of the House Public Works Committee, and Rep. John Culver (D-Ia). They have been joined by other congressmen whose districts include the Mississippi River area.

Culver introduced the project as a separate piece of legislation on Sept. 18. A small amount of money had been in previous versions of the bill for study of the project.

However, in the Sept. 25 versions of the bill a special section was added calling for the "Great River Road" and authorizing \$60 million for the road. * * *

IT'S A WONDERFUL TOWN

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, Marie J. Lederman, an assistant professor of English at Baruch College, has written a marvelous article on living in my hometown, New York. It appeared in a recent issue of "City" magazine, and I would like to share it with all of my colleagues.

The article follows:

NEW YORK

(By Marie J. Lederman)

Love affairs severed by time or space leave an intensity of emotion. I was six when I was forced to leave New York City. It was the beginning of World War II, and my father was a lieutenant commander in the Navy. During the next four years I began to miss and love New York more than I had ever missed or loved anything before.

It wasn't just the family and friends and school I had left, it was the comparison of life in New York with life in Pass Christian, Miss., my new home. The library in Pass Christian was a one-room building off the main street of town. I read the Oz books which filled the bottom shelf on one wall. I read many books, then, during long quiet afternoons on the porch, listening to the hummingbirds and smelling the pervasive pecans.

I learned a lot of other things too. My best friend, Maureen, wasn't allowed to drink a glass of water in the home of the young black girl who took care of me. One of the water fountains in the local five-and-ten was marked "Whites Only." Maureen often told

me that before she met my family and me she heard that Jews had horns.

I can remember thinking that I'd never see Times Square again. I missed going ice skating and Radio City and snow falling in the city streets. New York became the magic city of my dreams. And when I returned, after the war was over, I remember thinking how lucky I was—out of all the places in the world—to have been born and to be able to live in New York City.

Thirty years later I still feel the same. I was brought up in Brooklyn, lived for a short time in Riverdale, and now live once again in Brooklyn. My friends, like everyone else's, have fled to the suburbs. As soon as I can afford to, the only suburb I'll ever consider is Manhattan.

My friends in their suburbs don't lock their houses or cars, and I can't say that I don't envy them that. They boast about how safe their streets are at night, but where is there to go? Their children go to safe schools (translated: almost no black children). When we visit they always mention their dear friends, the one black couple who moved into the \$60,000 house on the next block. Of course, they're a little apprehensive because a second black family is thinking of moving within their mile radius; sometimes they talk of blockbusting.

I too would like to feel safe. We have two locks and a chain on our apartment door. And a lot of insurance. In the last three years we've had two cars, three batteries, and two hubcaps stolen. When we get back from a two-week trip, I'm thankful that the car is still in the long-term parking lot at Kennedy and that my apartment wasn't broken into. In the streets I'm always conscious of my pocketbook.

My suburban friends (and some of my Manhattan friends) are afraid to travel in the subways and claim that they haven't boarded a subway train in years. I travel on the IRT four days a week to teach at Baruch College. When I get on the train at Eastern Parkway most of the people on it are black; the white people get on the Atlantic Avenue stop, the Long Island Railway terminal. Traveling on the subways is never an esthetic experience; I don't like it. But every once in awhile I feel an inexplicable sense of camaraderie because of all of us in it, all going to and from work to try to keep our lives pieced together, all trying to live and find, each in his own way, some of the same things.

My classroom at Baruch, because of SEEK and Open Admissions, are filled with something of a cross section of New Yorkers. These classes are better now, because of the variety of my students' backgrounds, than they were some years ago when all the students came from backgrounds that were carbon copies of my own. The conflicts of our college are the conflicts of the city and our strengths its strengths. My son goes to the Brooklyn Ethical Culture School, always integrated because of its Park Slope location and its own policy. They had an assembly program some weeks ago to celebrate the legacy of Martin Luther King.

My son came home and recited some lines from a poem by Fenton Johnson, "Tired":
Throw the children into the river; civilization has given us too many. It is better to die than to grow up and find that you are colored.

Pluck the stars out of the heavens. The stars mark our destiny. The stars marked my destiny. I am tired of civilization.

He was surprised that I knew the poem; he assumes that I don't know much. I listened to him recite the lines aloud, my blond, blue-eyed son who has grown up with black classmates, with all the sense of anger and injustice an 11-year-old can feel. My son doesn't go to school in the suburbs.

We all lead harrowing, speed-filled lives, and I don't get to do nearly as many things in the city as I'd like. I want to pick up tickets to "Ain't Supposed To Die a Natural Death"; there's an exhibit at the Metropolitan Museum of Art that I've been wanting to see. One day I will spend the afternoon looking at store windows on Fifth Avenue. There's a long mental list of things I want to do, and probably I won't get around to half of them. Yet I like to know they're available if I have the time.

I would like to feel safer in New York. I would like the air and the streets to be cleaner. I would certainly like less noise in the subways. But I am not going to run away. If there is no safety, no comfort here in New York, where will I find it? The problems of New York City are the problems of the world in which I live; I do not expect to be absolved from them. Besides, in time the problems of the city must, of necessity, follow those who have tried to flee from them.

But why pretend that my choice not to run is cerebral? There is no place else in the deepest place in my heart, where I want to live, Love, I suppose, is like that.

OLDEST CHURCH

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the First Congregational Church, the oldest church in the city of Bristol, is celebrating its 225th anniversary this year.

From generation to generation, the First Congregational Church and its members have made important contributions to the development of Bristol during years of stress and bounty. The spirit of God, the deep and abiding faith in the dignity of man and the value of the individual mark the special mission of the church in the community.

For the interest of my colleagues, an account of the proud and glorious history of the First Congregational Church in Bristol follows:

FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CITY'S OLDEST CHURCH; AT 1747 POUNDING BRISTOL STILL AN INFANT

The small settlement of New Cambridge, which would one day become Bristol, was but a 20-year old infant when the First Congregational Church, the city's oldest, was founded in 1747.

The first permanent settler in this immediate area was Ebenezer Barnes, who established a home in East Bristol in 1728. He and the other early towns people, however, were forced to travel to nearby Farmington to attend church services.

Since it could be a rather precarious journey during the winter season, 20 families in 1742 petitioned to hire a minister for "winter privileges," whereby they would pay a preacher to conduct services only during those months.

The petition was granted for six months a year, to compensate for the muddy spring season, and so the first meetings were held in the home of John Brown on King Street.

ORGANIZED 1747

The church was officially organized in 1747, but wasn't incorporated until 1785. Work on the first meeting house, as the church was then called, was begun in the late 1740's. It was not opened for public worship until late 1748, and not completed until 1753.

This first meeting house and its two successors were built in the same area of its present location by the Federal Hill Green. When the land was first purchased only the house of Joseph Benton was within eyesight.

The second meeting house was begun in 1768, due to the rapid growth of the settlement. The third and present one was constructed in 1832.

The outside has remained basically unchanged to this day, but the interior has undergone some changes in regard to pews and the organ loft.

The church's first permanent minister was Rev. Samuel Newell, who was ordained in 1747, the same year the Congregational Society in New Cambridge was founded.

His service extended for 42 years, but his tenure was not entirely peaceful. Mr. Newell was a staunch advocate of the teachings of Calvin and Edwards, and his preaching caused some parishioners to split and form their own society, that of The Church of England.

Rev. Newell's successor, Rev. Giles H. Cowles, who served from 1789 through 1810, had a relatively peaceful stay, although there was still some opposition to Calvinist doctrines.

Under Rev. Jonathan Cone, 1811-1828, the first Sunday School was established and the first school for higher learning was promoted.

FIRST ACADEMY

The Academy, as it was called, was probably built somewhere between 1822 and 1825, on society grounds, where the T. H. Patterson School now stands. It was built by subscription and maintained by tuition fees. The only other local church then in existence, the Baptist, also took part in its upkeep.

Rev. Cone's pastorate also had its share of theological controversy, as did that of his successor, Rev. Abner J. Leavenworth, who served from 1829-1831.

Rev. David L. Parmelee's tenure, from 1832-1841, was relatively peaceful, but the Taylor-Tyler theological controversy marred the pastorates of Rev. Raymond H. Seeley, 1843-1849, and Rev. William H. Goodrich, 1850-1854.

There is no question that the Rev. Leverett Griggs was the most beloved pastor the First Congregational Church ever knew," wrote the late Bristol historian George W. Hull about the next Congregational minister, who served from 1856-1869.

He was first thought of as a heretic, but by the time Rev. Griggs died, his beliefs had become orthodox. His pastorate was during the difficult abolitionist days and his service to the community resulted in bestowing a tax exemption on the clergyman.

SPURRED NEWSPAPER

Mr. Griggs was succeeded by Rev. William W. Belden, 1870-1874, who, surprisingly, was partly responsible for the start of The Bristol Press, as he urged his friend Rev. Charles H. Riggs to come to Bristol and start a newspaper. He was also responsible for the doorless pews.

Then came: Rev. Henry T. Staats, 1874-1885, during which an addition for Sun. School classes and other functions was built on the south end of the meeting house; Rev. Asher Anderson, 1885-1890, helped start the Christian Endeavor Society; and Rev. William H. Belden, 1890-1891, was the last Edwardian preacher to speak about predestination at the church.

A pioneer of sorts, Rev. Thomas M. Miles, who innovated using individual communion cups and free pews (the first free pew system in Bristol), preached from 1892-1903.

He was followed by Rev. Dr. Calvin B. Moody, affectionately termed "Sunny Jim" for his friendly personality. During his tenure, 1903-1907, the idea to construct a Parish House was instigated. Mr. Moody also enjoyed a good relationship with the young people.

Construction of the Parish House was completed during the pastorate of Rev. Ernest L. Wismer, 1910-1927, who was considered a fearless preacher and remarkable scholar.

Also scholarly was Rev. Francis T. Cooke, 1927-1946, skilled in the Arabic language and a participant in the National Exchange. Cooke willingly volunteered to serve his country in World War II when fighting broke out.

STEWARDSHIP

Rev. Roswell F. Hinkelman served the parish from 1946-1959. A well-liked minister, Mr. Hinkelman was influential in strengthening church stewardship.

During his stay the Lena Forbes Barnes Memorial addition was constructed, and an exchange brought Rev. William H. S. Webb here. Mr. Webb later served as interim pastor and captivated everyone with his famous children's stories while Rev. Hinkelman preached in England during the summer of 1956.

Succeeding Rev. Hindleman was Rev. Richard A. Wolff. Remaining in Bristol from 1959-1967, Rev. Wolff helped the church write a new constitution, adopt the former parsonage for office use, and take in many new members.

Coming in 1965, Rev. Aubrey Murphy was the first ordained assistant minister of First Congregational, and he is still serving the parish. He has devoted much of his work towards the church school and other activities with the youth of the city as well as of the church.

Rev. Webb served as interim minister during 1967. The Rev. Theodore W. Boltz of West Hartford was called to the church as senior minister March 1, 1968, and is presently serving in this capacity. One of the greatest achievements in recent years, completed since Mr. Boltz came to the church, was the remodeling of the Parish House.

PARISH HOUSE REMODELED

The old gymnasium, which served the entire community as well as the church for some 56 years, has been eliminated to make way for badly needed Sunday School rooms. The old gym was probably the first built in the city.

The lower portion of the former gym still serves as a dining area, and the space under the walk-ways is now used for storage.

At the same time as this renovation, the summer of 1970, parking facilities, so necessary for a city church, were enlarged and made more adequate. Another recent innovation is the building of two cabinets to house historic memorabilia in the Lena Forbes Barnes Memorial Wing. Displays have been arranged depicting the vital role the church has played in Bristol's history.

TOM PELLY OF WASHINGTON STATE

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues on the House Merchant Marine Committee in lauding the congressional service of TOM PELLY of Washington State. Tom is a valuable House of Representatives resource in the fields of merchant shipping, environment control, and fish and wildlife. His years of service and experience, counsel, and advice will not be simply replaced in this House.

Tom has placed Federal service above partisanship in his chosen fields of expertise and concentration—not a small tribute I pay to this colleague. We will miss the leadership and fellowship of TOM PELLY on the Merchant Marine Committee—the country, I suspect, has not seen the last of his service.

HON. TOM PELLY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join so many of my colleagues this afternoon in honoring TOM PELLY on his outstanding career as a Member of Congress. His effective leadership throughout his career has set the highest standard of public service.

Tom is a great man and a great Republican whose calm, scholarly wisdom is appreciated by all those Members who are privileged to know him well. He has served his district, state, and country in a very effective fashion. We will long remember his leadership in maritime matters, conservation of natural resources and, above all, his dedication to the highest principles of governmental service.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that my dear friend, TOM PELLY, will not be in the halls of Congress next year. Mine is a personal regret, of course, but I could say the Nation itself will regret his decision to retire.

TOM PELLY and I have served on the same two committees for the entire 14 years I have been here. I can testify with accuracy and truth that he is a hard-working, energetic, able Member of the Congress. He has a significant hand in shaping national legislation which would benefit every citizen of our country. I know that he served his constituency continually and effectively. Those people shall certainly miss him.

TOM PELLY is one of my dear friends in the Congress, a friendship which I shall always cherish. I wish him and his family every happiness in the days to come.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, William Fitts Ryan was a man whose courage was as mighty as his convictions. This legislative body and our Nation have lost a great champion of human rights and civil liberties. Bill Ryan was a man of tremendous conscience and, because he often dissented from prevailing mores and espoused causes that were unfashionable or even unpopular, he has been properly called a man ahead of his time.

I join my colleagues who have already expressed their sorrow over the loss of this man of compassion and humility. We will miss Bill Ryan for his friendship, his progressive thinking, and for his relentless pursuit of the truth for the benefit of us all.