IN THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration nominations beginning Robert D. Hopkins, to be lieutenant, and ending William E. George, to be ensign, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 14, 1972.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ROLLING WITH THE PUNCHES

HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, during my years here in the Congress, I have grown to know and admire Joseph V. Machugh, who is no stranger to the Members of the House. I was most impressed with the contents of his most recent article and believe it to have a message for each of us. At this point I insert Joe's thoughts for the benefit of my colleagues and the general public:

ROLLING WITH THE PUNCHES

Were life itself for the most part to consist of smooth sailing, happy landings and striking success of personal pursuits—'twould indeed be an Idyllic existence. However, under such improbable circumstances, beneficiaries of that Utopia might suggest "plight of the poor, little rich boy" reared inside the walled mansion and grounds of the family home—and whose parents had spared the rod and spoiled the child—giving him free and untrammeled reign for his every desire. Inevitably, sooner or later that life would begin to pall and—as in the instance of our "first parents"—he would look for some new and untried source of stimulation without bonds of discipline—that indispensable ingredient for success of all human conduct—universally resented by millions of the short-sighted but, like other Laws of Nature—imperatively-lasting and inflexible as the force of gravity within the orbit of the Earth's surface.

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

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

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

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

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

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

For, if the Pen is mightier than the Sword—and Restraint rewards those who practice it—why not start to inculcate in minds of our rising and magnificently adroit youngsters of today—this cardinal Rule of Conduct:

"LET'S ROLL WITH THE PUNCHES OF LIFE!"

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

JOSEPH V. MACHUGH.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *September 16, 1972.*

INSERTS OWN REMARKS ON BUS TAKEOVER

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my own remarks concerning the bus takeover bill which we passed last Saturday evening.

I would like to state that this bill would still be in the subcommittee if I had not called it up to the full committee since the subcommittee chairman could not get a quorum. The full committee had to meet three times before a quorum was present. This statement, which follows, also applies to the teachers pay raise bill:

OCTOBER 10, 1972.

In the Senate Report on S. 4062 under the heading "Condemnation Procedure" on page 6, comment is made, "Nothing in this Act shall be construed as granting to the Transit Authority the power to, and the Transit Authority shall not, assume or otherwise acquire any of the liabilities, either contingent or actual, of D.C. Transit System, Inc."

Without qualification this restriction would hamstring the negotiation of a contract between the Transit Authority and D.C. Transit which has been proceeding to near completion these past few months. It is necessary that the Transit Authority be permitted to assume certain operating liabilities which are normal in these situations. This is necessary *providing, however,* that in assuming such liabilities provision is made for *compensation* to the Transit Authority by the D.C. Transit System.

The Conference Report should, therefore, clarify the above comment in the Senate Report so that it should read, "Nothing in this Act shall be construed as granting to the Transit Authority the power to, and the Transit Authority shall not, assume or otherwise acquire any of the liabilities, either contingent or actual, of D.C. Transit System, Inc., *unless compensation is paid therefor by D.C. Transit System, Inc. to the Transit Authority.*" (*Italic added.*)

A CITIZEN'S ROLE IN CRIME CONTROL—LOUIS SCHWEITZER

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in 1967, the National Crime Commission documented the archaic and inefficient processes which govern the operation of our criminal justice system. Since then we have embarked upon substantial efforts to modernize our law enforcement agencies, our courts, and our correctional institutions.

We have done so knowing the enormity of the task. We have done so knowing that the vitality and strength of our constitutional guarantees are relevant so long as they accommodate the vicissitude of changing conditions and the stress of changing times.

In an age when in the face of such pervasive public problems, made to appear to many that there is little that any individual man can do, one concerned citizen has left his mark on the cause of criminal justice reform.

That man was Louis Schweitzer. He was devoted to the ideals of American civil liberties and was passionately committed to making them work for those without resources, sometimes even of hope. The founder of the Vera Institute of Justice in New York City, Mr. Schweitzer made a singular contribution in the effort to make the criminal justice system in the United States more humane and more efficient.

Although he died last year, the Vera Institute continues to bring competence,

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

expertise, and commitment to the extraordinarily complex problems of criminal justice. Mr. President, a brief article recently appeared in the World magazine, written by Hallowell Bowser concerning this work of Mr. Schweitzer. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHAT CAN ONE MAN DO? LOUIS SCHWEITZER: MAGNIFICENT LAYMAN

(By Hallowell Bowser)

Louis Schweitzer was an ebullient American millionaire who had a rollicking good time with his money. Yet before he died last year he also managed, almost single-handedly, to set in motion some long-needed, still-ongoing changes in our system of justice.

Schweitzer's feelings against injustice were not rooted in any personal history of poverty: his father had emigrated to the U.S. from Russia in 1903, when Schweitzer was four, and had soon made good as a manufacturer of cigarette paper. Young Schweitzer was reared in comfortable circumstances and got an engineering degree from the University of Maine. When his father died, Louis and his two brothers took over the family firm and prospered mightily.

From the first, he was an easy touch for anyone who gave him a legitimate pitch for help, and his charities very much included himself. When his wife, an actress, complained that it was hard to find taxis in Manhattan after her nighttime performances, Schweitzer reacted impulsively; he bought a Mercedes-Benz taxicab and a $17,000 New York City taxi medallion, then actually found a hackie named Louis Schweitzer (no relation) to drive the cab. The arrangement was that they would split the profits—so long as the taxi was available whenever the Schweitzers needed to be driven somewhere.

In the same spirit, Schweitzer bought out his favorite barbershop, in Manhattan's Chrysler building, because it closed too early in the evening. He then gave the deed to the shop's head barber, on condition that he stay open later, and share the shop's income with him.

Similarly, when he had trouble flagging down gondolas during the busy season in Venice, he hit on a characteristic solution. He asked a gondoliere, "Wouldn't you like to have your own boat?" In broken English, the oarsman (a voluble type named Bruno) said sure—but a gondola cost a lot more money than he had.

"No problem," Schweitzer said, "I'm going to buy the gondola you operate, give it to you, and split the profits between us." Bruno, ecstatic, cried that he would not only reserve the gondola for the Schweitzers when they were in Venice, but would also give free rides to all their American friends. At this, Schweitzer feigned heavy displeasure. "In that case," he grumped, "I take back my offer. The deal is off!" Shattered, Bruno begged Schweitzer to explain his change of mind. "It's simple," Schweitzer said. "The deal is off unless you promise to charge my American friends double. They can afford it!"

The gondoliers' guild at first opposed the Bruno-Louis partnership: no foreigner, they huffed, had ever owned a Venetian gondola. Charm and money smoothed the way, however. Bruno got his gondola (named for Schweitzer's wife Lucille), and the passenger compartment of Schweitzer's Manhattan-based taxicab soon displayed this sign: WHEN IN VENICE, BE SURE TO ASK FOR BRUNO'S GONDOLA.

Though he broke even on the gondola, many of Schweitzer's whims cost him hard cash. Once, while on an ocean trip, he learned that an evening of boxing matches between the liner's crewmen had been arranged for the bored passengers. Schweitzer sought out the purser privately. "Listen," he said, "I want you to pass the word that I'll give a hundred dollars to every fighter who loses." "Don't you mean to the one who wins?" the purser asked. "No," Schweitzer said, "I mean the loser takes it all."

There followed some of the god-awfullest boxing matches seen since the heyday of the canvasback prizefighter called Fainting Phil Scott. Even the weakest missed punch would cause a heavily muscled stoker to pitch forward onto the canvas, where he would lie doggo till counted out. The passengers were mystified by these curious doings—all of them, that is, except the poker-faced, inwardly chuckling Schweitzer.

But Schweitzer was no mere playboy-idler. He worked hard at his business and just as hard at dispensing grants and handouts to deserving persons. One day in the early Sixties, a friend mentioned to him that each year about 50,000 persons had to stay cooped up in New York City's crowded jails for at least a month—sometimes much longer—because they could not afford the fifty or a hundred dollars needed to obtain release on bail, pending trial. This revelation deeply disturbed Schweitzer. It seemed to him that a man with strong family, church, and job ties would hardly be likely to skip town if a magistrate released him on recognizance—that is, without payment of bail.

It was then that Schweitzer set up the Vera Foundation (named after his mother). With the help of its young director, Herbert Sturz, and a few law-student volunteers, Vera began running quick checks on the backgrounds and general reliability of men being held for trial on minor charges. Soon forward-looking judges—notably Justice Bernard Botein—began releasing prisoners on recommendation of the Manhattan Bail Project, as the Vera group was called. Of the first 3500 men released, only 1.6 percent later failed to show up for trial. The usual bail-jumping rate is upwards of 3 percent. The Bail Project idea was soon taken over by the City of New York, and eventually spread to cities cross the country. Many of its features are embodied in the federal Bail Reform Act of 1966.

Later the Foundation, renamed the Vera Institute of Justice, pioneered a Summons Project, under which many people charged with minor offenses are taken direct to police precinct houses, are told when to appear in court, and are then set free. This process gets around the red tape and human misery too often attendant on formal arraignment and pretrial detention.

Going from strength to strength, Schweitzer and his institute still later set up a highly effective program that gives Skid Row derelicts medical and other help. Vera also introduced the idea, eventually taken over by New York City, of holding off on prosecution of first and petty offenders so long as they do well in various job programs.

With Schweitzer gone (he died last September at 73) his institute is developing new projects—e.g., heroin-maintenance programs—in line with his ideals of freedom and justice. His true monument, however, is the many thousands of obscure people who don't even know his name, but whose lives have been touched, in some cases transformed, by the revolution he so courageously began.

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, my colleague and distinguished House Member, CHARLES GRIFFIN of Mississippi is about to retire from this House.

I join with his numerous colleagues in paying respect to this dedicated public servant.

For the past 4 years the residents of the Third District of Mississippi have had this capable and dedicated American represent them in the House, and it is unfortunate that they will no longer have him as their spokesman in Washington.

I wish my colleague, Mr. GRIFFIN, good luck and good health in the years ahead.

SENATOR CHARLES PERCY—DEVELOPING MINORITY BUSINESS

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Senator in the other body, Mr. PERCY, has long been interested in developing minority business and in assisting black Americans.

His record in this field is well known, not only among blacks but among people generally in Illinois. I attach herewith an article from the Tuesday magazine of October 1972, in a supplement to the Washington Sunday Star, by John Farmer, entitled "Senator Charles Percy—Developing Minority Business." I am sure my colleagues in both Houses will want to read this very interesting article:

SENATOR CHARLES PERCY—DEVELOPING MINORITY BUSINESS

(By John Farmer)

Of all the minorities in this nation of minorities, perhaps the least visible in the rarified air of Capitol Hill in Washington is the Black businessman.

He is too frequently short on cash and shorter still on credit. With notable exceptions, he is short on the technical skills and experience required in the increasingly specialized world of Big Business and, ironically, he finds it hard to acquire that experience precisely because he lacks those skills.

In the same ironic vein, he often can't get the credit needed to launch his own business because he is short of, yes, cash and experience.

To cap his cup of frustration, the Black businessman—or aspiring businessman—has surprisingly little political clout in a Congress that has earned a reputation for catering more carefully to the needs of business than to those of any other interest group in the country.

This, in capsule form, is how the problem of the Black entrepreneur—or would-be entrepreneur—is seen by Senator Charles H. Percy of Illinois, who came to the Senate six years ago promising to carry the fight for greatly increased Black ownership of businesses and of homes.

Percy, who is standing for re-election this November, remains optimistic about the situation. "There has been steady progress under this Administration," he said in an interview in Washington, D.C. And he sees hope for improvement with the appointment of Peter Peterson to succeed Maurice Stans as Secretary of Commerce.

Black businessmen, said Percy, just couldn't have a more sympathetic or understanding person to work with than Pete Peterson." Implicit in Percy's praise of Peterson, there appears to be criticism of Stans.

"Let's just say I don't think it [develop-

ment of Black business ownership] was a matter of high priority with Maurice Stans."

Percy, however, believes that even with Peterson in charge it would be unwise to look for immediate or dramatic new initiatives from Washington to spur Black business ownership.

"I don't see any big breakthroughs coming or any new big projects," he said. "It's a matter now of building on the start we've made and making steady progress."

As a reflection of the mood in Congress on the question of Black entrepreneurship, there is much about Percy that is untypical. He is untypical in that his background—he was the boy wonder of American business two decades ago as president of Bell & Howell at age 29—singularly equips him to understand business viewpoints and needs and how one climbs the slippery corporate pole.

He is untypical, too, in that Percy knew impoverishment as a child during the depression. His family was on relief in Chicago for a time and during his high school years Percy held as many as four jobs at one time.

The work ethic is deeply engrained in Percy. By his senior year at the University of Chicago, Percy was "the richest boy who ever worked his way through college," according to Robert Hutchins, former chancellor of the university. Twelve years after graduation, Percy was a trustee of the University and president of Bell & Howell.

"His life sounds like a soap opera, doesn't it?" his wife, Loraine, once told authors David Broder and Stephen Hess.

But Percy freely concedes that such a spectacular rise in the corporate world would be almost impossible even today for an equally energetic Black.

Black commercial development, he also says, has been stunted by the years of discrimination. It's an old story. But the Black businessman also shares with his White counterpart a special liability of small business in this day of growing industrial and commercial concentration.

"The mortality rate is very high in all small business," said ex-businessman Percy. "It's a fact of life. Interest rates are high—eight or nine per cent—and how many small businesses in this country make that kind of profit?"

Couple this with the relatively small pool of business experience in the Black community, and you get a stiff resistance among bankers to loan small business start-up money to Blacks, he explains. Percy says he is encouraged by the growth of Black-owned banks, even though he is aware that Andrew Brimmer, a Black member of the Federal Reserve Board, has recently stated that Black bankers are, if anything, even more reluctant than some White bankers to loan money in the ghetto.

"Bankers will act like bankers," said Percy, philosophically. "White or Black."

With this in mind, Percy in 1970 sponsored legislation providing a federal interest subsidy grant to new small businesses or those in operation less than five years. But the bill died in the House, further evidence of the waning interest there in the once "fashionable" inner-city issues.

With this high-risk history, one might question the wisdom of the small business road for the aspiring Black business mogul. Would he be better advised to follow the more traditional route through the big corporation?"

"No," said Percy. "I'd like to see more Blacks step out and take the risk and really participate in the free enterprise system."

However, big business also has an obligation, Percy says, to open its ranks to qualified Blacks. And, reaching for ideas again, he talks speculatively of what American business colleges could do to help close the business know-how gap plaguing American Blacks.

But he emphasizes that there is a rising level of wealth and income in the inner cities of the nation that offer a new potential for enterprising Blacks. The development of franchise business, he maintains, is especially hopeful.

Local franchises for gas stations, bottling companies and fast-food restaurants offer Blacks the chance for ownership and business experience, with the expertise and business assistance of large, White-run corporations for support, he says.

The Black community, in short, could be a gold mine for Black businessmen.

Yet Percy is fully aware that the "national mood," as reflected in Congress, seems to have assigned the growth of Black entrepreneurship to the back-burner for the present. Possibly because of the scant likelihood of mustering support for programs aimed in this direction, Percy's own efforts seem less dynamic and do reflect the congressional mood.

This present course is also, in part, the product of Percy's own development both in the Senate and as a potential contender for leadership of the liberal wing of the Republican Party. When first elected, he lobbied eagerly and successfully for appointment to the Banking and Currency Committee, with jurisdiction over many minority business and housing programs, particularly his National Home Ownership Foundation, a plan for promoting home ownership as opposed to public housing rentals in the inner city.

But with increased seniority and the prospect of national horizons ahead, Percy has also found it necessary to occupy himself with foreign affairs, the national economy and Republican Party matters. These are the concerns of the larger national constituency he may someday seek.

Today, Percy's major committees are Appropriations and Government Operations and the Joint Senate-House Economic Committee. He has given up his seat on Banking and Currency. The war, his growing list of speaking engagements, the economy and, as much as anything, the Republican succession in the post-Nixon years—these interests have drained time and energy from the heavy preoccupation Percy gave to minority ownership of businesses and homes in his earlier Senate years and in his successful campaign for election.

Two years earlier, in 1964, "the Goldwater years," Percy had suffered the fate of most Republicans in that campaign—defeat. Always a man who could learn from hard facts and cold statistics, Percy was impressed with his loss of 89 per cent of the Black vote in Illinois.

A month after the election he told the Republican governors that their party would "never be known as the party of opportunity until we make it unmistakably clear where we stand as a party on civil rights." The following May he told the Illinois press association he had been wrong when he earlier had opposed a state open housing law. And when the state failed to act, Percy subsequently backed such a federal law.

Percy's new policy was rewarded. In 1966, his vote for Senator in th Black wards of Chicago was up six per cent over 1964, a larger increase than he enjoyed in those areas of the city where Republican strength is traditionally found.

Percy carried this zeal for the minority cause into the Senate. By April of his first year on Capitol Hill, Percy had persuaded every other Republican Senator to co-sponsor his national Home Ownership Foundation plan and sold it successfully to 109 of the 187 House GOP members. Few freshman have ever won such instant endorsement of any legislative proposal.

But that was 1967, and Republicans seemed on their way to building an urban image—John Lindsay in New York, Edward Brooke in Massachusetts, Mark Hatfield in Oregon. And Percy was in the forefront.

It was a time when the urban problem had a special urgency. And Republicans, seeing a chance for a political breakthrough in the disarray of the old, city Democratic machines, sought new answers to the burning urban questions.

Percy's home ownership plan was designed to provide a Republican alternative (a private, non-profit corporation operating with low-interest, government guaranteed bonds) to the old Democratic solution—public housing.

Similarly, his push for Black capitalism, Black business ownership, was designed to lure investment capital and know-how into the Black community with a singularly free enterprise appeal.

In December of 1969, the Senate Small Business Subcommittee, of which Percy was a member, held hearings on the special dilemma of the small businessman, especially the Black small businessman. And Percy, in a statement to the Senate, portrayed help for the Black businessman as "probably the most effective alternative" to separatism. "It comes," Percy said, "not as a replacement to ['Black power'] . . . but as an extension. It is 'green power'—money power."

The recurring theme of the hearings, Percy said, was "the repeated call for a national commitment to the interests of minority enterprise . . . Congress likewise must assume a commitment toward minority enterprise, thereby setting the pace for the rest of the nation."

But the urgency the issue enjoyed in those days has faded. And Percy is well aware of this change.

"Sure, there's a lessening of interest in urban affairs and civil rights on Capitol Hill," Percy acknowledged. "That's why Romney [Secretary of HUD, George Romney] is so disturbed."

It extends especially into the related field of civil rights, Percy declares. The days of the great struggles over civil rights legislation are probably gone, he says, and in the area of education, dominated now by the busing dispute, "there are signs of regression."

What if the cities were to explode into violence once more? "Congress would be right back into the problem," Percy speculated. "But that's all over."

Instead, Percy believes that Blacks in the inner city—much like students on college campuses—have concluded there is no lasting gain from violent protest. But this creates a challenge to the system, he said, "to reward and encourage those who would operate through that system."

What more can government do?

"It could do more to make known the whole idea that Blacks can get into business for themselves," he said, especially through better coordination with the advertising industry.

Percy also suggests that Blacks, because of certain lingering, self-defeating attitudes are, to a limited degree, also responsible for the slow growth of Black entrepreneurship.

"Too many Blacks just don't believe it is possible to make it on their own. I'd like to flush out the talent that's in the Black community," he said. As an example of aggressive Black economic leadership—based on a recognition of what is needed and serving that need—he cited the Rev. Jesse Jackson and his former Operation Breadbasket and present PUSH projects in Chicago.

Percy, the model for success in the modern business world, inevitably returns in his conversation to the pleasures of ownership and individual achievement.

"I remember we used to live over a German delicatessen," he said. "It was run by a man named Schultz, and I used to go in there and see him working at all hours. And

I said to him once, "You're always working. Don't you ever have any fun?'

"And I remember he said, 'This is fun because it's mine.' "

CONGRESSMAN ALBERT W. JOHNSON'S QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as my usual custom, I recently sent out my semiannual questionnaire seeking the views of the citizens of the 23d Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

I am pleased with the tremendous return and the high interest shown by the residents of the 23d District.

Today, I am reporting the results of this questionnaire for the information of all Members of Congress:

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

1. Would you favor voting to sustain a Presidential veto on bills which substantially exceed the Federal budget?

Yes, 79.5%; no, 15.2%; no answer, 5.3%.

2. With respect to Wage and Price Controls, do you favor:

a. immediately terminating controls, 9.0%.

b. continuing controls until inflation is ended, 54.4%.

c. continuing controls indefinitely, 14.4%.

d. going to a fully controlled economy including an OPA type local office and enforcement, 12.1%.

No answer, 10.1%.

3. Do you favor a continued effort to achieve voluntary prayer and Bible reading in our schools?

Yes, 86.3%; no, 12.3%; no answer, 1.4%.

4. There is a bill in Congress which would grant nationwide collective bargaining for teachers with the right to strike. Would you vote for this proposal?

Yes, 20.6%; no, 76.4%; no answer, 3.0%.

5. Do you favor making the interest on bonds of municipalities subject to the Federal income tax?

Yes, 48.4%; no, 46.5%; no answer, 5.1%.

6. There is a bill in Congress which would permit Federal employees to retire at age 50 after 30 years of service. Do you favor this proposal?

Yes 40.0%; No 56.5%; no answer 3.5%.

7. Do you favor an income tax credit to parents who have students in private elementary and secondary schools?

Yes 35.3%; No 63.0%; no answer 1.7%.

8. Do you favor eliminating the interest paid on a home mortgage as an income tax deduction?

Yes 22.5%; No 75.6%; no answer 1.9%.

9. Do you favor cuts in defense spending?

Yes 49.2%; No 44.4%; no answer 6.4%.

10. Do you favor Federal financing of public broadcasting on a long range (five year) basis?

Yes 15.8%; No 75.3%; no answer 8.9%.

11. Do you feel that we should expand agricultural and non-strategic trade with the Communist nations?

Yes 68.8%; No 26.0%; no answer 5.2%.

12. Do you feel that busing is a legitimate means to achieve racial balance in the public schools?

Yes 9.0%; No 89.3%; no answer 1.7%.

13. Do you favor diverting some of the highway user taxes now used to build roads to help finance urban mass transit systems?

Yes 37.6%; No 58.8%; no answer 3.6%.

14. Would you be willing to pay more for products and services if their manufacture and use could be made virtually pollution free?

Yes 62.7%; No 29.8%; no answer 7.5%.

NEW CONCEPTS IN SITING OF NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, because of the interest and concern about the siting of nuclear power plants, I enclose a perceptive speech by Commissioner James T. Ramey of the Atomic Energy Commission entitled "New Concepts in the Planning and Siting of Nuclear Power Plants.

This address was recently delivered in Asheville, N.C., and merits wide circulation.

I request that this speech be reprinted in the RECORD.

The speech follows:

NEW CONCEPTS IN THE PLANNING AND SITING OF NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

(By James T. Ramey, Commissioner, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission)

I am glad to be here today and to share with you the beauty and climate of western Carolina.

I was pleased to see that your program focuses on the role of planning—both short and long term—in electric power and related fields. I am happy that the concept of planning is finally becoming established and respectable. I can remember that some years ago the word planning had an unfavorable connotation—so much so that at an organization on the other side of the mountains where I worked even the use of the word "planning" was taboo—however various "studies" and "forecasts" were permitted and sometimes encouraged!

ENERGY CRISIS

When we gaze out over the scenic beauty that surrounds us here we are apt to forget the many problems that will be facing vast regions of the United States, such as the development of needed new electric power sources compatible with the environment and the many new sites for power generation that must be provided. Two years ago, the power difficulties experienced in the Northeastern and Middle Atlantic States and the shortages of fuel oil and coal ushered in the era of energy concern.

I am certain that this audience today needs no convincing that our modern society is completely dependent upon energy, and that in the years ahead, this country will need to tap in the most efficient manner possible all of our available resources—coal, oil, gas, hydro and nuclear—if our needs and goals are to be met.

Fortunately, the serious nature of our energy problems is being recognized, and many people are becoming aware of the fact that we can no longer take our energy supply for granted. Energy, indeed, may be becoming so fashionable a subject that it may rival the Environment or even *Women's Lib'* on various symposia schedules.

Between now and the end of the century, the U.S. is projected to require more energy than it has consumed in its entire history. While a slowing of population growth might result in a lessening of the rate of increase in the amount of energy needed, nevertheless, large additional amounts of energy will be essential.

As our needs for energy have grown, public concern over possible adverse environmental effects has led to increased difficulties in obtaining approval of various sites considered for nuclear plants, as well as for other types of electric generating stations. Growing competition for available land and water resources by other segments of our society has only tended to increase this already difficult situation.

To help resolve this critical problem, there will have to be longer range planning of utility expansions extending ten years or more in advance of construction, new and innovative siting concepts will have to be evaluated and developed, and new siting policies will have to be realized.

In my talk today, I expect to discuss some new concepts in the planning of power plants in terms of advances in nuclear technology, as well as new concepts more specially related to the siting of nuclear plants. I also hope to cover advances in technology of energy fuels outside the nuclear field. But first, I would like to summarize briefly the roule of nuclear power in the current scene.

STATUS OF NUCLEAR POWER

Present electrical generating capacity of U.S. utilities is about 380 million kilowatts. To meet the growing demand for electric energy, the Federal Power Commission, in its 1970 National Power Survey Report [1], projects that the generating capacity in the 50 states will rise to about 670 million kilowatts in 1980 and approximately 1,260 million in 1990. Today, operable nuclear power plants account for only 3½ percent of the country's generating capacity, but by 1990 the Federal Power Commission projects [2] that they will be producing 49 percent of the total generation with 38 percent of the total capacity. Fossil steam-electric plants will generate in 1990 about 44 percent of the total output with 44 percent of the capacity. Approximately 6 percent of total generation will be in hydroelectric stations representing 12 percent of the national capacity.

Looking at the status of nuclear power today, there are 28 operable nuclear power plants with a total capacity of about 13,300,000 kilowatts. An additional 116 nuclear plants are on order of which 51 are under construction and 65 are in planning and design stages. By the end of this decade, over 130 nuclear plants are scheduled to be on line, representing about one-fifth of the total U.S. electrical generating capacity.

The National Power Survey Report [3] indicates that of the various U.S. regions, the Southeast Region will require the most new capacity and nuclear power installations are projected to be 34,000,000 kilowatts in the 1970s and 60,000,000 kilowatts in the 1980s, or 49 and 44 percent, respectively of total additions in this region.

Since the beginning of 1969, about 35 percent of all the nuclear power capacity purchased in the U.S. was ordered by utilities in the Southeast Region,[4] although the population of this region is less than 20 percent of the national total. A very large area is covered, ranging from the Surry plant in eastern Virginia, to Browns Ferry in western Alabama, to Turkey Point at the southern tip of Florida.

Why is the U.S. turning to nuclear power? A major reason is that it has become economically competitive in a number of areas of the country. This has occurred even though the capital costs of nuclear plants have generally gone up faster than those of fossil plants. Secondly, despite some of our detractors, it is an environmentally cleaner type of energy. But beyond this, unless nuclear power is developed and used we will be fast approaching a point where the demand for energy may outstrip our ability to make that energy available.

Footnotes at end of article.

If the rapid rate of consumers' substitution of electric power for the direct use of fuels continues, about half of the gross energy supply in the year 2000 will be used to generate electricity. With an increasing dependence on electrical energy, the development of more advanced nuclear technologies will be crucial. Present day light water type nuclear reactors—while they have many advantageous characteristics—only extract about one percent of the energy available from their nuclear fuel. Fortunately, nature has arranged things so we can take advantage of the breeder reactor which has the ability to produce more fissionable nuclear fuel material than it consumes. Because of the breeder's more efficient use of nuclear fuels, our potential energy supply would be practically inexhaustible, and limitations on the use of energy could be virtually eliminated.

Based on its potential economics, the interest of the reactor manufacturers and electric utilities, and the base of technology already available, the liquid metal cooled fast breeder reactor (LMFBR) has been selected as the highest priority reactor concept for achieving the breeder objective. This program has received outstanding support from the Administration, Congress and industry.

On August 7 of this year, the AEC announced the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding providing for the construction and operation of the Nation's first liquid metal fast breeder reactor demonstration plant to be located on the Tennessee Valley Authority system near Oak Ridge, Tennessee. The plant will be designed to produce about 400,000 kilowatts of power while demonstrating breeder reactor technology.

I was most pleased to participate in the signing ceremonies with Chairman Schlesinger and officials of the two principal utilities participating with AEC in the project—Thomas Ayers, President, Commonwealth Edison Company of Chicago, and Chairman A. J. Wagner of the Tennessee Valley Authority—as well as representatives of the Breeder Reactor Corporation and the Project Management Corporation, two special corporations formed to carry out the project.

The Edison Electric Institute, with the very able leadership of Shearon Harris and his associates has been conducting a voluntary fund raising campaign for the first demonstration plant and it already has received pledges for support of the project amounting to approximately $200 million from investor-owned utilities. Pledges of approximately $40 million have also been obtained from the publicly-owned utilities.

In addition to the LMFBR, we are continuing support of several other reactor types including the High Temperature Gas Reactor (HTGR), which operates on the thorium-uranium cycle. A 330,000 electric kilowatt prototype of this concept at the Fort St. Vrain station outside Denver, Colorado, is presently undergoing initial testing. Six large commercial plants of the HTGR concept have already been ordered by U.S. utilities.

NUCLEAR DESALTING

The energy picture is so complex that the development of new energy sources cannot solve all the problems that lie ahead without other major thrusts being taken. During recent years several new concepts have evolved where more effective use of energy and/or sites could be achieved. One of the earliest disciplined efforts to make better use of energy was that of dual purpose nuclear plants, initially for electric power and desalting. Under this approach, prime energy would be used to generate electricity and then exhausted at low temperature process conditions to desalt saline waters, thus reducing the amount of reject heat from that which would have resulted from the two operations being conducted independently.

By combining the production of electric power and the desalting of water in a single, large dual purpose plant, inherent economies can also be obtained in relation to the individual production of either of these two vital commodities. Of equal importance, with nuclear energy as a power source, the vast energy resources of the atom would be joined with the unlimited waters of the sea to provide a long-term solution to two of man's most fundamental needs—energy and water.

During the past several years some progress has been made, not only in improving the fundamental technology of both the nuclear energy source and of the water desalting processes, but also in the understanding of the technical, economic and even administrative factors which affect the prospects for the application of large-scale nuclear desalting.

Nuclear desalting will be an important development to many sections of the world, and to many areas of the United States, including the West, large metropolitan areas such as New York City, and even our Gulf states. People in the Southwest already are feeling the economic pinch of water shortages (where the diversion of water is not always the happiest solution) and it was not too many years ago that the Northeast felt the effects of a severe drought.

ENERGY CENTERS

Paralleling technology development, various studies have been conducted to evaluate the potential role that large-scale dual purpose nuclear plants might play in the future. In the process, a new concept—that of the energy center or agro-industrial complex—has emerged as an extension of the previous concept for large-scale nuclear desalting. In the paper, Nuclear Power for Desalination and Agro-Industrial Complexes,[5] which I presented last year at the Fourth International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy in Geneva, the details of this new concept were discussed.

In general terms, an energy center means an integrated complex in which the large scale production of energy is effectively combined with consuming industries at a single site or contiguous area. Such complexes would enable the production of power at lower real costs than otherwise might be achievable, both because of the scale involved and the reduction or elimination of transmission and distribution costs. While energy centers have evolved in the past, particularly where sources of low cost hydro-electric power were available, the availability of nuclear power adds a new dimension to the concept by allowing the creation of an energy center without regard to the local availability of conventional energy sources.

In principle, energy centers may involve the production of a wide spectrum of energy intensive products ranging from completely industrial to completely agricultural. We conducted an industrial study with Dow Chemical and the Puerto Rican Government which emphasized petro-chemicals derived from sea water.[6] Much of the attention in the United States studies, however, has been focused on what we call the agro-industrial complex. In the agro-industrial complex, desalted water is itself a principal product and much of the concurrent production of electric energy is devoted to manufacture of agricultural chemicals which directly support the efficient application of the desalted water.[7]

NEW CITIES CONCEPT

An outgrowth of our thinking on energy centers has been the possibility that such centers might in the future form the nucleus of whole new cities.

Most urban areas are served by extensive electrical networks so that the energy center concept, in its full sense of an integrated complex of both energy producing and consuming facilities, may appear to be unnecessary. Despite this, the growing problems of many large metropolitan areas have stimulated examination of the application of energy centers to the urban industrial situation. You have already heard in these meetings that between now and the year 2000, the world population is projected to reach about six billion.[8] Much of the growth will be in urban areas. With the existing metropolitan areas in many parts of the world reaching their limit in terms of environmental impact and livability, it is obvious that much of this vast populaton growth will be settled in essentially new cities.

For long-range planning, the energy center concept offers an attractive way to provide an industrial nucleus for new cities. Here again, the fact that nuclear power plants can be placed without regard to the location of conventional energy sources makes it possible to locate these new centers and their surrounding cities in areas chosen primarily from the standpoint of environmental suitability. The establishment of entire new cities offers opportunities to introduce advantageous features which would probably be impractical to install in existing urban locations.[9]

For example, process steam or heated water from the nuclear power plant serving a new city might be used for space heating and cooling, for water renovation, and to support industrial processes. Such uses would reduce the total quantity of heat which would otherwise need to be discharged or wasted to the environment.

OFFSHORE SITING

As you are aware, there are limitations today to the siting of nuclear plants close to highly populated urban centers and this has stimulated thinking on the nearer term possibilities of locating large nuclear plants and even some selected industrial activities on artificial islands. The proposed Bolsa Island nuclear desalting project[10] which was to be constructed on a 40 acre man-made island approximately one-half mile off the coast of Southern California below Long Beach, was an example of this approach. Today, there may be a number of locations along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts where this siting concept could be used. The Great Lakes also hold some potential for this siting approach.

A further development of the island siting concept is the construction of nuclear power plants on large barges or other floating structures, which are then located several miles out to sea along the coast. Among the advantages of this concept are the ability to obtain unlimited supplies of cooling water without thermal effects on rivers or other confined waterways, and the potential of reducing seismic problems which might exist on adjacent land areas. Moreover, plants located on islands or barges ultimately might well be located in closer proximity to large urban load centers than would be possible in the case of a land-based plant under present criteria of population density.

The possibility of offshore siting is now being actively considered in the United States, both by interested utilities and equipment manufacturers. Public Service Electric and Gas Company of New Jersey[11] is proceding with its plans to place the first large barge-mounted nuclear power plant in operation by 1980. The site for this project will be about three miles off the New Jersey coast, slightly north of Atlantic City. The floating power plant will be in water approximately 40 feet in depth and surrounded by a massive breakwater that will offer protection against storms and ship collision.

The barge-mounted concept will extend the siting options available to the utilities and offers a number of other potential advantages. Since the entire plant can be fabricated at a manufacturing facility, greater standardization can be achieved (with pos-

---

Footnotes at end of article.

sible shortening of licensing times) and a stable and highly trained work force can be assured. In addition, this concept will enable quality assurance practices to be more readily implemented throughout the entire project. These projects will, of course, be subject to detailed safety and environmental review by the AEC in connection with its licensing proceedings.

POWER PLANT PARKS

Another siting concept that has been receiving increased attention recently is that of power plant parks. Such parks would consist of large blocks of generating capacity located at a single site with perhaps 10,000,000 kilowatts of installed capacity, or even 20-30,000,000 kilowatts, depending on the time frame.[12] Already there are sites where over 3,000,000 kilowatts of capacity have been installed and, other locations exist where their expansion could reach 6,000,000 to 9,000,000 kilowatts. In this particular region, the Carolina Power and Light Company announced plans over a year ago for the installation of four nuclear generating units of 4,000,000 kilowatts capacity at its Shearon Harris Station,[13] 20 miles south of Raleigh. Also, the Virginia Electric and Power Company [14] has made commitments for four nuclear units, totalling almost 4,000,000 kilowatts, at the North Anna Power Station, 30 miles east of Charlottesville, Virginia.

Power plant parks could result in conservation of needed land and reduce the number of sites needed, complement industrial development, enhance regional development, permit more extensive sharing of common facilities, reduce the number of required regulatory actions, and offer other advantages in construction and operation. Nuclear parks could also include onsite fuel reprocessing and fabrication facilities and thus reduce the problems of offsite shipments of spent fuels.

One of the major concerns about the power park concept is the large concentration of power capacity and investment at a single site. And, the waste heat rejection problems could be of special concern, as well as the increased government involvement that may be required.

An important aspect of siting is the need for adequate cooling. In the past, sites have been limited to those with adequate supplies of cooling water. Recent developments in nonevaporative or dry cooling systems, promise opportunities for much greater siting flexibility.[15] Dry cooling will permit expansion of existing sites where water availability might not otherwise be adequate, and will enable utilities to consider new sites that may be closer to the load centers or to transmission rights-of-way. The AEC is conducting an engineering development program for dry cooling systems with emphasis on lowering costs and assuring their suitability for large central station power plant use.

Dry cooling also offers environmental benefits as compared with other evaporative cooling concepts. It will be particularly useful for mine-mouth plants where very low fuel costs are available, but where water supplies are generally nonexistent. A 330,000 kilowatt plant at a mine-mouth site using dry towers has already been initiated for operation at Wyodak, Wyoming. This will be one of the largest such units in the world when it goes into operation in early 1977. Many utilities are following the progress of this project and the developments which will adapt dry towers to the large central station plants that are now being planned to meet future generating needs.

NEW ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES

In my remarks today I should say a few words about some of the more advanced energy concepts which have recently, apparently, captured the public's fancy.

In the future, fusion power may be an important alternative within the nuclear field. This process involves the fusing of light atoms at high temperatures and pressures, and is similar to the processes occurring in the sun and in the hydrogen bomb. The prospect of unlocking the virtually unlimited energy available from heavy hydrogen in the oceans is indeed an exciting vision. However, the first proof of the feasibility of fusion power is yet to be provided. With additional research and development support, we hope to prove feasibility in this decade. I can assure you that when we succeed in establishing the technical feasibility of fusion, we will then proceed aggressively with the engineering development needed to bring this concept into industrial use. I might note that funds for the nuclear fusion program have been significantly increased over the past few years, but the task ahead will not be easy.

There are a number of other, more novel, potential sources of electric power. These include, for example, solar energy, geothermal energy, tidal power and harnessing the Gulf Stream. In August 1971, Congress modified the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to authorize the AEC to undertake research and development efforts on "the preservation and enhancement of a viable environment by developing more efficient methods to meet the Nation's energy needs." The potential of more novel energy sources will be assessed, and, where appropriate, additional research and development may be undertaken to search for practical means for exploiting these sources. As a Nation dependent on energy, however, we cannot afford to wait for unproven technologies if we are to meet our more immediate needs and goals. So that leaves us with fossil fuels and nuclear fission power for the next 30 years or more.

One of our oldest energy sources, coal, has fallen on difficult ways. Severe ambient and emission standards for sulfur discharge from coal-fired power plant stacks, which will come into effect during the seventies, will require either stack clean-up or reduced sulfur in the fuel. The former has been vigorously pursued but with only limited success. The latter may turn out to be the better approach with further development.

If Eastern coal cannot be treated for sulfur removal, low-sulfur Western coal may need to be imported in large quantities for the Eastern power market. Some Mid-Western utilities are currently paying approximately $6 per ton shipping charges to import Western coal for blending with local coal for sulfur control. Higher power costs will be inevitable. And, simple substitution of low-sulfur fluid feels such as fuel oil or natural gas can only contribute to our increasing dependence on foreign imports.

Synthetic fuel production from high-sulfur Eastern coal, which also removes sulfur, is a possible solution to this dilemma. Large governmental support of such a program appears necessary, and the AEC, itself a large consumer of electric power based on Eastern coals for its diffusion plants, will be quite interested in the development programs that evolve and their results.

Over a longer period (perhaps within 50 years) fossil fuels will probably be more important as sources of chemicals than heat. Given an abundant supply of nuclear power (fission and fusion), liquid and gaseous fuels can be prepared from inorganic sources with no real limit on supply. CO_2 from the air or from calcium carbonate, and hydrogen from water can be combined to produce viable hydrocarbon fuels. Hydrogen itself could be used for transportation, space heat, and the generation of small blocks of electricity. Our Oak Ridge National Laboratory has been actively studying some of these options.

In closing, I hope that my brief review of some of the new concepts in nuclear power use and siting has stimulated your interest and outlook for the future. You can be assured, that these and other innovative approaches will have to be developed and applied if we are to meet our energy needs in the challenging years ahead.

FOOTNOTES

[1] The 1970 National Power Survey, Federal Power Commission, Part I, December 1971.

[2] Statement of John N. Nassikas, Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Hearings Before the Joint Committee on Defense Production, Congress of the United States, September 23, 1971.

[3] The 1970 National Power Survey, Federal Power Commission, Part II, Electric Power in the Southeast, 1970–1980–1990, April 1969.

[4] Status of Central Station Nuclear Power Reactors, Significant Milestones, WASH–1208 (6–72), June 1, 1972.

[5] "Nuclear Power for Desalination and Agro-Industrial Complexes," paper by James T. Ramey, Commissioner, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and R. Philip Hammond, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Geneva, Switzerland, September 1971.

[6] Puerto Rico Energy Center Study, TID–25603, July 1970.

[7] Nuclear Energy Centers—Industrial and Agro-Industrial Complexes, ORNL–4290, November 1968.

[8] Resources and Man—A Study and Recommendations by the Committee on Resources and Man of the Division of Earth Sciences, National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, July 20, 1968.

[9] Use of Steam-Electric Power Plants to Provide Thermal Energy to Urban Areas, ORNL–HUD–14, January 1971.

[10] Historical Report on Bolsa Island Nuclear Power and Desalting Plant, The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, MWD No. 885, March 1972.

[11] Press Release, Public Service Electric and Gas Company, March 16, 1972.

[12] "Demographic Policy and Power Plant Siting," testimony submitted by Alvin M. Weinberg to the Senate Internal and Insular Affairs Committee for the Symposium on Energy Policy and National Goals, Washington, D.C., October 20, 1971.

[13] Press Release, Carolina Power and Light Company, April 30, 1971.

[14] Press Release, Virginia Electric and Power Company, April 21, 1971.

[15] Cost Comparison of Dry-Type and Conventional Cooling Systems for Representative Nuclear Generating Plants, TID–26007, March 1972.

AN AFTERNOON OF MUSIC

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform my colleagues and constituents that I had the privilege of attending An Afternoon of Music, a splendid choral and musical program which was held on Saturday, October 7, 1972. This recital was sponsored by Theodore Charles Stone, president of the National Association of Negro Musicians, Inc., and the proceeds of that event go to the scholarship fund of the association. For around 2 hours the audience heard the powerful baritone voice of Raymond Frith, accompanied by Raymond Henry, and the wide ranging Willowbrook Orchestra and Choral Group under the professional direction of Joseph Lombardi, the music director.

After an invocation by the host minister, the Reverend Fred Diekman, the music filled the Reformed Church on Staten Island.

The committee chairman, Mrs. Emma J. Wilson, and her vice chairman, Miss

Lillian Pinckney and Miss Josephine Clutts are to be congratulated for arranging a delightful and interesting program.

CAMPAIGNING WITH BUTZ

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Packer on September 30, 1972:

CAMPAIGNING WITH BUTZ

(By Ken Scheibel)

Once in a blue moon a politician comes down the road that farmers really like.

He's no hero to housewives but Earl Butz on the campaign trail looks like a winner for President Nixon with farmers.

"I make no bones about the fact that I am a political Secretary of Agriculture!", Butz shouted at a Des Moines breakfast meeting with farmers. Farmers roared their approval.

President Nixon apparently knew what he was doing when he dispatched Secretary Butz to the farm belt to plug Republicans in the 1972 elections. Butz can put an audience in his pocket almost any time he wants. Being human he can tire. When he does he loses some of his punch.

Butz is a practical man. He knows that politics aside, farmers want money—more of it. He quickly describes himself as "your hired hand in Washington." He pledges to raise prices, income—and fatten farmers' pocketbooks. Judging from farmer reaction a reporter on a tour with Butz concludes that the formula clicks.

To a Burlington, Ia., group lunching on smoked pork chops, applesauce and beans, Butz avowed, "we want to export $10 billion in farm products every year. I think we are going to make it. Let's let farmers produce!" With the prospect that idle Iowa acres may be moving back into production—of farm income—applause rocked the jam-packed hall.

As an old hand in the farm belt the former Purdue university Dean touches on the sensitivities of farmers. With well-spoken fervor and some emotion Butz implores them to be proud citizens and shed any hangday shame about being "just farmers." The inspirational-message strikes home. Butz reads farmers like the back of his hand.

The Secretary of Agriculture is a superb speaker. He developed his skill in debate at an early age. He has been sharpening and polishing it ever since. Butz figuratively can cut an opponent to ribbons.

Today as he jets from one part of the country to another his prime target is Sen. George McGovern, the Democratic presidential candidate. During a typical day's campaigning Butz will call McGovern a "bald faced liar," a "perpetrator of falsehoods," a "wild-eyed" dreamer, and a witch hunter "making smear charges and innuendoes."

"Ten months ago Sen. McGovern said my confirmation as Secretary of Agriculture would be a national calamity," Butz cracked to a Minnesota audience. "Well, today I am here to tell you I feel exactly the same way about Sen. McGovern!"

Butz does not shout his message of Republicanism to farm audiences just to hear himself talk. Each speech has its set message. But the standard speech is not delivered until Butz has "warmed up" his audience. Often Butz tells jokes on himself, mentioning some names housewives call him on the food price issue. Farmers eat it up. After the warmup, the audience belongs to him.

Never does Butz talk down to a farmer audience. He has been too close to them for years to do other than preach a message of love and affection. Farmers and their wives sense this and respond to him warmly.

Indiana native Butz isn't a smash hit with everyone. Some farmers mock, scorn and disdain him, remaining stony faced throughout. A few go to sleep. But it is rare when Butz finishes a speech that he does not get a standing ovation.

A Butz speech is usually a mixture of dull facts and statistics, a bit of evangelistic oratory, self-praise GOP style, a plug for a local candidate, expression of hope for the future, and a generous dash of criticism of Democrats—notably McGovern. He tops this off by wrapping the flag around the Republican party and praise for the red, white and blue. "These colors don't run!" he shouted in Iowa. Farmers clapped their hands and whistled.

Butz shrewdly admits that although farm prices, income, exports and other economic indicators are rising, "this isn't good enough."

He says, "We won't be satisfied until the income of farm people at least equals the pay of non-farm people. That's what you want, isn't it?" The responsive roar indicates that it is, indeed.

"McGovern says he will appoint a working farmer as his Secretary of Agriculture," Butz scoffed. "Perhaps he considers Cesar Chavez to be a farmer."

One heckler asked Butz, "Who pays your salary while you are campaigning?"

"The same people who paid Sen. McGovern, Sen. Humphrey and Sen. Muskie the past few years," replied Butz quickly.

At the end of a long day of jet touring in the farm belt, Butz spoke before the National Plowing Contest at Vernon Center, Minn., plugging the free enterprise system and defending the wheat deal with Russia.

"Profit is not a four-letter word," he cried. "That is what this system is all about." Farmers nodded their agreement.

It is no wonder that today President Nixon is leaving the campaigning to Butz.

HON. JOHN McMILLAN

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives, the citizens of the Sixth Congressional District of South Carolina, and the country at large will miss the presence of a true statesman when we convene the 93d Congress.

JOHN MCMILLAN, known to his friends as "Mr. MAC" brought a capacity for leadership with him when he first came to this body in 1939. He demonstrated that leadership capability during his many years of service and I have had the distinct pleasure of serving under him on the House District Committee and being able to count him among my friends.

Mr. MAC, as chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, was often confronted with unpleasant and controversial issues. That he was able to rise above this turmoil and bring reason and order to the affairs of the District of Columbia gives tribute to his leadership abilities.

The Sixth District of South Carolina is dependent in large part on tobacco. JOHN MCMILLAN was ever knowledgeable about the needs of his constituents and was most successful in furthering their interests. The people of this country received the benefits of his efforts as surely as did the people who sent him to the House time after time. His stature as a man and as a national leader prepared him well to undertake his responsibilities in Washington and we will long miss him in this body.

Mr. MAC's concern about the little man and the need for economic growth in the rural areas impressed me when I first came to the House, for the needs of his congressional district are very similar to those of mine.

His leadership and courage were most welcome in guiding legislation through the House that would benefit rural Americans.

I regret that Mr. MAC will not be back with us next January and I wish for him and his wonderful family every happiness in the years to come.

DRUGS IN SCHOOLS

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on Crime recently conducted 2 days of important hearings on the problem of drug abuse by students in the Kansas City metropolitan area.

These hearings received considerable notice in the community and have resulted in an overdue look at the drug problem in the Kansas City schools. While not as severe a problem as in other cities where the Select Committee on Crime has held hearings on drugs in schools, the concern is reflected in stories written by the Kansas City Kansan and the Kansas City Star-Times, which I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

We were particularly grateful to television station KBMA, Channel 41, and to WDAF-Radio for the considerable coverage they gave to the hearings which enabled thousands of people to become acquainted with the drug abuse problem in the schools.

Related news clippings follow:

[From the Kansas City Kansan, Oct. 6, 1972]

WHEELER CRIME REPORT TELLS OF ABUSED DRUGS

(By John Sharp)

Barbiturates, amphetamines and now veterinary tranquilizers currently are the most abused drugs in the Kansas City area, according to testimony today by Kansas City, Mo., Mayor Charles B. Wheeler, MD.

Testifying in the Federal building here before the U.S. Home Select Committee on Crime, Wheeler said many of such drugs are obviously being made in bootleg chemical plants and are very dangerous.

Wheeler said the high levels of addiction to hard narcotics now being experienced in New York City could be reached in the Kansas City area in 10 years unless good preventive medicine is practiced now.

The committee, chaired by U.S. Rep. Claude Pepper, D-Fla., opened two days of hearings

here today on drug abuse in area schools. The local hearings were requested by U.S. Rep. Larry Winn, Jr., R-3rd Dist., a member of the committee.

In an opening statement, Pepper said on the basis of preliminary evaluations it can be concluded that drug abuse in area schools is extremely serious, widespread and growing worse.

He said narcotics arrests in the metropolitan area have skyrocketed more than 425 per cent in the last three years. More than 72 per cent of those arrested, he said, were between the ages of 16 and 24.

Pepper explained during preparations for the hearings here that a number of young drug users advised the committee staff that any type of drug is readily available in practically every high school in this area.

He said in the last two years the deaths of more than seven Kansas City teen-agers have been caused by drugs.

"It is no longer unusual in this area," he said, "to have a 17-year-old boy or girl die of an overdose of narcotics."

Pepper said the hearings are designed to determine the extent to which drugs are bought, sold and abused by students and to inquire into the "abject failure" of schools and other governmental institutions to attack the problem.

He said a recent survey by Columbia University shows that 34 per cent of high school students have used marijuana, 18 per cent have used barbiturates (downers), 16 per cent have used amphetamines (uppers), 14 per cent have used methadrine (speed), 8 per cent have used cocaine and 5 per cent have used heroin.

"Regrettably," Pepper said, "the policy of most school boards seems to be one of turning away from the problem by refusing to acknowledge the extent to which it exists at the local school level."

Today's hearings were attended by four Congressmen on the 11-member committee. These were Pepper, Winn, Rep. James R. Mann, D-S.C., and Rep. Sam Steiger, R-Ariz.

In his opening statement, Winn said drug abuse is one of the problems that doesn't stop at the state line. He noted cooperative efforts are needed to solve it.

Wheeler testified that the age of students involved in drug abuse is becoming consistently younger in the community. He said the fact that there are 17 different school districts in Kansas City, Mo., alone is one of the problems in developing a unified drug control program in the schools.

Wheeler said it is unfortunate that two area drug treatment projects—Renaissance West, a drug-free therapeutic community, and Phoenix Center, a prevention oriented street level program in Kansas City, Mo.,—apparently will not be refunded.

U.S. Rep. William Randall, D-Mo., testified briefly today, noting the important effect drug addiction has on crime because addicts must have money to pay for their addiction.

John Ivan, an assistant to Gov. Robert Docking, testified on behalf of the governor that the state has been actively fighting drug abuse for more than four years.

He credited Kansas Atty. Gen. Vern Miller with vigorously prosecuting drug violators, noting state drug arrests had risen from 418 in 1970 to 2,543 in 1971 due to Miller's actions.

In testimony submitted on his behalf, U.S. Sen. James B. Pearson, R-Kan., said the source of the drug problem is in the demand for narcotics in the U.S. and its schools.

He said the primary burden of combatting the drug problem falls on parents, school administrators, educators, law enforcement agencies, drug treatment centers and children themselves.

"At home and abroad, the federal government can aid us in this fight. But the struggle will be won or lost right here in the homes and schools of Kansas City and thousands of places like it across the nation," he said.

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon, Oct. 6, 1972]

HOUSE TALKS KANSAS CITY, DRUG CASES

KANSAS CITY, KANS.—The House Select Committee on Crime opens two days of hearings today on the "drug crisis in the Kansas City area schools."

Joseph A. Phillips, the committee's chief counsel, said Thursday drug abuse in the metropolitan area's schools has "exploded."

"In the last three years, narcotics arrests have skyrocketed more than 425 per cent," Phillips said. "Over 72 per cent of these arrested are between the ages of 16 and 24 years."

Phillips also noted drug-related deaths of seven Kansas City teen-agers in the last two years.

The committee, he said will examine the failure of government institutions, especially schools, to attack the problems.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star Oct. 6, 1972]

MAYOR OPENS U.S. PROBE ON AREA DRUG PROBLEM

(By John Hall)

Members of the U.S. House Select Committee on Crime today opened two days of public hearings on drug abuse. The sessions are in Kansas City, Kansas.

Mayor Charles B. Wheeler, in testifying before the group said that unless the federal government provides the money to combat the problem, amphetamines and barbiturates in greater Kansas City soon will become a heroin problem.

Wheeler was the first witness before the House Committee. The chairman is Rep. Claude Pepper (D-Fla.) and it includes Rep. Larry Winn, Jr. (R-Kan.). The committee will hear testimony from area law enforcement and school officials as well as drug users. The hearings are held in the east courtroom of the Federal Building in Kansas City, Kansas.

"Our schools are relatively unfunded by the taxpayers," Wheeler said, referring to the six elections in which taxpayers have voted down proposed school levy increases. "Our schools are deteriorating," Wheeler said. He called the schools "sources of hopelessness" in drug education. Wheeler said because of the lack of funds drug programs by the schools and city are unable to function.

"Children are looking to their peers." Wheeler said. He said the schools must be funded to fight drugs because children no longer listen to parents who are unaware of the drug situation.

In an interview before the hearing today, Michael Blommer, associate chief counsel for the House committee and an investigator who has worked in this area for several weeks, said the crisis is one of awareness. "On the coasts kids are dying (because of drugs)," Blommer said. "When the kids start dying here the people will wake up to the drug problem."

Blommer said his investigators discovered an alarming failure on the part of parents and school officials to realize just how serious the drug problem is. Blommer said what began here about five years ago as drug abuse among a select few who were looking for a "special experience" has not infiltrated every school. Blommer said drugs aren't expensive. "Kids use their school money to buy drugs," Blommer said.

A primary function of the hearings, Blommer said, is to call attention to the growing drug problem which is working its way into middle America. The myth of people using drugs only in the black or hip communities is not true, Blommer said. "Now they score at school," Blommer said.

Wheeler told House committee members that because no money was available, two of Kansas City's drug programs, Renaissance West and Phoenix Center, will be shut down at the end of this year.

Winn told Wheeler that federal money totaling $1 million was on its way to Kansas City. Winn said he has requested an equal amount of money for Kansas metropolitan cities.

Dr. William O'Connor, director of D.I.G. in Johnson County, leveled a charge at the house committee during his testimony. In a prepared statement, O'Connor charged that because of politics and administrative bureaucratic obstacles, the D.I.G. program also would die.

O'Connor accused the Kansas Governor's Commission on Criminal Administration, which has been critical of the D.I.G. program, as being a major reason why the D.I.G. program will die. O'Connor said he wants no part of any further drug programs until they are funded so they can function correctly.

The D.I.G. program, which originally was called Drug Intervention Groups, will close at the end of this year, O'Connor said, because of a lack of federal funds; most of his staff has quit and many of the young workers have lost interest.

"The hard drug users (in our program) are back on the streets," O'Connor told the committee. He laid the blame on the government's refusal to spend the money necessary to effectively combat what he sees as a growing drug problem.

O'Connor told the committee that if Renaissance West, Phoenix Center and the D.I.G. program are allowed to close, the area would have only one treatment facility, the methadone maintenance program for heroin addicts at the University of Kansas Medical Center. Dr. William V. McKnelly, Jr., director of that program, was scheduled to speak to the committee later today.

Joining Winn and Pepper for the hearings today were Rep. James R. Mann, (D-S.C.) and Rep. Sam Steiger (R-Ariz.). The hearings are scheduled to continue through today and resume tomorrow until all witnesses are heard.

[From the Kansas City Times, Oct. 7, 1972]

DRUG USE IN SCHOOLS AT 50 PERCENT, STUDENTS SAY

(By De M. Miller)

Drug usage has reached more than the 50 per cent level in Kansas City area schools, members of the U.S. House Select Committee on Crime were told repeatedly yesterday by witnesses in Kansas City, Kansas.

Witnesses testified in the east courtroom of the federal building at the first day of a 2-day hearing on the drug crisis in Kansas City area schools.

One of five Shawnee-Mission school students who testified before the committee said many types of drugs were readily available in or out of school.

Identified only as Marcia, 18 years old, a girl said 50 per cent or more of the students are using drugs and the number is increasing.

Another student, Kelly, 21, said while a student at the University of Kansas in Lawrence, he and a fraternity president operated a drug selling business funded by the fraternity's treasury. Kelly told the committee he spent most of a semester traveling across the country buying drugs and returning them to Kansas.

Kelly said his fraternity drug business specialized in the sale of drugs at businessmen's conventions here.

He said he bought and sold drugs to doctors

and teachers. He said he started dealing in drugs when he was in high school.

Rep. Sam Steiger (R-Ariz.), a member of the committee, asked Kelly how much he made at selling drugs.

"On concert nights a $75 investment would bring a $300 profit in front of Municipal Auditorium in Kansas City," Kelly said. He also said a $500 investment in marijuana would easily bring four to five times that amount on the campus in Lawrence.

Kelly also told the committee in his years of involvement in drug traffic he had never been arrested.

Martin, a 15-year old, said he took drugs to "relieve my mind and help me in school." Martin said he found he did better in classes when he was "stoned."

The students were generally critical of drug education programs attempted in their schools. They told the committee that scare tactics and uninformed drug educators such as police officers and school officials were not believed by the students.

"It's pretty hard for a student sitting in a high school auditorium to relate to a 45-year-old heroin addict who has spent 15 years in prison," Kelly said.

He told the committee members that films showing youths who were "stoned" were not believable when the youths sitting in the auditorium were stoned and that they were not acting like those in the films.

The students were five of 16 witnesses who appeared before the committee yesterday. A staff of investigators for the committee has been in the Kansas City area several weeks conducting interviews with area teachers, principals, students, police and court officials and health and medical authorities.

The first witness to appear before the committee was Mayor Charles B. Wheeler, who told the members that unless the federal government provides the money, the amphetamine and barbiturate problem in Greater Kansas City will soon become a heroin problem.

"Children are looking to their peers," Wheeler said. He told the committee the schools must be funded to participate in the fight against drugs since children no longer listen to parents who are unaware of the drug situation.

Also agreeing with the 50 per cent usage figure was Dr. William O'Connor, director of the DIG program in Johnson County, who followed the students in testimony.

The problem is growing, O'Connor said, but the schools are afraid to be progressive. O'Connor estimated about 50,000 persons in the metropolitan area need treatment but facilities for only about 1,100 were available.

"We are currently faced with the reality that drug abuse efforts are deteriorating and may be virtually nonexistent by the end of this year," O'Connor said in a statement presented to the committee.

"Renaissance West, the only drug free residential center available in this region, is in the process of closing. Phoenix Center, which operates the only prevention program on the Missouri side of the line, has received major funding through the Renaissance project and appears to be in jeopardy. The D.I.G. program is also in the process of closing.

"Within a few months, the only program available to youth in this area will be the methadone maintenance program," O'Connor said.

Dr. William V. McKnelly, Jr., director of the methadone maintenance clinic at the University of Kanasas Medical Center, said the average age of the patients has decreased since the program started.

McKnelly was critical of the public for not allowing school boards to effectively attack the drug problem in the schools. He said the school boards have never had a chance to initiate effective programs because of public pressure and therefore "have come out with wishy-washy programs."

Rep. Larry Winn, Jr., (R-Kan.) expressed shock at information from Sgt. Fred Tush, head of the narcotics bureau of the Johnson County sheriff's office, concerning deaths attributed to drugs.

Tush said since 1968 20 to 25 deaths in Johnson County have been attributed to drugs. He also said he personally believed the actual figure to be much higher.

Winn asked why the public has not been made aware of the drug related deaths.

Tush said most times the death is attributed to other factors or kept quiet by the family. Tush said his office has 20,000 names identified as persons being connected with drugs in his county.

Steve Philips, an undercover agent for the Kansas City Police Department, said he conducted a survey of high school students and found 52 per cent to be involved in drugs. Mervin Purdy, director of the narcotics division of the Kansas Bureau of Investigation, said of the more than 2,500 arrests in Kansas last year, about 75 per cent was from 16 to 22 years old.

The hearings will resume at 10 a.m. today. Chairman of the committee is Rep. Claude Pepper (D-Fla.). Others participating in the questioning yesterday were Rep. James R. Mann (D-S.C.), Rep. Sam Steiger (R-Ariz.), and Joseph A. Phillips, Michael W. Blommer and Chris Nolde, counsels for the committee.

Dr. Arzell Ball, superintendent of Shawnee Mission Schools, said last night he was amazed at the 50 per cent figure given by witnesses at the hearings yesterday. Dr. Ball is to testify before the committee this morning.

"I think that's greatly exaggerated," Ball said. "I just don't see it. If I were having to give a figure I would say 1 to 5 per cent, of course we have to determine what type of drugs we are talking about too."

Ball admitted he was not in the schools every day and a more accurate figure could be given by those in the schools. However he said he was sure the figure was not 50 per cent.

[From the Kansas City Star, Oct. 10, 1972]

CONGRESSIONAL CONNECTION ON LOCAL DRUG ABUSE

If the purpose of the hearings in Kansas City, Kansas, of the House Select Committee on Crime was to acquaint the public with the seriousness of the drug problem among young people, then the visit must be recognized as a success.

But we hope, too, that the members of the committee were listening when the director of D.I.G. (formerly Drug Intervention Groups) in Johnson County said that his operation and two other prevention centers are in danger of closing for lack of money. The primary reason for any congressional hearing is to gather information upon which to base legislation—including appropriations for various programs.

Some of the figures tossed about in the hearing were truly alarming, and we hope there was no distortion of the real situation or exaggeration of a condition that already is bad enough. The fact is, drug abuse is one of those ailments of society that cannot really be pinned down statistically unless you are talking about specific arrests, convictions or records of treatment.

To say that "50 per cent," or more, of all high school students are involved in drugs is a staggering proposition. If it is true, then the great wonder is that the schools can operate at all. Or to say that from 20 to 25 deaths have been caused in Johnson County by drugs over the last few years without definite information seems to be no great service. The spread between 20 and 25 is a rather large 25 per cent itself—hardly a precise estimate.

Student testimony to the effect that youthful pushers had sold drugs at "businessmen's conventions" and to doctors and teachers may have been in the nature of an amused put-on to discomfit the adult establishment. A doctor who wants drugs doesn't need to go to a college student body for a supply.

Committee members who seemed to hold the schools responsible for the waste and tragedy of narcotics addiction, and who said that students were allowed "too many breaks" thus letting them meet pushers, hardly were reacting with much logic. A member of Congress who tells a superintendent that he is giving the students too much freedom really is acting outside his competence although some of his more excitable constituents may like hearing it. But it is an unwarranted intrusion. The community is fortunate that sex education didn't come up.

The spread of dope addiction among young Americans is one of the sorrowful developments of this age. It is destructive and ruinous of lives. It deserves serious and urgent attention by the men and women who make laws. But no great purpose is served in carping criticism of school administrators or the petty assignment of blame. There is enough blame to go around for all—parents, law enforcement, the courts, religion, medicine, the social agencies and even the federal apparatus that includes Congress. And in the long run, exaggeration of an already deadly condition will backfire and cause indifference.

[From the Kansas City Star, Oct. 10, 1972]

DRUG USE STUDY PLANNED

Dr. Arzell Ball, superintendent of Shawnee Mission schools, said today he would make a comprehensive report Nov. 20 on the district's drug problem and what is being done about it.

Ball, critical of findings by the U.S. House Select Committee on Crime which ended two days of public hearings Saturday in Kansas City, Kansas, said the drug problem report would be presented to the district's advisory boards and the Board of Education.

Testimony during the hearings indicated that drug abuse is a widespread problem in greater Kansas City including Johnson and Wyandotte counties.

"I think it was a little unfair that we were being judged on the basis of what we were doing (in drug education) two years ago," Ball said referring to testimony before the House Committee. "We weren't very sophisticated then," Ball said.

Dr. Ball said he was considering whether to survey about 400 students to determine the extent of the problem.

Students testifying before the House Committee said drugs are a big problem in the Shawnee Mission schools. Ball criticized the student testimony saying many of the youths who testified had not attended Shawnee Mission schools for more than a year.

The committee has been criticized by others since the hearings for its selection of witnesses and data that indicated a high rate of drug usage in the metropolitan area.

Richard Bond, administrative assistant to U.S. Rep. Larry Winn, (R-Kan.) a member of the committee, said the committee used many statistics on drug abuse.

Bond said that in addition to the purported Chicago statistics, the committee used information from local law enforcement agencies and estimates by educators and students.

Bond related that one Johnson County law officer testified that since 1968 there were between 20 and 25 drug related deaths in that county.

Bond said that Rep. Claude Pepper, (D-Fla.) chairman of the committee, is reviewing the transcripts of the 2-day hearing and may make a statement about the alleged transposition of Chicago statistics to this area.

Bond said that the crime committee staff made all arrangements for witnesses and testimony and that neither he nor Winn participated in the procedure.

"The entire matter was handled by the committee staff," Bond said.

Ball said the survey of drug abuse in Shawnee-Mission schools would include student evaluations of the district's drug education program. A panel of students told the House committee that drug education programs in the Shawnee Mission schools were not believable.

The district's drug education program, Ball said, drew praise from Michael W. Blommer, associate chief oounsel for the House committee. But no school systems in the nation were found by the committee to have valid statistics on how many students use drugs, Ball said.

DR. LLOYD E. CHURCH: A DISTINGUISHED AMERICAN AND OUTSTANDING SHRINER

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in this day of worldwide concern for all humanity, it is indeed heartwarming to witness the daily efforts of a group of men dedicated to a better future for man, whatever their differences and divisions. I refer to the 5,000-member organization known as Almas Temple, one of the finest in the Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine of North America.

I particularly wish to relate to you my personal feelings and profound esteem for the highly competent, gracious, and articulate leader of this great group in the Nation's Capital, Dr. Lloyd E. Church, a prominent oral surgeon who lives in nearby Bethesda, Md., and a man who truly believes in the goodness of mankind:

DR. LLOYD E. CHURCH, ILLUSTRIOUS POTENTATE

Dr. Lloyd E. Church, the newly elected Illustrious Potentate of Almas Temple, was elevated to the high office on Friday, January 21, in special ceremonies at the Washington, D.C. headquarters.

The prominent Bethesda, Md., oral surgeon was born in Littleton, West Virginia, on September 25, 1919, and attended elementary and high schools in Moundsville, West Virginia, where his father, Dr. Howard Church, was engaged in dental practice.

The new Potentate received his B.A. degree from West Virginia University where he played in the University band, local jazz bands, and also worked on a survey crew of the West Virginia State Roads Commission along the Ohio Valley.

In 1944, he received his dental degree from the University of Maryland, helping defray expenses by working as a member of the Pinkerton Detective Agency at Baltimore, Maryland. Following graduation, he interned at Bellevue Hospital in New York City. The young intern utilized his musical talents and played with various bands to supplement the meager stipend he received while in training.

He completed a residency in oral surgery at the Medical College of Virginia Hospitals in Richmond, Va., and simultaneously he received a faculty appointment as instructor in oral surgery, anesthesia, and X-ray diagnosis in the dental school.

Dr. Church served as a captain in the U.S. Army Dental Corps in Texas, California, Japan, and China. He was assigned to the 361st Station Hospital in Japan and served on special duty at Sugama Prison in Tokyo during the Far East war crimes trials. He was the dental officer responsible for all the judges, prisoners of war, including Hedeiki Tojo, Iwani Matusi, and all the other military and civilian personnel associated with the tribunal. Capt. Church was in daily contact with all of the Japanese who were defendants in the trials and he acquired considerable knowledge concerning the Japanese war leaders and their philosophies concerning World War II.

On more than one occasion, his discussions with the Japanese prisoners led him to be nicknamed "The Razor," because of his comprehensive knowledge of their actions which led to the start of WWII with the bombing of Pearl Harbor.

The Bethesda surgeon was interviewed by the author of *Tora, Tora, Tora,* the movie which recounted the Pacific war, for vignettes dealing with his intimate knowledge of the Japanese war criminals and his experiences at Sugama prison.

While at the prison dental section, Capt. Church also served as Administrative Officer, as liaison with the Japanese civilians in the area, and directed the Officers' Club. Realizing that most of the Japanese civilian dentists had lost their supplies and equipment during the war, he volunteered his off-duty hours to help regain the needed material. In addition, he served as instructor in the oral surgery and anatomy departments of a nearby dental school.

Japanese instructors at a judo school nearby, learned of Capt. Church's charitable activities, and in turn, volunteered to teach him judo. He was a proficient student, and earned the prized Black Belt. His later military service took him to Shanghai, Nanking, and Peking in China.

Following his discharge from the Army in 1948, Dr. Church returned to Bethesda, Md., where he joined his father in practice and enrolled in George Washington University as a graduate student and as an instructor in the Department of Anatomy.

He received his Masters and Ph. D. degrees in anatomy from George Washington University and has served continuously as a member of the faculty in the Department of Anatomy and Surgery.

Dr. Church was appointed to the faculty of the University of Maryland School of Medicine as Assistant Professor of Anatomy. His graduate studies were related to the study of bone growth, development, and bone diseases. It was during this research, plus his own childhood experiences with illness, that led him to take a keen interest in the Shriner's Crippled Children's Hospitals. He serves as an Almas Temple representative to the Philadelphia Hospital.

His doctoral studies were conducted at Beltsville Experimental Station and in the Department of Orthopedic Pathology at the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center. While there, he received additional special training in Forensic and General Pathology, Oral Pathology, and experimental research methods.

Professional activities have taken Dr. Church to most of the United States and around the world. He is a founder and life member of the International Association of Oral Surgeons and has served as chairman of the first research committee of the American Society of Oral Surgeons.

The Maryland oral surgeon is a member of over 40 professional societies and has been elected to fellowship in the American College of Dentists, International College of Dentists, Royal Microscopic Society of Great Britain, Royal Society of Health of Great Britain, American Association for the Advancement of Science and Washington Academy of Science.

He is a member of the Cosmos Club, Philosophical Society of Washington, the Academy of Medicine of Washington, serves on numerous committees in local, state, and American Dental Association, and represents his local society in the Metropolitan Washington Regional Medical Program.

Dr. Church has published and presented more than 200 professional papers in this country and elsewhere in the world. He is on the staff of eight area hospitals. He served as consultant to the Food and Drug Administration and American Association for the Advancement of Science.

He is listed in 10 different Who's Who publications and has been elected to membership in Sigma Xi and Omicron Kappa Upsilon scientific and scholastic fraternities.

Parallel with his active professional activities, the Bethesda oral surgeon and new Illustrious Potentate assumes a full schedule of service to his community and fellow Nobles. He is an active member of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase and Montgomery County Chambers of Commerce and plays an active role as chairman of the M. C. Crime and Drug Abuse Committee.

He is an active member of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Kiwanis Club (his father was one of the founders), the Y.M.C.A., and he has served on every committee, local and statewide, of the American Cancer Society. He has, for the past 12 years, served as a member of the board of directors of the Montgomery County Unit, Maryland Division. Dr. Church's intense interest in the fight against cancer began when he underwent surgery on three separate occasions for cancer.

The busy Marylander is currently serving as a member of the Region IV Governor's Committee on Law Enforcement Planning Board and as a member of the Washington Hearing Society board of directors.

Parallel to his success in all these professional, social, military and charitable endeavors, the Masonic career of Dr. Church is of considerable interest. He was initiated into Brock Lodge #154 at Moundsville, W. Va., passed and raised in Pythagoes Lodge #123 in Baltimore, in April, 1944, while still a dental student.

One of his most rewarding experiences while in Japan was to become one of the 13 charter members of the Allied Masonic Club in Tokyo, Japan, the forerunner of the first post-war Masonic Lodge in Japan in 1947. Among his prized possessions is a Masonic Bible autographed by General Douglas MacArthur.

Dr. Church demitted from his lodge in West Virginia in 1961 and was unanimously elected to membership in Bethesda Lodge #204 in Bethesda where he still holds membership. In December 1959, he received his 32nd degree in Albert Pike Consistory, Washington, D.C. Dr. Church was Exalted in the Royal Arch Degree in 1965, Greeted in Washington Council #1 Royal and Selected Masters and Knighted in Washington Commandery #1 Knights Templar. He was invested with the Knight Commander of the Court of Honour Washington, D.C., on November 20, 1971. In 1965, he was appointed to the Divan of Almas Temple, Washington, D.C., as Assistant Outer Guard by Potentate Bernard D. Cooper.

In January, 1972, he was elected Potentate of Almas Temple in Washington.

In allied organizations, his affiliations include The Philalethes Society, National Sojourners, serving as President of Washington Chapter #3 in 1961. In 1962, Dr. Church was awarded the Certificate of Commendation for especially meritorious and outstanding service, and was named delegate to the national convention; Tokyo Chapter #267 Heroes of '76, served as commander, George Washington Camp #3; Royal Order of Scotland; Advisory Council Order of DeMolay; Bethesda Chapter, Military Order of World Wars, in which he served as Chapter Commander and Department of Maryland Commander and delegate to the convention.

He was instrumental, while Department

Commander, in planning the reenactment of General George Washington resigning his commission at the original site in the State House in Annapolis, Md., in the presence of the Governor and other dignitaries of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and state government.

Dr. Church is a member of Phi Delta Theta undergraduate fraternity and Psi Omega Dental fraternity.

He is an active member in the Bethesda United Methodist Church and he served as president of the Men's Club. He serves as usher, member of the board of stewards, and of the administrative board.

On April 1, 1964, he married Hildegard Cascio, a model and buyer at Best and Company in New York City and at Jordan Marsh in Miami Beach, Florida. Dr. and Mrs. Church and their daughter, Pamela Gail, reside at 7005 Glenbrook Road, Bethesda, Md.

FEDERAL DISTRICT JUDGE IN MISSOURI, IN DECISION, HOLDS THAT IMPOUNDMENT OF FUNDS BY OMB ILLEGAL—ISSUES WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about the withholding, freezing, and impoundment of funds by the Office of Management and Budget after Congress has made specific appropriations.

The arbitrary action of OMB in this area has become notorious and widespread. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that Chief Judge William H. Becker for the Western District of Missouri has recently issued a decree, holding that the impoundment of funds by the OMB, specifically moneys from the highway trust fund, is illegal.

The case was brought by the Missouri Highway Commission against John A. Volpe, Secretary of Transportation, and Casper W. Weinberger, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, alleging that the withholding of funds in this case was illegal. A writ of mandamus be issued, as well as a declaratory judgment by the Federal court against impoundments.

I believe my colleagues and others will be greatly interested in this decision and, for this reason, I ask that the opinion of Chief Judge William H. Becker be reprinted in the appendix of the RECORD.

The opinion and formal judgment follows:

[In the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Missouri, Central Division]

FORMAL JUDGMENT CONFIRMING JUDGMENT FOR PLAINTIFF ORALLY RENDERED AND ENTERED JUNE 19, 1972, ISSUING WRIT OF MANDAMUS, INJUNCTION AND FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

The State Highway Commission of Missouri, Plaintiff, v. John A. Volpe, Secretary of Transportation of the United States, and Casper W. Weinberger, Director of the Office of Management and Budget of the United States, Defendants. Civil Action: No. 1616.

Now on this 19th day of June 1972, this civil action was called for trial on the amended complaint pursuant to notice and order setting the action for trial. The plaintiff appeared by its counsel, Robert L. Hyder, Esquire, and Michael McCabe, Esquire. The defendants appeared by their counsel, Stuart E. Schiffer, Esquire, and Kenneth Cranston, Esquire.

Counsel for the defendants suggested the succession of Casper W. Weinberger to the original defendant George Shultz as Director of the Office of Management and Budget of the United States. Thereupon on motion of counsel for defendants, it was ordered pursuant to Rule 25(d), F.R.Civ.P., that Casper W. Weinberger be, and he was, in his official capacity, substituted as party defendant for the original defendant George Shultz.

The second, third and fourth defenses of the answer of defendants were taken up, submitted and denied. In this connection it was concluded that (1) the plaintiff does not lack standing to maintain this action, (2) the Court does not lack jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action and (3) the complaint does not fail to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

On the initiative of the Court the unnumbered last paragraph of the first defense of the answer was stricken as redundant, surplusage, and an impermissible form of qualified general denial in the context of the pleadings in this case.

With approval of the Court the parties stipulated that the record of the evidentiary hearing and arguments of June 24, 1971, in this cause be considered as part of the argument and evidence offered this day on the amended complaint without prejudice to any objection, motion, argument, legal contention and factual contention therein made, so that it should not be necessary for any party to reoffer at the trial any evidence offered on June 24, 1971.

Then this action was called for trial by the Court, without a jury. Plaintiff and defendants answered ready for trial. Opening statements were made by counsel for the plaintiff and defendants. Evidence in chief of the plaintiff was offered and received. The plaintiff rested. Then the defendants moved for dismissal under Rule 41(b) F.R.Civ.P., on the ground that on the facts and the law plaintiff is not entitled to relief, which motion was denied. The defendants offered evidence in chief and rested. The plaintiff rested without offering evidence in rebuttal. The issues were thereupon submitted by the parties for decision. Thereupon the following findings of fact and conclusions of law were made by the Court:

JURISDICTION

On the subject of jurisdiction it was found and concluded that the Court has jurisdiction to hear and determine the issues under each of the following statutes independently:

(1) Section 1361, Title 28, U.S.C.A., relating to actions in the nature of mandamus to compel an officer of the United States to perform a duty owed to the plaintiff.

(2) Chapter 7, Title 5, U.S.C.A., judicial review of administrative agencies, including Sections 702, 703, 704, 705 and 706.

VENUE

On the subject of venue it is found that venue of this action is properly laid in this district and that the defendants do not claim lack of venue.

REMEDIES AVAILABLE

The remedies available under Section 1361, Title 28, U.S.C.A., include mandamus, prohibitory injunction, mandatory injunction and declaratory judgment in the nature of mandamus.

The remedies available under Chapter 7, Title 5, U.S.C.A., include (1) holding unlawful and setting aside of agency action that is arbitrary, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law or in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, limitations or short of statutory right (§ 706) and (2) any form of legal action including declaratory judgment and writs of prohibitory or mandatory injunction (§ 703). Cf. *Citizens to Preserve Overton Park* v. *Volpe*, 401 U.S. 402, 28 L.Ed. 2d 136, 91 S.Ct. 814.

On the question of finality of the agency action under review, and exhaustion of administrative remedies, it is found and concluded that the agency action under review is final and that no unexhausted administrative remedies exist. Cf. § 704, Title 5, U.S.C.A.

On the question of adequacy of other remedies at law, it is found and concluded that plaintiff has no remedies in court at law or otherwise except those available in this action.

STANDING TO MAINTAIN THIS ACTION

Under federal law, the Constitution of Missouri and the statutes of Missouri, the plaintiff has standing to maintain this action as the state agency invested with exclusive and plenary powers and duties on behalf of the State of Missouri to receive and administer all federal highway funds and apportionments. Sections 226.010 to 226.190 R.S. Mo.; inclusive, particularly Sections 226.020, 226.150, 226.190 R.S. Mo.; Sections 29, 30(a) and 30(b), Article 4, Constitution of 1945; Section 101, Title 23, U.S.C.A., defining "State highway department."

DECISION ON THE MERITS

In order to accelerate the construction of the Federal-aid highway systems, including the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways ("System" hereinafter) and to provide for the prompt and early completion of the entire System simultaneously, the Congress of the United States enacted, and has from time to time amended, Title 23, United States Code, a comprehensive Federal-Aid Highway Act ("Act" hereinafter). Title 23, U.S.C.A.

To insure continuing adequate federal-aid moneys for completion of the System, Congress created the Highway Trust Fund ("Fund" hereinafter). Historical Note, § 120, Title 23, U.S.C.A. The defendant Secretary of Transportation of the United States ("Secretary" hereinafter) has been given the functions, powers and duties to administer the Fund in accordance with the Act, which provides a comprehensive plan and precise standards for apportioning the Fund annually, and for obligation of the Fund by state highway commissions in accordance with the Act. Sections 101 to 215 inclusive, Title 23, U.S.C.A.

Anticipating the possibility of executive or administrative impoundment or withholding of the apportioned Fund for legally impermissible reasons, Congress undertook to avoid such unauthorized action by making its intent, clear and unambiguous in paragraph (c) of § 101, Title 23, U.S.C.A., which reads as follows:

(c) It is the sense of Congress that under existing law no part of any sums authorized to be appropriated for expenditure upon any Federal-aid system which has been apportioned pursuant to the provisions of this title shall be impounded or withheld from obligation, for purposes and projects as provided in this title, by any officer or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government, except such specific sums as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, are necessary to be withheld from obligation for specific periods of time to assure that sufficient amounts will be available in the Highway Trust Fund to defray the expenditures which will be required to be made from such fund.

Paragraph (c) is now a part of the Act, Title 23, U.S.C.A., and is to be read and construed in the context of the comprehensive plan for administration of the Fund and the Act. Even if paragraph (c) were absent, the intent of the Act would be the same.

The record establishes without controversy that the Secretary with the approval of his co-defendant has from time to time by administrative action effectively withheld from the plaintiff, The State Highway Commission of Missouri ("Missouri" hereinafter), the obligation of sums lawfully apportioned to the State of Missouri from the Fund. Presently Missouri is forbidden by administrative action of the Secretary from obligating over $80,000,000 of the apportionment for the fiscal year 1973 (Apportioned funds for a coming fiscal year may be obligated in the preceding fiscal year under the Act.) The practice of ordering the withholding of obligation of parts of the apportionments has continued for a number of years, without reference to any fixed period of time. Often the withholding was done on a quarterly basis. Presently the withholding is fixed on an annual basis.

The effect of this practice, and of the current withholding of obligation by Missouri of prior apportionments and a large part of its apportionment from the Fund for the fiscal year 1973, has caused great and incalculable injury to Missouri because of continuing inflation of highway costs, and interruption of efficient obligation of the funds apportioned to Missouri. Missouri has provided proof of this injury beyond the customary burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence.

As a part of this proof, Missouri has established that it is and has been able, ready and willing, and desires and has desired, to obligate its apportionment from the Fund but is and has been prevented from doing so by the defendant Secretary, with the approval of his co-defendant Director. In this connection Missouri has proven that presently and in the past it has developed plans and projects which would be approved under the Act, and regulations made pursuant thereto. except for the withholding of the obligational authority by the Secretary. Therefore Missouri is entitled to relief if the action of the Secretary in withholding from obligation is unauthorized, without his discretion, arbitrary or otherwise illegal.

The Secretary claims that the law invests in him discretion to withhold from time to time authority for Missouri to obligate its unexpended apportionments. The Secretary concedes that the apportionments can readily be paid by the Fund from the ample moneys presently therein. If the Secretary lawfully possessed the discretion he claims Missouri should be given no relief. It has been concluded, however, that the current, as well as the past and possible future, withholding of obligational authority for the reasons relied on by the Secretary has been, is and will be, unauthorized, and without the lawful discretion of the Secretary.

The reasons advanced by the Secretary for the current and past withholding of obligational authority are foreign to the standards and purposes of the Act and the Fund. The reasons relied on are related to the prevention of inflation of wages and prices in the national economy. These reasons are impermissible reasons for action which frustrates the purposes and standards of the Act, including but not limited to those in Section 109, Title 23, U.S.C.A. Therefore it is not within the discretion of the Secretary to withhold obligational authority from Missouri, and judicial relief should be granted to Missouri. *Citizens to Preserve Overton Park* v. *Volpe*, 401 U.S. 402, 28 L.Ed. 2d 136, 91 S.Ct. 814, § 706, Title 5, U.S.C.A.

The appropriate relief to which Missouri is entitled includes prohibitory or mandatory injunction, and declaratory judgment. § 703, Title 5, U.S.C.A. It also includes mandamus. § 1361, Title 28, U.S.C.A. Missouri has no other adequate judicial or administrative remedy except this action. Therefore judgment will be entered granting an injunction, a writ of mandamus and a declaratory judgment.

JUDGMENT GRANTING INJUNCTION

It is therefore,

Ordered and adjudged that the defendants and each of them and their subordinates be, and they are hereby, enjoined and restrained now and in the future from withholding from Missouri, directly or indirectly, any authority to obligate its apportionment of Highway Trust Funds, for the fiscal year 1973 for any reason or reasons relating to the prevention or control of inflation in the national, regional or local economies, or in wages or prices in the nation, or any region or locality therein, or any combination of such reasons.

JUDGMENT GRANTING WRIT OF MANDAMUS

For the foregoing reasons, in addition and independently, it is hereby further

Ordered and adjudged that the defendant John A. Volpe, and his subordinates, be and they are hereby, commanded to annul and revoke by official act in writing the current announcements, orders, directives, limitations, regulations and other official written and printed documents and evidences of withholding of authority of Missouri to obligate its apportionment from the Highway Trust Fund for the fiscal year 1973.

DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

For the foregoing reasons, it is hereby further,

Declared and adjudged that the currently effective, and past official actions of the Secretary of Transportation, and his subordinates, in withholding authority from Missouri to obligate any apportionment from the Highway Trust Fund for reasons related to the prevention or control of inflation in the national, regional or local economies, or in wages and prices in the nation, or any region or locality therein, is unauthorized by law, illegal, in excess of lawful discretion and in violation of the Federal-Aid Highway Act.

RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

It is further,

Ordered that this Court retain jurisdiction of this action for the purpose of making and entering such further orders and judgments and taking other judicial action necessary, or desirable, to implement and enforce the judgments herein, and any one or more of them.

ORDER ON COSTS

It is,

Ordered that each party bear its or his own costs in this Court.

WILLIAM H. BECKER,
Chief Judge.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *August 7, 1972.*

WILLIAM MEYERS COLMER

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Honorable WILLIAM MEYERS COLMER, the dean of the delegation from the great State of Mississippi. Mr. COLMER has served his district, his State and his Nation with distinction since the 73d Congress and in recent Congress has served as chairman of the important Committee on Rules.

As he leaves, after so many years of loyal, dedicated service, he can be very proud of his achievements, and I want to thank him for his cooperation and assistance in the Rules Committee, as well as on the floor of the House. He will be missed by all of us who have been privileged to serve with him.

Mrs. Johnson joins me in wishing him a long, health and happy retirement.

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, BILL COLMER'S long and illustrious career in this body has been a great, continuing battle for constitutional government. His approach to legislation has been based on liberty and freedom, individual rights and dignity, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, and preservation of free enterprise. BILL COLMER remains a firm believer in the rights of the States. Countless times during debates on the House floor we have heard him refer to the 10th amendment to the Constitution and the rights reserved therein to the States.

BILL COLMER believes that the Constitution is the greatest document ever conceived by man, and this constant standard has guided his consideration of legislation for 40 years. No doubt this brilliant defense of the Constitution has been viewed by some as a rearguard action, a fight against the tides of the sea. But I believe his great battle has not been in vain. BILL COLMER has courageously pointed the way. Time and again he was almost alone. But the pendulum will again swing and he will be vindicated in upholding those great principles that made this Nation the hope of the free world.

Mr. Speaker, BILL COLMER has been a great chairman of the House Rules Committee, through which all legislation must flow before it can reach the floor of the House. He has fulfilled this tremendously important position with great dignity, patience, and skill. In regulating which bills can be cleared for House consideration, he has exhibited faultless tact and understanding in dealing with the other chairmen of the various legislative committees of the House. All of these other chairmen have on many occasions requested his committee to clear their respective bills.

Chairman COLMER has skillfully worked with the House leadership in scheduling legislation. In his position on the Rules Committee, BILL COLMER has worked well with representatives of all philosophical and political viewpoints. All of the many problems of society that compete for national priority attention have at various times been thrown in his lap. He has handled these many delicate problems with great fairness, understanding, and wit. Friends in the House have been proud of BILL COLMER.

Mr. Speaker, BILL COLMER has truly risen to the highest level of responsibility and prestige here in the House. Through it all he has been loyal to the great ideals and principles of the South-

land. He has been known for his courtly manner and his respect for womanhood.

Legislation BILL COLMER has sponsored has done much to aid the impoverished areas of the South and of the entire Nation. He has been a leader in the development of the commerce and trade facilities of the South, and his home city of Pascagoula on the beautiful gulf coast boasts one of the most modern ports and shipyards in the Nation.

BILL COLMER is known by all his colleagues as a man of uncompromising truth and unquestioned integrity. Through all the crucial legislative activity revolving around his committee, never have I seen him lose his temper. Never have we heard him speak in anger or become unduly excited and emotional. BILL COLMER has always been polite and affable, the very personification of the true gentleman he is.

My wife Millie first came to Washington as a reporter for U.S. News & World Report and she very soon came to admire and respect Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, my entire family and my constitutents join me wishing for BILL COLMER continued success and every happiness as he returns to his beloved Mississippi.

VIETNAM WAR VETERAN'S POEM

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include for reflection of the Members a poem by Lt. Col. Eric H. Wieler.

This poem shows the feelings of men who have fought for their country and who, when thousands of miles away, longed so intensely for the homes which they left. After having fought for the United States in South Vietnam, many have returned to an unfriendly home.

Historically, people who have worn the uniform of the United States in battle have been treated with respect and honor, but our returning veterans have had all manner of evil said against them. Our returning veterans should be treated with the same respect accorded those from previous wars, and all of us should unite to build a brave new America.

The poem follows:

MY AMERICAN DREAM

(By Lt. Col. Eric H. Wieler, USMC)

In RVN across the sea,
'tween battles when we pause,
We hear and read, in news from home,
The protests 'gainst our cause.

We're told of violence in the streets,
Of smog that fills the air,
Of strikes and riots, hate and fear—
Confusion everywhere.

"What's happened?" cried a few at first.
Their numbers now have grown.
"Where will it end?" you hear them ask.
The answers are not known.

"I had a dream . . . a man once said,
It may have cost his life,
But now I too would dream a dream,
Amidst this distant strife.

I dream of getting on a plane,
On my rotation date,
And waking in a promised land
Beyond "the Golden Gate."

I see a land where flowers grow
Beside each road and street,
Where trash is placed in litter cans,
To keep our country neat.

Where river water's crystal clear,
And so's the sky above.
Where neighbors all can coexist
With naught but thoughts of love.

Where those who fly the flag each day
Will not be ostracized.
Where strangers smile, and say, "Hello"—
A greeting highly prized.

Where servicemen in uniform
Are greeted with respect
By all their grateful countrymen,
Whose freedoms they protect.

Where prejudice is known no more,
Where love prevails, not hate.
Where all are treated just the same.
Let's pray it's not too late.

Where Negro and Caucasian walk
With Gentile and with Jew,
With Protesant and Catholic
As brothers tried and true.

Where honesty in government's
Accepted practice, and
The people all respect the laws
Laid down throughout the land.

Where people walk the streets at night
With ne'er a thought or fear
That they might not get home again
Because some danger's near.

Where, if a danger should appear,
Reaction would be fast,
And cries for help are heeded by
The strangers going past.

Where children learn while they are young
To listen and obey,
For knowledge gained in grammar school
Will guide them on their way.

Where college men, and women too,
Use all their time to learn
The many things they'll need to know
To lead us in their turn.

Instead of wasting so much time,
In protest sitting in,
While precious time is passing by.
To waste it is a sin.

Where men have opportunities
To earn a decent wage
At work that gives them pride in self,
To last them through old age.

Where every man is free to vote
Without a tax or test
To see if he is smart enough
To choose the one that's best.

Where churches fill on Sunday morn,
And grateful people pray
To thank their God, in their own way,
For what is theirs today.

Then I wake up and realize
That it was just a dream,
But I am curious and I ask
Myself, "What does it mean?"

The answer's there—that you and I
Must reap what we have sown.
We have ourselves, and no one else,
To blame for what we own.

We owe it to our ancestors,
Who gave their very best,
And to our children, after us,
To straighten up our mess.

And so I say to those of you
Who love the USA,
To those who want to stand with pride,
To see a better day,

Let's start right now, with honest toil,
Together! I'm with you.
With faith in God, we'll overcome,
And make this dream come true."

EDITOR LOUIE WADSWORTH

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, in the Times-Journal magazine of the Florida Times Union and Journal of Jacksonville, Fla., on October 15, 1972, appeared a very excellent and indepth story about a very dear friend of mine, Louie Wadsworth.

The writer of this story, Dick Hagood, is also a good friend and I think he really captured the true man, Louie Wadsworth, in this article.

I would like to share this with my colleagues because of the outstanding contributions Louie Wadsworth has made to his Nation and to his State.

The article is as follows:

EDITOR LOUIE WADSWORTH

Driving into Live Oak from Mayo, you approach a handsome white brick home straddling a corner at 11th and Pine streets, nestled serenely in a landscape of oaks and shrubs.

To many an oldtimer, it symbolizes stubborn persistence toward the common good, a willingness to wait for results that often were slow in coming. To some others, it was the home of a man who just tried to change things.

The house belongs to Louie and Clara Wadsworth. Until last November he drove home his concepts of what's best for Live Oak and Suwannee County as the unrelenting, though kindly, editor and publisher of the weekly Suwannee Democrat. Also until then, Mrs. Wadsworth reigned over the women's pages from time to time.

Today, after 41 years on the job, the general—he's a retired brigadier general of the Florida National Guard—still maintains a keen eye on the local situation and a willingness to fight the battles from another vantage point, though he freely admits that his stamina is not what it once was.

The black overstuffed lounge chair in the big recreation room is headquarters now, and he garners much of the news from The Florida Times-Union and the Tallahassee Democrat, plus the special Wednesday delivery of the Suwannee Democrat. He recently sold the Democrat to Danny McCrimon, a son-in-law, and to Walter Olive, who follow many of the precepts that elevated the weekly to the winners circle among state association judges.

"You can't give up on a project," the 66-year-old Wadsworth declared, emphasizing the point as he recalled some of the old battles, "You have to be satisfied with gradually seeing the people coming over to your side."

Such a case was zoning. "We worked on zoning for Live Oak for seven years before people were ready to adopt it," he declared with the obvious satisfaction of having achieved victory.

His greatest satisfaction came in the rerouting of U.S. Highway 90 straight through the center of town, bringing travellers into the shopping section rather than over circuitous border streets. That took a 10-year selling job that eventually involved some dealing at the state level.

"I told Charley Johns that if he would

straighten the road through Live Oak, I would support him for governor." The Bradford County candidate subsequently moved into the governor's chair and the project became a reality.

There also were the bonds to be approved back in the 60s after the poor quality of the county schools at the time cost them their accreditation. Today the schools are back on the list with facilities that could well serve as a state model.

There were other battles, some won and some lost, as he waded into the issues. But, according to Wadsworth, "It's not enough just to write an editorial. You've got to get out and support it."

Being a native of Suwannee County has some advantages, too, when you're trying to determine popular views and trends. "I didn't have to do research," he continued with the confidence born of long experience.

Joining clubs and organizations also can have its advantages when you need to know a lot of people, and the retired publisher played this game to the hilt. "I've often told the people I belong to everything but the Baptist Church and the Ku Klux Klan," he laughed.

While a good story is to be treasured, Wadsworth takes the view that telling it may not always be in the best interest. And if that is so, it should not be printed. For that reason, the Suwannee Democrat has never published suicides, though there have been "accidental deaths."

The messy domestic affairs also missed the pages of the Democrat on the grounds that people wanting to find out the details could resort to the court files. The paper wouldn't hurt people unnecessarily," he explained.

This include the Ruby McCollum case, which author William Bradford Huie blew into national prominence with his book version of North Florida justice. The McCollum woman had been charged with the pistol slaying of Dr. C. L. Adams, a prominent physician, and there had been innuendoes, abetted by Huie, concerning their relationship. She was subsequently committed to the state mental hospital at Chattahoochee.

"I didn't cover the case," Wadsworth said. "I had a feeling for the Adams family."

Besides, "Huie was just out of touch with our area of the country. He didn't think like we did. He lived in a different world."

Throughout the years, since he was graduated from Davidson College and signed on as a writer for C. P. Helfenstein, a Pennsylvania native and Yale graduate who bought the Democrat in 1929, Wadsworth maintains that he has found it easy to keep abreast of local events. "I never had any difficulty in Suwannee County in attending a meeting or getting information I asked for," he declared.

And when he bought the Democrat in 1946 and called his own shots, the news sources apparently opened up to him even more, including the courthouse. Without reservation he credits the sheriff's office as being the prime contact.

In the early days it was Sheriff W. H. Lyle, one of the old breed of county law enforcement officers who generally had command of the situation. "When I started out," Wadsworth continued, "he knew exactly what was going on in the county and he would tell you."

The retired publisher paid his due to the strength of the sheriff when it comes to conducting county affairs. "The sheriff is the most powerful man you've got in the county," he declared. "He actually has more raw power than any other man in the courthouse."

Besides Lyle, he ticked off former Suwannee Sheriff Hugh Lewis as another example of a man who knew how to wield control over a county. He also pointed to the late Ralph Witt of Columbia County, Willis McCall of Lake County and Simmie Moore of Madison as exemplars of the firm hand.

"Through the years the sheriff was the one you got the news from, including the personal items," according to Wadsworth in noting a transition from one era to the next. New Florida administrations and closer links with state and federal law enforcement officials have imposed a new direction in the course of county affairs, and the role of the sheriff is more likely to be what the state statutes say it is.

"It's more law enforcement now. It's not the high sheriff. It's a change of times. I don't think the people are going to put up with a dictator of any kind now."

Wadsworth didn't write editorials as such, but voiced his often pungent observations and beliefs through "Thinking Out Loud," an avidly read column that got down to the fundamentals. On the matter of zoning, he supported a straw vote on the subject and he declared on April 13, 1956:

"I think the time has come for us to face this question and I believe the majority of our people would like to see Live Oak move forward with measures that will consider what the Live Oak of years to come will look like."

On May 9, 1956, 1,124 citizens participated in the straw vote, with 830 in favor and 294 against. On Jan. 24, 1958, after a series of hearings, the city council approved a zoning ordinance for Live Oak.

That same year, in which he was named "Suwannee County Man of the Year," he observed after 10 years as owner of the Democrat:

"I well know in those years I have taken stands that did not meet universal approval, but I have tried to direct the Democrat along a course that will build up our county. I believe most will agree that progress has been made in the county and city during the 10-year period. I do not claim credit for this progress for those who have guided our governments through the years have been responsible."

At other times, the column devoted itself to human interest observations of the approximately 15,000 citizens who populate the county. Wadsworth drew on that ritual of the morning coffee conversations at the Big Dixie Grill and on a constant parade of visitors who dropped by the Democrat offices on Conner Street. There also were those relationships with the state and national hierarchy, including many such as former U.S. Sen. Spessard Holland and U.S. Rep. Don Fuqua who sought out his counsel regarding North Florida attitudes.

On election years, the course of the newspaper has generally remained clear-cut. "The Democrat normally endorsed state and national candidates," he said. "As for local candidates, The Democrat has opened its columns to all candidates."

He has had his successes and failures on the states scene, and he ruefully recalled one case he just couldn't sell. "I never could get 'em to vote against Jerry Carter. He told 'em he was the chief politician in Chicago and I agreed with him."

Furthermore, Wadsworth continued, "he was too old and Florida was a more modern state." The philosophy of the former public service commissioner just didn't mesh with that of the publisher.

Wadsworth marks his own politics down as "moderate," and his columns reflect this approach. A few years back when the U.S. Supreme Court ordered an end to racial segregation in the schools, he counseled compliance with the orders since there appeared to be no legal alternative.

The decision of the school board to consolidate the Suwannee County schools appears to have been correct in that it avoided many of the legal proceedings subsequently faced by many of the neighboring counties, which eventually did the same thing. There was no unanimous satisfaction, but on the other hand there was none of the strife predicted earlier from some quarters.

"I've always considered myself a moderate," according to Wadsworth. "I'm neither a Goldwater type nor a McGovern type. I'm not opposed to change although I don't like long hair."

And regarding the role of the newspaper in the community, he declared. "The community doesn't owe the newspaper anything. The newspaper owes the community for the opportunity of serving it. The publisher should serve the community so well that the merchants support it."

As such, Wadsworth has left an indelible mark on his native county and on his state and nation.

OUR NATION SALUTES CATHOLIC CATHEDRAL UPON THE CELEBRATION OF ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply honored and privileged to participate in the golden anniversary celebration of the Most Holy Name of Jesus Slovak National Catholic Cathedral on Sunday, October 15, and throughout the entire program was warmly comforted and inspired by the wealth and vibrancy of the cultural and spiritual achievements that this historic landmark church of God has contributed to the members of our community, State, and Nation over these past 50 years.

As the Reverend John Anthony Rencewicz, the present pastor of the church, conducted the services and with the greatest humility and deepest admiration and respect, in benediction, dedicated the anniversary celebration to all of those men and women who by their faith, courage, and sacrifice had achieved the establishment of the church, I could not help but reflect that the theme of the program, "A Living Tradition Passed On and On," was manifested throughout the program and the achievements of the distinguished members of the clergy who had gone before Father Rencewicz in service at this magnificent cathedral was indeed embodied in the quality of leadership, sincerity of purpose, and the richness of the wisdom of Father Rencewicz.

The Most Holy Name of Jesus Slovak National Catholic Cathedral was established on August 20, 1922, by pious folks of modest income, peaceful law-abiding citizens, whose community life revolved around the Polish church which they had built and generously supported with a deep concern for reviving the work of their patron saints, Cyril and Methodius, and organizing a new parish where the priest who had won their hearts as a model curate full of warmth and selfless devotion could continue to serve God and enrich their spiritual development with the love and understanding of a grateful religious community. The late Reverend Emery A. Jecusko was the first pastor and organizer of this Slovak National Catholic Church of Passaic, N.J., who served with honor and distinction

until his death at the age of 50 on July 23, 1938.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues here in the Congress to join with me in this national recognition to be forever recorded in the historic journal of Congress of the following most prestigious religious leaders of the Polish National Catholic Church who made major contributions to the establishment, preservation, and enhancement of the Most Holy Name of Jesus Slovak National Catholic Cathedral in the city of Passaic, State of New Jersey:

The late Reverend Emery A. Jecusko, first pastor and organizer, Most Holy Name of Jesus Slovak National Catholic Church.

The late Right Reverend Eugene W. Magyar, Bishop, the Most Holy Name of Jesus Slovak National Catholic Cathedral.

The late Right Reverend Francis Hodur, Prime Bishop, Polish National Catholic Church.

The late Right Reverend Leon Grochowski, Prime Bishop, Polish National Catholic Church.

The Most Reverend Thaddeus F. Zielinski, presently serving as prime bishop, Polish National Catholic Church.

Rev. John Anthony Rencewicz, presently serving as pastor, the Most Holy Name of Jesus Slovak National Catholic Cathedral.

Mr. Speaker, the preamble of the statement prepared by Mr. Andrew Yurga, president of the cathedral and chairman of the 50th Anniversary Committee describes most eloquently the excellence of the foundation on which this cathedral has aspired for these past 50 years and I would like to share it with you. It reads as follows:

The Most Holy Names of Jesus Cathedral of the Slovak National Catholic Church is a monument to faith, love and sacrifice but it is more; it is a living tradition gratefully received from one generation and reverently passed on to another.

Our church and this its cathedral parish are an integral part of the renaissance of the Slovak nation which began with the cultural Revival of the nineteenth century.

To appreciate the present; we must be acquainted with the past. For a thousand years Slovakia was under the harsh rule of foreigners who held our people in disdain and treated them badly.

The Slovak nation was converted to Christianity by the Greek missionary brothers Saints Cyril and Methodius. It is an incontestable historical fact that they established a free and independent national church whose divine services were conducted in the language of the people. The erosion of political sovereignty brought with it the absorption of this church by outsiders who were less than sympathetic to the needs and aspirations of our ancestors.

Fifty years ago a group of deeply religious Slovak Catholics left the Roman Church to establish this parish. What began a half century ago as a revolt against a strong, well established institution has survived the test of time and can now be seen for what in essence it really is—a restoration of a legitimate part of our heritage that had been denied to us for centuries.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that you join with me in saluting Father Rencewicz and the following list of officers of the cathedral as we commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Most Holy Name of Jesus Slovak National Catholic Cathedral, Passaic. N.J.:

OFFICERS FOR 1972

Andrew Yurga, President.
Steven Mathias, Sr., Honorary President.
George Elgar, Vice President.
William Gaydos, Recording Secretary.
Richard Svetz, Financial Secretary.
Ann Elgar, Assistant Financial Secretary.
Joyce Pastor, Treasurer.
William Zuka, Assistant Treasurer.
Carol Krupa, Publicity.
Mary Gawronski, Organist.

TRUSTEES

John Vrablik.
Michael Veliky.
William Gaydos.
Joseph Novak.
Michael Divak.
Clarence Krupa.
Emery Tursick.
Rudolph Blazo, Sr.
Anthony Pieshala.
George Hirkala.
Joseph Gaydos.
John Kmetz, Sr.
Josept Matusek.
Walter Byra.
Andrew Pribula.
Edgar Lippincott.
Edward Vanyo.
Joseph Bonpietro.
Sebastian Di Fillippi.
Albert Ruth.
Lew Goran.
John Rusnak.
Joseph Ships, Sr.
Stephen Rozic.
Ludwik Gawronski.
Mrs. John (Rose) Vrablik.
Mrs. Steven (Mae) Mathias.
Mrs. Joseph (Sally) Matusek.
Mrs. Edward (Jean) Vanyo.
Mrs. Clarence (Ann) Krupa.
Mrs. Margaret Mokray.
John Kozusko.
Paul Vaxmonsky, Jr.
Paul Vaxmonsky, Sr.
Mrs. (Betty) Dickson.
Victor Csirip, Jr.
Stanley Mikolajczyk.

Heartiest congratulations and best wishes for continued success and happiness to all of the parishioners who are also part of our Nation's salute on this golden anniversary celebration.

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct personal privilege for me to pay tribute to a distinguished Member of Congress, JOHN L. MCMILLAN of South Carolina.

Mr. MCMILLAN served as chairman of the House District Committee for 24 of his 34 years in Congress. As a member of that committee and a subcommittee chairman, I have been given a unique opportunity to serve the Nation and I am grateful to the chairman for his tutelage, guidance and confidence in committee endeavors.

The chairman is a man of strong conviction and firm resolution. There is never any ambiguity of opinion or wavering of viewpoint. You know by his consistent course of action and decision where he stands on any given issue. He defends his position with veracity, sincerity and nononsense decisiveness.

It has been a pleasure to associate with a gentleman of the stature of JOHN L. MCMILLAN—a distinguished alloy of strength and courage mixed with compassion.

CONGRESSMAN CULVER REPORTS TO IOWA'S SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, as is my custom, I am making an annual report to the citizens of the Second District on the accomplishments of the current session. The report follows:

THE 92D CONGRESS: A RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT

NEW PROGRAMS HELP STUDENTS FROM PRESCHOOL TO COLLEGE

Young people throughout the nation will benefit from these historic education measures:

Omnibus Education Act of 1972 is the most significant advance for higher education since Abraham Lincoln signed the Land Grant College Act over a century ago. This measure extends all existing aid to higher education programs and creates important new ones, including:

A new system of Basic Educational Opportunity Grants, entitling every college student to an annual grant of $1400, less the amount his parents can contribute;

A new program of direct institutional aid for colleges and universities;

Help for occupational and vocational education;

A National Institute of Education to develop better ways of teaching and learning at every level—preschool through graduate school.

Expanded Head Start Program to enable children of working families as well as the poor to participate in this voluntary day care program.

National School Lunch Act Amendments provide free and low price meals for needy children.

Vietnam Veterans Education Assistance means a major increase in aid for education and vocational rehabilitation for returning veterans.

THIRTY-TWO PERCENT SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE LEADS LIST OF ELDERLY BENEFITS

For older Americans, this has been one of the great Congresses in history—and the 32% Social Security increases passed in 1971 and 1972 are but the tip of the iceberg.

Here are some of the many benefits our 20 million senior citizens will realize from Congressional initiatives:

Nutritional meals for those who need them—even shut-ins;

Low-cost transportation;

Job training and employment;

Community centers;

Pre-retirement training;

Health and education services;

Gerontological centers to study the variety of problems older Americans face;

A new *National Insitute of Aging* to conduct research on the aging process and the special health problems of the elderly;

Congress also overrode a Presidential veto of a 20% increase in *Railroad Retirement benefits.*

NOTE.—The major legislation passed for America's older citizens during 1971–72 originated not in the White House, but in Congress. This legislation represents a lasting commitment to every American over 65.

NEW ACT REFORMS CAMPAIGN SPENDING

At a time when the costs of campaigning have skyrocketed, the Congress passed the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

This historic act:

Limits the amount of advertising spending in campaigns.

Requires broadcasters, newspapers and magazines to sell advertising to candidates at the lowest commercial rate.

Requires campaign committees to report contributions and expenditures of $100 or more.

Limits the amount a candidate or his family can contribute to his own campaign.

REVENUE SHARING AIDS STATE, LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

In response to pleas from hard-pressed states, counties and cities, Congress this year enacted a $30.1 billion revenue sharing bill.

State governments will receive one-third of the funds; local governments the other two-thirds. The money is expected to be spent on such high priority items as:

Public safety;
Environmental protection;
Public transportation;
Health;
Recreation;
Libraries; and
Social services for the poor and aged.

NEW CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS ON FOREIGN, MILITARY POLICY

Among the several actions of the 92nd Congress in foreign and military policy are:

SALT Agreements To Limit Strategic Weapons: Congress approved a five-year U.S.-Soviet accord limiting offensive nuclear weapons.

ABM Treaty With Soviet Union: The Senate approved a treaty with the Soviet Union limiting the number of ballistic missiles.

Military Draft: Congress amended the Selective Service Act to:

Extend the draft to June 1973.

Grant student deferments.

Increase military pay in order to encourage voluntary enlistments.

A GREAT CONGRESS FOR VETERANS

Many observers are calling the 92nd Congress the greatest Congress for veterans in history. In the past two years, we have passed major laws to educate our veterans, to provide them better treatment in VA hospitals, and to liberalize burial allowances for veterans.

New GI bill

This landmark measure increases educational allowances for Vietnam veterans by 25 percent. Fulltime students will now receive:

Single students: $220 a month;
Married students: $261 a month;
Married and one child: $298 a month; and
Each additional dependent: $18 a month.

National Cemetery bill

This law:

Transfers to the VA responsibility for administering all national cemeteries.

Increases burial allowances for veterans who die from service-connected disabilities.

Provides an additional burial allowance for veterans who do not wish to be buried in national cemeteries.

VA Medical School Act

To help meet the nation's medical manpower shortage—and to improve VA medical care—this pilot program authorizes the establishment of eight new medical schools in veterans' hospitals across the nation.

Veterans medical care

This new act will vastly improve the entire VA medical care system. To ease crowded hospital conditions, veterans with non-service-connected medical problems can now be treated as outpatients. Some families of permanently-disabled veterans or their survivors can also now receive hospital care.

Disabled veterans' benefits

Provides a 10% boost in benefits for disabled veterans.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION GIVE HIGH PRIORITY

Clean air and water, and the conservation of our resources and wildlife have been chief concerns of the 92nd Congress. This Congress has taken important action to protect the nation's environment.

Water Quality Standards Act provides $24.6 billion to clean up the nation's waters and control water pollution. The goal of this, the most far-reaching water pollution bill ever passed, is to end all discharges of pollutants into navigable waters by 1985.

Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act will help protect man and our environment, while permitting farmers to use pesticides to grow food and fiber.

Wildlife Hunting from Aircraft is prohibited, protecting certain wild birds, fish and other animals.

Youth Conservation Corps—To extend and expand this pilot youth conservation program.

CONGRESS ACTS TO MEET HEALTH CARE CRISIS

Quality health care—at prices people can afford—is one of the major problems facing Americans today. As a nation, we have slipped from 13th to 22nd place in male life expectancy, from 6th to 21st in infant mortality. Doctor bills and hospital costs have skyrocketed, yet 36 million Americans under age 65 are not covered by private health insurance. Moreover, the nation is suffering from a critical shortage of doctors and other trained health personnel.

The 92nd Congress has taken the initiative to meet the crisis with several important measures:

Medical Personnel—Two new laws provide nearly $4 billion to train more family doctors and nurses.

Conquest of Cancer Act—Sets aside $1.5 billion to find cures for cancer.

National Cooley's Anemia Control Act—A national effort to prevent and treat this blood disease which affects some 200,000 persons in the U.S., mostly children.

Multiple Sclerosis Research—Creates a National Advisory Commission to help find the cause of M.S. and develop cures.

Communicable Disease Control Act—Helps states and localities control the spread of communicable diseases.

National Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung and Blood Act.

Rehabilitation Act—An extension of the 50-year-old Vocational Rehabilitation Act, adding major new programs to aid the severely handicapped and other disabled persons.

Black Lung Benefits—To make it easier for coal miners, stricken by black lung disease, to receive benefits.

CONGRESS FOCUSES ON CONSUMER PROTECTION

In recent years, Congress has passed a host of measures on behalf of the American consumer. Truth-in-lending . . . wholesome meat and poultry . . . truth-in-packaging . . . auto, tire and toy safety . . . fair credit reporting . . . these are a few.

The 92nd Congress has expanded this record:

Flammable Fabrics Amendments of 1971 require manufacturers to certify that their products meet stringent anti-fire requirements.

Consumer Product Safety Act of 1972 assigns the Federal government a major role in protecting the consumer from unreasonable risks of death, injury or illness caused by consumer products. A new Consumer Product Safety Agency will set mandatory safety standards and remove products from distribution when necessary.

The Automobile "Bumper Bill" directs the Secretary of Transportation to fix minimum standards for bumpers to halt or reduce auto damage in low-speed collisions. The bill also outlaws tampering with mileage gauges.

NEW BILLS TO FIGHT CRIME AND DRUGS

Every public opinion poll of recent years shows that crime and drug abuse are major concerns of the American people. The 92nd Congress continued to face up to mounting problems in these crucial areas:

Crime

Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act. This major law provides $150 million over two years for:

Education and counseling, health services and recreational facilities for potential juvenile delinquents.

Training personnel in the juvenile delinquency field.

Drug abuse

Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act. This new law provides over $6 billion to:

Establish a National Institute on Drug Abuse;

Increase funds for special drug projects under the Community Mental Health Centers Act;

Help states develop drug abuse programs;

Require federally funded health facilities to offer needed treatment to drug addicts.

Foreign Shipments of Narcotics. Gives the President power to halt foreign aid to countries which allow shipments of narcotics into the U.S. or allow the continued flow of drugs to our servicemen overseas.

Addiction of Servicemen. Another new law requires the military to identify drug-dependent servicemen and to treat them.

Rehabilitation of Addicts. A third measure creates new programs to encourage the employment of rehabilitated addicts, with special preference for veterans.

CONGRESS AIDS RURAL AREAS

Too many rural Americans are denied the basic necessities of modern life. That's why many migrate to the large cities.

With passage of the *Rural Development Act of 1972*, Congress sought to improve the conditions of rural living, especially by increasing job opportunities on farms and in small towns.

The new law provides help for rural communities for housing, water quality management, pollution control and farm credit.

NEW AMENDMENTS BROADEN RIGHTS

The 26th and 27th Amendments to the Constitution were passed by this Congress to guarantee the vote to 18-year-olds and to end discrimination based on sex.

18-Year-old vote

This Amendment, first proposed in World War II, extends the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older in *all* elections. It was quickly ratified by the states and signed in July 1971. Because of it, eleven million more voters are eligible to vote in the Presidential election this year.

Equal rights for women

Throughout history, our laws, attitudes, regulations and customs have often discriminated against women. Numerous distinctions based on sex still exist in law. For example:

Twenty-six states prohibit women from working in certain occupations.

Thirty-seven states have fair employment practice laws, but only fifteen prohibit discrimination in employment based on sex.

Some communities still have dual pay schedules for men and women public school teachers.

To end discrimination, the Equal Rights Amendment says: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by

the United States or by any state on account of sex."

Twenty-one states have already ratified the Amendment; thirty-eight are required.

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS TROUBLE CONGRESS

Since January 1969, unemployment in the U.S. has climbed to over 5½ percent. The 1969 dollar has lost 12½ cents in value. The number of Americans on welfare has doubled. Business is off, profits are down and government tax revenues have dropped sharply. The Federal budget continues to show record deficits.

So one of the top priorities of this Congress was to help put people back to work. We passed the *Accelerated Public Works Act of 1971*, authorizing $2 billion to create 170,000 jobs in the public sector. (President Nixon vetoed this bill.) We then passed the *Emergency Employment Act* authorizing $2¼ billion for transitional public service jobs and special state employment assistance programs. We also earmarked $275 million for additional *unemployment benefits and allowances*.

Congress also:

Extended the President's authority to establish controls on prices, rents, wages and salaries.

Increased the personal income tax exemption per taxpayer and dependent to $675.

Came to the aid of small businesses by increasing the amounts of Federal loans and guarantees.

Finally, Congress acted to hold down record budget deficits by cutting the fat out of the Administration's budgets, while seeking to meet the nation's genuine needs. During the past three years, Congress has cut a total of $14½ billion from the Administration's appropriations requests—and the total appropriations this year will again be below the President's budget.

A FAITHFUL EMPLOYEE RETIRES

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, a faithful and dedicated employee of my office staff, Mrs. Michael Sullivan, has retired after 21 years of service to the 15th Congressional District of Texas.

Mrs. Sullivan—known as Nina to all of us in my office—was an expert in her area. She knew the Federal agencies and departments. She knew how to get service for my constituents. She was an invaluable aide, popular with her fellow workers, able to accomplish a vast amount of work without flurry or bustle.

Nina was thoroughly familiar with the special problems of south Texas. Before coming to Washington, she worked in Brownsville, in the 15th District, during World War II. Her knowledge of the district I proudly represent was comprehensive and thorough.

I feel sometimes that we may be inclined to take too much for granted the efforts of such loyal public servants as Nina Sullivan. Every Member owes much to his office staff and I think it is fitting that the debt should be acknowledged.

In my office, we miss Nina. I wish her well, and I hope that in her well-earned retirement she may choose to turn her talents, which include the ability to express herself in the written word, to setting down the story of her long service to the people of the 15th District of Texas.

VETERANS: FORGOTTEN AMERICANS?

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the following is informational material I am sending to my constituents in my Congressional District. I thought the subject would be of interest to my colleagues:

VETERANS: FORGOTTEN AMERICANS?

Due to the unpopularity of the Vietnam War, to inflation's rapid erosion of veterans benefits, and to the basic unpreparedness by our government to meet the needs of 5 million young Americans returning from the Vietnam struggle, when I first came to Congress in 1969 I found that our veterans were rapidly becoming forgotten Americans.

Though no one Member of Congress can single-handedly reverse a trend, fortunately a majority of my colleagues also recognized the need. Over the past four years, marked progress has been made in an effort to correct the prior neglect of our VA hospitals, our G.I. Education and Training programs, our G.I. loan programs and other veterans services.

Over the past four years, Congress has raised pension benefits by 17 percent, upped education benefits from $100 to $175 a month, nearly doubled annual expenditures on our VA hospitals, and earmarked $155 million for new hospital construction in 1973 alone, the largest such expenditure in 20 years.

But good as this record is, much remains to be done. For example—although G.I. education benefits have risen, compared to the escalating costs of higher education, benefits for today's veteran are not on a par with those earned by veterans of World War II, by means of which so many of us received our college educations.

Because of this I sponsored legislation calling for a monthly allotment of $200. This successfully passed the House. In the Senate this amount was raised to an even more realistic $250, and it is my hope that the Conference Committee will approve the higher figure.

I use this as only one example. When one realizes that 6 million veterans and their families rely for their survival in whole or in part on VA compensation or pension checks, one also realizes these programs must keep up with spiraling inflation. Jobless veterans must be furnished job training and employment. We owe them no less.

The priorities of the Congress in meeting the needs of veterans must be to insure the best hospital and medical care, to secure adequate and realistic pension benefits for all veterans, to strengthen the G.I. Education and Training Bill, and to offer better vocational assistance to returning veterans.

I intend to continue working toward these goals in Congress. Veterans will not be forgotten.

HAM FISH ACTS FOR VETERANS

The 91st Congress

[Bill No., Description, and Status]

H.R. 13196. Second Flag for deceased veterans survivors, Public Law 91–39.

H.R. 17009, Increase outside earnings allowance veterans' beneficiaries, Public Law 91–588.

H. Con. Res. 383, Call for humane treatment and safe return of POW's, Passed House and Senate.

H. Res. 626, Support for the President's Vietnam Policy, In Committee.

H.J. Res. 1389, To make November 11 a National Day in support of POW's, In Committee.

The 92d Congress

H.R. 4451, Voluntary Army, In Committee (passed Senate).

H.R. 6942, Maternity benefits for wives of recently discharged servicemen, In Committee.

H.R. 7834, Increased unemployment compensation for Vietnam veterans, In Committee.

H.R. 8121, Tax credits for employers who hire Vietnam veterans, In Committee.

H.R. 10043, Expand educational assistance under the GI Bill, Passed House and Senate.

H.R. 11400, To make a college which has changed its location eligible under the VA education benefits program, Passed House and Senate.

H.R. 12521, POW tax exemption, Public Law 92–279.

H.R. 15542, Readjustment Assistance Act of 1972 (additional job counseling money), Passed House and Senate.

H.R. 16202, To prevent the loss of Veterans Compensation due to the increase in Social Security, In Committee.

H. Con. Res. 112, Calling for humane treatment and release of American POW's, Passed House.

H. Con. Res. 622, Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the withdrawal of all American forces from Vietnam, In Committee.

H. J. Res. 609, Vietnam Unknown Soldier, Passed House.

H. J. Res. 964, Re-designate Nov. 11 as Veterans Day, In Committee.

H. J. Res. 1269, Vietnam Veterans Day, In Committee.

NEW LAWS ALLOW USE OF INSURANCE DIVIDENDS TO PURCHASE INSURANCE

As a result of recent Congressional action, Public Law 92–188, veterans with "V"-prefixed World War II National Service Life Insurance policies will be eligible to purchase paid-up insurance with their dividends.

Another new law, P.L. 92–193 makes it possible for older veterans with term policies to convert to a modified life plan at age 70. Premiums will remain at a level amount but insurance face value will be reduced 50 percent. Previous modified-life plans had a face value reduction of 50 percent on the insured's 65th birthday. Conversion to a modified plan would result in premiums remaining constant; term policy premiums increase periodically.

Notification of the availability of these two new plans is presently being sent out to all policy holders. Should you not receive a notice, please feel free to contact my office for further information.

VIETNAM VETERAN TO BE HONORED AT ARLINGTON

I have always held that, whether a war is popular or not, in America there can be no second class veteran. All have served and each deserves honor for that service.

Shortly after taking office in 1969, it became apparent to me that Vietnam veterans were in a particularly difficult position due to the unpopularity of the war in which they served.

In a bid to correct this situation, not only have I been in a four year battle to bring up G.I. benefits to a reasonable level, but in an effort to have this nation properly honor those who served in Vietnam, I introduced legislation to have the remains of an Unknown Vietnam Veteran enshrined at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington National Cemetery.

I am pleased to report that my bill (H.J. Res. 609) was incorporated by the House Veterans Committee with an omnibus National Cemeteries bill (H.R. 12674), and it is

now assured that an Unknown Soldier of the Vietnam conflict will rest in a rightful place of honor at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

I might note that this bill was of certain historic interest to me, as it was my father, when he was in Congress, who introduced the first legislation creating the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier following World War I. My bill was the first Congressional Act relating to burial at the Tomb since that time, as the unknown dead from World War II and Korea honored at the site were placed there by Executive Order.

HELP IN CORRECTING MILITARY RECORDS

In my four years in Congress, I have received numerous requests from veterans regarding correction of military records and review of discharge or separation proceedings. Often my office has been able to provide assistance in filing form DD149 (for the Correction of Military Records) and DD293 (for Review of Discharge or Separation). These forms are very important and complex, and should be completed with great care.

I would urge any veteran considering such applications to contact his local Veterans' Agent, or one of the national veterans' organizations, such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans or the American Legion.

I would be pleased to supply any interested veteran with all necessary forms to initiate these actions, and information with respect to obtaining assistance in completing the application.

Veterans may also apply for an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate from the Department of Labor, if three years have passed since their discharge. The Certificate does not affect the grade of discharge or level of veterans benefits, but it may assist in securing employment. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to issue such a certificate to any veteran who has received: 1) a general discharge, or 2) a discharge other than honorable if the veteran has met the conditions of rehabilitation under which this certificate is granted.

I would be pleased to provide any interested veteran with further information on this process upon request, or if I can help in any other way, please contact me either in Washington or through one of my District offices.

LAW CHANGED FOR HYDE PARK SCHOOL

When the famous Culinary Institute of America purchased St. Andrews on the Hudson in Hyde Park, they found under existing law that veterans would be unable to attend with G.I. Bill assistance.

This was because the move from New Haven was 90 miles, while the law specifically stated that any school which moved further than 30 miles would be ineligible for G.I. benefit certification until they had been in business in the new location for two full years. This mileage limitation was instituted to prevent fly-by-night operators from moving from place to place to take advantage of veterans as happened following World War II.

When Jacob Rosenthal, President of the Culinary Institute, contacted me, I introduced an amendment (HR 11400) to permit immediate G.I. certification if the school retains the same faculty, curriculum and student body. This amendment passed the House on March 6, passed the Senate, and will become law shortly.

Therefore, it gives me particular pleasure to welcome the Culinary Institute of America to our District, and I am sure many of our veterans will be attending this fine school.

VETERANS BENEFITS CHECKLIST AND TIMETABLE

You have the following eligibility period after separation, benefits, and where to apply:

8 years—GI Education: The VA will pay you while you complete high school, go to college, learn a trade—either on the job or in an apprenticeship program. Maximum is 36 months. You must begin your course in time to finish in 8 years. Any VA office.

No time limit—GI Loans: The VA will guarantee your loan for the purchase of a house, farm, mobile home, or condominium. Any VA office.

No time limit—Disability Compensation: The VA pays compensation for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by military service. Payments are made from date of separation if claim is filed within 1 year. Any VA office.

No time limit—Medical Care: The VA provides complete hospital care covering the full range of medical services. Outpatient treatment is available for all service-connected conditions. Drug treatment is available for veterans in need of help for drug dependence. Any VA office or hospital.

1 year—Dental Treatment: The VA provides complete dental care. The time limit does not apply for veterans with dental disabilities resulting from combat wounds or service injuries. Any VA office or hospital.

1 year (from date of notice of VA disability rating)—GI Insurance: Low cost life insurance (up to $10,000) is available for veterans with service-connected disabilities. Veterans who are totally disabled may apply for a waiver of premiums on these policies. Any VA office.

120 days or up to 1 year if totally disabled—Life Insurance: SGLI may be converted to an individual policy with a participating insurance company. Any approved life insurance company.

No time limit—Employment: Assistance is available in finding employment in private industry, in Federal service and in local government. Local or State Employment Service, U.S. Civil Service Commission. Any VA office.

HON. THOMAS ABERNETHY

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, Washington's loss is Okolona's gain. Certainly this sentiment must be shared by the many friends of my colleague, THOMAS ABERNETHY.

TOM ABERNETHY has spent 30 fruitful and valuable years in the House and represented very well the interests of the citizens of the First Congressional District of Mississippi.

It was my privilege to serve with TOM on the House Committee on the District of Columbia and benefit from his leadership and knowledge of District matters.

While TOM was called upon to help guide the affairs of the District of Columbia, he was ever cognizant of the concerns of his constituents in Mississippi. There have been few men who better represented the people who sent him to Congress and I know that the citizens of Mississippi will be pleased that TOM will be able to spend all of his time in that great State.

I wish for TOM and his fine family every happiness in the coming years. I know he will continue to provide valuable service to the people of Okolona and Jackson, Miss., through the practice of law and my best wishes go with him in these pursuits.

HOUSE PASSES STRONG ANTI-BUSING BILL—SENATE DEFEATED BUSING BILL

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as the Congress approaches adjournment, it should be noted that the House has taken positive action to end busing to achieve racial balance.

The House bill was a strong bill, permitting local districts to delay compliance on busing orders until all appeals in the lower courts have been exhausted.

The House bill also prohibits the busing of any student further than the school closest or next closest to his place of residence and bars the expenditure of Federal funds for crosstown busing, among several other strong provisions of the House act.

The other body in a preadjournment filibuster, defeated the busing bill; and the country and those concerned will be interested in these developments.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I enclose a copy of my own newsletter Capital Comments concerning the House action to end undesirable busing, and an editorial from the Evening Star of Monday, October 16, entitled "Death of a Busing Bill," for reprint in the RECORD.

The newsletter and editorial follow:

HOUSE TAKES POSITIVE ACTION TO END BUSING

A majority of the Members of the House—including your Representative—are deeply concerned over the continued forced busing of students to achieve racial balance—and positive action has been taken in the Congress to limit, curtail or halt such busing in the public interest.

The House recently passed legislation which, if approved by the Senate and signed by the President, will prohibit both the Executive Branch and the Federal Courts from busing any student further "than the school closest or next closest to his place of residence"—to use the language incorporated in the Act.

This bill would also provide that pending court cases involving busing can be "reopened and modified to comply with the provisions of this Act."

This bill further provides that—

The lack of a racial balance in a school does not constitute a denial of educational opportunity.

Assignment of students to neighborhood schools does not constitute a denial of equal educational opportunity.

Population shifts would not provide a reason for implementing or changing desegregation plans.

Court orders requiring desegregation are to be terminated if the court finds the school involved is not excluding any person because of race, creed or color.

In its efforts to end busing and return the Nation to the traditional neighborhood school concept, the House in an earlier edu-

cation bill last year had approved three amendments to curb busing.

These amendments—which are now law—are as follows:

The Ashbrook Amendment bars the expenditure of Federal funds—appropriations—for cross-town busing.

The Broomfield Amendment permits local school districts to delay compliance with busing orders by lower courts until all appeals have been exhausted.

The Green Amendment prohibits the Federal Government from requiring school districts to spend state or local money to finance busing.

Federal courts have skirted these amendments in recent rulings, contending that the language is imprecise. The bill just passed by the House appears to be precise and explicit in its prohibitions against busing.

In addition, along with 167 other Members of the House, your Representative has signed a discharge petition to bring out of the Committee on the Judiciary a proposed constitutional amendment prohibiting busing to achieve racial balance. The amendment provides the following language:

"No public school student shall, because of his race, creed or color, be assigned to or required to attend a particular school."

A constitutional amendment requires a two-thirds majority of both Houses of Congress and three-fourths of the State Legislatures before its adoption into the Constitution.

The House has thus taken affirmative and significant action to prohibit busing in the public interest.

Certainly we are hopeful that the Senate and the President will concur in these most recent legislative actions and move forward to implement the will of the people.

DEATH OF A BUSING BILL

Senate Minority Leader Scott, who has been around long enough to detect subtle political wind shifts, said a month ago of the anti-busing controversy: "My hunch is that both sides would rather have an issue than legislation."

His observation was apt, and we suspect the truth in it prevailed until the stiff anti-busing bill he was talking about finally arrived on the Senate floor and then bogged down in filibuster and a series of losing votes to invoke cloture. The legislation is dead, at least until next year, although that won't stop the politicians from hammering away at the issue in the three weeks remaining before election day.

The bill, unveiled by the administration in March, was a defensible one. In devising safeguards against excessive school busing, the President's strategists carefully thought through what would have to be done if the bill were to stand up as constitutional. One vital distinction they drew was to request much tougher restrictions on the cross-town busing of elementary school children than on the busing of older children in areas where outright segregation persisted. This was in line with court pronouncements that age is a legitimate consideration in ordering what amount of busing is necessary.

In late August the House passed the bill, but in much tougher form. It erased the vital age distinction, applying the busing-distance restrictions to children in all grades. Worse than that, its provision to permit the reopening of long-settled desegregation suits threatened an explosive collision between the legislative and judicial branches. The bill was simply too hard-line to survive, and not even the administration pushed it very hard after that.

It would be a mistake to expect the busing controversy to fade away completely once the election is over. For it is inseparable from the very big questions of school quality and racial concentration in the schools, questions that the federal government must inevitably begin to answer.

At the same time, there is consolation in the knowledge that the shaping of busing legislation will lie over until next year. By the time the 93rd Congress gets to it, the Supreme Court may well have clarified the dimensions of the issue with decisions on pivotal desegregation suits involving Detroit, Denver and Richmond. And as Senator Javits noted in last week's debate, there is likely to be "a much more rational atmosphere" on the busing scene after the election than before it.

FIRST AMENDMENT FREEDOMS LIMITED BY THE JUDICIARY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the constitutional prohibition in the first amendment safeguarding freedom of press should apply equally to all.

Unfortunately, Federal judges have now ruled that Congress can infringe on the first amendment right. The Nation's right-to-know machinery is able to use the first amendment provision to shield its efforts aimed at destroying the American way of life, yet the Supreme Court has now ruled that a newspaper cannot print real estate advertisements which "express a racial preference," relying on an act of Congress as its authority.

In other words, the Federal judges have held that the first amendment guarantee makes it possible for a newspaper to denounce or attempt to destroy the American system, but it cannot print material indicating an individual's preference.

In effect, then, the judges are aiding the press in maintaining its freedom, but are denying the individual the right to use the press to make his preferences known.

Free press and free speech are both rights protected by the first amendment. The courts latest ruling should be recognized for the threat it is in limiting first amendment freedoms.

A related news clipping follows my remarks:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 16, 1972]

WELFARE RULING UPHELD

The Supreme Court today upheld a ruling that Maryland cannot deny welfare payments to persons on strike and rejected a challenge by a Prince George County publisher to the legality of the ban against printing real estate advertisements which give a racial preference.

The court also turned aside a challenge by a Prince Georges County publisher to the constitutionality of the federal ban against printing real estate advertisements that express a racial preference.

The ban was approved by Congress as part of the Civil Rights Act of 1968.

The challenge was brought by Bill R. Hunter, the publisher and editor of "The Courier," a Prince Georges weekly newspaper with a circulation of about 29,000.

The Justice Department, invoking the 1968 act against a newspaper for the first time, filed suit against Hunter in July 1970, charging that two ads in the Jan. 8, 1970 issue of his paper contained illegal racial preferences.

One of the ads was for the rental of a basement apartment in a "private white home." The other was also for an apartment this one simply in a "white home."

ENVIRONMENT: THE BATTLE JOINED

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the following is informational material I am sending to my constituents in my congressional district. I thought the subject matter would be of interest to my colleagues:

ENVIRONMENT: THE BATTLE JOINED

In looking back over the four years I have been in Congress, it is impossible to say that the legislative fight to clean up our environment has been won. But I think it fair to state that during those four years the battle, which we must win if we are to survive, has at least been fairly joined for the first time in our nation's history.

When I came to Congress in 1969, one of the first pieces of legislation which I cosponsored and strongly backed was the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, which took effect January 1, 1970.

For the first time, this legislation enunciated it as national policy that the condition of our human environment was a major concern of our government. Although imperfect in many ways and in need of strengthening, I believe in the future, we will look back on the National Environmental Policy Act as the Magna Carta of environmental protection in this country.

Among other things, this Act sets it as policy that, as a government, we intend to do all within our power to "assure all Americans safe, healthful, productive and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings." It also sets as a goal the attainment of the "widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk to health or safety or other undesirable consequences" through governmental action.

Under this legislation, the Council on Environmental Quality was established, which, among other responsibilities reviews and polices the detailed environmental impact studies required under the law on every Federal project which could in any way change or endanger our environment.

From Court interpretations of this Act have come such landmark environmental decisions as the Calvert Cliffs-AEC decision, the Astoria 6 ruling, and the Greene County vs. Federal Power Commission decision in which I was personally involved.

Important as this Act is, though, like most legislation, it is far from perfect. As we go forward in the fight to clean up our air and water, dispose of our wastes, and control land use, Congress will have to move to strengthen and improve this basic piece of legislation.

An example of this need is reflected in an amendment to the Environmental Policy Act which I have introduced. This amendment would require circulation of impact statements to relevant Committees of Congress. This increase in information is needed as Congress authorizes and funds projects at the present time with no knowledge of the potential damage to the environment which may result, as such impact statements at the present time are only circulated within the Federal agencies.

But, with the National Environmental Policy Act, I believe the pioneer step to save and enhance our human environment was taken. To meet the needs of our people, Congress must move resolutely down this road, now fairly well charted.

It will not be an easy job, but I, for one, intend to continue to work toward the goal of a better, more healthful environment for all our people.

FISH ACTS TO SAVE OUR ENVIRONMENT

The 92d Congress

(Bill, No., description, and status)

H.R. 4359—To regulate Ocean Dumping. In Conference (Passed House and Senate).

H.R. 5076—Citizen suits to protect the environment. In Conference (Passed House and Senate).

H.R. 5223—Detergent Pollution Control Act. In Committee.

H.R. 5690—Water Pollution Control Act of 1972. In Conference (Passed House and Senate).

H.R. 5964—Additional Funds for Waste Treatment Facilities. In Conference (Passed House and Senate).

H.R. 5968—Upgrade Federal Water Quality Standards. In Conference (Passed House and Senate).

H.R. 6482—Regulation of Strip Mining. In Committee.

H.R. 6560—To require Congressional approval of Alaska Pipeline. In Committee.

H.R. 8151—To establish a National System of Solid Waste Management. In Committee.

H.R. 9680—Increase civil penalties under 1899 Refuse Act. In Committee.

H.R. 10045—Commission on Fuels and Energy Needs. In Committee.

H.R. 11288—Increase Congressional knowledge on environmental impact of protects. In Committee.

H.R. 13724—Reimbursement to New York State for Waste Treatment Plant Construction. In Conference (Passed House and Senate).

H.R. 14014—To require public hearings on Federally funded Airport Development. In Committee.

H.R. 14654—Additional Wilderness and Conservation lands. Passed House.

H. Res. 64—To create a standing Congressional Committee on Environment.—Passed House.

CLEAN WATER ACTION NEAR

After five months' work, House and Senate Conferees have agreed on most major provisions of the $24 billion program to clean up our nation's waters by 1985, including fines of up to $25,000 a day for polluters.

While it was encouraging to receive congratulatory letters for my work in behalf of the Water Pollution Control Act when it was voted on in the House from such environmental leaders as Michael McCloskey, Executive Director of the Sierra Club and Thomas L. Kimball, Executive Vice President of the National Wildlife Federation, it is far more heartening to know we may at last have a meaningful water clean up program on our statute books.

The bulk of the $24 billion authorization would be for Federal matching grants to municipalities to construct sewage treatment plants. Under the formula, the Federal share can go as high as 75 percent, if the state puts up 15 percent of the project costs. This would mean that the 40 percent local share which prevailed under the 1965 Act would be reduced to only 10 percent—a major saving for local taxpayers.

The balance, $5.7 billion would be for reimbursement of states which pre-paid Federal costs under the 1965 program. This would mean that New York would receive in the neighborhood of $1.3 billion in repayment.

Up to $800 million of the $5.7 billion would be for 3 percent interest loans to help industries meet the new water quality standards.

A measure I opposed in the House still remains in the bill. This would instruct the Environmental Protection Agency to set new standards under which the government would permit limited discharge of industrial municipal wastes into rivers, streams and inland waters.

This measure would also allow individual citizens or groups to bring suit to force the EPA to carry out the law or to seek injunctions against pollution if the citizen or group could prove direct interest in the case.

Although the bill cannot be called the perfect law, it represents the best effort yet in our nation's history, both in standards and level of financial commitment, to clean up our waters.

SOLID WASTE: A GROWING PROBLEM

Nobody wants garbage, but everyone produces it.

Yet, as a nation, we are producing garbage at such a rate that getting rid of it has become our third highest municipal cost, topped only by highways and schools.

Although no exact figures are available, it has been estimated that we create 3.5 billion tons of solid waste each year, while the disposal of this mountain of garbage is costing the American taxpayer $4.5 billion, and this figure is expected to triple by 1980.

This 3.5 billion ton garbage pile is made up of an estimated 250 million tons of household wastes, 110 million tons of industrial refuse, and 6.5 million tons of construction and demolition debris. Add to this an estimated 1.5 billion tons of animal waste and 1.1 billion tons of mineral industry waste and the dimensions of the problem come into sharp focus.

Disposal of this mountain of waste is now handled by more than 10,000 individual cities, towns and villages. A few hundred have incinerators, nearly all of which pollute the air. The rest use dumps which pollute the land and water. In addition, these methods waste basic natural resources.

Yet, we already have the techniques to recycle most of our wastes. The problem is that these methods are only practical if applied on a large scale.

For this reason, I have introduced the Solid Waste Management Act, the thrust of which would make each person responsible for the cost of disposal of his or her own trash, by the imposition of a disposal tax on each manufactured item.

Revenue from this disposal tax would go into a trust fund which would be used to establish regional recycling centers and to finance studies on better disposal and reclamation methods than now exist.

My plan, endorsed by the New York Pure Waters Authority and by the Environmental Action Coalition, is presently before the Ways and Means Committee. It is admittedly revolutionary in concept. But, if we are to successfully cope with our mounting mountains of garbage, it is clear methods other than those traditionally used must be found.

STRIP MINING CONTROL NEEDED

The development of super-sized earth moving equipment, coupled with the growing demand for cheap electrical power, have joined to create massive strip mining operations, one of the gravest long-term environmental threats faced by our nation today.

With vast areas of Kentucky, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Illinois already wasted and left for dead, coal companies are moving West, attracted by the abundant coal deposits in those regions, made profitable to exploit by the rising power demand to serve increasing population.

On site, strip mining means scalped hillsides, jumbled mounds of debris, pools of stagnant water, and land that will never be usable again. But because of the exposure minerals and acids always associated with coal deposits to the weather, leaching action soon can befoul an entire water shed to carry the environmental cost of this mining method to areas miles from the mining sites.

Yet, despite this widespread environmental damage, such operations at the present time are only controlled by weak state laws, when such controls exist at all.

Because of this, I have joined in co-sponsoring legislation (H.R. 6482) to regulate strip mining operations from the Federal level. In my view, such control is absolutely necessary if we are to prevent the gradual destruction of the face of America in the years ahead.

FISH STATEMENTS ON THE ENVIRONMENT

Over the years I have made a number of statements in the House of Representatives and before governmental regulatory boards on the environment, as well as statements on environmental legislation I have introduced. If you would like copies of these statements listed below, just write me at my Washington office, indicating which of the statements are of particular interest to you. I will be more than happy to send you copies.

"No" to the SST.

How Much Longer Can We Burn or Bury?

The Big Boys Against Prink Hill.

Marine Mammal Protection.

Statement before FPC during Power Line Hearing.

Stewart Air Force Base Expansion.

Statement before Atomic Safety and Licensing Board on Indian Point No. 2 Plant.

TRIBUTE TO HON. EMANUEL CELLER, DEAN OF THE HOUSE

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1972

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY), in paying tribute to the beloved dean of our delegation and of this House, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER.

For the past 50 years, Chairman CELLER—or "MANNIE" as many of us affectionately call him—has served in this body, a length of service exceeded only by Representative Carl Vinson of Georgia, who retired in 1955 after 50 years and 2 months in office.

As chairman of the House Judiciary Committee for 22 years, he has fought bravely in the defense of free expression, free press, free assembly, and for all civil liberties. His name appears on the last four constitutional amendments—permitting District of Columbia residents to vote for Presidents, abolishing the poll tax in Federal elections, providing for the disability of the President, and lowering the voting age to 18—and on nearly 400 bills that became law, including every major civil rights bill since 1960.

William S. White once termed Chairman CELLER "a sturdy foe of can't," and this he certainly has been. No one phrase better sums up MANNIE's character than a sentence taken from a note he made after returning from the Democratic National Convention in 1952:

> I have no room in my heart for any temperance toward the degradation or despoiling of human dignity.

This eloquent statement can serve as a keynote to Chairman CELLER's public life.

On this occasion, I want to offer to "MANNIE" my sincerest wishes for his continued good health. I know that his

wise counsel, rich experience, and helpful guidance will be missed.

I might note, Mr. Speaker, that this body recently voted to change the name of the building in which my district office is located from the Federal Building to the Emanuel Celler Building.

"DOPED" VERSUS DRUGS

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues a very fine voluntary effort by the people of a small community to do something about drug and alcohol abuse.

Two Georgia-Pacific employees, James Duquette and Peter Poissant of Chazy, N.Y., were so concerned with the drug problem in the small community that, together with New York State employee, Joan Neverett, they launched Operation DOPED—Drive Out Pushers and Eliminate Drugs.

I feel the program is excellent and one with which many other communities might have success. I am pround of the fact that my constituents were dedicated enough to the cure of this problem to devote their time and energy to help solve it.

I have included a description of the program.

GEORGIA-PACIFIC "DOPES" DRUGS

Most of America knows that small towns, as well as large cities, must face the current drug problem. No exception is Chazy, New York (population approximately 3,400) where two local residents employed at a Georgia-Pacific Corporation paper mill in nearby Plattsburgh joined a state employee to launch Operation DOPED to meet the drug problem head on.

The initials stand for "Drive Out Pushers and Eliminate Drugs." Since its start in April, it has grown into an integral part of the community.

The two G-P employees are James Duquette, 26, assistant personnel manager, and Peter Poissant, 45, core machine operator. The third initiator is Joan Neverett, employed by the New York State Department of Labor.

Duquette, who had previously worked for the State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission, had experience in the field and was recommended to Pete by Frank Stefanick, G-P's personnel manager at Plattsburgh.

Poissant conceived the idea for DOPED early this year because, he says, "I knew the problem was there and I have four kids of my own to protect. The idea is that we like the kids. The problem kids are not bad apples, but they are doing a bad thing (drugs and alcohol). We wanted to help, yet stay friends with them."

Though Pete admits the local problem was relative to the small size of the town, he says they "wanted to do something constructive and to aid law enforcement. The high school has about 1,000 students and real pride in its experimental curriculum. We don't want anything getting in the way."

Many big cities might learn from little Chazy. This is how the program works:

DOPED offers rewards for information which will lead to the arrest and conviction of drug pushers or distributors of alcohol to minors. Tips are held in confidence and rewards are to be distributed in a manner to prevent identification.

Money for rewards comes from public donation under guidance of a local steering committee and with the cooperation of the State Police area commander. So far the $1,850 raised includes the 25¢ allowance of an eight-year-old boy, $25 from an older lady pleased at being remembered in the drive, and $2 from a Connecticut traveler who said he appreciated seeing a community "digging in to do something about your problems."

Their budget required only $1,500.

Operation DOPED has had a number of good effects thus far. The fund raising involved the total community, engaged the help of young people, showed the youngsters the community cares, discouraged minors' use of drugs and alcohol because group pressure was lessened, and put a new deterrent in the way of pushers.

It also quieted those "loudest supporters of drug abuse," brought queries from other communities in outlying areas who like the idea, and helped the police.

Says Sgt. Richard Trombley of the Plattsburgh, New York, State Police office: "Because of DOPED, the drug people have ceased to operate openly. We don't believe the traffic has dried up, but they know the community isn't going to tolerate them."

He added: "Jim (Duquette) and Pete (Poissant) are both great guys. I've known Pete all my life. Chazy is my home town."

Surprising to many is the fact that results have come almost entirely from the fund drive itself rather than payment of rewards. The evidence of community togetherness against drug and alcohol abuse appears to be the secret of success.

Not one reward has been paid yet. The one anonymous phone call so far reported a cocaine party but asked no money in return. Police response was immediate.

If the time ever comes to streamline the name of Operation DOPED, the three founders can merely combine the first letters of their last names—N.P.D. (Never Push Drugs).

SALUTE TO HON. EMANUEL CELLER

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1972

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, after a generation of service in the House and after more than 20 years as chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, EMANUEL CELLER is retiring.

For many of us who have served with him, it is hard to believe he will not be with us next session. In the 10 years I have had the honor of serving in Congress, I have always looked to "MANNY" CELLER to epitomize fair-mindedness and gallantry. He has always lived up to his word, and would only give it when it was appropriate. Many of CELLER'S juniors admired his sound judgment and well-considered opinions. He was not only a judicious leader of the Judiciary Committee, but was a leading spokesman for many who were unfairly deprived of their constitutional rights.

MANNY'S contributions to the body of Federal law is immeasurable. His impact will be as strong as ever despite his absence in the House.

To my good friend and associate MANNY CELLER, I should like to extend my best wishes for a lively and interesting time at his new endeavors. I know that I and my colleagues shall miss him.

DEFENSE OF THE AUTOMOBILE

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, we hear much criticism these days of American business. The critics claim to base their criticism on such problems as overpopulation, environmental concern, and consumer representation. A spirited defense of American business, particularly the automobile and tire businesses, was given recently by Charles A. Eaves, Jr., executive vice president of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. In an address to a recent convention of the National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association in Las Vegas, Nev., Mr. Eaves said that—

All of us in business have too long accepted what initially appears to be the easy way out when faced with unfair bureaucratic criticism or legislation.

And he urged his listeners:

To speak out strongly while there is still time.

Saying that he thinks our Nation can accommodate quite a few more cars, roads, and people without resorting to a path of "zero growth or transportation and economic regression," Mr. Eaves reminds us that—

With 80 per cent of our population living on just 2 per cent of our land, we don't have over-population of cars or people—we have over-concentration.

And he suggests that the reasonable solution "is not to eliminate people or cars, but to disperse them through realistic but positive planning of highway systems and mass transportation." I commend Mr. Eaves' address to my colleagues and include it at this point in my remarks:

IN DEFENSE OF THE AUTOMOBILE

Recently, I was reviewing some of the present day complications in selling a product like a tire that—despite many changes and improvements over the years—still is round and basic black, just as it was at the turn of the century.

Then, I happened to pick up the September 16 issue of Business Week magazine and read an article about a man named Frank Perdue, who is making a fortune out of—not tires—but chickens.

Now when you think you have problems in sales, gross profits or merchandising while dealing in tires, just consider the chicken:

It's among the cheapest and least glamorous of meats,

In bygone years, it was a plucked prop for the lowest form of entertainment in vaudeville and slapstick,

It is sometimes a synonym for lack of courage,

And a chicken is hardly ever an object, at first glance, for innovation or romanticizing.

But Perdue, a meat processor from Salisbury, Md., didn't see the chicken that way.

Instead, he envisioned the chicken as a quality commodity, an object of beauty in the meatcase and on the serving tray, a treat for both eye and palate.

So he carried his enthusiasm into vigorous advertising in print and on television in the East, and set out to create a brand identity for *his* broilers.

His advertising tells how his chickens get their healthy yellow color and delicious taste from nutritious foods—including an exotic mash made from *marigold* petals.

Face to face on television, Perdue tells you that, "It Takes a Tough Man to Make a Tender Chicken," and how proud he is to put his name on his product.

In retail outlets, tags of different colors help the customer select packages of legs, thighs or other parts, and promise "Quality Guaranteed or Your Money Back."

All of this, in a market where a processor's profit runs between a quarter cent and a half a cent a pound.

In four good years, Perdue has doubled the sales of his brand and has become the country's biggest producer of branded broilers.

The public is paying as much as 25 per cent more at the retail point of sale for the name and the guarantee of value Perdue has brought to the chicken business.

Now what does all this have to do with tires?

Frankly, after reading that article, the possibilities for progress in the tire business look better than ever to me.

Frank Perdue found merchandising benefits in legs, thighs, necks and gizzards.

And here *we* are, taking a fresh look at *our* product that today can feature exotic new rubbers, fabrics unheard of just a few years ago, steel cord, low-slung racy shapes, eye-catching sidewalls, and tread designs that really contribute to traction;

A product that can carry you over our highways at an exhilarating pace and help give you access to the most remote sections of our land—and all of this in ever-increasing safety.

Frank Perdue made it an honor to sell a chicken.

His story helps me come to you with enthusiasm about the privilege it is for me to be on this platform . . . confident that none of us will lay an egg by continuing with our eggs in the tire business basket.

However, like Frank Perdue, we must learn to speak out! Let's tell the story of our business, its good points, its benefits, its values.

And so, today I would like to speak out in defense of the automobile, the wheel and the tire that goes on it; of hard work, competition and free enterprise—all of the things so quickly suspect to many who expect simple explanations and simple solutions for all of the nation's ills.

I will plead with you to raise the voice of reason to those who would throw away the whole car . . . without even checking to see what's wrong when it sputters . . . without a thought as to alternatives or consequences.

Or to those who would put a governor on the car by excessive regulation, handicap it against competition, and still expect it to make top speed while carrying a very substantial part of the load of the U.S. economy.

I will ask you to speak out when you leave here, loudly and clearly, to make the voice of reason heard, so that the jury of public opinion can achieve balance in its deliberations.

And since we're serving as our own court and counsel at this 52nd annual convention of the National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, let's make a point of order that no useful purpose can be served by a lengthy review of the history of automobile America.

Let us explore instead the consequences of any hasty, expedient measures proposed as cure-alls for problems caused by a growing population, a narrowing of the technology gap between us and other nations, and the inability of the U.S.A. to indefinitely absorb every demand on its largesse without someone ultimately paying both principal and interest.

As the old saying goes, "There's no free lunch."

All of us here today are familiar with some of the effects of the panacea approach to problems that have been generations in formation.

For example, safety experts attribute a major part of the appalling accident and death rate on the nation's highways to outmoded roads, driver negligence, and poor vehicle maintenance.

Yet, consumer champions and designated segments of government concentrate on criticism of the engineering of the automobile and the performance of its tires.

They show much less concern over the fact that only 32 states have mandatory vehicle inspection laws, and only 32 states mandate that tires must be removed from a car as unsafe when worn to the treadwear indicators. And even many of these states are less than adequate in their enforcement.

Nor do they seem forcefully concerned enough over present lack of progress in keeping the drunk or incapable driver off the road . . . despite evidence that 50 per cent of the drivers involved in accidents have been drinking.

Instead, they attack the motor vehicle itself, on many grounds:

That it is inefficient, taking too much space and fuel to transport an average of 1.9 people,

That it kills and maims too many people—according to them—all by itself,

That it causes the countryside to be paved over with highways,

Pollutes the air,

And takes too much tax money for roads and streets.

Some of these critics offer what they consider to be solutions.

Unfortunately, even though we now are a nation of more than 200-million souls, many of these alleged solutions would move transportation back to the age when our population of horses about equalled that of our people.

One such solution advocates siphoning off money from the Highway Trust Fund. Revenues for this fund come from special taxes on motor vehicle owners and operators. Some forces now propose using this money for mass transit systems like railroads.

In fact, last month the Senate approved an amendment by Senator Cooper of Kentucky that would permit up to $800-million to be diverted from the Highway Trust Fund for purchase of rail or bus transit equipment. House action still is pending.

Another group calls for cars that are not only safer, but smaller and fewer.

Fewer and smaller cars, they reason, would result in fewer accidents, reduce pollution, remedy traffic congestion, and force people to the use of mass transportation.

That this approach also would reduce employment and wages, and close down thousands of small businesses, not to mention posing somewhat of a transportation problem while we wait for the necessary mass transport systems to materialize, doesn't seem to concern them.

I sometimes suspect there may be an organization newly interested in horse breeding among the supporters of the fewer-car theory.

If the required number of horses, pulling rubber-tired vehicles, prevail over the motor car some time in the future, I'm sure another government agency will have to be formed to study a new pollution problem.

Personally, I think this nation can accommodate quite a few more cars, roads—and people—without resorting to a path of zero growth or transportation and economic regression.

In the year 1916, we had a population of 102-million people who owned 3.6-million motor vehicles.

Today, our people population has doubled while our vehicle population has increased 30 times.

Yet, our mileage of roads and streets has increased by less than a fourth since 1916.

One sometimes wonders whether the anti-car, anti-highway people know—or ignore—the fact that all of the streets and roads in the United States today occupy less than one per cent of the land.

Or that despite ever increasing total mileage driven, vehicle accidents per mile have declined steadily over the last 50 years through improvements in cars and highways.

Along those lines, it was very encouraging recently to see the Department of Transportation propose to strengthen Highway Safety Program standards.

The proposal would move all of our states toward such steps as periodic motor vehicle inspection, stiffer screening in driver licensing, mandatory use of seatbelts, improved driver education, tougher laws on drunk driving, and uniform traffic regulations.

That is the kind of positive approach that really gets to the heart of reducing the accident rate.

As for jams of cars or people, it's really not a problem of total numbers.

We don't have over-*population* of cars or people in the United States—we have over-*concentration*.

Eighty per cent of our population lives on just two per cent of our land.

Thus, the reasonable solution is not to *eliminate* people or cars, but to *disperse* them.

To give them the means and freedom to spread themselves around.

The logical approach is through further improvements in roads and the use of those much maligned commodities—the automobile, the truck and the motor bus.

The relatively fixed routes of other forms of mass transit, like rail systems, certainly have a place. But they tend to foster concentration of people, not relieve it.

We need planning—realistic but positive planning—to remedy concentration and congestion of people and vehicles.

It is neither realistic nor positive to let access to our cities get congested and unpleasant, merely on the theory that people eventually will find some other way to get there.

As tire men, you can appreciate the disruption that can be caused by negative, unrealistic approaches to the transportation challenges ahead.

But don't be complacent in your knowledge. Raise your voices so that others will know, too.

Regression need not necessarily come by dramatic measures like banning cars and trucks, or restricting the construction of needed highways.

It can tiptoe in quietly and strangle us slowly through discriminatory taxation or regulation.

Often it comes in the guise of a "cure-all" for a problem, with no real confrontation of the issues involved.

For example, in recent years, as the technology of foreign nations improved, U.S. manufacturing began to fall behind in percentage of productivity increase.

Thus, understandably, goods produced by foreign manufacturers are making serious dents in our U.S. markets. Shoes are one example. Others include autos, radios, television sets and, yes, tires.

One way to reverse this trend would be to encourage productivity in relation to the boosts in wages over the last several years through elimination of feather-bedding and other restrictive work practices.

However, so far, many labor leaders have opted instead to wage a campaign against American multinational companies, accusing them of exporting jobs to beat wage costs here and of contributing to the trade deficit.

Legislation such as the labor-backed Burke-Hartke bill would impose double taxation on American firms with plants abroad and have the effect of slowing—if not stopping, their overseas operations while reducing our export trade even more.

In our own industry, the output of overseas plants is primarily dedicated to the serving of overseas markets. Our plants in America have no way to compete effectively abroad under present conditions of foreign tariff walls and lower labor costs.

U.S. jobs actually would be lost, not gained, under such a move to economic isolationism.

Yet, beset by an import situation which lack of productivity helped create, labor leaders make American businessmen the goats. Whatever the cost to the country, that's easier than telling their union members that they must increase productivity and face up to needed labor reforms.

As tire men and businessmen, you have seen many examples of the strangulating effect discriminatory taxation and regulation can have on a business, an industry, the economy and eventually the very people the action was supposed to help.

Bill Marsh told me before the meeting today that five tire dealers went out of business in the past six months because they felt it too difficult to cope with the demands of the federal government.

Many of you attending this convention, like myself, are wondering what proposed government standards will mean to the retread business.

Now I'm not going to rehash all the elements of that question.

But along with your organization and the Rubber Manufacturers Association, we at Goodyear have spent days and months in preparing facts and suggestions for the Department of Transportation, and many hours in presenting them.

Our hope, like yours, is that the final standard will permit quality retreading to survive and prosper.

We'll continue to work toward that end.

But you'll have to speak out as individuals in every way you know how. Don't leave it all up to your supplier, or the NTDRA or one day you'll find yourself writing off your retreading investment, as will Goodyear.

I have no idea what the final retreading outcome will be. It may be that we'll have to tell our customers not to drive over 60 miles per hour on our retreaded tires, or they may wind up in jail.

I hope not. I believe that our retreading is better than that.

I do believe, though, that in pursuit of retread quality, there is more weeding out ahead in the garden of retreading.

And I can't be very optimistic about the future of any retreaders who may plan to operate with no real quality control behind their products.

Bill Marsh also advised me that many of you have some concern about another area of our business:

About the question of what radial tires will do to the tire market.

Bill says some of you even are wondering whether the tire industry is about to improve itself and its dealers right of the replacement business.

It seems to me I've heard that song before.

Remember a few years ago when someone talked about a 100,000-mile tire? Just the thought of such a tire struck panic deep in the hearts of some tire dealers.

More recently, there was talk that the bias-belted tire would shrink the market with *its* long treadware expectancy.

And what has happened?

Tire sales have continued to rise, right along with increases in total mileage driven each year and the rise in the average safe driving speeds on our still improving highway system.

I don't know of one dealer who lost ground in his business, due to the long-wearing performance of bias-belted tires.

In fact, most of you who adjusted to new marketing and buying trends have prospered as never before.

But now it's radials to be concerned about.

Perhaps I can reassure you on that point by citing some statistics from Western Europe:

In 1965, Western Europe had a total of 25-million auto registrations and radial tires occupied 28 per cent of the total replacement tire market.

By 1971, auto registrations had increased to 39-million, and the radial's share of the replacement tire market had risen to more than 65 per cent.

Now during that same period—1965 to 1971 total replacement tire sales in Western Europe rose from 28½-million units to nearly 53-million units.

But more importantly, despite the huge increase in the radial share of that Western Europe replacement market, sales of replacement tire units per car increased all the way from 1.14 to 1.37.

Here's another thought for you:

One of the interests of the Department of Transportation these days is in establishing levels of tire traction in a quality grading system.

As you know, when it comes to just the tread rubber of a tire, improvements in traction usually can be gained only at a sacrifice in wear.

However, belted tires, by reducing the scrubbing action of the tread, provided longer tire mileage without going to harder tread compounds.

It may well be that in the future we will be asked to trade off some of the long wear inherent in belted tires for a tread that will deliver very high traction.

So far as Goodyear is concerned, our position on radials is the same one we've had for many years on all tire constructions and materials. And that is this:

"As new products and markets emerge we will be in the forefront of development so that we can meet our customer demands, as we have done in the past, and will continue to do in the future."

We have been making radial tires in 20 countries, including the United States, and we manufacture and sell more radial tires worldwide than any other U.S. manufacturer.

We are increasing our capacity rapidly for radials in this country, including steel-belted radials.

And we are doing this in an orderly fashion, in keeping with the actual pace of the demand for radials, so that we can give you and your customers the kind of product and quality you want and deserve.

Whatever the mix in constructions, there are exciting and profitable years ahead for all of us.

Our projections indicate the renewal auto tire market will grow from an anticipated 148-million units this year to a figure approaching 200-million units by 1980.

I would caution you, however, not to concentrate on radials to the detriment of the rest of the auto tire construction mix.

If you concentrate too heavily on radials, someone else is going to make a lot of money serving those big markets for bias-ply and bias-belted tires. And you will be losing a great opportunity for sales and profit.

If you want still more inspiration, consider the market in truck tire sales:

Last year, renewal sales totaled 19.7-million units. This year, they're expected to reach more than 21.1-million. And by 1980, we expect them to reach 29-million units.

Some of that will come from the big trucks and commercial trailers, required to move the increasing output of American industry in general.

But a lot will come from the owners of small trucks, being used increasingly for both personal driving and for recreational purposes.

And from recreational vehicles themselves—motor homes, campers, boat trailers, all the equipment that has come along with the Age of Travel and Recreation.

This kind of vehicle represents the new land of opportunity in the tire business.

True, there are some problems to handle in setting up to obtain this kind of business:

Inventory of tires and wheels, education on the relatively high inflations required by some of the tires and on picking the proper size for the load and service—just to name the major ones.

But it can be handled. Currently, most of the camper and pickup business is going to outlets like tire company stores and mass merchandisers who have taken on the necessary service and accessories.

But our success shows it can be handled, and profitably. My suggestion to you is to get on board, and ride the crest with us. Don't cop out on this profit opportunity.

So, whether tires are wearing longer these days (and they are), whether it takes some effort to get in on the new markets like recreation tires, or what have you, please be positive and enthusiastic about the future of the tire business.

Prophesying doom without foundation or thought has just one drawback:

Do it too loud and too often and someone may believe you.

I urge you not to join the "Prophets of Doom" in an attitude toward a great business that shows every sign of continuing the growth it has enjoyed since its inception.

We all should be directing our concern instead toward creating and maintaining a favorable climate for our business . . . for all business.

American business and industry is being made the goat for far too many things:

For air and water pollution, lags in civil rights, equal opportunity, education, and housing for minorities and the underprivileged.

And even for the quality of American culture, whatever's lacking in that.

As the indigestion victim says in the television commercial, "It's hard to believe we did the whoooooole thing!"

Nevertheless, businessmen such as you and companies such as the one I work for have shouldered a heavy burden in trying to pull our share of the load in such matters.

Heavy expenditures are being made to correct plants and processes that contribute to pollution. Auto engines are being redesigned.

Training programs have been instituted to qualify the underprivileged for jobs.

Additional taxes have been assumed to pay for the many ways in which the government is trying to bring a better life to all the people.

And at the same time, we continue to strive for the profits that will permit the economy to grow as well as prosper.

It isn't easy.

Henry Ford II, chairman of the Ford Motor Company, with a record of social responsibility, stressed recently that companies "must be profitable in order to survive and to serve any function whatsoever in society."

He said corporations are not "all-purpose mechanisms" and are not well-equipped—in terms of their experience, skills and basic motivations—to serve social needs that are unrelated to their business operations.

The socially responsible industrial corporation, he said, "Isn't a general-purpose public service institution. It is a profit-making business which carries out traditional business functions in a socially responsible manner."

What Mr. Ford was saying, in effect, is that business can't do the whole social responsibility thing, all by itself, and continue to provide jobs and wages and all of those mundane, material items necessary to existence.

There *are* great problems facing the na-

tion; problems calling for steps more progressive than any ever undertaken in our history.

But these steps must be taken together—by government, by business, by labor, by all of the people, including those who sit in our great Halls of Learning and tell us what we're doing wrong, but not how to do it right.

It's one thing to worry about probable future fuel and power shortages and another to look seriously for alternatives. It's one thing to fret and fume about such shortages, and another to unequivocally oppose development of nuclear reactors for power, and assume the majority doesn't want or doesn't need it.

Do you feel some of these issues are beyond your area of concern, responsibility or ability to do anything about them?

No so. All of them are your concern, as well as mine and your association's. All of them ultimately can affect your business, and your way of life, one way or another.

The move that saps the productivity and profitability of the tire manufacturer is the move that makes the tires you sell less competitive against imports—because we *must* have capital investment to get us even or better so we can provide jobs to make competitive products.

The jobs that are lost to any industry represent a loss of purchasing power that will be felt in your business.

Believe it or not, government still is willing to respond to the will of the people, or to what it *believes* to be the will of the people.

But if only the voices of the extremists are heard, who is to blame if the government responds with extremist measures?

Perhaps if we had raised our voices a little louder in the mid-sixties, we would not now be shouldered with some of the costly, time-consuming features of tire standards and tire registration, with little apparent consumer interest or benefit.

I think all of us in business have too long accepted what initially appears to be the easy way out when faced with unfair bureaucratic criticism or legislation. And I'll concede that your suppliers, when they look at the legal costs to fight, have sometimes failed to stand behind their convictions.

Regardless of the possible good intentions of those whose efforts could hamstring business, there can be only one verdict as to the course we must take.

And that course is one of positive action—with our customers, in our communities, and to our representatives in government.

Milk spilt is usually spilled forever.

History shows that it takes far longer to amend and temper crippling legislation than it does to enact it.

That controls, regulations and restrictions tend to proliferate and grow, not abate and shrivel.

We know from personal experience, those of us in the tire business, that the people who raise their voices against us seldom bother themselves with all the facts, consideration of consequences, or even a retraction when proven to be in error.

We know that businessmen generally are reluctant to speak out in their own defense.

But it's time to speak out!

So I urge you to speak out strongly in defense of the automobile as a sound and practical means of transportation, to speak out in defense of the wheel and the tire that goes on it, to speak out in favor of hard work, competition and free enterprise—while there is still time.

See your congressman. Tell your senator. Write your newspaper. Put your opinions in Bill Marsh's hands, too. Remember, the business you save may be your very own.

CHECKING ON THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in December 1959, 19 Latin American countries and the United States agreed to the establishment of the Inter-American development Bank—IDB—the purpose of which was to promote the economic development of its member countries, individually and collectively. An article in the present issue of Barron's, the national business and financial weekly, by Shirley Scheibla, that publication's alert investigative reporter, points out that the IDB's operations have been somewhat less than responsible.

Citing a report by the General Accounting Office, the financial watchdog for Congress, Mrs. Scheibla details various areas and describes the GAO review as "one of the most devastating critiques of a financial institution ever made." It is not surprising to learn that Uncle Sam is, as usual, left holding the bag as we furnish 95 percent of its hard currency. Fortunately, committees in the House are looking into IDB's operations, and it is hoped that a firm position by Congress will result in much neded corrective action.

At this point I insert the Scheibla's article as it appeared in the October 16 issue of Barron's:

IN THE BORROWER'S INTEREST—THAT'S HOW THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK IS RUN

(By Shirley Scheibla)

As Congress rushed toward adjournment last week, the House and Senate still had not agreed on an appropriation for the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). The Administration asked for $837 million to add to the $3.5 billion the U.S. already has contributed. The Senate approved the full amount, while the House cut it to $418 million. If the two chambers do not reach a compromise before adjournment, they are expected to authorize a continuing resolution giving IDB either the lower House figure or the 1972 appropriation of $211 million. But even if the final 1973 appropriation comes to $837 million, the Administration would have to seek half a billion dollars more for fiscal 1974 to fulfill its pledge for IDB replenishment.

Since large sums are involved and the U.S. provides 95% of IDB's hard currency, Congress would like to know how the money is spent. Accordingly, its investigative arm, the General Accounting Office, set about to determine the effectiveness of U.S. participation in the IDB. The result is one of the most devastating critiques of a financial institution ever made. Indeed, the U.S. Treasury, officially charged with overseeing U.S. participation, was so concerned that it had parts of the report classified "Confidential."

FACE-SAVING MOVE

There is considerable disagreement regarding the classification within both Congress and the GAO—some officials pointedly suggest that its primary purpose is to spare the Treasury embarrassment. One can readily understand why. For the report shows that IDB loans are made on political grounds without economic criteria. In some cases loans have been made also to developed countries well able to obtain private market financing and to institutions that did not even exist. GAO found that the emphasis has been on a steady flow of aid, with scant heed paid to performance. The report concludes that the bank is run by and for the recipients of its largesse, with the main source of it, the U.S., failing to use the leverage which it commands.

Congress has been notably ill-informed regarding what goes on in the Bank. The U.S. Treasury refused to furnish the GAO minutes of the meeting of the IDB's executive directors, quarterly reports on problem loans and a consultant's study of the bank, all of which are available to the Department. When asked for its file of correspondence with the U.S. director, the Treasury produced only two documents later than 1962. Nevertheless, from other sources like the National Security Council and the State Department, the GAO was able to compile a remarkable amount of information.

One of the main reasons for the report's "Confidential" classification is its discussion of IDB operations in Paraguay. According to GAO, the Bank's own Group of Controllers for Evaluation & Review found that, "In IDB's eagerness to develop institutions (in Paraguay), loans and grants were made to institutions that did not physically exist at the time, and, in some cases, had no defined programs or specific projects on which the money could be spent. Some of the institutions that did exist still do not have the capacity to undertake new responsibilities. In most cases in which lagging disbursements were a problem, the borrowers did not have the technical or administrative capacity to meet the deadline set for project implementation."

GAO said the Group also found "an implied intention" by IDB management to mislead its board of executive directors regarding the cost of the Acaray hydroelectric project in Paraguay. The cost estimate was revised from $30 million to $24 million to win the board's approval. Now, however, the cost has mounted to $36.6 million.

PERMISSIVE ATTITUDE

Regarding IDB's general operations, the U.S. executive director wrote an official of the National Security Council: "There are too many cases where originally planned projects are substantially modified in the course of implementation and disbursements made without reference to initially established conditions. This situation is in part a reflection of less than adequate advance planning, but it also reflects a rather permissive attitude on the part of bank management and staff in the interest of avoiding loan cancellations."

On April 20, 1970, IDB formally authorized $26.4 million "to assist in financing the final design and reconstruction and paving of the Villa Hayes-Filadelfia section of the Trans-Chaco Highway in Paraguay." An IDB feasibility study found that the project would cost $24.5 million and would benefit half the Chaco region, with a population of 56,539. However, on a visit to the U.S. Embassy in Paraguay, the GAO learned that the population totaled only 8,000. Moreover, an official of the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) estimated the cost at $45 million, and representatives of the International Bank for Reconstruction & Development (World Bank) put it at $40 million. In the end, IDB accepted an estimated cost of $33 million, with the difference between that and the loan to be made up of local currency supplied by the government of Paraguay.

The Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress (CIAP), which is supposed to evaluate such projects, had a spirited discussion on the Paraguayan loan. The World Bank opposed it, primarily because a fiscal crisis was looming in Paraguay and the project would yield little benefit. However, according to a memorandum from an AID official published in the GAO report, "The IDB representative indicated that he felt that the priorities for loans and projects were a matter for the Paraguayan government, that President Stroessner has identified this project as his No. 1 priority, and that the IDB will respect this government of Paraguay priority selection since 'it is a technically sound project.'"

INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

In an oblique reference to Paraguay's aforementioned fiscal crisis, GAO said, "We understand that the government of Paraguay did not pass income tax measures until May 1971 and that the measures would not become effective until January 1972. A law passed in late December 1971 postponed implementation of these measures indefinitely."

Another controversial IDB loan analyzed in the GAO report concerns $10.5 million to Argentina for a program aimed at eradication of hoof and mouth disease. The U.S. Embassy found that it would only marginally contribute to its purpose and would be a poor use of limited resources. Various U.S. officials and technicians questioned whether the institution designated to carry out the program had the capacity to do so.

The National Advisory Council on International Monetary & Financial Policies discussed all these questions, and then approved the loan without answering them. It serves as staff for the Treasury in participating in IDB and other international financial institutions.

According to GAO, the U.S. Treasury has informally opposed but never voted against loans to countries which have expropriated U.S. property; as a result, several have been approved. These include five loans totaling $91.1 million to Peru and two loans for $25 million to Bolivia.

In March of 1972, Congress amended the IDB Act to require the U.S. executive director to vote against a loan to any country which has expropriated U.S. property. According to the GAO, however, this can block only a loan from the bank's Fund for Special Operations (FSO), the only fund to which the U.S. contributes the majority of capital and commands a majority vote.

GAO RECOMMENDATION

GAO recommended that the U.S. "actively promote an enforceable set of criteria on IDB lending to countries involved in expropriation to extend the intent of the Congress to lending from ordinary capital."

Page 25 of the GAO report had this to say: "U.S. officials initially sought a 1971 replenishment contribution of $600 million for FSO from the 22 Latin American members to match a proposed U.S. contribution of $900 million. The rationale for seeking the increased level of contributions from Latin American members included demonstrating for the benefit of the U.S. Congress a progressive Latin American interest in self-help. . . .

"However, the Latin American members refused the U.S. proposal and seemed willing to hold the replenishment of FSO to the 1967 level if the executive branch were willing to retain the previous replenishment ratio of U.S. to Latin American contributions at 3 to 1. In the interest of reducing this ratio to 2 to 1, the executive branch agreed to increase the U.S. contributions to $1 billion in return for a Latin American contribution of $500 million. It should be recalled that the Latin American contributions to FSO are in local currencies and that those of the United States are in dollars. Confidential.

"We did not see much evidence in the way of IDB reforms that would be undertaken in return for the U.S. commitment other than the fact that loans made from FSO were supposed to become repayable in the currency borrowed beginning with this replenishment. In fact, the question of whether the U.S. contribution should be made contingent under desired changes with IDB was raised during debates within the executive branch of the replenishment. Confidential.

AVOID HANG-UPS

"However, emphasis seemed to be on avoiding any 'hang-ups' with the Latin American members that would upset the Congressional timetable for approving the necessary legislation for the U.S. contribution. The prevailing decision was to draw attention to the changes needed but not to make the U.S. contribution contingent upon their implementation. Confidential."

GAO also maintained that the last U.S. contribution to IDB could have been delayed if funds to develop countries had been limited. It said the executive branch is concerned over unrestricted access to FSO's soft loans by developed countries, but has done little about it.

Back in 1967, Congress passed the Selden Amendment, which called for the U.S. director of IDB to propose independent audits of IDB by an international group. The GAO challenges the independence of the Group of Controllers for Evaluation & Review which was established in response the following year. Its three members—from the U.S., Brazil and Panama—all work under the guidance of and report to IDB's board.

The Selden Amendment also calls for the Comptroller General to analyze the reports for Congress. GAO found the Group's first three reports generally incompetent. While it has not yet finished studying the fourth report, on education, GAO said it "seems to represent a thorough analysis of existing conditions, and its conclusions are supported by examples." But the Treasury rejected the GAO suggestion that it advise the Comptroller General of its view of the recommendations of the Group and any IDB actions based on them. The Treasury argued that this would place the Congressional investigative arm in an improper supervisory role.

ADVICE IGNORED

The Group noted that after more than 10 years of activity, IDB still has no manuals of operations to guide its staff on matters of technical assistance, loan processing, loan administration, reporting requirements or project evaluation. That seems to leave a great deal to the judgment of technicians. But, according to GAO, their advice is often ignored or over-ridden.

Now the Administration is trying to attack other donor members to the Bank, believing this to be the key to more stringent performance criteria. GAO indicates that such a move "will place buffer states between the Latin American members and the U.S. to avoid confrontations."

Canada became a member on May 3, 1972, and, according to Joaquin E. Meyer, IDB information director, Germany and Japan have shown an interest in joining. During the last week of September, he said a special committee of the board of governors, representing all member countries, held executive sessions in Washington on questions regarding admittance of other donor members. But Mr. Meyer expects no decisions for six months to a year. Matters in contention include whether new donor members should be given the right to appoint governors and how many executive directors should represent them.

Venezuela, Argentina and Uruguay have suggested changing the bank's charter to permit it to move its headquarters to Latin America.

"HARD WAY TO OPERATE"

GAO's startling report has not gone unnoticed by Congress; despite its "Confidential" classification, all members are entitled to see it. The 107-page document is labeled "confidential" or "unclassified," paragraph by paragraph, thus requiring the confidential classification for the entire document because it contains confidential passages. On September 21, the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, held an open hearing on the unclassified parts of the report. Subcommittee Chairman Dante B. Fascell (D., Fla.) commented during the hearing, "I can't see what's so sensitive about who did or didn't get money and the conditions under which they got it. If Mr. Passman keeps chopping away, sooner or later we'll probably get information, but it seems a hard way to operate."

Rep. Fascell was referring to sections 504 of the pending appropriations bill authorized by Rep. Otto E. Passman (D., La.), chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. It stipulates that none of the funds appropriated for any international financial institution shall be available unless subject to an audit by the Comptroller General of the U.S. Opponents say such an audit would eliminate the most attractive feature of the multinational approach, which separates economic aid and politics. The GAO report established, however, that this aim has not been achieved at the IDB.

At the end of its report, GAO said: "The Congress may wish to consider: 'whether the executive branch's low-profile approach in dealing with IDB and its members is compatible with the magnitude of financial support the Congress is asked to approve for contributions to IDB.

"Whether the executive agencies' decision to withhold certain information from us and the Congress concerning IDB activities is compatible with such level of support.'"

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in honoring the honorable THOMAS ABERNETHY who is retiring from Congress this year. I consider Congressman ABERNETHY one of the ablest Congressmen on Capitol Hill and certainly one of the most outstanding lawyers in the Congress. I have sat next to Congressman ABERNETHY on the Agriculture Committee during the past 28 years and have also served with him on the House District Committee since he became a member of that committee. Mr. ABERNETHY is one of our outstanding presiding officers and I doubt if there is any Congressman who can do a better job of presiding over bills in the Congress.

It has been a real pleasure to know Congressman ABERNETHY's wife and children. They are a credit to the State of Mississippi and our country.

The Congress and our Nation have suffered a great loss in TOM's decision not to be a candidate again.

HON. JIM KEE

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to take this opportunity to salute Congressman JIM KEE of West Virginia—my friend and a man I admire greatly.

JIM and I served together on both our committee assignments of Public Works and Interior and Insular Affairs. It is a pleasure to have had the privilege of serving with him in the Congress and his loss will be sorely felt in the committees and in the House. His West Virginia constituents will miss his effective and innovative leadership.

Even though we are of different political parties, JIM and I have developed a close and very fruitful working and personal relationship during his years in the Congress and I truly regret the fact that he will not be among us when the Congress reconvenes in January.

We have shared many goals and accomplishments over the years through the time of our service together, and I can assure my distinguished friend that I shall never forget his friendship. Knowing him as I do I am sure we can count on his continuing interest and involvement in public affairs. I only ask that I can count on having his continuing advice and counsel from time to time because he is a veritable "walking encyclopedia" due to his many years of service on Capitol Hill as a Congressman, a staff member, the son of a wonderful mother and father, who like JIM, also had very distinguished records of service in this House of Representatives.

As I have accompanied JIM KEE on many committee trips, primarily associated with floods or other natural disasters throughout the entire United States, I grew to appreciate the very warm and compassionate characteristics of this man's personality. He constantly demonstrated deep concern for the disaster victim, the downtrodden, the little guy and, as we say, the average men and women in our society.

I was extended the very great privilege of being invited to speak, by the great Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH of West Virginia, at a luncheon in "JIM KEE Country," honoring a famous aviation pioneer. Also in attendance that day was JIM's lovely mother, Mrs. Kee.

At that time I remarked to both JIM and his mother that "these folks are my kind of people"—the same is true of Congressman JIM KEE. He's my kind of people.

How does one adequately describe a tried and true friend? I can only attempt to partially convey, in words, my feelings and description of him.

The JIM KEE I know and will remember is a courageous, concerned, considerate and compassionate man that really loved his family, his people and his country—he is truly a "card-carrying American."

In conclusion, I will attempt to write a couple of phrases that I believe "fit JIM KEE to a tee."

Be kind, for everyone you meet is fighting a hard battle.

One cannot find any rule of conduct to excel "simplicity" and "sincerity."

Thank you for your friendship and may the Good Lord be kindly to you, JIM.

THE 92D CONGRESS AND MONTANA

HON. RICHARD G. SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling that during our activities as representatives of our various constituencies, we very often do not fully comprehend the long range over-view of each Congressman's philosophy and his legislative interests which reflect the views of his constituency. I insert the following remarks of mine, pertaining to my western Montana constituency, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that my fellow Representatives may examine a capsulized cross section of the areas of interest predominant in my district, and examine my basic method of personalizing my representation of western Montana:

MY PHILOSOPHY

My philosophy as Representative from the First Congressional District of Montana has been to be the representative for Montana, not from Montana. I believe that representation is best when it's closest to the people. I have represented the individual Montanan rather than having been a captive of any one organization.

Recognizing the heavy tax burden on Montanans, I have consistently voted against unwarranted federal spending.

I have been particularly active in handling constituent requests and solving problems for individuals, groups and city-county-state governments. To be sure that Montanans have ready access to myself and my staff, I have operated full-time District offices in Helena and Missoula, Montana. I have kept my Washington, D.C. office open on Saturdays and invited Montanans to call me collect, anytime.

To be sure that I am properly representing Montanans views, I return to Montana at least once every month, while maintaining a better than 90% attendance and voting record. Public listening sessions have been held in every corner of the district.

I have answered a weekly average of 500 letters and telegrams, and 250 telephone calls. I have mailed each constituent a newsletter every two months, sent papers of interest to individuals and groups, provided Federal government publications, taped a weekly radio program on current topics, and asked for Montanans views on issues and problems through questionnaire surveys.

Never before has a First District of Montana Congressman brought representation so close to his constituents.

In reflecting Montanans views, I have taken the following stands, which I think, serve to illustrate and emphasize the concern of Western Montana residents for the problems facing this nation.

I voted against massive foreign aid, which is, in reality, a subsidy for low-cost foreign labor; against using education funds for school busing solely to obtain racial balance, in that education funds must be used to improve quality of education. I supported quotas, tariffs and surcharges protecting American labor against unfair foreign competition; introduced legislation requiring rigid inspection of foreign meat slaughtered for importation to the U.S., inspection done with no cost to the U.S. taxpayer and I supported U.S. withdrawal and deescalation of the Vietnam War. I voted for Emergency Public Service Employment Funds to relieve unemployment caused by the deescalation of the war and voted to increase Social Security Benefits for the aged. I voted for welfare reform, requiring able-bodied men and women to work for welfare payments. I voted for reduction in income taxes, increased work-study funds, against the S.S.T., against the Lockheed loan. I acquired funds to correct air pollution and environmental problems in the Townsend, Montana area, introduced a bill to punish dope pushers, introduced a bill to impose severe penalties on those who use guns to commit crimes and I supported using foreign import tariffs to reforest public lands, I voted to end corruption in political campaigns by requiring reporting procedures identifying illegal contributions and expenditures, and I voted for federal funds to combat water pollution.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that through cooperative efforts, public and private, cures for diseases can be found. Rising medical costs dictate new approaches to health insurance, and in the continuation of adequately staffed local community health facilities. I supported the following list of health legislation designed to meet those needs:

H.R. 14185—Provides increased penalties for heroin pushers.

H.R. 12596—establishes a Special Action Office on Drug abuse to marshal forces to combat the drug problem.

H.R. Con. Res. 363—Supports international efforts to restrict narcotics traffic.

H.R. 3659 (PL 92-218)—Conquest of Cancer Act implements a national drive to defeat cancer.

H.R. 15375—improves national traffic and motor vehicle safety.

H.R. 8630 (PL 92-158)—Nurses' Training Act to provide grants to assist trainees in the nursing profession and to construct facilities to accomplish this training.

H.R. 8629 (PL 92-157)—Doctors' Training, similar to the Nurses' Training Act, provides funding for better facilities and training of Doctors.

H.R. 9212 (PL 92-303)—Improves and broadens benefits to survivors of coal miners who succumb to "Black Lung" (Pneumoconiosis).

H.R. 15475—Establishes National Advisory Committee on Multiple Sclerosis.

H.R. 1406 and 6956—Provides for thorough inspection of import meats and labels them as such from producer to consumer.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that one of the most important issues facing us is that of the environment. Through sound resource management practices Montana can protect its environment and, at the same time, maintain a healthy economy. The multiple use, or best use principle of land management is the key.

While Federal regulations are necessary, the prime responsibility for pollution control lies with local and State governments, however. I have reflected the feelings of Montanans in my support of the following list of environmental legislation:

H.R. 11896—Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the most comprehensive measure ever enacted to combat water pollution.

H.R. 396 & 9747—Designates as wilderness the Lincoln Back Country and Spanish areas.

H.R. 15418—Provides additional funding for improved forest management.

H.R. 5241—Encourages state and local governments to develop programs for disposing of junk cars.

H.R. 5060, 12186 & 4360—Prohibits shooting of animals from aircraft, added protection for eagles and establishment of marine sanctuaries.

H.R. 9594—To designate the Grant-Kohrs Ranch as an Historic site.

H.J. Res. 350—Establishes a joint Senate-House Committee on the environment.

H.R. 10446—Requires Federal contractors to observe sound environmental practices.

I also secured funding for dust abatement and wildlife sanctuaries in the vicinity of Canyon Ferry Dam.

Mr. Speaker, the progress we enjoy today is the result of the sweat and toil of prior generations. It is our responsibility to assure the senior citizen a life of dignity and we should utilize their experience and abilities. I supported or sponsored the following list of legislation designed to do just that:

H.R. 1—Ties Social Security benefits to cost-of-living rise.

H.R. 5861—Provides a full exemption for those 65 and older from Social Security payments.

H.R. 12308—Establishes a National Institute on Aging.

H.R. 12325—Provides homemaking and consumer education assistance for the elderly.

H.R. 13128—Updates pensions for World War I Veterans & widows.

H.R. 14977—Provides for voluntary employment programs for older Americans.

H. Res. 124—Establishes a Select Committee on the Aging to study problems and needs of the elderly.

S. 1163—Provides increases in the field of nutrition, education, and low-cost meals for the aged.

I also supported funding of the Green Thumb program and the creation and building of Senior Citizen centers.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that young adults must be respected as individuals, and must share equally as citizens, the privileges and responsibilities of our society. All Montana youth should have the chance to better themselves through Vo-Tech or college training. The future of Montana, and of the United States, lies in creating job opportunities for our youth. I have sponsored or supported the following list of legislation aimed at improving the world of the young adult:

H.R. 6531—Provides incentives for building a volunteer Army, thereby eliminating a need for the draft.

H.R. Res. 223—Amends the U.S. Constitution to lower the voting age to 18 years.

H.R. 12596—Coordinates all of the Federal agencies connected with the drug abuse problem into a Special Office for Prevention of Drug Abuse.

H. Res. 739—Expands Federal Student Intern Program for interns for employment during the summer months.

H.R. 7352—Establishes an Institute for collecting information on and training officials for the treatment and control of juvenile offenders.

H.R. 11112—Provides individual income tax deductions for Vo-Tech and other higher education costs.

H.R. 14552—Allows single individuals same tax benefits as married persons.

Mr. Speaker, we as Representatives of the people of the United States must, as a matter of necessity and expediency, improve the exchange of our own internal congressional communications so we can better understand the feelings and issues of importance facing the diverse segments of our population. I hope that this capsulized over-view of my reflection of the views of Western Montanans helps to serve that end.

MAKE THE U.S. PAY AND PAY DEARLY FOR ITS SUPPORT OF ISRAEL

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, according to reports, Eygptian President Sadat has said that he hopes to promote relations with China, to patch up his quarrel with the Soviet Union and to make the United States "pay and pay dearly" for its support of Israel.

Exactly what the Eygptian President meant by this remark is not clear. We can reasonably assume several possibilities—such as continued and/or increased terrorism, or, perhaps, even an all-out war against Israel.

The later possibility is perhaps most frightening—because it would make our national politicians put up or shut up on their pledges to aid Israel at all costs.

The Communists realize the inroads which they have made on the American people through the Vietnam War. It is certainly reasonable to assume that the American people do not want and would not support another Korea or Vietnam in the Middle East.

One thing is certain President Sadat's threat against the United States should make our politicians reflect on what is most important in their election—promises of support for Israel in return for campaign funds or promises to mothers and dads to keep us out of another war in return for reelection.

I insert a related news story following my remarks:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 16, 1972]

ISRAEL RAIDS GUERRILLA BASES DESPITE QUIET ON BORDERS

Israeli warplanes struck yesterday at five Palestinian guerrilla bases in Lebanon and Syria.

* * * * *

Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir said that the raid came "in order to make the terrorists conscious that Jewish blood cannot be spilled without any reaction."

She said that Lebanon and Syria were hit because in those countries terrorists planned the Munich killings. the Tel Aviv airport massacre and the wave of letter-bombs mailed to Jews.

Yesterday's raid was the first action against Arab guerrillas in Lebanon and Syria since Israel's sweep into southern Lebanon, Sept 16–17. The Israeli spokesman listed the targets in Lebanon as Sinik, near Sidon; Dakifa and Dier el Ashayer, and a guerrilla naval base at Ras el Naba, south of the Litani River Delta.

Israel's northern border has remained quiet since last month's ground incursions into 16 guerrilla bases in Lebanon.

* * * * *

"This is stupid, crazy, it makes no sense," said one Lebanese.

The response stemmed from the belief that the Lebanese government had clamped down as stiffly as is politically possible on the Palestine guerrillas here after last month's Israeli assault.

Less than 48 hours before the Israeli air bombardment of Palestinian camps near Sidon and Tyre, fighting broke out in the Arquob region of Lebanon between moderate and extremist elements of the Palestinian guerrilla movement, with losses to those guerrillas seeking a more active role against Israel.

The Lebanese army within the past week has again engaged the guerrillas in unannounced firefights to control their movements near the Israeli border. Residents of Lebanon have found a great increase in the number of army roadblocks set up to check guerrilla movements.

Foreign travelers in the border area report that the army * * * from the Israeli border.

Only Saturday, it was announced that the principal Palestinian guerrilla organizations were considering shifting their headquarters from Lebanon to Syria.

It was widely accepted by the Lebanese public that the Israeli attacks in September were a response to the Munich tragedy. But today's assault was regarded as unprovoked, uncalled for in the face of the Lebanese governments strong efforts to control the fedayeen, and likely to arouse public sympathy for the guerrillas for the first time recently.

Meanwhile, in Cairo Egyptian President Sadat said that he hoped to promote relations with China, to patch up his quarrel with the Soviet Union and to make the United States "pay and pay dearly" for its support of Israel.

The speech came on the eve of the departure of Egyptian Premier Aziz Sidki for Moscow to plead for a renewal of ties between Moscow and Cairo.

Sidki's mission could lead to a renewal of some Soviet arms supplies to Egypt.

Sadat said that he values highly the close relationship between the Soviets and the Egyptians and has no faith in American efforts to promote a Middle East peace agreement.

Sidki will be accompanied by virtually the same high-level team which traveled with him to Moscow in July to deliver Sadat's ultimatum—supply us with advanced offensive weapons or pull out the Soviet military presence.

Egyptian Defense Minister Gen. Mohamed Sadek, was quoted recently by a diplomat as saying that his troops have only enough ammunition to fight a ten-day war. The Soviet withdrawal apparently went far beyond what Sadat wanted, leaving his armed forces in disarray. This, in the assessment of diplomats in Cairo, has forced him to mend his fences with the Soviets.

CONGRESSMAN CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I join in with the rest of my

colleagues to bid a fond farewell to a fellow Democrat and committeeman, Congressman CHARLES H. GRIFFIN.

While serving on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee with the gentleman from Mississippi, I have learned to respect his judgment and am well aware of his perceptive views. The House of Representatives has lost a dedicated man who was a true representative of his district and the State of Mississippi.

I regret that many of us are going to lose a gracious individual whom we were privileged to know as a friend rather than just as a colleague in the legislative branch.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT CONSULTATION AMENDMENT

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have tried to keep my colleagues informed of developments regarding the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. I take this opportunity to draw attention to the present status of H.R. 17021, to provide on-site consultation to small employers.

Weeks of hearings before the House Select Labor Subcommittee and the Small Business Subcommittee all focused on consultation as the primary need of small businessmen who seek to comply with complex and technical OSHA standards. The bill provided that an employer with 25 or fewer employees could request the Department of Labor to come to the plant and interpret the standards for him. No citations could be issued and, with the limited exceptions of imminent danger and serious violation situations, no enforcement procedures would be triggered.

In spite of many efforts to bring H.R. 17021 to the House floor under suspension, the bill was not brought up. Only emergency and procedural matters were permitted during the last days of the session. Although the Senate passed the bill as an amendment to the Public Works and Economic Development Amendments of 1972, it was dropped in conference as nongermane.

The bill received the endorsement of the National Safety Council, the administration, the AFL–CIO, bipartisan cosponsorship, and perhaps most importantly, the wholehearted support of the National Small Business Association and the National Federation of Independent Business.

On October 12, I inserted for the RECORD the endorsement of the NSBA. I would like to share with my colleagues at this time the further endorsements of the NFIB and the National Safety Council.

The items follow:

[Telegrams]

CHICAGO, ILL.,
October 11, 1972.

Hon. WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The National Safety Council wishes you well in and supports your efforts to obtain House approval for H.R. 17020. On-site consultative assistance to small employers will help improve their occupational safety and health performance. It will also enhance voluntary cooperation and compliance by eliminating a climate of apprehension now present in much of the business community. However, we are seriously concerned that the inadequacy of authorizations in section 2 (B) (3) will prevent full effectiveness of the bill and hope that these amounts can be substantially increased.

HOWARD PYLE,
President, National Safety Council.

WASHINGTON, D.C.
October 12, 1972.

Hon. WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of our 318,000 small business member firms, I strongly support your efforts to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act through H.R. 17021.

I hope this will be a successful first step toward making the administration of OSHA fair for all businesses.

WILSON S. JOHNSON,
President, National Federation of Independent Business.

DR. DURWARD HALL

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad period for some of us as we bid fond adieus to so many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle who will not return in the next Congress. Parting is, as the poet once said, such sweet sorrow that for purely personal reasons I have eschewed joining in the many ecomiums that have been and are being paid on this floor.

This is not because I think any the less of those who are leaving but rather that my poor remarks undoubtedly would be eclipsed by the fluent rhetoric of my more eloquent colleagues.

Nevertheless, I simply cannot allow one of my colleagues to depart without making some little obesiance in his direction. I refer, of course, to the esteemed and noble gentleman from Missouri, Dr. DURWARD HALL, who has chosen not to stand again for election.

In my judgment, Dr. HALL is perhaps the most conscientious man and legislator it has ever been my good fortune to know. He has, to my knowledge, spent more time on this floor than any of us, following carefully the debates to make certain that he has heard and weighed not both sides but all sides of an argument. Dr. HALL is one of those rare individuals who relies more on his ears than on his mouth—he listens well.

Dr. HALL gave up a successful and lucrative practice in surgery in the belief that he could serve his fellow man more fruitfully as a Member of this body. A graduate of a great medical college, chief surgeon in an important clinic, 7 years in the Army as chief of personnel in the office of the Surgeon General, a Legion of Honor winner, honored by his peers as a fellow in the American College of Surgeons and a diplomat in the American Board of Surgery, these and many other honors, he has worn lightly and moestly.

Dr. HALL will have served 12 years in this estimable body at the end of this year. They were years of hard work and patient and tireless devotion to his constituents in the Seventh Congressional District of Missouri and to the welfare of this Nation, which he loves so well.

I only wish that I were able to say what is in my heart for this fine citizen and man. I wish for him and his devoted wife years of unblemished health and happiness.

CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM COLMER

HON. JOHN M. SLACK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, with the end of this session of the 92d Congress we will lose the leadership, force of example, and stimulation provided by our outstanding chairman of the Rules Committee, Hon. WILLIAM COLMER of Mississippi.

If you glance at the Congressional Directory you will note that his biography is capsuled in just five lines of type. Just think of that. Only five lines to summarize an active career in Congress over a period of 40 years. From first election during the threatening days of 1932, through depression, war, peace, inflation, and through all of the complex patterns of problems they brought to a self-governing nation, it can fairly be said that he has seen it, heard it all, and never failed to bear his full share of the controversies developed and the decisions finally taken.

During my service in the Congress I have admired him for many qualities, not limited to his often-demonstrated skills and the range of his experience. I have admired the way in which he has weathered the force of repeated storms, held to his convictions, and still retained a fine and judicious fairness along with a sense of humor that would have long ago eroded under pressure in a lesser man, made of less durable fibers.

I join all those who extend congratulations on his magnificent career and best wishes for many years at home in Mississippi where he can enjoy our future efforts with spectator interest and appropriate comments, as always.

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in saluting Congressman JOHN L. MCMILLAN.

His long and distinguished career in the House of Representatives, which spans over three decades, has been one of dedicated service to his district and to the State of South Carolina, and he can certainly reflect with great personal satisfaction on his many achievements during this time.

I extend to him my sincere best wishes for every success in his forthcoming pursuits.

COSTS OF H.R. 1

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it may be helpful for the Members to make additional cost information relative to the conference version of H.R. 1 available. I am therefore inserting in the RECORD the following tables prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

Outgo over present law calendar 1974 (conference agreement)

[In billions of dollars]

Trust Funds	
Social Security Cash Benefits	2.3
Hospital Insurance	1.6
Supplementary Medical Insurance	.1
Total	4.0
General Revenues	
Supplemental Security Income	1.8
Food Stamp Cash-Out	—.3
Foster Care	.2
Medicaid	—.8
Supplementary Medical Insurance	.4
Total	1.3
Grand total	5.3

ADDITIONAL SOCIAL SECURITY PAYMENTS RESULTING THE SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1972

[In millions]

Provision	Additional payments in calendar year 1973	1974
CASH BENEFITS		
Total	$1,842	$2,347
Increased benefits for widows and widowers up to 100 percent of PIA at age 65 (limited to OAIB)	977	1,109
Retirement test changes:		
$2,100 exempt amount; $1 for $2 above $2,100	556	842
Earnings in year of attainment of age 72	10	14
Special minimum PIA up to $170	18	20
Credit for future delayed retirement	10	27
Noncontributory credits for military service after 1956	41	46
Eliminate support requirement for divorced wives and surviving divorced wives	20	23
Student child benefits payable after age 22 to end of semester	17	19
Age 62 computation point for men	2	14
Reduce disability waiting period to 5 months	108	128
Liberalized disability insured status for blind workers	32	38
Liberalized workmen's compensation offset (80 percent of high 1 year)	17	22
Children disabled at age 18 to 21	16	17
Increased allowance for vocational rehabilitation expenditures	18	28
MEDICARE		
Total, pt. A	773	1,634
Coverage of disabled	624	1,412
Liberalize ECF benefits	88	110
Waiver of beneficiary liability	30	35
Coverage of chronic kidney disease	31	77
Total, pt. B	72	476
Coverage of disabled	98	465
Increase in deductible	—64	—115
Coverage of speech pathology	8	18
Coverage of chiropractors	7	35
Eliminate SMI coinsurance for home health	12	15
Coverage of chronic kidney disease patients	11	58

COMPARISON OF CONTRIBUTION RATES (EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES, EACH)

[In percent]

	OASDI	HI [2]	Total
Present law [1] calendar year:			
1973 to 1977	4.60	0.90	5.50
1978 to 1985	4.50	1.00	5.50
1986 to 1992	4.50	1.10	5.60
1993 to 1997	4.50	1.20	5.70
1998 to 2010	4.50	(1.20)	(5.70)
2011 plus	5.35	(1.20)	(6.55)
Conference committee bill [1] calendar year:			
1973 to 1977	4.85	1.00	5.85
1978 to 1980	4.80	1.25	6.05
1981 to 1985	4.80	1.35	6.15
1986 to 1997	4.80	1.45	6.25
1998 to 2010	4.80	(1.45)	(6.25)
2011 plus	5.85	(1.45)	(7.30)

[1] $10,800 base in 1973, $12,000 base in 1974, automatic thereafter.

[2] Cost estimates for hospital insurance are made for a 25-year period only.

DOLLAR AMOUNT OF EMPLOYEE SOCIAL SECURITY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR CALENDAR YEARS 1973 AND 1974 FOR SELECTED LEVELS OF ANNUAL EARNINGS (CONFERENCE AGREEMENT)

	Contribution rate (percent)	Maximum covered earnings	Median earnings (male) ($7,433 for 1973; $7,804 for 1974)	Minimum wage earner $3,328 earnings
1973:				
Present law ($10,800)	5.5	$594	$408.82	$183.04
Conference bill ($10,800)	5.85	631	434.83	194.69
1974:				
Present law ($12,000)	5.5	$660	$429.22	$183.04
Conference bill ($12,000)	5.85	702	456.53	194.69

COST IMPACT ON MEDICARE OF H.R. 1 (CONFERENCE VERSION)

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1973	Fiscal year 1974
Section:		
201. Disabled under medicare		+$1,310
213. Waiver of beneficiary liability	+$15	+32
247. Liberalized ECF	+33	+99
299. Renal dialysis		+67
Total, part A	+48	+1,508
Section:		
201. Disabled under medicare	+$24	+$300
204. Increase in part B deductible	−32	−79
283. Speech pathology	+2	+14
273. Chiropractors		+20
299K. Termination of home health coinsurance	+5	+14
299I. Renal dialysis		+35
Total, part B	−1	+314

COST IMPACT ON MEDICAID OF H.R. 1 (CONFERENCE VERSION)—Continued

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Section and Title	Effective date	Fiscal year 1973	Fiscal year 1974
201. Disabled under medicare	July 1973		−$67
204. Change in deductible	January 1973	+$3	+8
207. Incentives for utilization review	July 1973		−152
208. Cost-sharing under medicaid	January 1973	−44	−89
209. Determination of payments for families under medicaid	January 1974		+15
225. Limits on SNH/ICF payments	January 1973	−11	−22
231. Maintenance of effort	Enacted	−540	−600
235. Management information system	January 1972	+10	+10
247. Level of care requirements	January 1973	−6	−14
249B. 100 percent reimbursement SNH inspectors.	October 1972	+14	+20
249E. Title XIX eligibility for recipients of social security benefit increase.	do	+39	+10
271. Increased matching, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.	July 1971	+10	+10
299B. Coverage of mentally ill children	January 1973	+40	+110
299E. 90 percent funding of family planning services.	October 1972	+15	+32
299I. Coverage of renal disease	July 1973		−17
Total fiscal impact		−470	−746

Section and title	Effective date	Calendar year 1973	Calendar year 1974
201. Disabled under medicare	July 1973	−$30	−$70
204. Change in SMI deductible	January 1973	+7	+8
207. Incentives for utilization review	July 1973	−74	−162
208. Cost-sharing under medicaid	January 1973	−89	−89
209. Determination of payments for families under medicaid	January 1974		+33
225. Limits on SNH/ICF payments	January 1973	−22	−22
231. Maintenance of effort	Enacted	−570	−640
235. Management information system	January 1972	+10	+10
247. Level of care requirements	January 1973	−13	−14
249B. 100 percent reimbursement SNH inspectors.	October 1972	+19	[1] +10
249E. Title XIX eligibility for recipients of social security benefit increase.	do	+30	[2]
271. Increased matching, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.	January 1972	+10	+10
299B. Coverage of mentally ill children	January 1973	+104	+120
299E. 90 percent funding of family planning services.	October 1972	+30	+36
299I. Coverage of renal disease	July 1973	−13	−20
Total fiscal impact		−601	−790

[1] 249B lapses June 30, 1974.
[2] 249E lapses Sept. 30, 1973.

	Fiscal year 1973	Fiscal year 1974
Current Program Costs [1]	5,236	6,092
Savings	470	746
Costs Under H.R. 1	4,766	5,346

[1] Includes administration.

	Calendar year 1973	Calendar year 1974
Current program costs [1]	$5,655	$6,559
Savings	601	790
Costs under H.R. 1	5,054	5,769

[1] Includes administration.

Section and title	Calendar year 1973	Calendar year 1974
201. Disabled under medicare	+$624	+$1,412
213. Waiver of beneficiary liability	+30	+35
247. Liberalized ECF	+88	+110
299. Chronic kidney disease patients	+31	+77
Total part A	+$773	+1,634
201. Disabled under medicare	+98	+465
204. Increase in part B deductible	−64	−115
283. Speech Pathology	+8	+18
273. Chiropractors	+7	+35
299K. Termination of home health coinsurance	+12	+15
299I. Chronic kidney disease patients	+11	+58
Total part B	+72	+476

THANK YOU, JOHN BYRNES

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the voluntary retirement of the Honorable JOHN BYRNES will leave a vast and painful void in our State's delegation to the 93d Congress.

JOHN BYRNES has served 32 years in public life. An able lawyer, he was the Republican floor leader of the Wisconsin Senate before election to this body 28 years ago.

Any fair account of his career and contributions in this House—if it could be drawn—probably would become too lengthy to suit the discerning taste of a man with his passion for economy. Let it be said, simply, that few have served with the compassion, the dignity, and sheer ability which have characterized the service of JOHN BYRNES.

As a neighbor who has been privileged to follow his career throughout most of my lifetime, I want to share one brief vignette, to illustrate the respect he has earned throughout our State of Wisconsin.

This impression came, not surprisingly, from a University of Wisconsin political science professor and his class of 20 students who were visiting Washington. After they had spent 2 weeks in meetings with officials around this city, and with the members of four State's delegation. I asked the group: "What has impressed you the most about your stay in Washington?"

There was not a moment's hesitation. This was the reply:

If you really want to learn, talk with JOHN BYRNES.

That is a true story. And—like the students who nodded in agreement—his colleagues in the House will long remember, and cherish, the counsel we have come to expect on the most complicated questions; the genial wisdom and patience we take for granted; and most of all the opportunity we have to just "talk with JOHN BYRNES."

THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished service of TOM ABERNETHY in this body spans 30 years of the most dramatic and challenging era in our Nation's history. When TOM came to the Congress, cotton was king in his great State of Mississippi and throughout much of the Southland. Times change, and the voluntary retirement of TOM ABERNETHY is a great loss to the Congress and to the Nation. We will miss his service here and his wise counsel.

TOM has always been able in debate in the traditions of Mississippi and the South. He is devoted to and has fought for constitutional government and a Nation ruled by law rather than by men.

As a senior member of the Committee on Agriculture, TOM had a guiding hand in every piece of legislation affecting rural America, which forms the stability and the foundation of our representative democracy. He quickly recognized the need to diversify the economy of rural America, and has taken the lead in rural renewal.

TOM has been greatly concerned too for the problems facing urban America and the Nation's Capital, and has worked far beyond the call of duty on the District of Columbia Committee, a committee that does not directly affect his own district. He has attempted to make it possible for the District to fulfill the role envisioned by the Founding Fathers as one of the world's greatest cities.

Genial and affable, admired and respected on the House floor and in committee, a defender of the House of Representatives' position as the greatest deliberative body and closest to the people, TOM ABERNETHY has been a Congressman's Congressman. His lovely wife Alice Margaret has been an outstanding

helpmate through political campaigns and service in Washington.

Millie joins me in wishing for TOM and his wonderful family continued success and every happiness in the future.

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE U.N.O. TO PRESERVE U.S. SOVEREIGNTY CONTINUES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has seen much debate and controversy over the continued role of the United States in the United Nations.

Some might point with pride to the congressional action cutting the U.S. contribution to the U.N. to $25 billion as a first step toward placing the U.N. in its proper perspective.

Unfortunately, this is not enough. The U.N. still exists; the United States is still a member of that body, and the internationalists—or one-worlders—continue to pirate the taxpayer's treasury and use the U.N. to subvert the sovereignty of the United States, thus threatening the lives of American citizens by destroying their ability to control their own destiny.

Two recent incidents emphasize the continued danger to the United States from the United Nations and U.N. regional organizations. First, the Atlantic Union Resolution passed the Senate of the United States by voice vote; this legislation was reported out of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and was the subject of a hearing before the Rules Committee. Fortunately, the Rules Committee refused to grant this legislation a rule, thus blocking it for this session.

The Atlantic Union Resolution proposed to set up a delegation to explore U.S. entry into a Federal union with the 14 other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—a regional branch of the United Nations.

Such a membership would reduce the United States to the pre-Revolutionary War status of a European state—if not a colony—in a confederation under the one word auspices of the United Nations. In fact, the resolution by its provision would attempt "to create an Atlantic Union within the framework of the United Nations" to "reduce the cost of the common defense, provide a stable currency for world trade, facilitate commerce of all kinds, enhance the welfare of the people of the member nations, and increase their capacity to aid the people of developing nations."

The other recent incident indicating that the internationalists continue to use the United Nations to subvert the sovereignty of the U.S. Government was the attempt to bring up the Genocide Treaty in the Senate under unanimous consent. Fortunately the distinguished Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN) objected, thus blocking this threat to the constitutionally secured liberties of the American people.

In my remarks of October 4, 1972—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 33814—I pointed out that the crime of genocide—which is not adequately defined by the treaty—will be supranational and thus will transcend our Constitution. A person charged with the crime of genocide, if he is a U.S. citizen, would not be protected by our precious Bill of Rights of the U.S. Constitution.

Furthermore, ratification of the Genocide Treaty would clearly annul the existing Connally reservation—which is the last remaining bulwark of protection of the individual American citizen from the collective actions of the United Nations and its related agencies

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 will be 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.

The American people can be thankful that the Congress did not approve the Atlantic Union Resolution and that the Senate did not ratify the Genocide Treaty. But the people cannot rest; the internationalists will certainly attempt to get these measures approved in the next Congress.

The Atlantic Union Resolution was first introduced in 1951—President Nixon, then a Senator, was one of the original co-sponsors.

The Genocide Treaty has been pending in the Senate since 1950. There is every reason to suspect that efforts will be made to ratify this Treaty during the next session. The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has gone on record—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 36298—asking his colleagues to "support early action on the Genocide Convention in the next Congress."

And so, Mr. Speaker, the battle to protect our constitutional system of government goes on. It is appropriate, then, to consider the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Langer, during the Senate debates on the ratification of the U.N. Charter. Senator Langer was one of two Senators to vote against ratification of this Charter. Certainly his prophecies have been fulfilled.

I include his remarks at this point in the RECORD:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 28, 1945]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, will the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive F, the United Nations Charter?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, during my service in the Senate in behalf of the common people, I have never sold the truth to serve the hour. I have no quarrel with the vote of any honest Senator upon this floor. Each one took the same oath that I took, namely, to defend and uphold the Constitution of the United States of America.

Practically all Members of this body have indicated that they will vote for the charter. Under my oath, Mr. President, and under my conscience, I cannot so vote. If I did I would feel that I was betraying the hundreds of thousands who have died in this war for the United States, and the hundreds of thousands who have sacrificed their loved ones and their treasure. I would be willing to vote for the appropriation of the last dollar in the United States Treasury, and the last dollar that we could borrow if, by spending that money, we could eliminate war, which we all abhor and hate. I would unhesitantly vote for the Charter if I felt that it offered even the tiniest hope of a permanent peace. But, in spite of that, Mr. President, I feel from the bottom of my heart that the adoption of the Charter—and, make sure, we are going to implement it—will mean perpetuating war. I feel that it will mean the enslavement of millions of people from Poland to India, from Korea to Java, as well as people in many other places on this earth.

Mr. President, I feel that the adoption of the Charter will be one step more toward compulsory and military conscription, and all that which goes with war.

In my opinion, the charter is not at all similar to the Constitution of the United States which was adopted by the Original Colonies. I may say at this point that I agree with what the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] said earlier in the day, when he stated:

"Most important of all, the American Constitution went to great length to guarantee genuine equality to States entering into the Union. Neither Ben Franklin nor the other members of the Constitutional Convention would have tolerated a constitution by which two or three or five of the States were given a veto power over all of the rest."

Mr. President, I say to you and to the other Members of the Senate that, in my judgment, if the Charter had been in effect when the American Revolution took place, France and all other countries who came to help us would not have been able to come, and today we would still be a colony under the rule of England.

Mr. President, in my campaign for the senatorship 5 years ago I pledged to the fathers and mothers of North Dakota that I would never vote to send our boys away to be slaughtered upon the battlefields of Europe. I kept that pledge on this floor. I promised in that campaign to vote in the Senate to expend the last dollar, if necessary, in order to defend the Western Hemisphere. Again I say, Mr. President, that I kept that pledge to the people of North Dakota.

Having so pledged myself, and having been elected to my senatorship upon such pledge, and having been elected to create an organization to which we would give a promise, either express or implied, that it would have authority to send our boys all over the earth, I cannot support the Charter. I believe it is fraught with danger to the American people, and to American institutions. I further believe that when a candidate for office pledges himself by specific promises, those promises should be honored, regardless of the political consequences which may follow to the candidate who made them.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I reiterate that we ought not to vote on this Charter in the absence of our 11,000,000 fighting men and women. They are now away, and we do not know what their attitude will be upon their return, after having been to the four corners of the earth and after having fought upon the seven seas. We sit here, Mr. President, in our fine offices and upon this senatorial floor, blissfully ignorant of what those 11,000,000 veterans may be thinking. After all, they constitute the backbone of the common people of America. Certainly there is no reason for such a hurry to pass this Charter that some steps could not have been taken to have referred the matter to the people of the country, including the men and women in the armed forces, before the final vote

was taken upon it. As their representative here in the Senate, I cannot, I will not, God helping me, vote for a measure which I believe to be unlawful under our Constitution, a measure which, in my opinion, betrays the very people who sent us to the Senate as their representatives.

MILTON JOWERS: A LEGENDARY COACH

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the fastest growing universities in the State of Texas is southwest Texas State University located in San Marcos in my district.

Last Saturday, the many friends of Milton Jowers paused to honor their coach who has compiled a 35-year coaching record capped with a 587–146–3 win/lose skien, and more devoted friends and admirers than most people accomplish in two lifetimes.

Quoting from an article by George Breazeale published in the Austin American Statesman, the following seems to best describe the man:

The Jowers mystique came full circle, revealing two things about the man: His steadfast policy of treating every player alike, and his uncompromising, unflinching honesty.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the record of Milton Jowers, as I am very proud of what he has meant to so many young people over the years. I insert the following article by Mr. Breazeale:

SWT HONORS COACH—NO SOLITUDE FOR JOWERS

(By George Breazeale)

"This man sitting here," said the speaker, "kicked more tails, said more ugly things and deprived more people of their individual rights than just about anybody you could name."

That track record might have most people sitting alone, very much alone, in an old rocking chair. But Milton Jowers, about whom these words were spoken, had no solitude Saturday.

From far and near former high school and college athletes some calling Milton Jowers "coach" for more than 35 years, converged on San Marcos to convey their esteem to a remarkable man indeed.

They were present, almost 200 strong, as part of Coach Jowers Appreciation Day activities at Southwest Texas State, where the legend of the man blossomed to full flower. But links from a fabulous victory chain (587–146–3 lifetime coaching record in football and basketball) were all there.

Athletes who had played basketball for Jowers at Shiner High School, his basketball and football warriors at San Marcos High School in the years just before World War II, basketballers who toiled for him at Southwest Texas from 1946 through 1951 and SWTS footballers of two eras, 1951 through 1953 and 1961 through 1964, were all there, populating 10 tables at a Saturday noon barbecue.

Spokesmen from each era called up memories, humorous now in retrospect, but each one a revealing facet of a coaching personality whose genius perhaps lay in securing maximum effort and disciplined performance from the athletes who played for him.

And, as each tale unfolded, the Jowers mystique came full circle revealing two things about the man: his steadfast policy of treating every player alike, and his uncompromising, unflinching honesty.

When Milton Jowers arose to respond to the tributes, his boys learned quickly that almost a decade away from active coaching has changed him not a bit.

"If all of you came here today expecting me to tell you I'm sorry for all the times I chewed you out, you're going to be disappointed."

"But," he added, "I never once chewed any of you out that I didn't love. Now, if I chewed some of you out more than I did others it wasn't because I loved you more . . . it was because you fouled up more.

"But I do want you to know this. I appreciate your being here today much more than I can ever say."

Long ago, while his troops were still doing battle in football and basketball—and one ex-player said Saturday that a typical Jowers pre-game pep talk went, "you lose this one and I'll have your hide"—he presented his philosophy of the coach-athlete relationship.

"I had rather a player of mine respect me as a man and as a coach than like me personally, although I would hope I could get that same respect and be liked."

Saturday, his boys, many of them now coaches, gathered for the noon barbecue and again that night when Southwest Texas' footballers came from behind in the final minute for a 24–20 win over Stephen F. Austin, displayed their feelings about the coach-athlete bond.

His coaching record indicates Jowers' policy of "constructive criticism"—or "chewing out," if one foregoes euphemisms—rarely failed. And even when he returned to football coaching in 1961 after an eight-year layoff, he espoused his theories succinctly:

"The football player who gets out and hits and blocks and tackles has always won—and I don't think the atomic age is going to change that. As long as the boys I have will hit a lick, we'll get along."

They coexisted famously. By 1963, SWTS had a 10–0 record, the school's first unbeaten season in four decades, and had the Bobcats been invited to participate in the NAIA playoffs, might well have given Jowers a national small college football championship to accompany the NAIA basketball title won by his 1960 team.

Jowers coached Little All-Americans in both sports during his hitches at Southwest Texas—but one personnel theme was noted again and again: his ability to hone and polish diamond-in-the-rough prospects from small high schools into towering talents. Basketballers J. C. (Spider) Maze and Charles Sharp and footballer Jerry Cole were prime examples of athletes, perhaps not overly sophisticated when they came to Southwest Texas, who responded to this technique.

And indeed Jowers was not unaware that the player who realizes his talents are not fully developed is eminently coachable.

"He had me pretty well under control from the time I came to Southwest Texas because he knew where I was from," said Dale Johanson, who played his high school football at a tiny Class B way-station.

Jowers taught them honesty, too—as a hilarious story told Saturday indicated.

Some enterprising individual in the athletic dorm secured a 10-gallon metal drum of ice cream and was dispensing the nectar to the warriors—when in walked Jowers.

"Who brought this up here?" Jowers demanded.

"I did," one individual responded, reluctantly.

"Where did you get it?"

"Downtown."

"I mean where downtown?"

Jowers bored in.

"I found it."

"Where did you find it?"

A long pause.

"In the back of an ice cream truck," was the long delayed response.

That brought gales of laughter Saturday—but a man familiar with the story added the not-surprising postscript.

"He marched them downtown to where it came from and made them face up to the people. Anyone who knows him wouldn't expect him to do anything else," the man said.

Those who honored him Saturday know him well. And they would have been disappointed only if they had found his indomitable spirit diminished.

A LOOK AT THE RECORD

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as is my regular custom, I am sending the constituents of Ohio's 10th Congressional District an end-of-the-session newsletter reviewing the activities of the Congress and their congressional office. I take this opportunity to insert this report in the RECORD:

THE 92D CONGRESS: "A LOOK AT THE RECORD"

CONGRESSMAN MILLER HIGHLIGHTS HOUSE ACTION

The 92d Congress gets a mixed report card. While it attempted to address a broad range of domestic and international issues, it failed to deal substantively with many of the Administration's major proposals.

During the First Session of the 92d Congress, which met from January 21 to December 16, 1971, the Congress gave its approval to the President's economic stabilization program including a 3-year $15.7 billion tax reduction, terminated the SST program, created a 2-year public service jobs program, extended the draft to June, 1973, expanded the authority of the farm credit system, approved and sent to the states a constitutional amendment lowering the voting age to eighteen, expanded federal assistance to nursing and medical schools, and required adult welfare recipients to sign up for work or lose part of their benefits.

Shortly after reconvening on January 18 of this year, the Congress gave final approval to the Federal Election Campaign Act, a comprehensive measure designed to place limits on political campaign expenditures and require the disclosure of campaign contributors. Acting to marshal federal resources to combat the nation's drug problem, the Congress also voted to create a Special Action Office on Drug Abuse Prevention to coordinate all federal drug abuse programs and initiate new ones.

Forty years after it was first proposed, a Constitutional amendment guaranteeing equal rights for men and women was approved and sent to the states for ratification. In June, the Congress completed action on a massive higher education bill that extends all major aid-to-higher education programs, creates a new basic student financial aid grant program, and sets up direct financial assistance to colleges and universities.

Three years after President Nixon proposed his revenue sharing plan, the Congress cleared a five year, $30 billion program of direct aid to states and local governments for use in broad, high priority projects. In addition to the new monies available under revenue sharing, future growth and development in Southeastern Ohio will be greatly enhanced by the Rural Development Act which provides for a more comprehensive and

coordinated federal effort to improve the economy and living conditions in rural areas.

In respect to arms control, the Senate gave its approval to the ABM treaty between the U.S. and the Soviet Union freezing antiballistic missile system deployments, and both Houses cleared the President's interim agreement with the Soviets limiting offensive nuclear weapons.

The most significant environmental legislation which passed the Congress was a $24 billion water pollution control measure to help communities clean up our waters and restrict the discharge of industrial pollutants.

The second session will close with no action being taken on consumer warranties, welfare reform, pension plan protection, national health insurance, government reorganization, and legislation to limit the use of busing.

In summary, it was a busy two years; through September 30, 1972, 24,882 measures were introduced, 582 bills were enacted into law, 599 recorded votes were taken in the House and the proceedings of the Congress filled 60,051 pages in the Congressional Record.

DISTRICT DEVELOPMENTS

The economic outlook of Southeastern Ohio is considerably brighter as construction continues on the new $488 million Gavin Power Plant complex in Gallia and Meigs Counties. Essential to the anticipated growth of the area is an adequate water system. Last month approval was announced of a $2,370,000 grant from the Economic Development Administration (EDA) to the Leading Creek Conservancy District, for construction of a water distribution system for industrial, public and residential use. The EDA grant follows an earlier loan approval of $1 million from the Farmers Home Administration (FHA) and precedes an anticipated $1,121,000 subsequent FHA loan. Additional water system development was evidenced in Jackson County as local officials were advised of the approval of a $1,078,000 rural water loan from FHA.

In June, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) and the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) jointly announced the awarding of over $2 million in funds to the Ohio Valley Health Services Foundation, Athens, for establishment of a regionalized seven county emergency ambulance service pilot project. The health demonstration project—one of only five in the country—is designed to help alleviate the severe shortage of emergency ambulance service in rural areas.

Other health and medical projects in the news include: a $200,000 grant to Marietta Memorial Hospital for assistance in the construction of additional long-term care facilities; an $80,665 National Institutes of Health grant to Rio Grande College for a Medical Laboratory Technician Program; a $395,000 ARC grant to assist in the construction of a satellite out-patient facility of Zanesville's Bethesda Hospital in Morgan County; and a $445,631 ARC grant for construction of a comprehensive Health Training Institute at Hocking Technical College, Nelsonville.

MILLER VOTING RECORD

Some of the important issues acted upon during the second session of the 92nd Congress are indicated below along with my vote on each bill:

S. 382—Election Campaign Reform—to set limitations on the amount of money candidates may spend in campaigns for federal office.—Yes.

H.R. 12089—To establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse prevention to coordinate federal drug abuse prevention programs.—Yes.

H.R. 12910—To increase the national debt limit to $450 billion through June 30, 1972.—No.

H.R. 12067—To appropriate $3.189 billion for foreign aid in fiscal year 1972.—No.

H.R. 11021—Noise Control Act—to require federal noise emission standards for various commercial products.—Yes.

H.R. 12828—To raise the educational, vocational rehabilitation and special training allowances for veterans.—Yes.

H.R. 11624—To increase from $3 million to $5 million the authorization for TRANSPO—an international transportation exposition.—No.

H.R. 8395—To expand and extend programs to rehabilitate the physically and mentally disabled.—Yes.

H.R. 11896—Water Pollution Control Act—to set up an accelerated federal water pollution control program and build local waste treatment plants.—Yes.

H.R. 14070—To authorize $3.4 billion for the space program in fiscal year 1973.—No.

H.R. 13089—Providing for acceleration of tree planting programs on national forest lands in need of reforestation.—Yes.

H.R. 9212—To ease restrictions for exminers to qualify for black lung benefits and extend benefits to more dependents of deceased victims.—Yes.

H.R. 11627—To provide federal standards requiring auto bumpers to withstand low speed collisions and set up a consumer information program on auto repair costs.—Yes.

S. 659—To extend and expand federal aid to higher education programs and student financial aid programs.—Yes.

H.R. 14370—Revenue sharing—authorizing direct federal payments to states and local governments for high priority projects.—Yes.

H.R. 15657—To amend and extend programs to provide health and social services for older Americans.—Yes.

H.R. 15390—To provide for a 20 percent across-the-board increase in social security benefits.—Yes.

H.R. 12931—Rural Development Act—to provide for improving the economy and living conditions in rural America.—Yes.

S. 748—To authorize a $900 million payment as the U.S. contribution to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank.—No.

H.R. 13915—Amendment to the Equal Education Oportunities Act barring the busing of a student to any school except the one nearest the student's home.—Yes.

H. J. Res. 1227—Resolution authorizing the President to approve the interim SALT agreement, limiting offensive nuclear weapons between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.—Yes.

H.R. 14896—To expand and strengthen child nutrition programs.—Yes.

H.R. 15003—To create a new, independent commission to regulate consumer products in order to reduce or prevent product-related injuries.—Yes.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Congressman Miller played a key legislative role in gaining approval of perhaps the most complex and far-reaching environmental measure ever considered by the Congress. The bill—the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972—authorizes more than $24 billion to help states and local communities clean up the nation's waterways, requires the application of advanced municipal waste disposal methods, and establishes a two-phase clean-up program with increasingly more stringent restrictions on industrial pollution. The Tenth District lawmaker was one of nine House members assigned to meet with their Senate counterparts in a joint conference committee to resolve the differences between the House and Senate passed measures.

MILLER BILLS INTRODUCED

Streambank Erosion

H.R. 14681—To authorize the Secretary of the Army to investigate, plan and construct projects for the control of steambank erosion.

Economic Development

H.R. 16040—To provide federal assistance to economically distressed areas in developing long-lasting economic improvement.

Holiday Observance

H.R. 13456—To restore November 11th as Veterans Day and May 30th as Memorial Day.

Highway Safety

H.R. 13538—Authorizes an $850 million annual program for highway safety improvements, education, and research. Major components of this bill have been incorporated into the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1972.

Dam Inspection

H.R. 15977—To authorize the Secretary of the Army to undertake a national program of inspection of publicly and privately owned dams.

Budget Reform

H.R. 15509—To reestablish the Congressional role in developing budget priorities and modernizing the mechanics of Congress to deal with fiscal policies in a systematic and analytical manner.

Federal Spending

H.R. 16305—To place a $250 billion ceiling on expenditures in FY 1973.

Cancer Conquest

H.R. 10609—To establish a Conquest of Cancer Agency within the National Institutes of Health to carry out an expanded, intensified, and coordinated cancer research program.

DISTRICT ACTIVITIES

Highlight of our fair display was a public opinion poll on current issues of national interest. Results of the poll have been released to the news media on a county-by-county basis. Here is a compilation of results of the poll based on answers from the 12 Fairs held to date. We would like to take this opportunity to thank the approximately 6,000 persons who took the time to provide us with their views.

(answers in percent)

Do you favor a no-fault automobile insurance program? Yes, 75; no, 25.

Should the sale or transfer of handguns other than those suitable for sporting purposes be prohibited? Yes, 41; no, 59.

Would you favor a national tax in the form of a "value added tax" to relieve the burden of local property taxes? Yes, 49; no, 51.

Should the Federal Government intervene in prolonged strikes which adversely affect the public interest? Yes, 73; no, 27.

Should the U.S. Foreign Aid Program be: Increased, 5; decreased, 81; remain the same, 14.

Do you approve of the recent agreements between the U.S. and the Soviet Union to limit offensive and defensive weapons? Yes, 71; no, 29.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM M. COLMER

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I offer these few farewell words to a great Congressman and chairman of the Rules Committee. His legislative record clearly reveals him to have been a gifted congressional leader who expended every ounce of his extraordinary talents and diligence in honorably serving his country and constituents.

Mr. COLMER has commanded my utmost respect and has set an example

which I have strived to emulate. He possesses integrity, personal independence, and a strong desire to help others and has always demonstrated professional competence in every endeavor he has undertaken. His work deserves the plaudits of the Nation and we in the House express our appreciation for his untiring efforts in every field.

A TRIBUTE TO MR. EDMOND McGOWAN, JR.

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, last week, National Fire Prevention Week, was a week to work to prevent fires and to honor those who protect us from fire.

As a legislator from a rural district, I am especially aware of the self-sacrifice and dedication of volunteer firefighters who exemplify community service and spirit.

Recently, two residents of North Stonington, Conn., wrote to tell me of the efforts of one young volunteer in their local fire department. At age 18, Edmond McGowan, Jr., has contributed more to his community than many people do in a lifetime.

When he was 16 he recognized the urgent need for an emergency ambulance service for his town. He began an intense campaign to organize and finance the service and is recognized today as the person responsible for the founding of the North Stonington Ambulance Service.

I am inserting into the RECORD, the two letters explaining his effort and wish to join in the praise of Ed McGowan, Jr., for his work in Stonington:

DEAR MR. STEELE: Edmond McGowan, Jr., is as public spirited a young man as any parent could ever hope to have, and of which any town could be proud.

For a number of years he has personally been a tremendous help to me while I was the Fire Chief of the North Stonington Volunteer Fire Co., Inc. (1956 thru 1970).

At the age of 13 he would come to the Fire Station looking for things to do. I would give him the tasks of sweeping floors, washing and waxing floors, mowing and trimming the grass, which he would do without question and always with the greatest enthusiasm.

As he got older, more meaningful jobs were in order, such as polishing the fire and rescue trucks, small repair and paint jobs around the station, and always looking forward to the day when he would be 16 and could become a Jr. member of the Department.

On his 16th birthday he joined the department, which I know was a proud day in his life and went about being a real active member. The unit men bought him a full dress uniform so he could attend parades and musters. Still always willing to do anything to make it a better "outfit."

One of his pet expressions throughout the years, and still is today, is "we have a sharp looking outfit Chief."

Edmond and I talked many times throughout the years about an ambulance for the Town of North Stonington, as we were working around the station. At the age of 16 the urge was so intense that he began a campaign to start an ambulance unit for the town. People were approached, meetings started, money raised, and this dream became a reality. Today he is named the "Founder."

Even today, though I feel his first love is the ambulance unit, he still finds time to be an active fireman, responding to alarms, and helping the present Chief in any way he can.

His devotion to any task is always 100% until it is complete, and at the age of 18, he has given more time, more effort, to more endeavors, than any young man I have ever known.

Respectfully,

RICHARD H. SENIOR, *Past Chief.*

DEAR MR. STEELE: While working with the Rescue Unit of the Fire Company, Edmond McGowan, Jr., saw how much the town needed an ambulance service. He went door to door asking people of the town to help him start an ambulance service. So, at the age of sixteen, Edmond was named Founder of the North Stonington Ambulance Service. He served as Vice President for one year. Again he put many hours in collecting funds, purchasing an ambulance and training people for this service. He has made about 90% of the emergency calls with the ambulance.

One year ago he was one of the instructors in the Corporation, in which now he serves as Captain to the unit. Also he is a First Aid Instructor and volunteers many hours in teaching this not only in North Stonington but in neighhboring towns. Edmond will always help whenever called upon.

Signed ROY S. LEE.

HON. ELIZABETH ANDREWS

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the lovely and gracious lady from Alabama, ELIZABETH ANDREWS, as the 92d Congress draws near a close. I am sorry I could not be present on the floor of the House to deliver my remarks personally.

In the short period she has served as a Member of this body—completing the term of her late husband and our distinguished former colleague and friend, George Andrews—she has served with dignity and distinction and has continued the record of service to Alabama begun by her late husband 28 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Alabama radiates a quiet dignity in this Chamber. We will miss having her in the Congress next year to represent our State, but I trust all of her future endeavors will be fruitful. I am sure my comments echo the sentiments of all Members of the House.

SENIOR CITIZENS: NOT FORGOTTEN

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the following is informational material I am sending to my constituents in my congressional district. I thought the subject matter would be of interest to my colleagues:

SENIOR CITIZENS: NOT FORGOTTEN

On October 1, 1972, Senior Citizens in our District will receive their first Social Security benefit checks reflecting the 20 percent increase passed by Congress and signed into law by the President.

The law which authorized this 20 percent increase, and which I sponsored and strongly supported, also places future benefit increases on an automatic cost of living basis, which will mean that for the first time our Senior Citizens will not have their benefits lag behind inflationary increases as they wait for Congress to act.

With the October 1st, 20 percent increase, I am pleased to note that since 1969, Social Security benefits have risen a full 51 percent. I am also pleased that during my four years in Congress I have been deeply involved in the fight to move our older citizens from the position of forgotten Americans to their rightful place of respect and independence.

Although from the time I first took office it was clear that the basic problem facing our 25 million Senior Citizens was one of income, it was also clear that the problems of aging did not stop there. It is for this reason that I sponsored legislation to implement the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide one hot meal a day for citizens in need who are 60 or over. I am happy to report that this legislation passed both the House and Senate and has now been signed into law. It will be implemented as soon as funds for the program have been appropriated.

Another area of deep concern to me has been the cost of drugs to our Senior Citizens. As so many of our older Americans depend on maintenance drugs for life and health, I introduced legislation which would place the majority of this drug cost under Medicare insurance. Under this plan, a Senior Citizen needing drugs would pay $1.00 per prescription with Medicare paying the remainder. Although this legislation is pending in Committee in the House, I am pleased to report that a similar proposal has been approved by the Senate Finance Committee, so that we can expect positive action on the cost of prescription drugs for the elderly in the near future.

These positive steps do not mean that the fight for decency and equality for our older citizens has been won. It does mean though, that they are no longer forgotten.

In a bid to more accurately focus Congressional and national attention on the problems peculiar to aging, I am pushing for passage of my bill (H. Res. 158) to create a Select Committee on the Aging in the House of Representatives to handle all legislation dealing with Senior Citizens.

FISH ACTS FOR OLDER AMERICANS

91ST CONGRESS

Bill No.—Description—Status

H.R. 11246, to provide automatic cost of living increases in Social Security benefits; Passed House in 91st (became law in 92nd).

H.R. 12222, to extend the Food Stamp Act of 1964; Public Law 91–671.

H.R. 14239, to increase Social Security benefits by 15 percent; Public Law 91–172.

92D CONGRESS

H.R. 4244, to extend Medicare coverage to out-of-hospital prescription drugs; In Committee.

H.R. 5971, to liberalize widows' benefits under Social Security; Passed House (in Senate).

H.R. 7579, to provide automatic cost of living increases in Social Security benefits; Public Law 92–336.

H.R. 7580, to increase amount of allowable earnings before loss of Social Security ben-

efits from $1,680 to $2,400; Compromise of $2,000 passed House (in Senate).

H.R. 8079, to provide tax deductions for expenditures on home repairs; In Committee.

H.R. 12166, to provide real property tax credit for Senior Citizens; In Committee.

H.R. 12719, to amend and extend Older Americans Act of 1965, providing hot meals for the elderly; Public Law 92-258.

H.R. 14607, to establish an Older Americans Conservation Corps, providing work and income for the elderly; In Committee.

H.R. 15366, to provide a 20-percent Social Security benefits increase; Public Law 92-336.

H.R. 15894, to provide a 20-percent Railroad Retirement increase to match the Social Security increase; Passed House (in Senate).

H.R. 16206, to prevent loss of Veterans compensation and pension benefits as result of 20 percent Social Security increase; In Committee.

House Res. 158, to create a Select Committee on Aging in House of Representatives; In Committee.

House Res. 1033, to authorize a Senior Citizens intern program by House of Representatives; In Committee.

Congress Acts To Provide Hot Meals

When Congress this year enacted legislation authorizing $100 million in Fiscal Year 1973 and $150 million in FY 1974 to provide one hot meal a day for older Americans over 60, it was the first meaningful implementation of the right of every resident to adequate nutrition, as specified in the Older Americans Act of 1965.

Although this positive program is now law, it has not yet been implemented pending appropriation of the funds by Congress. I anticipate this funding will occur later this fall, with the program in full swing by early next year.

Although these 5 day a week free hot meals will be targeted primarily toward those of 60 and over who are living below the poverty level, income is not the only criterion for eligibility under the program.

Other elderly who will be eligible are 1) those who lack the skills to select and prepare nourishing and well balanced meals, 2) those with limited mobility which impairs their capacity to shop and cook for themselves, and 3) those with feelings of rejection and loneliness which rob them of the incentive to prepare and eat meals alone.

To implement this program New York State will receive $9.3 million the first year and $13.6 million the second. The amount of these funds is based upon the percentage of persons over 60 living within the state.

The program will be administered by the New York Office of Aging, which is already gearing up to handle this new program, so that they will be able to implement it rapidly when funding is provided.

According to the State Office of Aging, it is believed school cafeterias will be used for preparation of meals in certain instances. This has been made possible through a law passed by the state legislature in 1972.

Although no definite plans have been developed at this time on how Senior Citizens will be directly informed when the program is implemented, it is believed that Social Security mailings may be used to reach the elderly, as was recently done for operation FIND.

To implement the program, full use will be made of the Department of Agriculture's Food and Nutrition Service, to insure that meals will be nourishing. Although centers will be created where Senior Citizens can gather for their meal, some meals will be home delivered and for those Senior Citizens living too far from the central sites to walk, transportation will be provided.

This is a good program, and is one of the most important steps taken to date to implement the Older Americans Act declaration that every Senior Citizen receive an adequate and wholesome diet. I am proud to have been a sponsor of this important piece of legislation, and to have worked hard for its passage.

In the Future

In July the House passed a bill to amend and expand the Older Americans Act which is now under consideration in the Senate, and stands an excellent possibility of becoming law. This legislation provides some important features for Senior Citizens.

Among other things it: 1) extends and expands federal grants for programs to assist the elderly authorized under the Older Americans Act of 1965; 2) creates a National Advisory Council on Aging; 3) seeks to encourage state agencies on aging through federal grant programs to develop comprehensive, coordinated, community based services for the elderly; and 4) provides for special demonstration projects in transportation, housing employment, pre-retirement guidance and continuing education for the elderly.

Perhaps We Can Help

Because of the growing complexity of our lives, every day I receive dozens of letters from constituents asking for help in dealing with some Federal agency. Many of these, some from Senior Citizens who have found, through no fault of their own, that there has been some mix up or other difficulty with their Social Security records

For example, a constituent had a claim for disability benefits under Social Security which was not being moved. After intervention on his behalf by my office, he received a check from the Social Security Administration in the amount of $1,700.

In another instance a recently retired worker felt an error had been made in computation of his Social Security benefits payments. After a review of his files which I requested, it was found he was correct and his monthly check was raised from $152.70 to $177.40 less Medicare payments.

If you feel at any time that I can be of similar assistance to you, please write me in Washington and I will take up the problem in your behalf. To assist me in this I have an expert staff and we are all anxious to be of assistance when and if it is needed.

Food and Housing Help for Elderly

Older citizens who live in rural areas may be eligible for a loan to build or buy an adequate but modest home. The Farmers Home Administration has programs which can lower interest rates to as low as 1 percent.

The Farmers Home Administration also has a loan program designed for low-income rural families who own their homes to make repairs to remove hazards to health and safety. The loans can be used to fix a roof, make the house weathertight, provide safe adequate water and waste disposal systems, install a bath or make other improvements. These loans also bear an interest rate of 1 percent.

Many individuals over 65 do not know about the Food Stamp Program which enables low-income households to buy more food of greater variety to improve their diets, at a lower price. Here's a short guide that tells who can get food stamps.

	With monthly income below	You pay	For food stamps worth
1 person	$178	$26	$36
2 persons	233	44	64
3 persons	307	74	92

People with income above these limits also may be eligible for food stamps if they have unusual expenses such as big medical or hospital bills, high rent payments, or other financial hardships.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development also has a program to assist Senior Citizens on fixed incomes who wish to own their own homes by paying part of the interest cost, thereby lowering the monthly mortgage payments. I am introducing legislation to expand and liberalize this program.

LEGISLATIVE REPORT FOR FIREFIGHTERS

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the 92d Congress I introduced a comprehensive series of bills designed to halt the steady increase in annual death and property losses caused by fire in America. This omnibus fire legislation will provide our country's fire service with urgently needed financial assistance, and provide improved equipment and expanded educational and training opportunities for the men who risk their lives daily to protect the public from the devastating effects of fire.

This year, for the first time, the Presidential proclamation for Fire Prevention Week noted the "need for improved public information, for early detection and alarm, and for better protective equipment for firefighters."

The bills which I have introduced have been endorsed by individuals and organizations from across the Nation as a practical and urgently needed step toward reducing our country's grave fire problem which endangers every man, woman and child. The 157,000-member International Association of Fire Fighters, the AFL-CIO, as well as individual volunteer fire companies support this legislative program. It has been cited by the President's Commission on Fire Prevention and Control and, most recently, Chief Kenney, as president of the International Association of Fire Chiefs, spoke in favor on the legislation.

Fire knows no social or geographical boundaries, but has intruded on the lives of countless individuals in every State, county, and district. In fact, the United States experiences a per capita death rate from fire that is twice that of Canada, four times that of Great Britain, and six and a half times that of Japan.

Following is a list of my bills:

List of Bills

H.R. 16856. Amends the Hazardous Materials Transportation Control Act of 1970 to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations providing for the placarding of certain vehicles transporting hazardous materials in interstate and foreign commerce.

H.R. 16857. Amends the Flammable Fabrics Act to extend the provisions of that Act to construction materials used in the interiors of homes, offices, and other places of assembly or accommodation, and to authorize the establishment of toxicity standards.

H.R. 16858. Provides financial aid for local fire departments in the purchase of fire-

fighting suits and self-contained breathing apparatus.

H.R. 16859. Establishes a National Fire Data and Information Clearinghouse.

H.R. 16860. Extends for 3 years the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to carry out fire research and safety programs.

H.R. 16861. Provides for the creation of the National Fire Academy.

H.R. 16862. Provides the Secretary of Commerce with the authority to make grants to States, counties, and local communities to pay for up to one-half of the costs of training programs for firemen.

H.R. 16863. Provides financial aid to local fire departments in the purchase of advanced firefighting equipment.

H.R. 16864. Provides the Secretary of Commerce with the authority to make grants to accredited institutions of higher education to pay up to one-half of the costs of fire science programs.

SENATOR B. EVERETT JORDAN

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Senator EVERETT JORDAN of North Carolina has for the past 14 years been a friend and colleague you could depend on. We have worked with him closely in the effort to preserve jobs in the American textile industry, an area of tremendous concern to the Senator. In conference with the Senate Public Works Committee, the Senator was extremely effective in advancing the Senate position; but he always maintained the patience and tact that made it a pleasure to work with him.

Senator JORDAN is a true gentleman, in the highest traditions of our Southland, and man of unquestioned integrity and honesty. He has the affection and admiration of people all over South Carolina. Mrs. Dorn, herself a Tarheel, joins me in wishing for Senator JORDAN continued success, every happiness and the best always.

COLUMBIAN FOUNDATION HONORS FORTUNE POPE

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to offer my warmest congratulations to my close friend Fortune R. Pope upon his receipt of the 1972 Columbian Foundation Man of the Year Award. In selecting Mr. Pope this year, the Columbian Foundation chose a man whose feelings and actions have carried forth his strong commitment and deep conviction that one should cherish and protect the rights of all men.

In an age characterized by an over abundance of specialization and personal encapsulation, it is indeed refreshing to find a man who truly personifies the eclectic philosophy: An industrialist, publisher, academician, and philanthropist, Fortune has crossed philosophical as well as national boundaries in his endeavors to bring meaningful change within the human community.

Among his multifarious positions, Mr. Pope is editor and publisher of the largest Italo-American newspaper in the Nation, Il Progresso. He is the president of Colonial Sand Co., Inc., as well as president of radio station WHOM and WHOM–FM. In education he has supervised the distribution of more than $1 million in scholarships to needy and deserving high school seniors in both public and parochial schools in the New York Metropolitan area. He serves, too, as a trustee of Saint Peter's College in Jersey City.

In honoring Mr. Pope on October 6, it was noted that he "has shown particular concern for those who have been victims of capricious fate, in the form of natural disasters." Fortune has led various successful campaigns to aid the people of Italy struck by the Po Valley floods, the Calabria-Salerno and Florence floods, and the earthquake which jolted Sicily. He has also lent his support to the extensive efforts to help the flood victims in Puerto Rico. In the United States, the Pope Foundation has contributed millions of dollars to such fields as education, health, welfare, and religion.

For those of us who have known Fortune Pope as a leader and a friend, his unending accomplishments are no surprise. He typifies and embodies the characteristics of a socratic humility and a herculean strength. He is content with the personal satisfaction that he has helped his fellow man, but I am pleased to have this opportunity to share his achievements and deeds with you at this time. His recognition as "Man of the Year" is certainly well deserved, and our gratitude and commendations are long overdue.

On the evening of October 6, 1972, remarks were made by many of Fortune Pope's friends expressing their sentiments on the appropriateness of bestowing this honor to Mr. Pope. Speaking that evening and presenting the award for the Columbian Foundation was its president, Frank R. Galante. Introducing Fortune Pope and depicting the feelings of his many friends was Frank A. Langella, member of the board of trustees of the Columbian Foundation. At this point I would like to insert in the RECORD the comments that Mr. Langella made that evening:

REMARKS HONORING FORTUNE R. POPE

(By Frank A. Langella)

Ladies and gentlemen, tonight, perhaps more than any other night, I think it's fair to say that "The children of Columbus are still building America."

And when you consider the total man who is Fortune R. Pope, I believe you will have to agree, Fortune *is one* of "The children of Columbus who is still building America."

I know many of you are aware of this, but let me just say for the record that the Pope family, in our estimation, is one of the leading, and most respected, Italian-American families in this Nation. And yet, they are very modest . . . or, as a friend said, they're embarrassed by too much fanfare. It's true. They are more interested in making things happen.

Take Fortune's father, Generoso, for example . . . and the story of how he bought Il Progresso. He had heard that the paper was bankrupt, and up for sale at an auction. He also found out that a group of investors was planning to buy it. Generoso rushed downtown . . . not because he was excited about getting involved in a bankrupt newspaper, but because he did not want the other group to take control of it. And without having the time to inspect the plant that he was going to try and buy, he went to the auction and got into a bidding contest.

The bidding went back and forth, higher and higher, and finally reached two million dollars. At that point Generoso decided to get it over with, so he yelled out "two-million five."

The other bidder shrugged his shoulders, and Generoso won. But when he went up to sign the papers, he found out that the auctioneer had written in two million *five thousand* dollars. So when Generoso got home that night, he said to the family . . . "Guess what? Today I saved four hundred and ninety-five thousand dollars!" Buying that newspaper was probably the greatest thing he could've done as far as Fortune is concerned.

They tell me that Fortune has ink in his veins. And that he knows the newspaper operation inside and out, down to the last detail. It must be good for business. Today, under Fortune's leadership, as editor and publisher, Il Progresso is the largest and most influential Italian-American newspaper in the country. As I said before, the children of Columbus are still building America.

This tremendous interest in knowing every detail is a deep characteristic of the Pope family. They're executives, but you'll never see them glued to a desk chair. They're always on the move . . . staying close to all their enterprises. Take Colonial Sand and Stone Company, for example. Fortune or his brother Tony is up at six a.m. with the drivers every morning checking things over. . . . knowing every detail of what's going on. And with six-hundred trucks in three states, that's quite a trick. But they have a good system for staying on top of everything. Every car, every major office, every truck, tugboat, barge and every helicopter in the organization is equipped with a mobile radio unit. And if you go into Fortune's office, you'll hear the radio network going all the time . . . so Fortune hears everything that's going on—the office orders, the drivers on the road, everything. Colonial is an enterprise that Fortune and his brother Anthony expanded into New Jersey in 1950 . . . and today it is the biggest sand and stone company in the country.

May I say again, that the children of Columbus are still building America.

Believe me, it was not easy for this New York outfit to get started in New Jersey, but they finally did break the ice, and to this day they have been loyal to the contractor who gave Colonial its first job in New Jersey. Once, in fact, this contractor couldn't get sand fast enough to complete a huge job. He was in trouble.

The only sand available was way up in Sussex County. So the Pope family pulled their trucks in from jobs in Connecticut and New York and kept a steady convoy going back and forth, day and night, until the job was done. And they charged him as if they had gotten the sand locally.

By the way, none of this information about the Pope family came from Fortune. Trying to get a story or personal information out of him is as easy as pulling out your own wisdom tooth.

Fortune is a very loyal man. There is no doubt about it. And he expects loyalty in return. Boy, does he expect loyalty!

I remember one time when he was organizing a committee to help flood victims in

Italy. He wanted some participation from New Jersey, so he invited me over to New York for the first meeting.

Unfortunately, I was sick that particular evening. Fortune called me on the phone and said, "What are you doing home, Frank, I need you for this committee meeting tonight. I said, "I'm in bed with a temperature and an attack of the Gout."

He said, "So, call Doctor Eddie Albano and get a shot or something, and I'll send a driver over to pick you up." I said, "O.K., but my temperature is up to 104 degrees." And he said, "Oh, for Pete's sake, why didn't you say so—in that case we'll have you picked up in an ambulance."

This feeling of civic responsibility is a very strong characteristic in Fortune. And he has also been very quick to respond to help victims of natural disasters, both here and abroad.

The Pope Foundation itself has contributed several million dollars to institutions in the field of education, health, religion, and welfare. And, especially important, there is no ethnic, racial, or religious limitation.

I know that much of this information is in your program, but let me just cite a few interesting facts. As president and owner of radio station W.H.O.M., Fortune has been a leader in campaigns for Spanish-speaking people. These campaigns have included aid to flood victims in Puerto Rico and the distribution of toys at Christmastime.

W.H.O.M. is also well known for broadcasting the most beautiful music this side of heaven, especially on Sunday mornings, at 92.3 on your F.M. dial. As publisher and owner of Il Progresso, he's also been a leader in fund raising campaigns in Italy. Campaigns that now total well over a million dollars.

The Government of Italy will never forget what he has done. In fact, the highest of Italian honors has been conferred upon him by presidents, prime ministers, and cardinals alike.

Eighteen years ago, Fortune and the Columbus civic committee began a scholarship program for needy and deserving high school students in the New York Metropolitan area. And while he was president, the committee awarded 1.1 million dollars in scholarships to 4,800 students.

I could go on and on about Fortune Pope. But I think you will all understand now why the Columbian Foundation chose him for its annual achievement award in 1972.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am very proud to present one of the children of Columbus who is still building America . . . Mr. Fortune R. Pope.

"DOC" HALL

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I join our colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, Dr. DURWARD HALL—the watchdog of the House.

I know of no more capable legislator, no one better informed about legislation that has come before the House. Too often—in the press of day-to-day business—we fall into the habit of relying on others for facts about bills under debate. This was never the case with "Doc" HALL; he always knew what was in the bill and never failed to object to provisions in the legislation which he felt were detrimental to the best interests of the American people.

It is fitting that we should pause here in the rush to adjourn and to consider the accomplishments of this man from Missouri. He was never one to yield to the pressures of expediency and always insisted on reason and deliberate speed. He took his job seriously and expected other Members to do likewise.

Words cannot express my gratitude for the honor of this friendship and for the privilege of having served with him. The Nation's debt to him is great. His character and attitude toward his job—everything about him—reflect what is truly great about America. It is the Nation's loss that he has chosen not to seek reelection at the end of this Congress. "Doc" has performed a yeoman's job for his people and our country.

Mrs. Rarick and I join with the people of the Sixth District of Louisiana in wishing "Doc" HALL the best of health and happiness during his every future endeavor.

HON. BILL RYAN

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, when the 93d Congress convenes next year, the New York delegation will be absent one of its most distinguished and beloved Members, Bill Ryan, who was lost to us through an untimely death at the peak of his career. Those of us who were privileged to know Bill had been enriched by his friendship. Millions of Americans who did not know him have benefited from his legislative accomplishments and his example of political and personal courage.

William Fitts Ryan's death was a tragedy not only for his family, but for those of us who knew him. Bill was a good friend and a trusted colleague, and his passing was a deep personal loss to me. But his courage, foresight, and vision of America were also an example and an inspiration for me.

For the 12 years he was a Member of the House, Bill Ryan was a politician who championed good causes long before they were popular causes. Bill's political opponents in the Congress sometimes doubted the validity of his positions, but they never doubted the sincerity of his convictions and the deep sense of morality which formed the basis for his concerns. Working with him created the greatest respect for the warmth, intelligence, and thoughtfulness of the man.

If ever there was a model Congressman, Bill Ryan was that person. He combined great courage of convictions with great foresight. Long before it was popular, he spoke of admitting the People's Republic of China to the United Nations; he voiced opposition to the tragic, senseless war in Vietnam and opposed the expensive arms race that saw the Defense Department stockpiling nuclear armaments far beyond reason or necessity. Throughout his career he fought against racism and for individual rights. Men of his caliber are rare and we should cherish them when they pass our way. It may be a long time before another as competent, as courageous, and as dedicated as Bill Ryan will grace this House.

Bill is gone—but his memory and his good works will remain to remind each of us of our solemn responsibilities and the things which are as yet undone.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 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?

THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Honorable THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, from the great State of Mississippi, who is retiring after serving with distinction in the House of Representatives since his election in 1942.

Representative ABERNETHY served on the committees on the District of Columbia and Agriculture, where he played a major role in the enactment of legislation so vital to the welfare of his State, the District of Columbia, and the Nation.

I want to thank Mr. ABERNETHY for his cooperation and assistance, and to commend him on a job well done. He will be missed by all of us who have been privileged to serve with him.

Mrs. Johnson joins me in wishing him a long, healthy, and happy retirement.

B. EVERETT JORDAN

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest gentlemen I have ever known, B.

EVERETT JORDAN, will be leaving the Senate this year, proudly concluding almost 15 years of dedicated service to the people of North Carolina and the Nation.

Senator JORDAN'S warm unassuming manner, his compassion for others, his smile, his hand always extended in friendship, his willingness to listen and go to bat for you, his wit, his Christian principles, his great love for his country, his State and his family, his honesty and his sense of fair play are qualities well known to those whose lives have been touched by this strong, remarkable man.

For more than 12 years, Mrs. Taylor and I have lived in the same Washington apartment building as the Jordans. EVERETT and his gracious wife Katherine have been among our closest personal friends. We have shared many experiences, joys, and disappointments. As Senator JORDAN leaves the Congress, the State of North Carolina will be losing the services of an able and conscientious legislator. Many of us will miss the day-to-day associations with a highly respected colleague.

Mrs. Taylor and I wish for EVERETT and Katherine continued good health, happiness, and much success during the years ahead. We shall always hold many pleasant memories of the two of them.

STATEMENT ON H.R. 16732

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Speaker, a famous Greek philosopher has written:

"Small opportunities are often the beginning of great enterprises.

I believe that quote really sums up the hopes and aspirations that many of us have for the limited SBIC program for it is the seed capital provided by a limited SBIC that provides a small enterprise a chance to survive and grow.

The limited SBIC program is an excellent example of what people working together can do to help others get a start, preserving at the same time the fundaments of the American free enterprise system. Private ownership and management and private initiative and risk are its foundation.

The Nation's business corporations, foundations, church groups, and other private investment sources must now help the limited SBICs meet the challenge of the 1970's by increasing their commitment—both in dollars and assistance. The promise of a good beginning must not be allowed to waste.

A recent study coordinated by Rutgers University Graduate School of Business found that 36 limited SBICs reporting results had:

First, evaluated some 10,000 business proposals, financing 422 disadvantaged business;

Second, under active consideration 300 proposals for limited SBICs investment of $9 million and investment from the other sources of $24 million;

Third, invested $7.6 million and generated $36-million in additional investment in minority businesses; and

Fourth, financed business owned by blacks, Spanish-speaking, Indians, Orientals, and disadvantaged whites which employ 5,500 persons—or a full time equivalent of 4,400 persons—and gross annual sales of $82 million.

These are deals that might otherwise have been lost. The results reflect what businessmen—minority and majority—accomplish working together.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly endorse H.R. 16732 and urge its adoption.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN EDWARD A. GARMATZ

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I bid a fond farewell to a dedicated public servant and outstanding chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, EDWARD A. GARMATZ. He contributed much to the maritime and fisheries industries and to the national welfare. He was instrumental in steering the landmark Merchant Marine Act of 1970 which guarantees a future for the American flag on the high seas of a troubled and competitive world through the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the House of Representatives.

His concern for our Nation's ecology has left a legacy to the Congress of the United States and to the people of Maryland which will never be forgotten. He is a gentleman of the highest caliber—a credit to his people in Maryland, and to his country. He has been a loyal Democrat who has given outstanding service to his party and his country for as long as I can remember and he deserves the warm praise and admiration of his fellow Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I join, along with my colleagues, in expressing farewell to a great American.

HON. JOHN H. TERRY

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1972

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my regret at the departure of our colleague and friend JACK TERRY.

The great State of New York has a well deserved reputation for legislative excellence based on the caliber of the men and women she sends to Congress. But even in this distinguished company JACK TERRY has stood out. The people of New York's 34th District have been fortunate to have this effective and experienced legislator represent them in the 92d congress.

I wish he were not leaving, but since he has decided to retire, Mrs. Veysey and I wish him Godspeed and the best of luck as he returns to the private practice of law.

TENTH BIENNIAL CONVENTION OF THE BYELORUSSIANS OF NORTH AMERICA

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, America itself is an excellent example of the importance the contributions of people of diverse cultural backgrounds can make to a nation. In recognition of this fact, and to once again express my concern and support for the ideal of freedom everywhere, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the recently held 10th biennial convention of Byelorussians of North America.

The Byelorussian-American Association along with its Canadian counterpart, the Byelorussian Canadian Alliance, convened this past September in Toronto, Canada. At this gathering it was resolved by all in attendance:

To encourage in Soviet Byelorussia manifest trends toward liberalization, extension of civil rights, and cultural freedom. . . . To preserve in our own midst, along with Canadian and American values, our Byelorussian heritage—language, history, traditions, and the concern for the well-being of the entire Byelorussian nation.

These, I suggest, are truly worthwhile concerns and I applaud the endeavors of this brave and courageous people.

Byelorussians everywhere have good cause to be proud of their heritage. For it is one which dates back a thousand years and has long been respected for its high level of civilization—a civilization which successfull synthesized Byzantine and Western European cultural and political influences. These Americans and Canadians of Byelorussian ancestory are justifiably concerned for the preservation of this rich heritage. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to theirs in expressing a continuing concern for justice and freedom.

"EMANUEL CELLER—THE DEAN OF THE HOUSE"

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, as the 92d Congress passes into history, the legislative career of one of our most distinguished Members comes to a close. After 50 years of historic service to his

constituents and to his country, MANNY CELLER is retiring from public office.

His career in Congress has been historic not only in terms of its length, but in terms of its achievements, as well. For half a century, MANNY CELLER has been one of Congress' and the Nation's most vigorous champions of equal justice and human rights. As chairman of the Judiciary, he has been a creative and prolific legislator—the author of hundreds of pieces of progressive legislation, including four constitutional amendments.

During moments of reflection, the typical Congressman wonders whether his or her efforts will advance, even negligibly, the public well-being. MANNY's only concern is whether history will properly acknowledge his role as the most accomplished legislator of his time.

I have been privileged to know MANNY for the past 10 years and to work closely with him on matters of interest to our New York constituencies. His knowledge of urban problems and the vigor with which he pursues even the most minor project, were often of great assistance to me in dealing with district matters.

I will miss this man who has been a friend to his colleagues and an adviser to Presidents. But mostly, the Nation will miss his dedication and leadership.

TV NEWS DEMAGOGUERY BY CBS AND GEORGE HERMAN

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I was watching the Cronkite CBS evening news tonight when a typical example of news reporting demagoguery blurted out of my desk set. Having grown accustomed to the subtle innuendo. I was shocked, even hardened as I have become to their managed news, to hear their welfare program assessment.

Their news team studied the defeat of the so-called welfare reform bill. Various participants—John Erlichman, Senators RIBICOFF and LONG and the President himself—were shown in news clips. In summary, George Herman stated that in the next session, Mr. Nixon would probably turn his back on the liberals and woe the conservatives with an even more repressive program.

Note that closely. Mr. Herman is one of the worst hatchet men on television. Some time ago I inserted in the RECORD the entire interview of Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN by Mr. Herman and his panel. It was sickening. They were sycophants at best in interviewing Senator MCGOVERN, dishonest at worst.

This is the way these types brainwash the American people. Mr. Herman is guilty of the worst kind of political demagoguery in injecting such a fantastic slur on conservatives. He paints the picture that the liberals want to help and the conservatives want, as he puts it, repressive welfare reform.

The American people want welfare reform. What the reasonable person might call tightening up, Mr. Herman obviously calls repressive. At least it should be known that he is at work, plying his trade on the unsuspecting television viewer. Mr. Cronkite does not fit in the Herman mold but, sadly enough, it was on his program that this atrocious political slander occurred.

TRIBUTE TO CHAIRMAN JOHN BLATNIK

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, as the 92d Congress draws to a close, I want to express my respect and admiration for one of the truly great Americans serving in the U.S. House of Representatives, Representative JOHN BLATNIK, chairman of the Committee on Public Works.

It was my good fortune to meet Representative BLATNIK 26 years ago when he first came to Congress. As a matter of fact, I had the pleasure of introducing Representative BLATNIK for the first speech he made in Washington just a few weeks after he assumed the sacred obligation as a Member of this body.

I admired Chairman BLATNIK and I am fortunate to consider him a true and loyal friend. Upon my election to the 89th Congress, I specifically requested to be assigned to the Committee on Public Works, at which time he was the No. 2 ranking majority member.

Over the years, I have thoroughly enjoyed the privilege and responsibility of serving on various subcommittees he has headed and, of course, the full committee on which he serves as chairman. He paid me the high honor of appointing me chairman of the Subcommittee on Conservation and Watershed Development, an assignment which I dearly cherish.

I will always be grateful to my very dear friend for assigning me to this position of trust.

As I have stated, I am grateful to be a Member of this body, following the dedicated service of my late father and mother. These past 8 years have been memorable as a result of working with our beloved chairman. He is an outstanding leader, a great organizer, and he has effectively demonstrated his dedication to the building of America.

Long a leader in the antipollution fight which he started 26 years ago, he was in fact a lone voice in the wilderness. He gave freely of himself to go that extra step, and his mission to alert the Nation to its water pollution problems has resulted in bill after bill being enacted into law. These bills have contributed significantly to help the residents of America fight this menace of water pollution.

Chairman BLATNIK's effective leadership excels in both Houses of Congress. His positive stature inspires those of us who serve on his committee to do our part in helping him fight his vital legislative battles.

In conclusion, our Nation should be grateful to have such an able leader protecting our interests in the legislative branch of our Government.

BERTIE COUNTY, N.C., CELEBRATES 250TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay special tribute to Bertie County, N.C., celebrating its 250th anniversary this month.

Bertie County just completed a special 2-week celebration of this milestone. Mr. Harry L. Thompson was chairman of the anniversary planning commission, and he, along with the hundreds of involved citizens in Bertie County, worked hard to make the celebration the success it was. I commend the Bertie County citizens for their appreciation of history and their interest in preserving their priceless heritage.

Bertie County was first established at a "General Biennial Assembly, held at Edenton, in Chowan Precinct, the Second Day of October, One Thousand Seven Hundred and Twenty-two and continued by several adjournments, the Nineteenth Day of the same Month. An Act appointing that part of Albemarle County lying on the West Side of Chowan River, to be a Precinct, by the name of Bertie Precinct." Bertie's history goes even further back, however.

Probably the first Europeans to explore the shoreline of Bertie were Englishmen, members of Sir Walter Raleigh's expedition which had come to Roanoke Island in 1585. And there were Indians present in Bertie even then who had dwelt there for centuries.

Within this county's boundaries was the home of the first permanent white settler, Nathaniel Batts. His home was built as early as 1655, for a price of 1,382 pounds of tobacco.

During the last 2 weeks, Bertie County's nine incorporated towns each had a day in which to celebrate with various events—including an art show, gospel and country and western music, a display of prehistoric Indian relics, special train trips, and the culmination of a 7½-year dream—the opening of Gov. David Stone's house—1808–10—completely restored.

Mr. John Tyler was chairman of the restoration project and commented:

> What has been so unique about this restoration is the fact it has had such wonderful support, not only locally but statewide, and so many people have been involved. I really feel it belongs to the people—it has been a grass roots restoration, but at the same time it has attracted so much interest from foundations and from the state.

I think the people of Bertie County deserve special credit for drawing attention to this priceless estate and seeing to it that neither time decaying it nor "progress" destroying it would defeat them in their efforts to preserve it.

My congratulations to the citizens of Bertie County. Bertie County's past is the sturdy foundation upon which her future will be built, and I would say the folks in Bertie have quite a successful future in store for them.

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, among the many Members who are retiring, there is one who has been particularly close to me for many years. I refer to my good friend and respected colleague from New York, ALEXANDER PIRNIE.

AL embodies all the qualities and talents that are essential to the makeup of an effective legislator. He has been an effective and responsive member of the House Armed Services Committee. At all times he has been devoted to the public interest, serving his district, State, and country well and faithfully.

However, I feel that AL should be especially commended for his services to the Interparliamentary Union Conference. He served as chairman of the IPU from 1965 to 1968 and was eminently well qualified to serve in this position. I can attest to the years of hardwork and leadership that he provided to the IPU, as well as being an active and effective spokesman for that organization.

I join the Members of the House who wish AL well in his retirement, and I am looking forward to continuing our friendship.

WHY 18-YEAR-OLDS SHOULD VOTE

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of discussion these days about the extension of the franchise to 18-year-old Americans. An essay entered by Wendy Beale of Waterford, N.Y., in the national contest of the Italian American War Veterans is one of the best analyses of the question that I have seen. I herewith share it with my colleagues:

WHY 18-YEAR-OLDS SHOULD VOTE

(By Wendy Beale)

"A life spent worthily should be measured by nobler lines—by deeds, not years."—Sheridan.

As soon as I read this statement, I realized how accurately it expressed my attitude concerning lowering the voting age to eighteen. Granted, time reaps from us a certain amount of maturity from the harvest of experience and age, but utilizing age as a yard stick as an estimate of maturity is a deceiving and specious situation.

It is generally accepted that today's youth are better educated than their predecessors. As a result of the abundance and availability of the mass media which efficiently covers the current happenings in the world, we have an exceptionally well informed generation. Television alone delivers to millions of doorsteps the crucial events and issues of the day. Many of our youth between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one are college students who are in contact with intellectual study and observations daily. What better equipped citizen exists than one who is involved in the stimulating and inspirational pursuit of knowledge?

Numerous adults appear to be less than interested in the world, and are more anxious about their next car payment or mortgage. My purpose here is not to disparage adults, but denote that where adults are often concerned about their families or acquaintances, young people can afford to care about mankind as a whole. Although youth may be somewhat inexperienced, their idealism and resilience are a definite advantage. They are rarely apathetic.

Another important aspect of this situation is frustration. The source of campus demonstrations and riots seems to be disconcerted frustration. These young adults need a role in electing our leaders who formulate the policies which shape their lives. By granting them the right to participate in determining their future, we are offering them the opportunity to seek reform and improvement within our existing democratic system.

The idealism, energy, and vitality of our youth are sorely needed in our political system. I am confident that democracy is unsurpassed by any other political system, and I am convinced that the eighteen to twenty-one year olds can contribute to it with their knowledge and responsibility this amazing era has bestowed upon them. Sincere idealism and a fervent capacity to get involved are integral ingredients in the recipe for a future democracy more resplendent and effective than we have ever known.

POLAND COMES A LONG WAY

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the story of Poland's resurrection out of the ashes of World War II is a moving account of a brave and determined people.

Unfortunately, that story is too little known—or appreciated. It was, therefore, gratifying to read in the Washington Evening Star-Daily News of October 15 the excellent and stirring report of Mr. Jack Schnedler.

As Mr. Schnedler says so well, after reading this story no one should ever again laugh at so-called Polish jokes.

The article follows:

FROM ASHES OF 1945: POLAND COMES A LONG WAY

(By Jack Schnedler)

OSWIECIM, POLAND.—In Germany, this was Auschwitz, where the Nazis exterminated 4 million human beings. The two prolific death camps of Auschwitz and Birkenau here are now museums, in which it is possible to see an entire roomful of hair shorn from victims and another laden with clothing of small children who were sent to the gas chambers.

Auschwitz is a truly terrible place to visit, but is part of a remarkable story that the traveler in Poland finds himself piecing together with wonderment.

The Poles have rebuilt their country from the ashes of 1945 in a way that is one of the most inspiring sagas an American will come across in Europe. Marcia and I spent nine days camping in Warsaw and Cracow and the Tatra Mountains, and we left vowing never again to laugh at a Polish joke.

Most of the story of Poland's rebirth can be seen in the capital city of Warsaw. Two-thirds of Warsaw's prewar population of 1.3 million died under the Nazis, and only 200 of its 500,000 Jews survived the holocaust. The city was 85 percent destroyed and its historic sections were entirely flattened. A moving film of the systematic destruction, made by the Nazis themselves in 1944, is shown at the Warsaw History Museum on the old town Market Square.

The winding streets and centuries architecture of the old town section have been faithfully restored, along with virtually every other building of historic value. Warsaw's population is back to its 1939 level, and the evidence of Nazi devastation is almost gone. The largest remaining reconstruction project, on the magnificient old royal castle near the entrance to the old town, is under way and expected to be completed by 1976.

Poland remains a Communist country, and the foreign visitor still must obtain a visa in advance and prepay some expenses ($3 a day for camping). But after five weeks in the Soviet Union, Warsaw seemed to us practically a den of capitalist consumerism.

There were stylishly dressed women, supermarkets of sorts and—glory of glories—Coco-Cola. There were Western newspapers, too, although they were not for sale; they could be read only on the premises in a special lounge at the Europejski Hotel.

We ran across not a single other American camping at Warsaw or our other Polish stops. Perhaps the thicket of regulations promulgated Orbis, the official tourist agency, discourage many people. But we found that it was easy to keep a wide berth of Orbis, and the average Pole we met was quite friendly and helpful, even though there was a dearth of English spoken. Marcia's broken German turned out to be useful.

Along with its other assets, Poland is dirt-cheap for the foreign visitor. We had a full dinner for two with beer one evening at a commendable resturant in Cracow for a total of $2.40 including tip.

Cracow is 200 miles south of Warsaw and preceded it as the Polish capital. Hans Frank, the German governor-general, ruled occupied Poland from Cracow's beautiful Wawel Castle, former seat of the Polish kings. The city escaped the systematic destruction planned by the Nazis in 1945 because of the rapid arrival of the Red armies, so Cracow today presents an even purer picture of Poland's past glories than does Warsaw. We rank its main Market Square with the Grand Place of Brussels for sheer magnificence.

There is one lonely part of Cracow, the Jewish quarter called Kazaimerz. Hitler's final solution left few Jews to return to Cracow or any of the Polish cities after the war, but a scattering of Judaic monuments has been preserved in Makimierz.

And there is Auschwitz-Birkenau,, an hour's drive west of Cracow. The town of Oswiecim is now the site of the largest chemical works in Poland, but the two death camps on the outskirts have been preserved as they were in 1945.

Auschwitz is a bustling tourist center complete with hotel and restaurant and postcards. The mocking sign in German still hangs over the main entrance; "Arbeit macht frei" (Work brings freedom).

The substantial red brick buildings in the compound could pass for a housing development, but inside are the horrible displays; the hair, the clothing, the piles of suitcases with owners' names and birth dates painted on the sides, the spectacles, the artificial limbs. And lining the walls by the thousand, the photographs of the victims; men, women, children.

Birkenau, the sister camp where the majority of the 4 million actually were killed, lies 2 miles down the road from Auschwitz It is less visited by tourists and therefore more pristine in its horrors.

The huge crematoria built by the Germans is now a tumble of concrete ruins. Many of the wooden barracks have been dismantled, leaving only the rows of little brick chimneys in neat patterns across the field.

It is a long way from this to the pros-

pering Warsaw of 1972, and it is a remarkable people who have made the journey back.

DEL MONTE ALSO THE CONSUMER'S FRIEND

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the current discussion surrounding the consumer movement and proposed consumer legislation frequently stresses the negative aspects of business and often implies that the business community is indifferent to the interests of the consumer. I am pleased to note two examples of positive corporate response to consumer proposals.

The first is a recent announcement that the Del Monte Corp. has become the first U.S. canner to initiate a nutritional labeling program. On October 10, 1972, Mr. Richard G. Landis, president of Del Monte, announced that beginning with the 1973 packing season the majority of Del Monte brand foods will contain a new information panel listing calories, fat, protein, carbohydrates, and percentage of a standard recommended daily allowance of 10 basic nutrients contained in a 1-cup portion. These labels will be appearing on the grocery shelves next summer.

The second item is a compendium recently published by the Senate Committee on Commerce setting forth the responses of the 300 largest U.S. corporations providing them with opportunity to outline their activities in the field of corporate responsibility toward the consumer. The Del Monte Corp. was among those responding and I insert their reply which outlines this company's actions in a number of areas of interest to consumers:

DEL MONTE ALSO THE CONSUMERS' FRIEND

FOOD SAFETY

Programs to assure the safety and wholesomeness of canned foods represent a prime example of voluntary actions through industry-government cooperation. They also are among food industry practices which most often are taken for granted.

Predecessor companies of Del Monte Corporation took the leading role in the founding in 1907 of the National Canners Association, whose first official act was adoption of a pure food guaranty. Del Monte also was a pioneer in the establishment of scientifically developed safety standards for the cooking of low-acid foods. In the early 1920's, the Company was a leading force in the adoption by the State of California of a program for state regulation and inspection of canneries. Industry-government cooperation is illustrated by the fact that a major part of this ongoing program is carried out in the Berkeley laboratories of NCA. Time-and-temperature schedules for cooking are established by NCA personnel. Cost of this model program is met 60 per cent by industry and 40 per cent by the state.

A similar safety program at the national level has been advocated by Del Monte since the late 1950's. Efforts reached fruition in 1971 when the NCA, with the strong support of Del Monte, asked the Food and Drug Administration to adopt uniform processing standards for food canneries. This voluntary Better Process Control Program will require government registration of canneries, uniform processing guidelines, automatic recording of processing data, new training programs for retort supervisory personnel, and other procedures to assure the complete safety and wholesomeness of canned foods.

Del Monte pioneered the use of a simple but effective device for confirming that low-acid canned foods have passed through the cooking process. The method involves applying to each can a blue, heat-sensitive paint that turns white when subjected to the high temperatures of processing. Del Monte began using this system in the late 1950's as one of several voluntary steps to assure food safety.

Thanks to these and other safety programs—and to the extreme care in food preparation exercised by our industry—the incidence of botulism poisoning, which occasionally occurs in home-cooked foods, is less than one in *100 billion* in commercially canned foods. The programs mentioned above are designed to reduce or eliminate even this infinitesimal incidence rate.

Del Monte gave early support to an industry-wide survey of food additives conducted in 1971 by the National Academy of Sciences. Findings will provide the Food and Drug Administration with information for monitoring and controlling use of additives. Of 680 chemicals listed by FDA as generally recognized as safe (GRAS), Del Monte uses only 23.

The food industry, with Del Monte an active participant, also is working toward the establishment of international food standards under the auspices of the United Nations. The program, known as Codex Alimentarius, seeks the protection of consumer interests and the promotion of honest and fair dealing in world markets. More than 70 nations are participating.

LID SAFETY

Del Monte began marketing single-serving products in easy-opening aluminum pull-top cans in California in January, 1970, and nationally in January, 1971. By October, 1970, the Company was aware of customer complaints that raised the question of the lid's safety. Acting on its own, Del Monte subsequently investigated virtually every potential safety device put forward by the can manufacturing industry. As an interim remedy, the Company plans by June 1, 1972, to begin converting to a "guard bead" lid which greatly reduces the chance of cuts from licking. For the long-term, Del Monte is investigating a promising "triple fold" lid that eliminates the raw edge. If mass production of "triple fold" proves feasible, the Company hopes to being a changeover in early 1973. Can labels also carry a warning.

PESTICIDES

More than a decade ago Del Monte developed a model program for controlled use of pesticides and turned it over to the canning industry. The initial phase, a pesticide usage control program, was made available in 1960 through the National Canners Association.

In 1962 Del Monte prepared a second document—a Pesticide Safety Manual. It was uesd by NCA in the preparation of a safety manual distributed to canner members. In addition, Del Monte has made a limited distribution—based on legitimate request—to non-canning companies, public health agencies, and federal agencies, such as the Department of Agriculture.

Del Monte also prepared a Pesticide Information Manual for Physicians in 1963 and has made it available to physicians in areas where Del Monte crops are grown.

Chemicals serve as the basic weapon against pests because they are the most effective in the greatest number of situations, most notably when insects have already attacked a growing crop. But non-chemical methods also are effective in certain situations, and Del Monte employs several of them: cultural control (cultivating and growing crops when and where pests are not present); physical controls, such as the flooding of fields and the use of barriers; insect-resistant plants; and biological controls.

Pesticides are applied to Del Monte crops when the presence of pests or the imminent threat of disease pose a problem that cannot be controlled by less costly non-chemical measures. The fact that pesticides are expensive is in itself an incentive to use them only when other measures will not do an effective job.

LABELING

The label represents one of a canner's most useful tools in communicating with its customers. With this in mind, Del Monte has used descriptive labeling since 1936. Types of information found on its labels have varied over the years, depending on consumer needs and interests. But descriptive labeling was intended primarily to assist housewives in selecting exactly the size of can and style of pack best suited to their needs. Del Monte also has supported descriptive labeling programs promoted by the National Canners Association.

In the 1970's, increasingly sophisticated consumers are looking to food labels for even more information. Beginning with the 1972 pack, a full list of ingredients will be found on all Del Monte canned foods; the practice of listing them on non-standardized foods is being extended to those for which federal standards of identity have been established. The Company's 1972 labels also will advise consumers that information on nutrients contained in a Del Monte product may be obtained from the Company upon request. To answer these requests, Del Monte has produced a Nutrition Guide listing nutritional and caloric values of a broad range of canned and processed fruits and vegetables; a table showing the recommended daily amounts of various nutrients according to age, sex, weight and height, and other factors; a summary of the major functions of nutrients and calories and in which foods they are found; and a presentation of the "Basic Four Food Group" as a simple guide to planning nutritious meals.

Industry and government officials have been working together to devise a practical method of providing nutrition information on labels. Del Monte supports the concept, provided the nutrition information is understandable and helpful to the average consumer. We believe the interests of the consumer are not served by inundating her with information that could confuse or inadvertently mislead; hence, our efforts to *educate* as well as inform the consumer; to teach her how to use the nutrition information to which she is entitled.

The Food and Drug Administration is currently gathering information on how nutritional labeling can be made effective. One source is a series of experiments being conducted by the Consumer Research Institute, of which Del Monte is a member.

CONSUMER EDUCATION

Del Monte long has been active in nutrition education. As early as the 1930's its national magazine advertisements stressed the importance of vitamins in the daily diet. In addition, the Company maintains an active correspondence with consumers and educators. More than 90 per cent of letters are answered the week they are received.

Requests for teaching aids and other nutrition information have more than doubled in the past three years, and they account for a bulk of the more than 15,000 letters on nutrition matters answered annually. Letters come from students, teachers, consumers, health departments, physicians, dietitians,

youth groups, and others. In the past five years, Del Monte has supplied schools with nearly 5 million pieces of teaching materials for home economics classes.

In 1970, as consumers developed greater interest in nutrition, Del Monte created wall charts and cards that explain the Basic Four Food Groups, a simple guide to good nutrition. The materials were printed in English and Spanish, and more than 1.2 million have been distributed to schools, health departments, universities, and other groups. Mrs. Virginia Knauer, director of the White House Consumer Affairs Office, has endorsed the educational effort. About 220,000 of the Spanish language materials were distributed in California, Texas, New Mexico, Florida, New York, Puerto Rico, Trinidad and other areas.

Del Monte economists participated in production of a consumer education film by the University of California Extension Service. The 60-second public service film was distributed to television stations throughout the nation and carried the message that juices, fruits and vegetables make the most nutritious snacks. Plans are being made to produce three additional public service films in 1972 in cooperation with the university.

CONSUMER AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

The quality of Del Monte food products is intimately connected with the quality of the environment in which they are produced. In recognition of this fact, the Company's ongoing activities in consumer and environmental protection were consolidated in 1971. The inseparable functions are being administered by the newly created Consumer and Environmental Protection Department.

In its continuing search for environmental controls, Del Monte is experimenting with a new method of peeling Cling Peaches that would lessen waste disposal problems and reduce water use by as much as 90 per cent. As in conventional methods, dry caustic peeling requires the application of a caustic solution to loosen skins. However, whereas peels are washed off by jets of water in conventional practice, they are rubbed off in the new method as the peaches pass over a bed of spinning, soft-rubber discs. By completely separating peels from the water, the new method reduces treatment requirements for liquid wastes. Del Monte tested dry caustic peeling last year at its San Jose, California, cannery and will do further experimenting there in 1972 to determine commercial feasibility of the method.

Responding to growing consumer concern about solid waste disposal, Del Monte last year began including recycling symbols on many of its labels. The symbols serve as a reminder that steel and aluminum cans are recyclable and that paper fiber used in other types of containers was made from recycled or recyclable materials. Symbols will be appearing on more and more Del Monte labels to encourage recycling activities.

The Company pioneered the development of lagooning and aerating systems for treating liquid plant effluents in the 1930's, and has developed several ingenious methods of converting solid waste such as corn-cobs, peach pits, and pineapple husks to useful by-products.

CONTAINER SIMPLIFICATION

Del Monte participated in National Canners Association efforts to develop can-size standards with the Department of Commerce. NCA's Committee on Simplification of Containers proposed 16 container standards, but the program was abandoned in 1971 because of budget cuts in Commerce. Further, Commerce's Bureau of Standards took the position that the agency should not be in a position of judging can sizes in adopting a voluntary program. It is the policy of Commerce to limit its involvement in voluntary standards to those cases where a real need is not being met effectively by private groups.

CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP

Del Monte is playing a role of public leadership through activities of its senior management. The Del Monte Chairman Alfred W. Eames, Jr. chairs the California Chamber of Commerce Consumer Affairs Committee which is sponsoring the first national Solid Waste Management Conference. He also has served as a member of the National Industrial Polution Control Council. Del Monte Vice Chairman Ross B. Yerby serves as Western regional fund-raising chairman for the Nutrition Foundation and The Council for Better Business Bureaus. Del Monte President Richard G. Landis is a member of the California Cannery Inspection Board. Del Monte's director of public affairs, Joseph Barish, was elected chairman of the California Governor's Advisory Council on Consumer Affairs, whose statutory membership includes representatives of business, government, labor, and consumers. Time devoted to this public service by top management personnel represents a significant contribution of corporate creative resources.

Del Monte was a prime mover in the founding of The Nutrition Foundation, a nonprofit organization which, since 1941, has channeled more than $9.5 million in research funds into basic studies of food value, nutrition and health. In so doing, the Foundation has played a major role in developing some of our fundamental knowledge of nutrition. The Company recently moved to substantially increase its support of the Foundation.

Del Monte also is giving strong support to a new approach to self-regulation of the marketplace—the programs of the Council of Better Business Bureaus. Formed in 1970, CBBB was chosen by large and small businesses across the nation as the focal point for a newly demonstrated concern for the customer. Del Monte is critically evaluating the effectiveness of a pilot project in which the San Francisco BBB opened storefront offices in five low-income minority neighborhoods.

In recognition of the need for fostering communication between environmental groups and the business community, Del Monte was the major factor in the business community in establishing in 1972 an Environmental Information Clearinghouse for the San Francisco Bay Area. The Clearinghouse is a joint program of services administered by leaders of both business and ecology groups. No similar organization performs this function in the Bay Area, and the Clearinghouse may become a model for future projects in other regions.

Certain expertise is shared by Del Monte as a matter of conscience. Last year the Company initiated nutrition counseling to the San Francisco Bay Area Alcoholism Program, a rehabilitation program for adult male Native Americans. Del Monte nutritionists designed a low-cost menu, recommended economics in the Program's purchasing procedures, assisted in planning efficient use of storage facilities, and helped design efficient food preparation methods. The counseling format is being analyzed as a possible model program for use in other areas of the nation.

On the international level, Del Monte expertise in the fields of nutrition and marketing was shared with the government of Kenya. Under contract with the U.S. Agency for International Development, Del Monte dispatched two experts to Kenya in 1968 to conduct nutritional food habits and marketing investigations. A report on how that government could promote better nutrition was issued in 1969.

Del Monte played a significant role in the broadening of the National School Lunch Program in 1970 to permit the private sector to supply the program for the first time. The Company created an awareness in the Executive and Legislative Branches as to the benefits to child nutrition that would result if the private sector were enlisted to participate in feeding operations. Buffalo, New York, was one of the first inner-city school districts to take advantage of the expanded program and awarded a contract to Service Systems Corporation, a Del Monte subsidiary, for 12,000 hot lunches daily.

In recent years Del Monte has increased its dialogue with students. Last year, for example, the Company helped underwrite at the University of California what was understood to be the first undergraduate course devoted to consumer issues. Del Monte was the subject of a case history on nutrition labeling released for national distribution through Harvard Clearinghouse. And the Company last year cooperated with the Stanford University Student Committee for Corporate Responsibility in attempts to construct a model for measuring the level of corporate social responsibility. Del Monte intends to encourage similar student dialogue in the future.

Recent television commercials and magazine advertisements highlighting the way Del Monte judges quality of fresh fruits and vegetables—and how growers achieve that quality—have been acclaimed by consumer groups for balancing educational value with brand identity.

JIM KEE SPEAKS ON WATER RESOURCES

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, our able colleague JIM KEE of West Virginia spoke on October 12 to the annual meeting of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association meeting in Cincinnati.

As all of us know, the gentleman from West Virginia has devoted much of his lifetime to the care and preservation of this Nation's natural wealth, notably including our priceless and irreplaceable water resources. For the past 2 years, he has served actively and effectively as chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee on Conservation and Watersheds.

Because of the valuable insights provided in this report, I submit it for printing in the RECORD and commend it to the reading of the membership:

STATEMENT OF HONORABLE JAMES KEE

Mr. Mack, distinguished guests and members of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association—first, I want to thank you for the thrill of returning again this year, at your invitation, to be with you today. As a West Virginian, I feel at home here. It's just a neighborly visit—and we have been neighbors for a long time! It was so gracious of you to invite Pat Spence, staff member of the House Committee on Public Works, and myself to participate during your 77th annual meeting.

As a Member of Congress, and legislation is my business, I am going to talk about just that—this is a legislative report to you.

I also want to commend the Ohio Valley Improvement Association for the very fine work you are doing to develop and upgrade the great Ohio Valley.

When a group such as this bands together as a closely-knit team reaching out for the fullest development of its community's natural and human resources—this is indeed what I would term "creative citizenship" of the highest order. Not only will the Ohio Valley benefit from your accomplishments—but all America will benefit—particularly

Ohio, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky and other States.

As you well know, Ohio has sent to Washington some very able and dedicated Representatives. You sent them there to represent you. Therefore, they need your continued help in order to do their job more effectively. I am not talking about campaign donations now—though I am sure they need those too—but I am talking here about your getting to know your Representatives, visiting with them and making your needs and wishes known to them. When they are in the process of hammering out legislative measures which affect you, let your voices be heard, give them your support and encouragement. It lends muscle to their efforts.

In the time allotted me—I cannot discuss all of the tremendous legislation that has come out of the 92nd Congress. I would—however—like to highlight for you some of the key bills—spelled *key* that is—that have come out of our committee on public works and are of immediate and specific interest to each of you.

The fact is unquestioned that the 92nd Congress has been active and productive—in spite of what Ralph Nader says.

First—we have the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill. This important legislation contains an authorization for bank protection works along the Ohio River from upstream New Matamoras to Cincinnati—and local flood protection works at Chillicothe prior to the beginning of construction of the Mill Creek Reservoir.

Then there is the Federal Water Pollution Control Act amendments of 1972.

This far-reaching and long-ranged piece of legislation has been before both Houses of Congress since early in the 92nd Congress. It passed the Senate last November with an 86 to zero vote: and it passed the House last March with a vote of 378 to 14. Then long and fruitful sessions were held by a conference committee of both Houses to reconcile the differences in the bills under consideration. We in the House feel that the end product of these meetings made possible a workable and realistic bill. Coupled with the legislation already on the books—we feel that it will go far in reducing and eliminating pollution to our rivers and streams.

We hear so much about pollution these days that it sounds at times like a "new idea"—a brainchild of the "new breed."

Chairman John Blatnik of the House Committee on Public Works began warning the American people of the coming crisis of water pollution 26 years ago. For too long—he was "a lone voice crying in the wilderness." But—finally—people started to awaken to the tragic truth—that pollution was indeed a threat to our nation. The wheels of progress started turning and we started trying to do something.

The great spotlight fell upon our enormous pollution problems.

Then came something of an hysterical reaction that so typifies man's sudden awareness of something. Just overnight there sprung up tens of thousands of self-styled environmentalists—ecologists and conservationists. And I say "self-styled" to distinguish those who would bring to a screeching halt all progress and stop all construction in the name of ecology separated from the highly skilled—deeply motivated and dedicated groups that are working "within the system" to bring about changes that are not only desirable but mandatory if we are to survive.

Speaking of the "new idea" or "new cause"—one famous entertainer who was recruited to the "new cause" was asked—when he recommended that all big dams should go—what about the hundreds of thousands of people who would perish or be harmed by such a program—answered—"we have too many people as it is." He is a "self-styled" environmentalist with a rather "to hell with them attitude" that seems to be contrary to their missionary zeal about conservation. I wonder if this type of thinking had been prevalent 200 years ago—if we'd be across the Appalachian mountains yet.

The National Environmental Protection Act of 1969 is a great piece of legislation. Its purposes as enunciated by Congress: "To declare a national policy which will encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment to promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man: to enrich the understanding of the ecological systems and natural resources important to the Nation—and to establish a council on environmental quality."

What happened? Since the passage of that great piece of legislation—the courts have been deluged with citizens suits seeking declaratory judgments and injunctions against the Atomic Energy Commission—the Corps of Engineers—the Department of Transportation—Housing and Urban Development—National Environmental Protection Agency—Forest Service—Department of Interior—Soil Conservation Service—and so on. Up to May 1972—there had been 49 such cases in the district courts—and 12 appeals.

Now—the injunction process of our common law is a priceless and needed heritage that should never be abandoned. Nor should it be unduly restrictive. However—for those who would stop progress anytime such progress is deemed by a certain individual or group of individuals as un-needed—the injunction is an effective weapon and it can throw a devastating wrench in the wheels of progress—to the delay—expense—and detriment of all others.

It became a matter of the courts interpreting the National Environmental Protection Act.

In many of the cases we reviewed—the citizen or citizen group was found to have standing—and injunctive relief was granted. But finally—in the case of Sierra Club v. Morton—Secretary of the Interior—et al.—the Supreme Court handed down a decision on April 19, 1972.

In that case—the petitioner—a membership corporation with a "special interest in the conservation and sound maintenance of the national parks—game refuges—and forests of the country" brought this suit for a declaratory judgment and an injunctive restraining federal officials from approving an extensive skiing development in the mineral king valley and the Sequoia National Forest in California. I might note here that the Sierra Club has had *at least ten* suits in the District Court for the District of Columbia alone. The petitioner relied on section 10 of the Administrator Procedure Act—which accords judicial review to a "person suffering legal wrong because of agency action—or adversely affected or aggrieved by agency action within the meaning of a relevant statute."

On the theory that this was a "public" action involving questions as to the use of natural resources—petitioner did not allege that the challenged development would affect the club or its members in their activities—or that they used Mineral King—but it maintained that "the project would adversely change the area's aesthetics and ecology."

The district court granted a preliminary injunction and determined that the hearing raised questions "concerning possible excess statutory authority." The court of appeals reversed—holding that the club lacked standing—and had not shown irreparable injury.

The court held: "A person has standing *only* if he can show that *he himself* has suffered or will suffer injury—whether economic or otherwise." So—without the element of individualized harm to itself or its members—the Sierra Club lacked standing to maintain the action.

This finding was affirmed by the Supreme Court on April 19, 1972.

I am sure this is music to the ears of all here who are interested in the development of the great Ohio Valley. At least it assures you that Congress did not intend—nor will the courts allow—Joe Doaks from the State of elsewhere to come to Ohio and dictate how you develop your valley.

However—you've still got problems—from yet another source! The Office of Management and Budget—formerly the Bureau of the Budget—has approved a proposal by the Water Resources Council which—if allowed to stand—would bring to a halt most—if not all—public works in the Nation.

The proposal would make the interest rate to be used in evaluating the benefit-cost ratio 7 percent. Immediately rising to 10 percent within 3 to 5 years. At the current rate of 5⅜ percent—half of the proposed public works projects fall by the wayside since the B/C ratio fails to meet the minimum 1.1.1 requirement. Furthermore—any project not started with 5 years would be de-authorized. And—even worse—those projects already approved and not started would be re-computed under the new formula. These proposals probably pose a bigger threat to national improvements than the efforts of those previously mentioned.

Accordingly— I have co-sponsored a bill—H.R. 16941 which would stop these grossly unfair changes in the ground rules. This bill will be reintroduced in the 93rd Congress. But I will not burden you with reading it for you. This act may be cited as the "Water and Related Land Resources Policy Act of 1972."

Another bill I sponsored this year would attack the problem of non-point source pollution from agricultural—rural and developing areas. It is estimated that these sources of pollution are 700 times greater than all others. We held extensive hearings throughout the Nation studying the problem—drafted the bill and held hearings. We propose $5 billion be put into this fight. Due to the coming end of the 92nd Congress—a new version of that legislation will be introduced next year.

We are truly living in great and exciting times. They are troubled times to be sure—but one of the world's greatest historians—having devoted a lifetime to studying and recording history from the beginning of civilization was asked: "What was the most important thing you learned in your life's study of all significant historical events?"

He promptly replied, "When it gets darkest—the stars come out."

America has had darkness before—and the stars came out. We can see them now on a field of blue in the flag of the United States of America—"One Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

May the Good Lord, our Maker, bless each and every one of you—and help you in your endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I must bid a farewell to one of the most dedicated men in Congress, THOMAS G. ABERNETHY. His work as one of the senior members on the House Agriculture Committee was recognized by all as being exceptional and outstanding. He was one

of the most influential Members of Congress during his 30 years on Capitol Hill. During his time in Congress we relied on his valuable and sound judgment.

Mr. ABERNETHY is truly a great American and gave much unselfish time to his constituents, and they benefited greatly from his long years of service. He is a man with great courage and ability and we who remain shall miss him in the years to come.

NORTH CAROLINA JAYCEES SPONSOR ENVIRONMENTAL CONFERENCE

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, the North Carolina Jaycees are on the move. In a joint effort with the University of North Carolina's outstanding School of Public Health, the North Carolina Jaycees are sponsoring an Environmental Conference between November 30 and December 3 in Chapel Hill.

This conference is much more than a one-time 4-day seminar on the environment. This conference will provide a launching pad for a 2-year, community based, environmental program throughout the entire State of North Carolina. Joining with the Jaycees in this important mission will be government and business leaders, college faculty, students, and local officials.

Concern for the environment is not new within the Jaycee organization, but now they are involving others with this concern. They are wisely broadening the base of support for environmental efforts, for it is going to take all of us, working together, to preserve mankind and Mother Earth for the 21st century.

Jaycees are going to lead the way into the 21st century, for I know from my own personal experience as a Jaycee what valuable training our young men are receiving as citizens and community leaders. As an American citizen, I am already deeply grateful for the contributions these outstanding young men have made. And I still deeply espouse the Jaycee credo that community service is the quality that builds the individual and that the quality of society is as good as the individuals who comprise it.

In tackling the vexing, complex, sometimes frightening environmental problems we have today, the Jaycees have proven once again that they are moving with the times and have their eyes on the future.

We are a populous nation, a nation of affluence, and therefore the demands we place on our environment are heavy. As Pogo, the comic-strip philosopher said:

> We have met the enemy, and they are us.

Difficult decisions and compromises must continue to be made about where we are heading, and what we value most for our future.

The solutions, I think, must lie somewhere between the prophets of total doom with predictions of the end of mankind, and the smug complacency of those who think someone else is taking care of it, or that our technology, which got us into this dilemma, will magically extricate us from it.

It is men like the N.C. Jaycees who will disprove Albert Schweitzer's warning that:

> Man has lost the capacity to foresee and to forestall. He will end by destroying the earth.

Today's men of vision in the Jaycee organization are laying the groundwork to rebuild, revitalize and preserve our precious natural resources.

Jaycees know that the real solution to the problems which confront our communities today is having people who are big enough to shoulder the responsibilities of leadership. Big governments can lay great plans, but only big people—like the Jaycees and the people like Jaycees—can build them into realities.

I know my distinguished colleagues will join with me in wishing the North Carolina Jaycees and the U.N.C. School of Public Health much success with their upcoming conference.

EULOGY OF HON. KARL LECOMPTE

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

Saturday, October 14, 1972

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with high personal regard for a good friend and former colleague that I join today in praising the name and accomplishments of the late Hon. Karl LeCompte, who served in this Chamber from 1939 to 1959 as Representative from the Iowa Fourth and Fifth Districts.

Although it was my pleasure to serve alongside this distinguished Member for only 4 years, I came to regard him with the greatest fondness and the greatest respect. He was a man of consumate ability and the broadest comprehension. And he was perhaps, the most helpful veteran Member of the Congress that any freshman Congressman could ever hope to meet.

The Republican Party of Iowa has a long and distinguished history, and Karl LeCompte was identified with much of it in one way or another, dating back almost to the Civil War. His father, Charles F. LeCompte, had come to Iowa in 1865, settling at Corydon, and was instrumental in establishing the Corydon Times-Republican, in Wayne County. When Charles LeCompte retired from journalism in 1910, control of the Times-Republican passed to his son Karl, who served as editor and publisher for 30 years, and did his father proud. I believe I am correct in saying that the Times-Republican is the oldest newspaper in Wayne County, Iowa.

The approach of American entrance into World War I brought Karl LeCompte into politics, as a successful candidate for the State senate in 1916. He was the youngest member elected to that body as of that time. In the First World War, he served as a private in the medical detachment of U.S. General Hospital No. 26, and when the war was over, returned to the publishing business and his place in the State senate.

Called upon to enter the national political arena during the tumultuous days of the second Roosevelt administration, Karl LeCompte agreed to run for Congress in 1938, and was elected in this first attempt. He would remain in Congress, through 10 consecutive terms, establishing a record of the brightest, most productive kind. As a member of the Committee on House Administration, he rose to the position of ranking minority member and, in the 80th and 83d Congresses, acceded to the chairmanship.

During his tenure in the House of Representatives, he also was engaged for many years as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He represented the Iowa Republican Members of the House on the important Committee on Committees, and served for a time with the Republican Policy Committee.

My association with Karl LeCompte was always stimulating, and his courtesy, friendliness, and kindness of heart endeared him to everyone who had the pleasure of his association.

He was one of the greatest of our kind, and is deserving this day of our praise and adulation.

CONGRESSMAN ROBERT McCLORY REVIEWS THE 92D CONGRESS

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, as the 92d Congress draws to a close, I take this opportunity to inform my constituents of the results of the legislative branch's efforts during the last 2 years.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Congressional concern about the Nation's environment was displayed in many bills which cleared both the House and the Senate, and have now gone to the President for his signature. Most important was a comprehensive Water Pollution Control Act, which creates a program designed to clean up waterways, eliminate pollutant discharges, and build new municipal waste treatment plants. I supported this bill—as well as several amendments which strengthened further this measure. Also, I urged unsuccessfully adoption of an amendment which would have included ground waters within the purview of the program.

The Congress passed other measures aimed at controlling pesticides, toxic substances, and ocean dumping—as well as bills creating the first two major national parks in urban areas. We failed to take action, however, on a bill to establish a national land-use management policy—intended to provide a prudent use of our natural resources in the future.

EDUCATION

The 92d Congress enacted a major higher education bill which provides for aid to both students and institutions of higher learning, creates a national institute of education, and establishes several innovative educational programs. The House Ways and Means Committee announced its intention to report a bill which would create income tax credits for nonpublic school tuition, and this proposal should receive considerable attention in the next Congress.

SOCIAL SERVICES

In the last 2 years, we increased both social security and railroad retirement benefits by 30 percent. We improved the vocational rehabilitation and older Americans programs. But we did not act on the President's proposal for a retirement benefits program for self-employed individuals. In addition, the Congress thoroughly frustrated the President's high-priority welfare reform plan, thus doing nothing to stem the rising welfare caseloads and budgets across the country. Mr. Nixon's plan, with its work incentives and work requirements, would have made a vital beginning at reversing the welfare rolls.

CRIME

The 92d Congress passed legislation which should give additional protection to foreign officials within our borders. It enacted a tough antihijacking bill designed to crack down on aircraft piracy. It also took action toward combating the problem of dangerous drugs in our society—something of great significance to me as a member of the important Judiciary Committee. A Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention was established within the Executive Office of the President to provide central direction for drug programs throughout the Government, and legislation was passed to improve and further implement the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act.

GUN CONTROL

Following the attempted assassination of Gov. George Wallace, extensive efforts were made to outlaw certain cheap handguns assembled in this country from parts manufactured abroad. Legislation was passed in the Senate but failed to emerge from the House Judiciary Committee, notwithstanding active efforts to present some meaningful gun control legislation to the House floor, including increased penalties for criminals who commit felonies with the use of firearms.

VETERANS

Both Houses of Congress passed and sent to the President a bill which would provide increased education and training benefits for veterans of the Armed Forces. A pay bill which would have stimulated further the development of an all-volunteer military—a goal for which I have worked—passed the House, but died in the other body.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

During the past 2 years, the Congress passed two proposed constitutional amendments and sent them to the States, where approval by three-fourths of the State legislatures is necessary for these amendments to become part of the Constitution. One amendment which grants to citizens 18 years of age and older the right to vote has become the 26th amendment. The other proposed amendment, which grants equal rights to men and women, is still being considered by various State legislatures. I am proud to have supported both of these amendments, in the Judiciary Committee and on the floor of the House, and am particularly pleased to have been the leading Republican proponent of the equal rights measure.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The Congress took positive steps to protect the rights of minority group citizens. I sponsored and successfully managed a jury reform measure to assure the elimination of discrimination on Federal court juries. Congress granted the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission additional authority to prohibit discrimination in hiring and strengthened the Small Business Administration's authority to create corporations for the purpose of making loans to enterprises started by minority group members. However, neither House took action on a large number of bills proposed by the administration to aid American Indians, including an Indian business development program.

REVENUE SHARING

President Nixon proposed revenue-sharing measures intended to provide States and localities with additional funds to use in solving problems which are best approached at levels of government closer to the people than the Federal Government in Washington. While the Congress did approve a general revenue-sharing plan, the measure, as passed, is unfortunately one which treats Kane, Lake, and McHenry Counties harshly in comparison with the House-passed bill. However, the Congress did not consider the specialized programs to share funds in any of the following areas: rural community development, law enforcement, manpower training, and transportation.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

The government reorganization proposals which the President put forward were intended to make the Federal Government itself more efficient and more responsive to the needs of the citizenry. Mr. Nixon's hope to transform seven present departments into new Departments of Human Resources, Community Development, Natural Resources, and Economic Affairs were ignored by the 92d Congress.

In summary, the 92d was a productive Congress, but left much important business undone. There will be excellent opportunities for moving ahead with these legislative proposals next year in the new 93d Congress.

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I join in the tributes to my long time friend and colleague, THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, as he prepares to retire from this Congress.

For 30 years he has been in the forefront in the Congress, as he fought for what he believed in, and practiced what he preached.

THOMAS ABERNETHY, if I may paraphrase an old expression Mr. Speaker comes from "a cut of cloth" that has so typically characterized the distinguished delegation from Mississippi, in both Houses, the House of Representatives and the Senate. From a State that has sent great men to this Congress, comes one THOMAS ABERNETHY.

We have been fortunate in having him with us, and the people of Mississippi have been fortunate in having him as their Representative in Congress.

CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, soon after I came to the Congress I met CHARLIE GRIFFIN, able assistant to then Congressman John Bell Williams. The people of the Mississippi Third District made an excellent choice in sending CHARLIE to Congress when Mr. Williams was elected Governor. A man of unquestioned character and the highest integrity, CHARLIE GRIFFIN added greatly to the deliberations of this body. In his service here he has put country first; he has not been a sectional representative. CHARLIE leaves this body voluntarily at the prime of his career, and we predict for him many years of public service. We wish for CHARLIE and his lovely wife continued success, every happiness, and the best always.

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, these are, in a very real sense, days of great sadness in this body. With so many of our esteemed colleagues taking their leave of us, it is like being witness to our own depreciation.

The departure of the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ) is especially distressing because it will leave us without his good sense, reasonableness, fairness, and dedication to the best interests of this country.

His 25 years of service in this body constitute a great contribution to the American maritime and fishing industries and hence to the Nation itself, to the State of Maryland, and to the people of the Third Congressional District.

We shall miss Mr. GARMATZ, for we are in his debt.

I wish him well.

HON. JOHN McMILLAN

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, after I was first elected to Congress in 1960, I had the good fortune to be assigned an office directly across the hall from Congressman JOHN MCMILLAN of South Carolina.

"Mr. MACK," as we soon came to affectionately regard him, and his excellent staff took us under their wing and in their gracious South Carolina manner, shepherded us through those first confusing days when a freshman Congressman needs a friend.

That friendship has continued through the years, during which my admiration of JOHN MCMILLAN has steadily increased.

Congressman MCMILLAN has demonstrated unshakable integrity and has made a lasting contribution to solid constitutional government. The people of South Carolina are losing the services of a dedicated and effective Congressman and committee chairman and those of us who have come to regard "Mr. MACK" with such personal esteem will miss him.

A HALF CENTURY OF SERVICE BY CONGRESSMAN CELLER

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1972

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored to join with our colleagues in paying a well-deserved tribute to the very able and distinguished dean of the House, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER of Brooklyn.

As the Washington Post so very aptly noted editorially this morning:

> Very few members of the House make such an imprint on the nation's laws and on the Congress itself that their departure may fairly be termed the end of an era.

It is not trite to say that Chairman CELLER has truly become a legend in his own time.

At the end of the 92d Congress, Mr. CELLER will have completed 50 years of dedicated and productive service in the House. He has served under nine Presidents and has chaired the Judiciary Committee for a record 22 years. As chairman of this important committee, Congressman CELLER guided four constitutional amendments through the House, secured the enactment of every major civil rights bill of the 20th century and was successful in having other significant legislation passed, such as the abolition of the discriminatory national-origins quota in the immigration law and the monumental Celler-Kefauver antitrust act. He has authored some 400 laws during his congressional career—an outstanding achievement I am confident has not been duplicated in the history of the Republic.

In addition to chairing the Judiciary Committee, MANNY CELLER has also served as dean of the New York congressional delegation. In this capacity he has been energetic and tireless in striving to improve conditions in numerous sectors for the people of the State of New York and New York City. He has striven to insure that New York City and New York State participate equitably in Federal domestic programs and that they receive just and fair treatment by Federal departments and agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I feel honored to have had the opportunity to serve in the Congress with Chairman CELLER and, at times, to have benefited from his advice and counsel. His energy and wisdom will be greatly missed and I wish him continued good health and Godspeed as he returns to private life after having spent almost his entire adult life in public service.

MIKE BERNSTEIN

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mike Bernstein retired this month as minority counsel for labor of the House Education and Labor Committee. He has received well-deserved praise for his unchallenged professional competence, from the President of the United States, Members of the U.S. Senate, and the House of Representatives from both sides of the aisle, and a great many others.

I fully subscribe to these testimonials to Mike. I have relied heavily on his counsel throughout 6 years in Congress. In addition, it can be stressed that above all, Mike Bernstein is a fine human being. His grasp of history and literature as well as his wonderful sense of humor have gained him warm and lasting friendships. On that basis, Mr. Speaker, I add this small tribute to an esteemed friend.

HON. WAYNE ASPINALL

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress adjourns, we lose many fine Members of Congress. When the 93d Congress convenes in January my good friend, WAYNE ASPINALL, of Colorado, will not be with us, and we will all miss him. He has served his district, State, and Nation well for the last 24 years, and he has been an outstanding chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

WAYNE ASPINALL and I have many close ties. Belonging to the same college fraternity we have enjoyed many happy occasions together. Certainly I shall miss him as will many of our group, but more important, the Congress and the Nation will lose the service in Congress of one of the outstanding Members of Congress of all time. Always informed, always fair, and always courageous.

It has been said that we in this Congress are losing a larger percentage of our able Members than ever before. As I realize we lose WAYNE ASPINALL and the three Members from my own State, BILL COLMER, TOM ABERNETHY, and CHARLIE GRIFFIN, it is easy to believe the statement.

WAYNE, to you and Mrs. Aspinall we wish many happy and busy years.

U.S. BICENTENNIAL

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, as this Nation continues on the road to its bicentennial, we will dedicate memorials to those people who contributed to the cause of American independence.

It is appropriate, therefore, that the Congress has approved H.R. 256, a bill authorizing the establishment of the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site. The bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to acquire a home associated with the Polish-American hero and soldier, Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, and turn it into a national memorial in his honor. As a sponsor of a comparable bill, I applaud the overwhelming support given to this bill in both this House and the other body.

During the Revolutionary War, many people crossed the Atlantic and cast their lot with the struggling colonists. Among these was the son of Polish gentry, Thaddeus Kosciuszko. Skilled in artillery and engineering, Kosciuszko learned of the American movement in 1776 and offered his services to the American cause.

Kosciuszko quickly showed his mettle and engineering skill. His work on fortifications along the Delaware River earned him a commission in the Continental Army. The refusal of the Americans to follow his tactical advice might have led to the loss of Fort Ticonderoga on Lake Champlain. His brilliant choice of battlefields and erection of fortifications contributed significantly to the great victory at Saratoga and earned him the praise of his commander, Gen. Horatio Gates. Later, his fortifications at West Point guarded the Hudson River and helped prevent a split of the infant nation by the British. In recognition of his meritorious service, the Continental Congress gave Kosciuszko a commission as brigadier general in October 1783 and granted him American citizenship.

However, rather than remain in the peaceful atmosphere of the new United States, this stanch lover of freedom heard the plaintive call of liberty and returned to his native Poland. Once partitioned, and threatened again by powerful neighbors, Poland sought to maintain its sovereignty. Kosciuszko threw himself into this struggle with the

same vigor that he had exhibited in America. However, he was wounded and captured by the Russians in 1794 and imprisoned for 2 years.

Upon his release, Kosciuszko briefly returned to America where he took up residence in Philadelphia at a modest boarding house. The purpose of H.R. 256 is to preserve the house as a lasting memorial to this great patriot.

Mr. Speaker, history has graciously acknowledged the selfless contributions of Kosciuszko to the American War of Independence. He served his adopted country with honor and distinction. Yet, this country has not provided an adequate memorial to this hero of both our fight for freedom and the struggle for freedom of his native Poland.

The National Parks Advisory Board noted that—

Thaddeus Kosciuszko was a figure of such significance in American history as to merit appropriate memorialization.

I firmly believe that the establishment of this Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site will finally provide a fitting tribute to a great soldier and patriot.

Since Jamestown, over 360 years ago, Polish immigrants have toiled to build this country, and their contributions to all walks of American life have enriched and strengthened our heritage. This Historic Site will honor not only Kosciuszko, but it will also serve as a reminder of the contributions of the sons and daughters of Poland to the achievements of this Nation. This recognition is long-awaited and well-deserved.

BREAD, A "CORONARY" FIGHTER

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, recently, those of us who are vitally interested in agriculture have been keenly aware of such issues as farm income, the Soviet-United States wheat purchase, consumer affairs, high food costs, rural migration, and so forth.

As this session of Congress comes to a close, I would like to leave one additional thought with my colleagues, with consumer advocates, and especially with citizens interested in good nutrition and diet.

I have the privilege of representing the largest wheat producing district in the Nation. As I have pointed out to my colleagues before, consumption of wheat and wheat products is important to all citizens in regard to health and a balanced diet.

Despite the fact we spend billions of dollars each year for medical care, the United States now ranks 40th for male life expectancy and 23d for women. Part of this problem stems from heart disease, high blood pressure, and a "national diet" too high in calories and exceedingly high in saturated fat.

The answer to this problem, at least in part, is simple. Contrary to popular belief on the part of the amply endowed seeking to become less so, bread is not fattening. Bread is a major food, very low in fat, does not contain sugar, and is relatively low in salt. Let us clear up this misconception about bread being a fattening food.

In the October 10 issue of the Milling and Baking News, there is an article regarding the address given by famed nutritionist, Dr. Jean Mayer, at the Day of Bread ceremonies in Omaha, October 9. What Dr. Mayer has to say regarding the nutritional value of bread should be of interest to all diet- and health-conscious Americans. In recommending this article to my colleagues, I do so with some unsolicited but sincere advice. As we go back to our respective districts to solicit the advice and counsel of those we are privileged to represent, there is no better way to achieve understanding and common agreement than by breaking bread together.

Traveling from one meeting to another, from a coffee, a barbecue, a chicken dinner, a reception to an ice cream social, there is real danger of exceeding your own diet limit and putting yourself into a high blood pressure situation. To avoid this, I recommend breaking bread with your constituents. Who is there among us that has a harsh word for his fellow man who eating a delicious and nutritious hot roll?

Mr. Speaker, I commend the article, "Bread, A Coronary Fighter," to the attention of my calorie and health conscious colleagues:

MAYER: BREAD A "CORONARY" FIGHTER

OMAHA, October 9.—Bread offers "one great hope" in the battle to curtail the current "explosion of mortality from heart diseases," asserted Dr. Jean Mayer at Day of Bread luncheon sponsored in Omaha Oct. 3. "Heart disease is the paramount problem of our time," he said.

About 140 invited guests—home economists and members of the press included—attended the "Day" luncheon, at the Raddison-Blackstone hotel. The luncheon and Dr. Mayer's appearance were sponsored by ConAgra, Inc.

"The basic medical fact of our time," declared Dr. Mayer, noted nutritionist and professor of nutrition at the School of Public Health at Harvard, "is that we are doing extremely badly in the United States in regard to life expectancy of adults, particularly males."

Among all nations, he said, the United States now ranks 40th for male life expectancy and 23rd for women—this despite a massive expenditure of $70 billion a year for medical care and research. The explosion in heart diseases, he said, has gobbled up all advances in care and research.

HEALTH RELATED TO DIET

A primary problem, as Dr. Mayer saw it, is hypertension, high blood pressure. Some 20 million persons in this nation knowingly or unknowingly suffer from it, he said. It is related to a diet too high in calories and "exceedingly high in fat, particularly saturated fat," and too little exercise.

"Where does bread come into this?" he asked. "In a very simple way, bread is a major food which is very low in fat, not containing sugar and relatively low in salt. As bread consumption has receded, it has been replaced by a variety of foods, all high in fat, by some snack foods which are either extremely high in fat and salt or extremely high in sugar . . .

"The one way I can see to knock down that saturated fat content of the diet is to bring back the consumption of calories as bread," Dr. Mayer told a press conference before the luncheon.

CALORIE CONCERN, SWITCH TO MEATS

Two reasons for the decline in per capita consumption of bread, he declared at the luncheon, are blatant misconceptions about nutrition and the move with affluence to higher priced protein, meat. "People have somehow accepted the idea that bread is high in calories," he said. "People who are on reducing diets won't touch it."

Yet, he said, a slice of bread contains about 70 calories while a slice of roast beef, high in fat, contains from 200 to 300 calories. Protein from fats and carbohydrates do not differ significantly, he said, each at 4 calories per gram.

"Generally, I find the misconception about what is fattening and what isn't, and the concept that only carbohydrates are fattening, is one major reason bread consumption has gone down. As it goes down, all too often what goes up is intake of a lot of saturated fat . . ."

TOO MANY CALORIES FROM FAT

"At the beginning of this century, American people ate only about 30% of their calories as fat. We are now at 43% and in some groups vulnerable to heart diseases, more than 50% of the calories in the diet are derived from fat.

"The only way to get back to reasonable balance is to have people again get a substantial portion of their calories from bread and bread-type foods."

Why have critics attacked bread? Dr. Mayer offered one palpable reason. It is that bread symbolizes all food. For people who don't like the food supply in general and for people who don't like the way society evolved, bread simply became a handy target.

BETTER THAN MOST BREADS

"The general myth is that those breads surrounded by plastic wrappers that you buy in those sort of inhuman, gleaming supermarkets, really can't be very good," he said. But it is every bit as good, or better, from a nutritional viewpoint, as any other bread in the world, he added.

Admitting that his next statement might "alienate his baking friends for all time," Dr. Mayer said: "I don't like the taste of that company bread in the plastic material. But nutritionally, it's perfectly all right. The problem of taste and the problem of nutrition are two different things."

He prefers the long French loaf he enjoyed during his boyhood in Paris, he said, "but from a nutritional standpoint, the standard loaf of white enriched bread in the United States is a much better bread than that picturesque and better-tasting bread sold in French bakery shops."

NO "SINISTER PLOT" AFOOT

Later, he added: "It is my fond hope that we will develop more breads which are both nutritious and taste as good as we can make it. It is absurd to suggest, as some of the literature says, that there is a sinister plot on the part of the nation's bakers to impose that white bread on an unwilling American public. For better or for worse, that [white bread] is what people want."

The history of whole wheat bread, he said, has been "fairly dismal" in this country. These loaves have been available all along. People are voting with their purchases, he said, and they're not choosing whole wheat loaves.

MEAT EQUALS PROTEIN, NO CALORIES

The other major reason for a swing away from bread in the diet has been a certain mystique that has grown up about the role of meat, Dr. Mayer stated. "People like to believe that steak is all protein and no calories," he said, while most persons—

women, mostly—believe that bread is calorie-laden.

"Meat makes an important contribution to protein and trace minerals in the diet," he said, "but the grading system used here emphasizes marbilization of meat that is high in saturated fat." Eggs, too, he said, are good foods, but high in cholesterol. While eggs are good food for children and young women, he said, "it happens not to be a good food for middle aged men."

100 POUNDS OF SUGAR A YEAR

Other aspects of the diet, too, "must give us pause," Dr. Mayer said. The average American eats about 100 lbs of sugar annually, he said. "That's an awful lot of sugar." The total amount of sugar in the diet has remained the same in recent years, he stated, even though over-all consumption of all food has declined.

Dr. Mayer also noted a trend to salty snacks, mainly among youth. Too much salt consumption, he said, is a significant factor in hypertension.

All these aspects—too many calories altogether, too many calories from fat intake, too much sugar and salt—when tied to the sedentary lifestyle of Americans, he said, pose serious problems leading to the upswing of cardio-vascular diseases in the United States.

"What can we do about it?" he asked.

"From a practical viewpoint, I think that two groups of foods that ought to be emphasized in the American diet are bread and fruits and vegetables." Too often, he noted, fruits and especially vegetables are viewed as foods that children, not adults, should eat. In this way it is frequently sidetracked as part of the adult diet. But they do not carry unfavorable connotations.

"Bread presents another problem," Dr. Mayer noted, elaborating on its image of a high calorie food and as a symbol of what is wrong with society. "Bread has become a scapegoat," he said.

As a symbol, bread can have no defenses, he said. But its image of high calories, coupled with unfair allegations of scant nutritional value, are defensible.

Improving its taste, he said, and offering more varieties, also would enhance its chances in the marketplace. Dr. Mayer was encouraged by "an increasing number of variety breads" on the market in the past couple years. But he remained convinced that standard enriched white bread would continue to be the mainstay of the baker's line:

"There is not, so far as I can determine," Dr. Mayer noted wryly, "any sort of dark conspiracy to force everybody to buy white bread.

"In fact, the profit margins seem to be somewhat better on darker variety breads than on white bread. Therefore, if people would buy these, the bakers would probably welcome it.

But since the Middle Ages, white flour is what people like . . . Under these conditions, to reproach the bakers for manufacturing and advertising white bread is unrealistic."

But things are changing in the bread tastes, Dr. Mayer opined. "Spontaneously we are seeing an increase in specialty breads, an increased consumption of breads which are made from less refined flour and additional ingredients." Dr. Mayer cautioned his audience not to expect too much out of bread, however, especially high-priced loaves made from a great many things.

"I shudder a bit when I see people selling breads under fancy names at a dollar a loaf, loaded with molasses and butter and all kinds of other ingredients which tend to double the calorie content per slice and enormously raise the price without any additional nutritional benefit."

Dr. Mayer predicted that people will continue to become more interested in bread and hoped that they would "savor it for the taste alone" instead of "using it—as someone has called it—as an edible napkin." (Dr. Mayer was that "someone" who attached that label to white bread in an earlier presentation to bakers.)

Returning to his theme of bread as "one great hope" to lessening the cardio-vascular disease, he stated:

"Including bread as an important part of the meal, in fact will knock down the high saturated fat content and high sugar intake which has been characteristic of our diet."

Dr. Mayer yearned for a return to the simple diet. Breads, cheeses, a variety of fruits and vegetables, he said, make up a fairly simple, but nutritionally sound and balanced diet.

In conclusion, Dr. Mayer said: "I think bread is a good thing, and there ought to be more of it."

RINGSIDE SEATS AT THE BEST SHOW ON EARTH

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the stormiest marriages in Washington is the match between members of the press and those of us in elected or appointed positions.

But it endures. Mostly, I think, because of an underlying mutual respect and realization that the task of neither partner in the relationship is easy. Beyond that, there is the basic understanding that both sides are somehow necessary for the constructive conduct of the Nation s business.

One of the brighter, more resourceful reporters in Washington in my experience is Susan Schiffer, correspondent for Westinghouse television stations across the country. She fulfills her role completely and in the process serves the highest calling of her profession.

Recently, during a Women's Liberation Weekend at her alma mater, Wheaton College in Norton, Mass., Susan discussed Washington as it looks from her ringside seat.

I herewith submit her remarks on that occasion:

WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENTS: RINGSIDE SEATS AT THE BEST SHOW ON EARTH

One of America's most respected journalists, James Reston, asserts that:

"The 19th century was the era of the novelist; the 20th the era of the journalist. a distracted people, busy with the fierce competitions of modern life, must be addressed while they are paying attention, which is usually at the moment of some great international event."

By a gigantic leap, Americans crossed the gulf from the daguerreotype to color television in less than a century.

The nation's newsmaking profession attained dignity as well as a menacing power. In 1828, Macaulay called the gallery where reporters sat in the English parliament a "fourth estate of the realm". But Macaulay could not have imagined the almost constitutional—even supra constitutional powers of Washington's press corps.

Since the rise of the modern Presidential Press conference in 1933, capital correspondents have had the power to question the chief executive face-to-face, to needle him, to embarrass him, to force him into positions or into public refusal to take a position. A President may find it inconvenient to meet with a group of dissident senators or congressmen; he seldom dares refuse the press. If he does, that refusal, itself, becomes news. It is only very recently, and as a result of increasing pressures by reporters, that the phrase "no comment" has become a way of saying something important.

Even before 1950, Washington had about 1,500 correspondents (only about 300 of whom were political reporters while the rest worked for various trade publications) and about 3,000 government information officials prepared to serve them. (Despite the fact that except on rare occasions and only for special reasons, does a self-respecting correspondent consult PR men; a good reporter will always go, or try to go, straight to the main source of the story.)

Yet, in 1969, the federal government spent more than four hundred million dollars on public relations and public information. The executive branch spends more on publicity, news, views, publications and special pleadings than is spent to operate the entirety of the legislative and judicial branches. All together, federal expenditures on telling and showing the tax payers are more than double the combined costs of news gathering by the two major American wire services, the three major television networks, and the ten largest newspapers.

Obviously, the positive is accentuated and the negative avoided. Officials tend to be accessible only when the news is good. Yet the correspondent who criticises the practices of powerful bureaucrats destroys his own value as a reporter. Indignant officials exclude him from press conferences and delete his name from mailing lists. The reporter completely loses personal touch with the government about which he or she is supposed to report and it becomes hard to compete with journalists who present "favorable" news.

This attempted control of the press is nothing new. If anything is clear about press-government relationships throughout our history, it is this: in theory, America's leaders have wanted a free and independent press as a check upon government; in practice, they wanted no such thing.

According to theory, by carefully refraining from setting up an official information branch within the government, and by granting freedom to the press under the first amendment, the country's founders asserted their belief that an independent information system is central to democracy. But the gap between theory and practice was apparent from the beginning. The constitutional convention of 1787 was held in secret and from then on, secrecy in government became standard practice.

Abraham Lincoln, who knew the extent of political power and the great editors of the mid 19th century, pointed out:

"In this and like communities, public sentiment is everything. With public sentiment, nothing can fail, without it, nothing can succeed. Consequently, he who moulds public sentiment goes deeper than he who enacts statutes or pronounces decisions."

All politicians and presidents try to manage the news. It would be dangerous, though, if they were ever able to systematically close down the channels of information from their offices and administrations. so that decisions could be made without public debate and controversy. After the disastrous Bay of Pigs Invasion, which the *New York Times* had not warned us about to avoid jeopardizing national security, President Kennedy said that he wished that hints of the invasion had been published which would have caused it to have been reappraised.

According to Reston,

"There are really three ways to deal with the press. The best way is to tell them everything; this keeps them busy and eventually

exhausts and bores them. The next best way is to tell them nothing, which at least excites the cop in them and gives them the excitement of a mystery. The worst way, which is Mr. Nixon's way and also Mr. Johnson's way is to try to manipulate them, to pretend to be candid in private conversation, but to use every trick in the book to get them to fill the headlines and front pages with calculated trash!"

Contrary to what some witnesses and most government officials think, the Washington press corps cannot take the role of sweetheart. The necessity for a challenging journalism does not spring from the fact that officials lie, although they do. Far more often, the public is misled because well-meaning officials or politicians really believe in their policies and programs. Believing as devoutly as they do, the public interest is approached through a narrow channel and from a narrow perspective. Men with narrow perspectives cannot be expected to really serve the public interest unless they are called to account by an independent press.

This is why most Washington reporters are adversaries. In other words, no matter how friendly they are with a politician or official, there is usually a degree of tension in the relationship when serving in their professional roles. As one of President Johnson's press officers said, "the official views public communications in terms of help or hindrance towards a common goal; the reporter views communications in terms of what he regards as reality." The divergence is inevitable.

To stimulate awareness, the Washington journalists challenge and probe—to move vital issues into the public arena before a decision become concrete.

A proper adversary relationship is a delicate balance of tact and antagonism, cooperation and conflict.

One of the strictest problems of being an adversary in Washington is defining the proper stance towards your sources and at the same time be independent of them. Occasionally a reporter digs up information that, if announced, would run counter to public interest. Some highly placed source usually asks that it be kept secret. Whether it is or not depends on the reporters' judgment of the public interest and how persuasively the source argues.

Basically there are two kinds of reporters—the "ins" and the "outs." The "ins" are those who play along with the news sources, handle in their way, tend to overlook minor indiscretions, and, in general, protect their sources. The "outs," in contrast, fight their sources, or at least needle them. They get their news by insisting on their right to it by sheer perseverence—and let the source know they intend to play it straight. Their news is obtained the hard way, running the risk of being ostracized not only by the sources but also by the reporters who are "ins." Only a very few reporters are able to work both ways, and it depends on the circumstances.

Although the relationship of the Washington Press Corps with the government is its key one, its relationship with each other is also important—much more so than most outsiders realize. Taking into consideration that there are some strays and non-conformists, most of the Washington press corps tends to travel in a pack. One columnist, Stewart Alsop, has even compared us to a pack of beagles.

"There is a physical resemblance: not all reporters have stumpy legs and prominent tails (though some do), but almost all develop in time the anxious, preoccupied, self-important air of beagles. The resemblance, however, is more spiritual than physical. The beagle is a highly competitive dog; but he is always ready to follow uncritically any other beagle who claims to have smelled a rabbit. When one beagle gives tongue, all others instantly join in, and off the whole pack screams, each yelping like mad in order to convince the onlookers that he was really the first to pick up the scent. Sometimes the scent is actually that of a rabbit, but quite often the beagles, as they chase each other around in circles, giving tongue lustily, are simply smelling each other."

In the same way, when one Washington correspondent reports something which is—or which seems to be—new or important, most of the press corps immediately begins to follow the same story. This herd instinct, which creates fashions in the news, has its dangers. After the commitment of American combat troops in 1965, the war in Viet Nam became the dominant foreign news story. The result being that the Middle East Crisis in the spring of 1967 came as a sudden shock to most citizens—and to most reporters as well. This same tendency to over-report one subject and under-report others also affects domestic news coverage, for instance over-emphasis on the South's integration problems at the expense of the North's.

Although events themselves—war, a crisis, or an election—are the basic factors in determining what the Washington press corps reports; more than ever before correspondents are concerning themselves with what events mean. Why has been added to the who—what—when—where formula of news writing. This condition is partly caused by the increasing complexity of the news and partly because the whys can lead to a syndicated column or a top job with a TV network.

One cannot discuss the Washington Press without mentioning, however briefly, one of the legitimate criticisms of the corps. It is an article of faith on the Republican Right that virtually the entire Washington Press corps is the willing handmaiden of the "Liberal Establishment." They do have a point. Journalists who make their living mainly by their written words are often quasi intellectuals and until recently, the Democratic Party has been the party of the intellectuals. The system is solidified by political candidates who are convinced that most publishers are Republicans. Many Republican candidates try to avoid the reporters who actually cover the news, while basking in the warm glow of approval on the editorial pages. For precisely the same reason, the Democratic candidates with an instinct for survival, tend to cultivate the working press, and in the process, to provide them with news.

Television news has greater impact than any of the other forms of media: (The latest Elmer Roper survey shows that the majority of Americans, 67%, chose television as their primary news source), yet the medium has built in handicaps.

A half hour newscast usually only contains seventeen minutes of news or the same number of words which appear in only two columns of the front page of the *New York Times*. While a "production piece" (which usually means silent film which the reporter voices over and an interview) can last two or three minutes, a "talking head" or standard interview, is usually to be kept under one and a half minutes. So after spending all day at a Congressional hearing or background session, a reporter or editor must chose only a segment of what was said. When the choice is between a diffuse idea and a more sensational phrase, the headline often wins out.

Being a woman member of the Washington Press Corps has both its own built-in handicaps and rewards. Our male colleagues feel that we should act like ladies, look like girls, think like men, and work like dogs. The tools of the trade include stamina, flexibility, binoculars, track shoes and an affinity for phone booths. The bane of our existence is the politician who prefers to unburden his troubles rather than news, but since men naturally like to explain things to women, most politicans and reporters are usually quite helpful if we are prepared to smile, listen, and nod at the appropriate occasion.

Despite the handicaps, the power of the Washington Press Corps continues. Facts do influence events and supposedly have more impact than what journalists say about what happened. Although news is what matters most, it is reporters and editors who determine what is news and what other correspondents say about the news influences this decision.

The influence of the Washington Press Corps is the greater because of its continuing presence. The press shares one characteristic with the upper bureaucracy of the permanent government establishment, it survives elections.

Presidents may come and Presidents may go, but a James Reston or a Eric Severeid remain. The opportunity of having been part of political Washington while several presidents have come and gone, imparts to a successful correspondent a certain status and authority—and in some occasions, a certain pomposity as well.

Ed Lahey expressed Washington's dangers quite well:

"It's very easy for a reporter to be beaten to death by Lady Fingers. Once you get softened up by rubbing elbows with the lords of creation at cocktail parties on Embassy Row, you never want to go back to your roots. The impact of Washington can turn a simple bumpkin into a self-important statesman, or a pedestrian news reporter into a pretentious journalist."

The power of political journalism is dangerous, but it is also necessary. The mess in Viet Nam is an example of what happens when journalism fails. In 1961, well before the United States became deeply committed, only a few hundred advisors were in Viet Nam. Then quite secretly, President Kennedy and his lieutenants decided to increase the American presence to 15,000. But they said publicly that only a modest increase was contemplated, and the press dutifully reported the statement. Had reporters discovered and published the details of the secret meeting at which the decision was made, the disaster that Viet Nam has become might never have occurred.

If the reporting of government affairs were left solely to government officials, we could expect an endless series of secret decisions on controversial issues and reports in the form of peaceful pictures, uneasy optimism and heartening statistics. The impulses of political preservation are always strong.

Despite public outcry, the reputation of Washington correspondents depends on their ability to ask hard questions, and to occasionally put "Politicians and officials on the spot while also maintaining their collaboration." Although occasionally angering the public for what we expose, the role of the adversary necessitates our seeking out the abuse and power. We walk the tightrope between tact and antagonism, cooperation and conflict and need your understanding.

TRIBUTE TO "CHUCK" YEAGER

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a number of colleagues and I paid tribute last Thursday on the floor of the House to West Virginia's Brig. Gen. Charles E. "Chuck" Yeager of Hamlin on the silver anniversary of his historic flight, October 14, 1947, marking the first time man had ever flown faster than the speed of sound. The tributes

may be found on pages 35563–66 and 35586 of the October 12, 1972 RECORD.

A more personal view of Chuck Yeager and what he means to West Virginia and his boyhood in Hamlin were warmly described in a column written by Mrs. Oneita Hilbert Adkins, a Hamlin native, which appeared in the October 12 edition of the St. Albans, W. Va., Advertiser and which follows:

SILVER ANNIVERSARY OF "CHUCK" YEAGER'S FLIGHT THROUGH SOUND BARRIER

(By Oneita Hilbert Adkins)

October 14 1972, will mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the world shattering flight, traveling faster than the speed of sound, by Brigadier General Charles Yeager, Hamlin native, on the desert sands of California, near the Edwards Air Force Base, although this event was not made public for some months later.

Folks in the Lincoln County community were not too surprised upon learning that their native son was now a personality of world renown, because, he, perhaps more than any other person instilled an awareness of the frightful rigors of war so far removed from this sleepy little town, as "Chuck" Yeager with his daring swoops over Hamlin came without warning, ofttimes signaling his arrival at the Charleston Airport for some member of his family to pick him up for the trip to Hamlin which sometimes took as long as his plane trip from California or other points unknown.

Charles, as he is better known to me, grew up in Hamlin, my hometown, in much the same way as any ordinary boy, maybe a little more daring. The Yeager family were farmers before moving to Hamlin from Myra when Charles was a mere lad, his father then became associated in the gas-well drilling business until his death a few years ago. Charles did chores about the place, which included gardening and mowing the lawn, occasionally slipping away to fish in the Mud River. Most of all he liked the hills where he could walk alone or hunt, he said "he had hunted as long as he could remember". Charles was considered an average student, believed you weren't supposed to excel in everything, although he usually made good marks in math. Like all boys he enjoyed sports, football and basketball. He was a member of the Lincoln County band and was considered "no slouch" on the trombone and marching was his special "cup of tea".

After his graduation from high-school in the summer of 1941 there was not much to offer in the way of jobs in the small residential community, although his father wanted him to attend college, he had no taste for it.

A returning friend, an Army pilot, encouraged Charles to enlist, although he was only eighteen he had spent two summers at Ft. Benjamin Harrison with the Citizens Military Camp, he was not a novice by any standard in how to wear a uniform and drill.

In September, 1941, he enlisted in the Army Air Corp as a private. Thereafter most of his life has been one exciting exploit after the other from his historic plunge through the dreaded sonic barrier, his prowess in World War II, which was "something else" and each ensuing sequence has drawn worldwide acclaim, more like the experiences one would see in the movies.

All the accomplishments of his life, coupled with a modest versatile personality, have joined to make "Chuck Yeager" a household word and truly a great man. From his early days at Hamlin High School to the conference tables of diplomacy.

Memorials are usually reserved for those who have gone on, but Brig. Gen. Yeager, a bridge was built spanning the Kanawha River just east of Charleston, W. Va. on I–64 as a memorial of his historic flight that so befittingly characterizes his feat in bridging the airways of the World. In 1970, another memorial was erected near the east side of St. Albans, W. Va. by the Explorer Post No. 376, whose leader was Jack Dawson of that city. They requested a plane, perhaps one the flyer himself had piloted, but received a 7,000 pound "Honest John" rocket instead, which reposes on a giant slab of concrete along side of U.S. Rt. 60, and the tranquil waters of the mighty Kanawha River. Still another is to come later this year by the National Air Space Museum of the Smithsonian Institution with a stamp commemorating the flight a quarter of a century ago.

Charles doesn't get home as much as he probably would like, being a father of four adult children and his busy life has curtailed these homecoming somewhat. When he does visit his mother and family it is usually without fanfare, although in the early days he could be seen mingling with friends on the streets of Hamlin wearing a sport shirt and a big smile. He is still fond of the food of his boyhood days and especially if he happens to come home during molasses making time where cane mills were abundant only a few years ago. And Charles was not averse to stashing away a gallon jug of "sorghum molasses" for his return home.

A special salute goes to Brigadier General Charles Yeager on this historic date, for truly he is a son of a heritage where men tilled the soil and timbered the forests that espoused a son to the World whose contribution to aviation will live throughout the annals of time.

DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION WEEK

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, approximately 1 year ago, I, as one of the U.S. delegates to the North Atlantic Assembly and as vice chairman of the Scientific and Technical Committee of that great body, was in the midst of preparing an urgent address on the serious threat of the narcotics problem to all people of all nations. At that time, I stated:

To date, international control of narcotic drugs has been ineffective and international organizations have been falling further and further behind in their efforts to deal with the narcotics problem. In particular, almost all the illegal heroin in the United States comes from foreign countries with significant sources of illegal narcotics located in the NATO area.

Many months have passed since I delivered this statement; some progress has been made. My proposal to impose economic sanctions on all foreign governments which fail to take adequate steps to curtail the illegal production, processing, and export of heroin has been adopted as an amendment to the 1971 Foreign Assistance Act. After constant pressing, the administration reversed its previous stand and came forth to clearly support this vital legislation. Thus, on the international level, the awareness of the world community of the strength and firmness of the U.S. position on this crucial issue has taken a strong step forward.

But, what of the progress within our own country? How successful have our efforts been to combat this crucial plague which has so extensively afflicted our youth. This week, as we all know, is National Drug Abuse Prevention Week. As the very first Member of Congress to introduce legislation in this sensitive area, I am particularly pleased that the administration has made this declaration. For pervasiveness of this epidemic has drastically intensified; it has spread from ghetto to suburb, from city street to children's elementary school, and the need for every single citizen of this Nation to learn to understand and to deal effectively with this horrid disease, grows ever more important with each passing day.

On October 5, testifying before Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Judiciary Committee, I called directly on the President to make available the full resources and facilities of our Federal Government to both assist in the treatment of addicts and to aid in cracking down on drug pushers. The situation has become increasingly complex. A combination of prevention, of education, of treatment and of great foresight is called for. From contacting the mayors of all cities within my constituency informing them of my plans, to encouraging educational programs on drug abuse prevention for all our children, to continually urging suggestions, new approaches and innovative ideas to handle this situation, I feel, that although we have made some accomplishments, we have, in no way, met the crux of this issue.

On November 17, I have the honor once again, of joining a number of my colleagues in representing the United States at this year's NATO Assembly. As part of my visit, I am chairman of a working group on the control of narcotics. A year has passed, and on all levels, local, State, national, and international, we have much to accomplish and a long road to travel.

I sincerely hope that in the near future, we will have no need to call for a week in dedication of drug abuse prevention, that in the near future, our people will not of the cruelty and injustice of this disease. Until that time, however, we must all join hands to work increasingly to reach this goal.

A NATIONAL MONUMENT TO LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, inspired by the dedication of our Nation's police officers generally, and the courage and zeal of the officers of my county's outstanding police force in particular, and at the recommendation of Patrolman Tom Dwen, PBA president, I have this day introduced legislation to establish a National Law Enforcement Heroes Monument in our Nation's Capital.

Since the session is nearing a close, there is no possibility of positive action on this bill this year. It will be my purpose to campaign actively for heavy co-

sponsorship and enactment in the 93d Congress at an early date in the new year.

I will urge all Members at that time to join me in this deserving tribute to men in blue everywhere.

PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE SCHMITZ' ECONOMIC VIEWS

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I include the views on the domestic and international economy of our colleague from California. They are forthright, succinct, and I feel stimulating to all:

[From Business Week, Oct. 14, 1972]

CANDIDATE SCHMITZ' ECONOMIC VIEWS

A funny thing happened to John G. Schmitz in his bid for a second term in Congress from the California district where President Nixon has his San Clemente home. The 42-year-old ultraconservative, who loves a good joke, was beaten in the Republican primary but wound up with the American Party's nomination for the Presidency.

Now, Schmitz is campaigning hard to equal the 10-million-vote showing made in 1968 by his American Party predecessor, George C. Wallace. Sounding much the same themes, the former philosophy instructor at Santa Ana Community College is also pitching chiefly for Governor Wallace's old constituency. In a Business Week interview last week, Schmitz detailed his staunchly free-enterprise views on government spending, welfare, taxes, and other economic matters.

Q. Is it true that the White House helped defeat you in that primary?

SCHMITZ. Jack Anderson said Nixon sent his henchmen out to California to get me, and just because Anderson said it, doesn't mean it's not true?

Q. Is this really why you lost?

A. I lost because the White House switched 180 degrees, and I wouldn't switch with them. I stumped the country telling what Richard Nixon was doing. In 1968, he said that if we had to become like the Democrats to get elected, there was no reason for the GOP to exist. Then he became exactly like the Democrats. Richard Nixon has destroyed the Republican Party as a conservative entity.

Q. In what way has Nixon become exactly like the Democrats?

A. When I was a Republican, we used to rail against the Keynesian economics of the Democrats. Now, in just four years, Nixon has run up one-fourth of the entire national debt. And he submits an unbalanced budget and calls it a full-employment budget.

I'll tell you, business is never going to be the same unless we stop Richard Nixon. I sincerely believe that he is totalitarianizing this country. If you want to have the corporate state, as in Nazi Germany, then businessmen could operate in it. But they're not going to operate in a manner they would like. A lot of them are already getting on the bandwagon—Lockheed, Amtrak, all getting in on government welfare. Businessmen seem to have the knack of accepting the lesser of two evils. I want to give them an alternative.

Q. Do you have George Wallace's support?

A. He says I'm one of his favorite people in politics.

Q. Isn't Wallace willing to accept more government intervention in the economy, say, in aid to the states?

A. During his campaign, he had a rather cute answer when asked about accepting a lot of federal aid in Alabama. He said, "Well, at least we spent it on Americans." I'd rather do what he did than pour the money down foreign ratholes. But the American Party does want Washington to get out of welfare and education. We don't feel there are any problems in either field that cannot be solved at the state or local level.

Q. That sounds like the Nixon Administration's stand on revenue sharing.

A. No. Their position is phony, just rhetoric. Nixon's plan just siphons the money through the federal government. If he really wanted to return control to the local areas, he would let local governments have the revenue sources and finance themselves.

The federal government getting into education builds up the federal bureaucracy, federal controls, federal totalitarianism, federal money waste, and the federal brokerage fee. In 10 years, the human resources cut of the budget pie has gone from 20% to 40% while defense has been halved to 30%.

Q. What would you do about this?

A. I'd put that human resources money into defense. We've been reordering priorities for 15 years by robbing defense Peter to pay socialist Paul. We now find ourselves No. 2 militarily to a system that can't even build its own trucks. I agree with George Washington that the surest way to guarantee peace is to let it be known you're always prepared for war.

Q. Are you suggesting that Nixon's peace moves toward Russian and China . . .

A. I'm not suggesting it, I'm saying it. They're more apt to lead to war than to peace. As John Jay put it, I wouldn't give a farthing for parchment security. For 50 years, the Soviet Union has been almost completely dependent on the U.S. for its technology. Now, recently Nixon was in the Soviet Union talking of bringing the Russians advanced computer technology. What goes through my mind as a Marine reserve aviator? Such technology, in the form of SAM missiles in North Vietnam, is going to make it easier for them to turn U.S. fliers into POWs.

Q. Would you sever all trade with the Communists? What about the grain deal with the Soviet Union?

A. I would cut off all trade with the enemy as long as they were killing our troops. But I might take a second look at the grain deal. I might bend a bit if I thought our need for gold was crucial and I could make a deal for it.

Q. Why is gold so crucial?

A. Because of the U.S. gold losses, we are losing any vestige of financial independence. Last week, the International Monetary Fund met in Washington. I just don't like the idea of a few people getting together and deciding how the international money system should work. You could call that planning. I might call it conspiracy. The IMF is going to run the system. Can't you then logically say that it's going to be running nations?

Q. How else could you coordinate a monetary system involving 124 nations?

A. Well, the way economist Ludwig von Mises says. There are certain natural laws and laws of economics that are far better than any man can devise. You just foul things up by intervening.

Q. Is one of those laws the gold standard, to which you want to return?

A. Yes. I'm author of a bill to allow people to own gold. Why can't you own gold now? Because it makes you independent of a controlled money system.

Q. But the world doesn't have enough gold to go around, and a great deal of it is in the Soviet Union.

A. There's also gold in South Africa and in California. It's just not feasible to mine it in California at $38 an ounce. The ideal price is whatever the free market will bear.

Q. Doesn't this leave a lot of room for speculators to fatten up on the impoverishment of the U.S. dollar?

A. You don't think that the dollar has been impoverished by speculation, do you? It's been impoverished by the imbalance of payments. We've been debauching our own currency by spending more abroad than we're taking in.

Q. Where, by the way, do you get your economic ideas? Von Mises?

A. I read his books. Von Mises probably would not go along with our anti-monopoly plank, although he is not as libertarian as some of his disciples.

Q. Is it true that you would also abolish the Federal Reserve System?

A. Yes. This is old populist George Wallace's view, too. In 1913, there was this big William Jennings Bryan reaction against the financial rule of a few men. So they met on Jeckyll Island, Ga., to solve the problem. And what they did was to institutionalize the problem by creating the Fed.

Q. You've sounded a bit like a populist, too—a bit like Senator McGovern—on tax reform, talking about closing loopholes for the superrich.

A. Yeah, well . . . I may call for it, but he sure gets the fat-cat money. We're the thin-cat party. Our biggest contribution to date is $6,000 from a North Dakota farmer. That party of the crusade of the young, the poor, and the nonwhite is mighty well-oiled. I've been in public office eight years and never seen a tax-reform package that wasn't just a cover-up for tax hikes.

Q. What are your reform proposals?

A. The basic reform I would inaugurate is not to spend more than you take in. This may sound like major surgery, but we are dying of cancer. We are going down the tube.

Either we are going bankrupt or there's a guy in charge of the government who's kidding us. Back in 1968, Nixon said we were going to go bankrupt if we didn't cut $10 billion off Lyndon Johnson's $170 billion budget. Now he is talking of holding the line at $250 billion.

Q. How serious is inflation now?

A. You know what Phase III is? That's the election. Nixon himself said using wage and price controls to halt inflation is like holding down the lid on a boiling kettle, and you had to turn down the heat and cut deficit spending. When the kettle blows, it's going to blow hard. All he cares about is that it not happen until after Nov. 7.

Q. How do you back off drastically from deficit spending without causing a recession and more unemployment?

A. When you cut spending in the government sector, that money goes into private spending. For every job the government creates with a small businessman's tax money, that businessman could have created two or three.

Q. You've referred to the Lockheed bailout. What would you have done?

A. I'd say to Lockheed: That's the occupational hazard, you should have dealt with an American company rather than Rolls-Royce. I don't think the American taxpayer should have had to bail out Rolls-Royce on that one. We could have let Lockheed, without legislation, renegotiate the contracts on, say, the Cheyenne helicopter if it got into financial trouble because of government foul-ups. And if Lockheed had to go under on civilian deals, you could have salvaged the defense aspects through government resale.

Q. Getting back to tax reform, are you concerned over the charge that many people do not pay their fair share?

A. Our income tax forms are so complicated that no one can understand them. Even in the middle-income range, those who are able to afford a tax attorney can make but a lot better. You could probably find some violation in everyone's return, and this allows for selective, tyrannical enforcement. So I would simplify the tax system.

Q. What about so-called loopholes for oil depletion and capital gains?

A. The oil depletion allowance can be justified as an incentive to developing domestic oil fields. But the big tax-exempt foundations are something else. Whether it's Republican Rockefellers on one side or Democratic Harrimans on the other, it's the same kitchen serving two restaurants. The foundations are used for political leverage. People think that because someone is wealthy, he must be conservative and a free-enterpriser. No, when a person has all the money he needs, his goal becomes power.

Q. Do you then favor income or wealth redistribution?

A. No, that not what I'm saying. If these fat cats are really concerned about us thin cats and are really so charitable, they could redistribute their wealth by their own decision. But now they give it away, through foundations, by using government to exact more taxes from the already over-burdened middle class.

Q. Who do you see as your constituency—small businessmen, Wallace people?

A. Yes, them, but anyone willing to work for a living, the vast majority of Americans who have been taken for granted by the other two parties. I think we'll hold those blue-collar Democrats who went for Wallace on such issues as busing and opposition to amnesty. Being Milwaukee-born, and a former Blatz brewery vat cleaner as I worked my way through college, I think I'll be able to hold that vote in the North. I wasn't born with a silver spoon in my mouth.

INDUSTRY/OSHA COOPERATION

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, during the oversight hearings on the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 in September, the Select Subcommittee on Labor of the Education and Labor Committee was privileged to hear testimony from the American Pulpwood Association. The statement is a good example of the constructive relationship that can be established by cooperation between industry and the Department of Labor.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN PULPWOOD ASSOCIATION

(By K. S. Rolston, manager, technical program, American Pulpwood Association)

The American Pulpwood Association is supported by producers and consumers of pulpwood, raw material for the nation's paper industry. Our programs are primarily education, training and extension activities aimed at improving the technical aspects and management practices of many thousands of small pulpwood logging establishments located in rural areas throughout the nation. These logging operations are within the OSHA target industry category "Lumber and Wood Products" and are receiving much more OSHA attention than many other businesses.

The American Pulpwood Association has been very active in safety training activities for the past twenty years and we feel that, among trade associations supported by the forest industry, we are in a position of leadership. During the past six years, we have received five annual association safety awards from the National Safety Council. This is a highly coveted award and we feel that we have earned it.

Our experience with the administration of the Occupational Safety and Health Act leads us to believe that it is a powerful tool for improving the accident control situation in the pulpwood logging business. We believe that the Act is just and worthy and that it has been well administered to date.

Inclusion in one of the five target industry categories was no surprise. Pulpwood loggers are subject to many very unusual hazards and virtually all logging operations are quite small businesses without benefit of professional safety staff.

SMALL BUSINESSES CAN BE INFORMED

Shortly after being informed of our target industry status our association held more than 300 meetings in forested areas to inform pulpwood logging operators of their responsibilities under the act. We directly reached more than 8,000 employers and thru publications reached an additional 30,000. The educational program was successful largely because of cooperation among our members, but the OSHA staff was extremely helpful, providing us with information on the law and the standards and reviewing our visual aid program and printed materials. Our members know what OSHA requires—and thousands of non-member loggers who were invited to attend our local area meetings know about OSHA too.

APA didn't have to carry out this information program alone. State associations such as the Wisconsin-Michigan Timber Producers Association, Georgia Forestry Association, Florida Forestry Association, Pennsylvania Logging Safety Council, Maine Forest Forum, and Minnesota Timber Producers Association really pitched in to help out.

I would suggest that it is the role of an effective trade association to inform their members about issues that affect them. If it wasn't the role of trade associations to keep their members informed, interpret government rules and regulations, and participate in standards making activities, we wouldn't need may trade associations.

LOGGERS CAN COMPLY WITH MOST OSHA REQUIREMENTS

Almost without exception pulpwood logging operators find no quarrel with OSHA requirements or the safety standards that apply to their operations. Sure, there were problems, loggers don't have offices and we still haven't figured out whether to tack up the OSHA employee information poster on a tree or on the side of a log truck. We definitely support the OSHA proposal to relieve small businessmen with less than 8 employees of the rather complex recordkeeping provisions. The important point that I would like to make is that during our 300 meetings with 8,000 loggers there were virtually no complaints about the economic impact of the safety standards. In fact, time and again we heard comments to the effect that "these safety standards are just telling us to do what we should have already been doing."

We haven't heard any adverse comments about the level of OSHA penalties assessed our members either. One pulpwood logging operator who received a relatively high penalty ($600.00) in circumstances surrounding a fatality on his job said that the penalty was minor in comparison with the terrible cost of losing a valued employee.

OSHA COMPLIANCE OFFICERS HAVE BEEN REASONABLE

Our Association has an OSHA inspection reporting service and we get information back from the field about logging operations that have been inspected. We have received no complaints regarding OSHA administration and as far as we know no pulpwood logging operator has filed a contest before the Review Commission.

We got reports about the conduct of OSHA compliance officers—and, with one exception, they have been reasonable and fair—even friendly. One employer said that, although he had to pay a penalty, he'd learned a lot of other things that needed doing—and he felt that the penalty had been cheap in comparison with the safety consulting service he'd received. I could give you several other stories like this.

We understand that some employer groups feel the need for government consultation on-site without risk of penalty and we respect their position. The logging business is not as complicated as some others and we feel that we can, and are, communicating the OSHA requirements, and how to comply with them. We would have to be shown how consultation on-site would help our members before we got excited about it.

Complaints about improper action or attitude on the part of the OSHA people are just not compatible with our experience. If there are problems of this nature, can't they be handled in the same way one might call attention to improper behavior by an F.B.I. agent or a postal carrier?

OSHA STANDARDS

Pulpwood logging operations are covered under a specific section of the OSHA standards package derived from an American National Standards Institute safety standard.[1] Our association sponsored this standard. Work began in 1967. Twenty-seven organizations representing employers, unions, equipment manufacturers, insurance, and government participated in the development of four review drafts, and all approved the final ballot draft. We made it and can live with it because it's for safety and it sets achievable standards.

Complaints from some groups center around the substance of other portions of the OSHA standards package—and it is true that some of these standards are trivial. We have faith that government, industry, and labor can work together to correct these problems. The act provides the appropriate machinery to get the job done.

We are already involved in revision work to further improve the ANSI standards that apply to logging and have formed ANSI committees to develop additional standards in related areas. We suggest that other trade associations may find this actively beneficial to their membership.

THE HIGH COST OF INJURIES OR THE HIGH COST OF OSHA?

How expensive has it been for pulpwood logging operators to get their logging operation into compliance? I can't give you exact figures. I do know that we haven't received any complaints about the cost of hard hats, guards, or other safety equipment and we certainly haven't heard of anyone going out of business because of the high cost of OSHA.

The humane motivation for accident prevention is the major concern for all of us, but we also must assess the economic demands required to achieve humane goals. A major economic concern for pulpwood logging operations is the high cost of Workmen's Compensation Insurance, currently in some states more than $20.00 per hundred dollars a payroll. If the leverage provided by the Occupational Safety and Health Act can improve the injury experience on these logging operations, the cost savings potential from reduction of Workmen's Compensation Insurance rates is far more important than the cost of compliance with OSHA.

In addition to the potential for reducing direct costs of injuries such as Workmen's Compensation and medical costs, there is a greater potential for savings through reduction of the indirect costs of injuries such as lost production, work interruption and damage to equipment which are always associated with high injury rates. These indirect costs can be four times higher than the direct costs. Accident control measures taken

[1] Safety Requirements for Pulpwood Logging, ONSI 03.1–1971.

to reduce direct cost of injuries automatically reduce indirect costs.

SMALL EMPLOYERS AND LARGE EMPLOYERS

Many studies have shown that employers of small business establishments suffer higher injury rates. Most logging operations employ less than 15 men—and are in the target industry category.

We are very concerned that Congress proposes to exempt small businesses from the Act. Is it fair to a worker to assure him safe and healthful working conditions on jobs employing more than 15 and leave a worker on a smaller crew in jeopardy? Who's going to explain this to the worker left without protection and how can a worker so deprived be expected to have respect for this government? Perhaps there are acceptable answers to these questions and if there are—we would like to hear them.

We urge the Congress to reconsider withdrawing the protection of OSHA from workers employed in small businesses. If this were to happen a real opportunity to improve logging safety will be lost. In the long run these small employers are certain to accrue material benefits from compliance with the Act as their cost from injuries decline.

CONCLUSION

The administration of this very important legislation is in its infancy. Yet already we are certain that it has had a constructive impact on our industry. More logging workers are wearing personal protective equipment than ever before, more safety practics are being followed, some of the more hazardous aspects of logging machinery have been improved, and logging equipment manufacturers are improving the safety and health aspects of their machinery. OSHA has created a vital new interest in safety at all levels in our industry. If the majority of employers are exempted from enforcement, even if only for a year, we're going to lose the needed momentum.

Other industries may genuinely need legislative or administrative action to serve the best needs for employee safety and health and the requests we are aware of would not adversely affect the pulpwood logging industry. Our industry does need the full coverage of the Act if we are ever going to move out of the OSHA target industry status.

BYELORUSSIA

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to place in the record a resolution recently passed by the 10th Convention of Byelorussians of North America.

I certainly support their resolution, and I want to take this time to say that I will continue my efforts to be of help to them and to their friends and families who are still living under Soviet oppression in Byelorussia.

The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION

(The 10th Biennial Convention of Byelorussians of North America held in Toronto, Canada, on September 2–3, 1972)

Whereas Russian rule over Byelorussia—first forcibly annexed by Muscovy in 1772 and 1793—was re-established by force of Bolshevik arms through destruction of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, which had been proclaimed independent on March 25, 1918;

Whereas the Soviet Byelorussian government, including its spokesmen in the United Nations, does not represent the will of the Byelorussian people, but constitutes a docile instrument of Russian imperialism and propaganda;

Whereas the wealth of the Byelorussian land is being siphoned off by the central Soviet government to finance Russian expansionist schemes throughout the world (with Byelorussian territories partitioned by Moscow in a political game between herself and Byelorussia's neighbors);

Whereas the Communist Party in Byelorussia, under the subterfuge of the so-called merging of nations, conducts an intensive campaign of Russification and discrimination against Byelorussian culture;

Whereas many Byelorussian patriots in Byelorussia, especially among the young and the intelligentsia, do their utmost to defend and develop Byelorussian national interests,

Therefore we the Byelorussians of Canada and the United States of America, gathered at the 10th biennial Convention of Byelorussians of North America in the great city of Toronto, Canada, on September 2–3, 1972, to commemorate the 90th birthday of two of the foremost Byelorussian poets and national leaders, Janka Kupala, murdered in Moscow in 1942) and Jakub Kolas (d. 1956), as well as to mark the 450th anniversary of printing in Byelorussia, do unanimously resolve

To continue the struggle for re-establishment of a free and independent Byelorussian Democratic Republic;

To encourage in Soviet Byelorussia manifest trends toward liberalization, extension of civil rights, and cultural freedom;

To expose economic exploitation and Russification of Byelorussia, now being continued under the smoke screen of the 50th anniversary of Soviet federation;

To preserve in our own midst, along with Canadian and American values, our Byelorussian heritage—language, history, traditions, and the concern for the well-being of the entire Byelorussian nation;

To support any resistance among the Byelorussian people in the Soviet Union directed toward the restitution of Byelorussia's territorial integrity and free development of material and cultural values.

Byelorussian Canadian Alliance, 524 St. Clarens Ave., Toronto, Ont., Canada.

Byelorrusian-American Association, Inc., 166–34 Gothic Drive, Jamaica, N.Y., U.S.A.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have found that the public has a high degree of interest in the publications of the Federal Government. The research, the information and the compilation of material made by the various agencies of our Government provide in these publications a method of informing our citizens not only of the nature of our Federal Government but also the answers to many questions our constituents have regarding specific topics. In an effort to be of assistance to my constituents of the Ninth Congressional District, I am making available the following publications:

PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE FOR CONSTITUENTS:

A facsimile of the Declaration of Independence on parchment.

"Our Flag," a booklet carrying the history of the American flag, color photographs of the flags that have been used by our nation and of the 50 State flags.

Document containing Vietnam and Asian Continent maps. It also includes indexes and economic and topographic maps.

"Arthritis—The Basic Facts," a publication of the Arthritis Foundation made available to Members of Congress for distribution to interested constituents.

FIVE CHILD CARE BOOKLETS

Prenatal Care.
Infant Care.
Your Child From One to Six.
Your Child From Six to Twelve.
The Adolescent in Your Family.

Those desiring one or more of the above-named publications should indicate by check marks in the appropriate boxes which ones they want send this form to Representative Henry Helstoski, 326 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE

Name _____
Street _____
Town_____, N.J._____Zip

REPORTS ON A PREVIOUSLY OVERLOOKED MINORITY

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the approximately 6 million Americans of Mexican descent constitute the Nation's second largest minority group—and, with the exception of the American Indian, its poorest. I think the problems of the Mexican American has been seriously overlooked by the American public as a whole. Mexican Americans suffer severe education handicaps—50 percent have completed less than 8 years of schooling—and are employed primarily as manual laborers. The problems that face the Mexican American population in the United States have complex historical roots. That is why at this time I would like to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a book review by Mr. Ragnar Lange who is an economist who specializes in Latin American affairs. The books that he reviews are "Aztlan" by Luis Valdez and Stan Steiner and "The Chicanos" by Matt S. Meier and Feliciano Rivera. This review appeared in the Sunday Star and Daily News on September 17, 1972.

The article follows:

REPORTS ON A PREVIOUSLY OVERLOOKED MINORITY

(By Ragnar Lange)

The approximately six million Americans of Mexican descent constitute the nation's second largest minority group—and, with the exception of the American Indian, its poorest.

Demographically concentrated in the Southwest, Mexican Americans represent 28 percent of the population in New Mexico, 15 percent in Arizona and Texas, and 9 percent in California and Colorado. Today Mexican Americans are 80 percent urbanized and approximately one-fifth have left the Southwest to settle in such midwestern and eastern metropolises as Chicago, Detroit and Washington, D.C. Although the urbanization of a given ethnic group is usually accompanied by a decline in its birth rate, the

birth rate of Mexican Americans continues to be extremely high and is currently double that of the population at large.

Mexican Americans suffer severe educational handicaps—50 percent have completed less than eight years of schooling—and are employed primarily as manual laborers. They consequently bear the brunt of job displacement due to mechanization and automation and depend heavily on public assistance. Their welfare receipts far exceed their numerical proportion in the population; in Denver, for example, they receive more than 67 percent of the general welfare payments.

In many areas of the country, Mexican Americans are victims of racial prejudice and injustice. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights reported in 1970: "There is evidence of widespread patterns of police misconduct against Mexican Americans in the Southwest." In Texas, Mexican American children were forced to attend segregated schools until a 1948 court decision declared such segregation unconstitutional. The practice of paying Mexican American workers a "differential wage"—from 20 to 40 percent less than the going rate—persists in many places despite the continuing efforts of labor unions and the federal government to put an end to it.

The deep problems afflicting the Mexican American minority have complex historical roots. Years before the founding of Jamestown, the Spanish had established Santa Fe and built a string of missions along the California coast. Unlike their British counterparts, the Spanish settlers intermarried freely wth Indian women and this mingling of bloods produced a new ethnic group known as "Mestizos." Their descendents, who today make up more than 87 percent of Mexico's population, are referred to collectively as "La Raza."

After Mexico won its independence from Spain, the Mexican government encouraged Anglo-American settlers to migrate to the northern states of Tejas, Nuevo Mejico, Sonora and Alta California. Anglos were given generous land grants and warmly welcomed by the Mexicans who taught them the techniques of desert agriculture. However, when political trouble began brewing in Mexico, the Anglos were quick to seize the opportunity to agitate for Texan independence. The fall of the Alamo in March, 1836, was a setback for the separationists, but Houston's victory over Santa Anna at Jacinto a few weeks signaled the end of Mexican rule. By 1840, Texas' independence was recognized by the U.S., France and Great Britain.

It then remained only for the U.S. to fulfill its "manifest destiny" by extending its borders to the Pacific. To this end, U.S. officials forced Mexico into a war described by Gen. Ulysses S. Grant as the "most unjust ever waged by a stronger against a weaker nation." According to Gen. Winfield S. Scott, who commanded the expedition, U.S. troops "committed atrocities to make heaven weep and every American of Christian morals blush for his country." When it was all over, Mexico had lost more than half of her national territory and the U.S. had gained New Mexico, Arizona, California, Utah, and most of Colorado.

Before signing the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, the Mexican government requested and received guarantees from the U.S. concerning the civil, religious and property rights of the 80,000 Mexicans living in the area to be ceded. The Mexican government also offered resettlement and land grants to any of its citizens who wished to relocate within the national borders. Nonetheless, the overwhelming majority—more than 78,000 individuals—elected to become American citizens. It is an ironic twist of fate that many of the 2,000 Mexicans who did accept relocation in order to avoid U.S. rule settled in an area which was later transferred to the U.S. through the Gadsden Purchase.

The years from 1850 to 1875 were marked by outbreaks of guerrilla warfare in the Southwest as Mexicans resisted the Anglo advance. Joaquin Murieta, relentless is his determination to avenge the rape-murder of his wife by a band of 13 Anglos, terrorized California; and in Texas, Juan Cortina led commando-type raids against the English-speaking settlers whom he described as "malicious and crafty monsters."

Still, by the turn of the century a degree of acculturation had occurred in many areas and it seemed possible that the Mexican American minority might eventually be absorbed into the Anglo culture. This was the closest La Raza ever came to being assimilated, however, because within a few years the turmoil of the Mexican Revolution of 1910 caused hundreds of thousands of Mexicans to flee to the U.S. These new arrivals reinforced Mexican Americans' cultural consciousness while at the same time increasing Anglo hostility toward them.

The economic results of this massive infusion of unskilled laborers proved disastrous for Mexican Americans. Wages in the Southwest soon fell to subsistence levels and family units were broken up as husbands and fathers were forced to go north in search of employment. As their economic situation became increasingly desperate, the Mexican Americans retreated into deeper social and cultural isolation.

However, World War II was to have a dramatic impact on Mexican American attitudes. Mexican Americans served in all branches of the Armed Forces and fought with exceptional valor. Seventeen of them were awarded the Medal of Honor. These veterans returned home with new skills, a new pride and increased expectations. When they found their ambitions blocked by prejudice and discrimination, they began to form political action groups such as the G.I. Forum for the purpose of obtaining recognition of their full rights as U.S. citizens. These organizations were the precursors of what is today the Chicano movement.

The task of defining Chicanismo is rendered extremely difficult by the fact that many of the numerous Chicano organizations have divergent goals. In brief, the movement's ideology is based on the concept of self-determination for Mexican Americans. While to some groups self-determination means the right of Mexican Americans to secede from the United States and re-establish the legendary Aztec nation of Aztlan, most are seeking to increase Chicano participation in the democratic process through voter registration drives and political education. Recent Chicano election victories in southern Texas have convinced many militants that political power can come from the ballot box as effectively as from the barrel of a gun.

The publication of two outstanding books about Mexican Americans should do much to increase public understanding of both their culture and their problems. "Aztlan" is a superb collection of poems, myths, stories, speeches and essays spanning the centuries from Mayan times to the present. The selections include the account of the creation of the earth from the Mayan Popol Vuh, Cortez' description of overturning the blood-soaked idols in the shrines of Tenochtitlan, Santa Anna's report on the Mexican victory at the Alamo, and Joaquin Murieta's declaration of guerrilla war. The only disappointment in the "Aztlan" anthology is the introduction by Luis Valdez which contains an overdose of racial insult and vernacular obscenities.

In contrast, "The Chicanos" by Matt Meier and Feliciano Rivera is a scholarly attempt to place the Mexican American minority in historical perspective. The chapters about pre-Columbian Mexico, U.S. expansionism and the conflict of cultures are especially rewarding, and the Chicano movement is discussed at length. My only reservation concerns the author's failure to explore the social and economic conditions prevailing in Mexico which have caused millions of Mexican citizens to migrate to the U.S. in spite of the difficulties they face here. Nonetheless, its historical insights make "The Chicanos" a valuable book and an excellent companion volume to "Aztlan."

AMERICANS OF POLISH HERITAGE

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons America is a strong and respected Nation is its human wealth—and Americans of Polish heritage have made vital contributions to that wealth.

One of my constituents—New Jersey Assemblyman at Large Edwin A. Kolodziej, of Sayreville—cited this in a moving speech he made in honor of New Jersey Polish American Day. I insert that speech with pride and with the hope that my colleagues—like myself—will be reminded of the great patriotism and contributions of Americans of Polish heritage.

The speech follows:

SPEECH OF EDWIN A. KOLODZIEJ

As we approach the bicentennial of our country, it is appropriate that we pause to take stock of ourselves as a nation and as a people. I do not recall who said that there are three dimensions to every man: One as he sees himself; the second as others see him; and the third, the most elusive and most difficult to grasp, as the person really is.

Certainly, this rule applies to collective human groups or nations. Indeed, it does in the sense that the essential image of a nation is the result of forces one of which is the way the people see themselves. Similarly, what kind of a nation we will be in the future will hinge largely on how we see ourselves today and what inferences we make from what we perceive for the future.

That many Americans sense something is wrong in the land could suggest grave consequences for the future. Many feel alienated from their society, and their government and its institutions. They are not unlike Skawinski, the lighthouse keeper in Sienkiwicz's *Letters From America*, who feels he has lost all contact with his native land; all interest in fact, in his home and country; a man who feels uprooted, spiritless and lost. Like Skawinski, the American people believe their nation is in trouble.

But I say to you that Americans of Polish heritage should not be unaccustomed or unmindful of challenging and troubled times. Violence and tumultuous events have characterized the course of Polish history.

Poles were among the first settlers in America. Polish pioneers such as Anthony Sadowski were hard workers who braved the dangers of the new world. They built shelters, dug wells, cleared the land, and paved the way for the growth of a young nation. Many idealistic Poles, such as Thaddeus Kosciuszko and Casimir Pulaski joined troubled Americans in the fight for independence.

The first large group of Polish immigrants

who arrived in Cleveland in 1835 were Polish Patriots who had been engaged in the quest for independence and freedom and who had been forced to leave their country. The tens of thousands of Polish immigrants who came to America during and after World War II, many of whom are before me now, were products of a long register of war-inflicted miseries. Most were born, raised and educated in an Independent Poland between the two world wars. They possess a highly developed social consciousness, strong patriotic feelings and a keen awareness of common bonds and common experiences. They exemplified the Polish dedication to freedom and justice which has shone throughout the Polish heritage. We should be ever grateful to those Poles who gave their lives, so that all Americans might live in freedom.

However, as individuals of Polish heritage, we should also be grateful to America. Many Polish war refugees found refuge in the United States. America provided many Poles with opportunities to return from the battlefields to continue their education, and to build families and careers. America has provided Polish-Americans with opportunities for enriching as well as enjoying the land of their adoption.

Now America is troubled. America gave you a hand—Now give a hand to America. While we should treasure and nurture an understanding of our heritage, as Americans we should heed the words of Bernard Baruch, that "While we didn't all come over on the same ship, we are all in the same boat". The present anxiety over the state of the nation focuses particularly on tensions and divisions among its citizens. We as Polish-Americans should open our minds and hearts and accept the motto: "Intolerance only of intolerance."

We are now perhaps in the most difficult period for this country and for the world. After passing through an extended period of social upheaval and a divisive and misguided war, we are in the situation of a man who has undergone a major operation and is suffering anguish until the post-operative wound is healed. No doctor can alleviate the patient's suffering right after surgery. He can only shorten the period of recuperation by attentive care.

I say to you that we must give America a hand and provide this attentive care. I would say that the next decades will see the people come to a fuller realization of the fact that the sense of life lies in participation, in a more active participation in developing the country and in promoting human welfare. Then, they will perceive as clearly the road leading up to this goal. I believe the words of Thomas Wolfe, "that the true discovery of America is before us; that the true fulfillment of our mighty and immortal land is yet to come.

Any sense of apartness, of selfish unwillingness to share the concerns of our fellows, or even to listen to them, simply must be ended. Our country is facing challenges greater than any which it has ever faced. I say to you this is no time for idle cynicism. This is no time to abandon the drive, the principles and the imaginative creativity which have characterized the Poles since this country's birth. This is a time for spirit and energy. This is a time for stouthearted men who can turn dreams into reality.

I summon you as individuals to heed the words of my creed "I am only one man, but I am one man. I can't do everything, but I can do something. And what I can do, by the grace of God, I will do." If you will do something, make my creed your creed:

Polonia are only one people, but they are one people.

Polonia can't do everything, but they can do something.

And what Polonia can do by the Grace of God they will do!

REVIEW OF THE 92D CONGRESS

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, my senior colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT) and I recently devoted our biweekly radio and television report to Pennsylvania to an end-of-the-session summary of the second session of the 92d Congress. As Republican leader, Senator SCOTT is uniquely qualified to comment on the accomplishments and nonaccomplishments of Congress.

In the hope that our discussion may be of interest to our colleagues and constituents, I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of the report be printed in the RECORD.

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

RADIO AND TELEVISION REPORT

Following is the text of "Your Senators Report", a program done by Senator Richard S. Schweiker (R-Pa.) for broadcast on television and radio stations in Pennsylvania.

Guest: U.S. Senator Hugh Scott (R-Pa.) Senate Minority Leader.

SCHWEIKER. This is Senator Dick Schweiker. Today as my guest Senator Scott and I are going to talk about the accomplishments and non-accomplishments of the second session of the 92nd Congress.

ANNOUNCER. From Washington, we present "Your Senators Report", a report to Pennsylvania from the United States Senate by Senator Richard S. Schweiker and Senator Hugh Scott. Now, here is Senator Schweiker.

SCHWEIKER. I am very pleased today to change our pace a litle bit, and, in essence, invite Senator Scott to our show. As many of you viewers and listeners know, Senator Scott and I have been alternating turns in this show, but we did promise that every once in a while that we would get back together when it was of interest to the people of Pennsylvania, particularly when we could talk about Congress, per se. I have asked that Senator Scott, our Republican Leader, be here with me today to go over some of the accomplishments and some of the non-accomplishments of this Congress. Hugh. I am delighted to have you back on our show again.

SCOTT. I am happy to be here, Dick, and I am glad that you are carrying the show because usually on my own half I have had to think up all the questions. This time it is up to you.

SCHWEIKER. I will start out, Hugh, by saying as Republican Leader you are in a particularly important position to tell us what you feel some of the real important major accomplishments were this session of the Congress.

SCOTT. As you know, Dick, we have had a mixed bag. We passed the campaign spending reform bill, we ended the draft—that was the biggest news to the most number of people, I guess. Probably the most important legislation was revenue sharing; $5 billion. Later I may come back to it, a little bit later on. Then we had some Constitutional amendments. As you know, we extended the right to vote from 18 to 21. We had the equal rights amendment. The 18-year-old vote, of course, is now in the Constitution. The equal rights amendment is waiting for the states to ratify it. We passed a 20 percent social security increase, now law, and we have sent an important water pollution control bill to the President, which will have been disposed of by the time this program appears. We will have, of course, many other less important matters, but nevertheless major matters, to discuss. But in addition to that we did a lot for Pennsylvania.

SCHWEIKER. We certainly did, Hugh. I just want to second the motion and say that I certainly agree with your analysis of the major programs. I believe the 18-year-old vote is going to have an explicit impact on the long-range political process, and I believe the equal rights amendment for women is long-range and going to mean a lot.

I think immediately, the one that I am most delighted with which I think President Nixon deserved a lot of credit for, is ending the draft. I think that without his effort, without his leadership, without his help, and of course our support in Congress, it would not have been possible. I believe that when they announced a few weeks ago that they had every intention of meeting that deadline, and that next year when it expires—and they mean it—we are well on our way to it. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, we are gearing up in other areas to make sure that we do get it, so I am delighted.

Now, Hugh, you raised a question about Pennsylvania. When I think of the four years that I have been in the Senate, we have probably a longer list of things this year that have been done for Pennsylvania than any time in the 12 years that I have been in Washington.

SCOTT. All the laundry that we sent in has come back nicely cleaned and pressed.

SCHWEIKER. With a Pennsylvania trademark on it. There is no doubt that a lot of this, of course, is caused by your efforts as Republican Leader. I am also pleased with the fact that because of the fine working relationship that you and I have, we have never differed, or we have never really had any misunderstandings at all about Pennsylvania's interest. They have always been first, last and always, and I think that is one of the reasons that this list is pretty long, too.

SCOTT. I think so. And I think you might want to enumerate some of them. People up in Erie have a special interest in one bill and Philadelphia in Penn's Landing. Perhaps we will spread it all over the state this time.

SCHWEIKER. I think we are delighted to see that we did get money to save Presque Isle, the beach erosion project in Erie, for $3.5 million, which has been authorized and gone through Congress; the Agnes Relief Act, where you, the President, and all of us, played a major role—probably the largest single thing that we could point to. I joined you in your amendment to open the school aid programs to the private and public schools, so that they could get back on their feet instantaneously. And a lot of them have done that. I had another amendment to help small businessmen use money for working capital, so that they could open their doors immediately and serve their people, keep jobs. I guess that would have to go down as the most broad-scaled impact on Pennsylvania.

SCOTT. It certainly was. We promised action. We got more than $2 billion for that flood. And then we realized that we hadn't taken care of the rights-of-way of rail lines and rollingstock, and we put in a bill together for $48 million so that we can get our rail system operating again. We passed it in the Senate as a joint bill and then at the very last minute, last weekend, we were able to squeeze it through the House on a suspension of the rules only today—and we are doing this program before you see it—the only bill on the calendar was to provide that certain parts of the Delaware River be made non-navigable. That sounds technical, but what we are doing is to permit the waterfront development at Penn's Landing. Now the Presque Isle Bill was your bill. Tamaqua Project—have you mentioned what you did in Tamaqua?

SCHWEIKER. We got $2.3 million for the Tamaqua flood tunnel to make sure that the special situation that floods up there very readily will be by-passed by a flood tunnel. We are delighted that that went through, which you were a co-sponsor of, too. In addition, the Tioga-Hammond and Cowanesque dams for Susquehanna flood control also became law. I believe these are important things.

Probably the biggest thing that came through my committee was the black lung benefit bill—updating in benefits to broaden the category. A lot of people in the anthracite area—Scranton and Wilkes Barre—and the soft-coal areas of southwestern Pennsylvania are going to benefit because of the broader, more liberal interpretations to compensate the black lung victims.

SCOTT. That is real initiative there. And that is interesting because the President told me the other day that his father-in-law died of miner's disease, which is black lung.

SCHWEIKER. The same thing, just an older name for it, really.

SCOTT. In Philadelphia, people are delighted that we had the Kosciuszko home made a government historic site. And the Ben Franklin Memorial——

SCHWEIKER. That was your bill.

SCOTT. The Franklin Institute will be known as the official memorial to Franklin. In Pittsburgh, we hope it is still Pittsburgh . . . The other is your bill, the ethnic heritage bill. If that important program is awarded to Pittsburgh, as we hope it will, it will bring a cultural addition to the city. More than that, it will bring employment and we are doing our best to get that. Those are some of the things that we have been working on.

Another of them is the Court Surplus Disposal Act, which is an interesting one because it would transfer the old Philadelphia Court House to the city government for local law enforcement and court use. I think that is useful. Then as a memorial to our late colleague Jim Fulton, the Chartiers Creek section was designated as the James B. Fulton Flood Control Project. The Justice Department appropriated $10 million for the new juvenile correctional center in Philadelphia. Then there was something that we did with the AEC. Do you remember what that was, Dick?

SCHWEIKER. Yes. We got research continued in the matter of heart pacemakers. My mother has a pacemaker. I am sure that it has prolonged her lire and I am sure that it has prolonged other peoples lives, but there is a problem of changing batteries. If we can get a nuclear one that will last indefinitely, people in this category will not have to undergo serious operations periodically to renew their energy source. We continued research in the area of pacemaker nuclear supplies in Pennsylvania.

SCOTT. I remember we showed what a pacemaker is like on the Senate floor—an atomic energy pacemaker. We rarely bring live exhibits on the Senate floor. I didn't bring any Pandas back when I went to China.

SCHWEIKER. My children would have appreciated that. Another area, too, that benefits Pennsylvania as part of the major package is the revenue sharing bill, which will give about $413 million to Pennsylvania, something around $60 million plus dollars to Philadelphia, and $12 or $14 million to Pittsburgh and a number of areas throughout the state that get a breakdown on that.

SCOTT. You had a great deal to do because one of your committees is Labor and Public Welfare. And that is the health bills. I wonder if you want to. . . .

SCHWEIKER. Yes. I think one of the major health accomplishments this year . . . First of all the cancer bill, and following the cancer bill, the heart bill. Two amendments of mine were in that. One was to set up an Office of Education within the National Institutes of Health. We know now how to stop heart disease. We know that smoking affects it, we know that obesity affects it, we know that high blood pressure affects it, we know that a number of different things affect it. If we educate our people to watch out for these things, we can solve half the problems.

Another bill, of course, is sickle cell anemia. We have had a lot of work among the Black people in Philadelphia. The Yancy Durham Foundation there—with Joe Frazier—has been one of the leaders there. And in Pittsburgh, the Black Athletes Foundation with Willy Stargell. We have set up a bill so that these groups can get help and support for solving this dread disease among our Black citizens?

SCOTT. What about the lead paint bill?

SCHWEIKER. The lead paint bill is in the process of going from one body to the other. So whether we will be able to get it out of the House before we adjourn, we won't know, since we are taping this program several days ahead of adjournment. But we are still trying.

SCOTT. What is the standing of the flammable fabrics bill? I am really asking questions about matters which are primarily within your jurisdiction.

SCHWEIKER. There, Hugh, we tightened up our procedures for trying to protect our young children, particularly those under six, from having nightgowns and sleepwear that go up in flames if the child would lean on an electric stove or sweep over some kind of an open flame. One amendment, particularly, that I was concerned about, would now extend this protection up to age 14. A lot of children above six get around an open flame or electric stove that might set off their clothing. The way that clothing is these days, it will go up in smoke in a matter of a few minutes. This will be part of the new products safety bill that is just coming out. They will set that up in a form of a regulation for next year.

SCOTT. We passed the Tinicum Marsh bill. I am interested in that bill, and the Piscataway project. Congressman John Saylor is very much interested in it. We enacted into law the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission extension.

We haven't mentioned foreign policy. I think we ought to mention major accomplishments such as our treaty with Russia on defensive weapons and the interim agreement of the SALT agreement on offensive weapons. I think it will have a lot to do with the future survival—

SCHWEIKER. I think we did forget those from the major categories. We were looking more internally. But certainly in terms of long-range impact, this may do more hopefully to avert a clash between us and the Soviet Union than anything else we have done. It may also in the long run end up saving the taxpayers a lot of money if we can complete another agreement, SALT II, as we call it, on some of the offensive missiles, which we didn't get into this time. We can really begin to save a lot of armament costs, slow down the armament race. These have major impact on taxes and the well-being and preservation of our whole way of life.

SCOTT. A very small matter, but of interest to a lot of doctors, is the fact that we sent a resolution down for the President's signature to finalize that the Thomas Jefferson University, formerly Jefferson Medical College, is the first college or university in the nation to bear the full name of the third President. So the matters at times are small, and at times very large. This has been a busy session. We have had 14- and 17-hour day sessions.

SCHWEIKER. We certainly have. We have set a new record on votes, you know. When I first was in the House of Representatives, before I got to the Senate, we would average about 250 votes a year. Now in the Senate I guess we are more prolific because we have amendments that require votes. It jumped immediately to about 400 roll call votes a year. Now this year we set a new record—over 500 roll call votes in a year. So, Hugh, nobody can say that they don't know where we stand on these things. We have voted 500 times as a matter of record, if they want to look into it.

SCOTT. I have a pretty good record for attendance, even though I was in China. But yours is better. It must be around 99 percent. Mine is 93 percent, which is pretty good for a party leader, who has to go other places.

SCHWEIKER. I would have gone to China, too, if I had had the chance. I don't blame you. I think it helps to understand the world problems, the world relationships. I think one of the other areas too, that we might just mention a minute is higher education. You know we have made a federal commitment to colleges to help pull them out of some of the doldrums and economic tailspins they have been in. Two-thirds of colleges today, according to the Carnegie Foundation, are headed or in financial trouble. We are going to, in essence, help the colleges; recognize their high priority on our list.

SCOTT. The bill to help the private schools and colleges that you mentioned, under the Agnes Recovery Act, is a first. Congress has never done anything like that. With all the fights in the Supreme Court over what you can do for private educational institutions, we have broken through that with something that you can do. That is construction aid, repair, rehabilitation. That $4 million check that President Nixon gave to Wilkes College is very symbolic.

SCHWEIKER. I think that was a very significant breakthrough. I have been a supporter, of course, of aid to some of our private schools. We haven't gotten legislation through yet. I suspect next year it will be on the agenda, but this could be a very important precedent, in my judgment.

I might interrupt just a minute, Hugh. To those viewers and listeners who turned in late, this is Senator Schweiker, and I am here with my senior colleague, Senator Hugh Scott, doing our bi-weekly show. We are reviewing the accomplishments and non-accomplishments of the second session of the 92nd Congress.

SCHWEIKER. That will wake everybody up. Now lets turn—and not tune, Hugh—to some of the non-accomplishments. Maybe you want to comment, particularly as Leader, because you have the frustrations of trying to move a sometimes unwieldy body forward. Maybe you want to comment a little about some of our procedures.

SCOTT. Well, as you said, we have 100 more votes than ever before, certainly since 1880. Even with 530 votes, that doesn't mean that they were all good. Some of them were unnecessary and some of them were bad and some of them were delaying votes and quite a few of them were taken because somebody had a bill he wanted a record vote on to show folks back home how well he did and some were noncontroversial. But when you got rid of all that, there was still a tremendous amount of grist to be ground.

Some things that were not done ought to be mentioned without being a carping critic. The quality and quantity of votes, as I said, don't necessarily mean the same thing. These are some of the things that I view that ought to be done. Welfare reform, which was pretty well shot to pieces by the Senate action, and was in many ways needlessly delayed, I think, in the House. It took them 15 months to get it over here. I understand that Wilbur Mills, Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee—no matter what compromise comes out before we quit this week on welfare reform—has agreed that since we have abolished Title IV—and that is no real reform this year, except in social security areas—he's promised

that the House, as soon as it organizes next year, will meet and send over what we call a "Bobtail" bill—an incomplete bill on welfare. This time he is going to say to the Senate: you took so long we couldn't work one out; this time you start early and you write the welfare bill, then we will chew it up. Now we hope that out of that will come, first, early action and, second, something far better than what we were presented with this year when we had a breakdown on it.

There was a filibuster on the Consumer Protection Agency Bill. You and I have both done our best to get a workable, effective consumer bill. Mrs. Knauer came out strongly for it, Virginia Knauer. The President wanted a good bill and we just couldn't get one. There was a big filibuster on in the education bill and that goes over until next year, presumably. Among some of the things that were not done at all, and we both regret that, was a veto of a child care bill, although there are millions of dollars in the pipeline and in legislation for child care. It would be wrong to say there isn't, but we want to come back to a further child care bill next year.

SCHWEIKER. We were able, I might mention, Hugh, to get in the Office of Economic Opportunity bill that passed a reduced, modified program, a modest program that keeps the thing going and also was acceptable to the President. So we made a little bit of an end run around that, which the President agreed to okay.

SCOTT. He did not get any part of his governmental reorganization, which would be one good way to save money, one good way to have a streamlined government to get rid of some of the waste that is going on. We ought to have pension reform. One of the things that disturbs me more than anything else is the absolute failure to do anything about people's pensions. A man has a pension. He worked 18 years for a company. The company goes out of busines, and the pension isn't there. He ought to be able to take his pension with him.

SCHWEIKER. Yes, unfortunately our Labor Committee passed a good bill, and then, because of jurisdictional reasons, it was referred to the Finance Committee. They gutted it, and that unfortunately had the effect of killing it this session. But I agree with you that it ought to be the No. 1 priority next year. The minimum wage bill also got caught in a cross fire between the House and Senate. Mainly, the House could not agree on who their conferees should be. So that died this year. It probably will be brought up next year.

SCOTT. Well it will have to be brought up next year, I think. And then we had a limitation on the President's war powers, which I am sure both of us supported. I know I voted for it in the committee and on the floor. Yet that got stalled in the House because of some disagreements, and we had alternating cemeteries working around here for a while.

SCHWEIKER. That is right. I think the purpose of that war powers bill, of course, is to prevent the kind of situations that developed in Vietnam so that we all know what we are getting into, what the procedures are, and what the war making responsibility is. I think it is a very important bill and I hope that we can bring it up again next year.

SCOTT. The dilemma that I think maybe a lot of people don't understand is that the Constitution says Congress shall have the power to declare war. The Constitution also says the President shall have the powers of the Commander-in-Chief. That left a fuzzy area in between, particularly about undeclared wars, police actions, entry into other countries territories, and all the rest. This bill seeks to set up some guidelines so that any President, any future President, for that matter, will know just what Congress regards as its part of the function and what it regards as the President's part. I think it is a desirable thing. I may have shocked them downtown a little when I voted for it, but it is simply a way to set out the rules in the future. It is too late to set them out for this war.

There are some remedies, I think, for these things. Take congressional reform. What do you think about that? What can we do in that area?

SCHWEIKER. I think that we certainly have to come to grips with the filibuster problem. I think that really stalls us. While both sides of the fence now use the filibuster, I hate to see it become an ongoing way of life. I think that we ought to take a harder look at that. I think another, of course, is the number of roll calls. I think, as you mentioned, they have gotten out of hand. There is no sense in having a roll call if we all agree. Now we don't always all agree, but the roll call where we do all agree seems to me rather after the fact.

I think also we need to streamline our whole appropriations spending budget system, and probably have a congressional budget of some kind so that we can have a positive, constructive position, and the President can, too. Then we work it our during the course of the year, instead of as we are now—caught up at the tail end of the session with it. We should have been forthright and come to grips with it in the early part of the year.

SCOTT. Well, we need a number of things. We need better computerization. We are probably the only corporation of this size, which is a good many times bigger than General Motors, without proper data retrieval computerization. We can't push any bottons up here and find out exactly what we did in 1939, for example, on a bill; what needs to be done because of the things we didn't do in 1947. Computers would help with that. We ought to have joint hearings of the House and Senate appropriations committees to save the witnesses downtown. The cabinet officers ought not to have to come up here four times—twice for the appropriations committees and twice for the two authorization committees, like Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations. We could use better cooperation between the parties, although I have seen many instances where it has expedited matters. You and three other Senators some time ago put in some very good reforms that have not been too often noted. One of them was to cut out that lengthy speech making in the morning.

SCHWEIKER. That is right. We got the Senate hour-long speeches down to 15 minutes. That is a pleasant relief, I might say.

SCOTT. Yes. Unless you get special permission a day before to talk for 15 minutes, you can only talk three minutes in the morning so that we get through the bills. Senator Pastore put in something that is technical but it says, in effect, that for the first three hours of debate on a bill you have got to talk about the bill. You can't talk about something else. Before that, you used to bring up a bill that had to do with a weapon system in the Pentagon, and people would be talking about sheep grazing in a western state, or something. We have the Pastore rule of germaneness. Other reforms have been recommended over the years. I would like to see a reform that Senator Packwood has interested himself in. On certain regular days each month we would agree not to meet so that Senators can go home and report to the folks back there as to what went on.

SCHWEIKER. Yes, this was part of our original package. But it got shelved in the give and take that occurred. It would give us some idea of how to schedule. You know I had to cancel a number of speaking engagements back home, which I felt I had to do because the Senate was voting, I'm sure some of the people didn't like it. But if we knew ahead of time exactly what days were coming, we could schedule trips home so we can keep up with our constituents. It is just as much part of our job to know our state—know their problems, talk to them, meet them—as it is to be here. Although being here and voting is the important thing, we ought to balance it so we can do both.

SCOTT. Well, I have been here every night but one this week, and so have you. If we have to be here tomorrow night, I will cancel speeches in Ohio. If we have to be here the day after that, I cancel speeches in Illinois. Then I have speeches in Pennsylvania the week afterwards. As it is now, we can't plan. But speaking of planning, I would sort of like to make a guess on what is going to happen next year.

SCHWEIKER. All right. Why don't you look ahead. We don't have much time. Look ahead briefly to what you see the President doing next, if he is re-elected.

SCOTT. Well, I think that there will be some kind of spending ceiling to give the President a chance to do something that Congress doesn't do. The Congress passes all these bills, and then can't add. They don't realize that everything they put together is more than the budget will stand. It is like a housewife at the supermarket. She may buy in so many departments of the store that when she comes up to pay the bill, she hasn't got enough money. She says: I will have to owe you $5 until next Thursday.

Well, we want the President to be able to straighten that out and look at the whole lump sum and correct some of the totals. But the way to do it is a mater of great disagreement. He will try again next year, I think. He is going to come in with much tougher series of welfare proposals, I believe, next year. And no doubt I suspect he will propose special revenue sharing—transportation, urban renewal development, education, crime, including drugs. We have got to have pension reform. We have got to have comprehensive health care. Those are just a few of the things under. . . .

SCHWEIKER. I want to say, too, Hugh, that I predict that you are going to be re-elected as the Republican Leader. And very hopefully you are also going to be our Senate Majority Leader next year.

SCOTT. I am so glad I gave you time to get that in.

SCHWEIKER. We had to work that in towards the end of the show. Well, I want to say, Hugh, that I enjoyed having you on the guest list today of our show to wind up the accomplishments and nonaccomplishments of the 92d Congress. We have enjoyed working together during the year. I think we have had a very good year for Pennsylvania, and hopefully a good year for the country. Thanks a lot for joining me.

SCOTT. Glad to be here. Next year you and I separately will also have a number of interesting guests.

SCHWEIKER. Right, Tune in.

EDITOR AND PUBLISHER COMMENT ON EUGENE C. PULLIAM EDITORIAL

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following, from Editor and Publisher of October 7, 1972, comments on the prominent publisher Mr. Eugene C. Pulliam's recent editoral on Federal restriction of television broadcasting:

ARE NEWSPAPERS FAR BEHIND?

The appeal of Publisher Eugene C. Pulliam for newspaper support in the fight against government restrictions of television broadcasting, particularly by the bureaucratic

regulations of the Federal Communications Commission without the consent of Congress, deserves serious consideration. Pulliam has no financial interest directly or indirectly in television or radio. The essence of his message is that if free television succumbs to bureaucratic controls the written press cannot be far behind.

With few exceptions, newspapers have not jumped to the defense of broadcasters in their many battles with FCC over challenges to station renewals, exercise of the fairness doctrine, the philosophy of free counter-advertising, proposals for regulated free time and program controls, etc.

Some publishers, who have broadcast interests of their own, might feel that it would appear to be self-serving to speak out in print on these issues. Some others have the mistaken idea that any misfortune that befalls their major advertising competitor will be good for newspapers.

We feel, as does Pulliam, that all media are in this fight together, whether they want it or not. It is all very well to say that broadcasting is already under government control because of licensing, but it is another thing to admit that licensing of broadcast channels gives government the right to regulate stations as to what they can or cannot, or must, air in free or paid time.

Proposals have already been made that because television advertising is regulated (the ban against cigarette ads, for instance, and counter-advertising) newspaper advertising should be subject to the same rules. Proposals are on the table to force television to provide a certain amount of free time for broadcasts of special interest. That is control of editorial content. And, you can bet your bottom dollar that if it is made to stick in one medium, broadcasting, an attempt will be made to extend the philosophy to all media, especially newspapers.

It is sheer complacency to relax and state that it would be unconstitutional. Under creeping bureaucratic control and broadening court decisions, "unconstitutional" could become the least valuable word in our lexicon. Let's not permit it to become a hindsight word.

AID TO NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a number of communications regarding title II of H.R. 16141, which would allow a tax credit—up to a maximum of $200 per year—for tuition paid to send a child to a private nonprofit elementary or secondary school.

While in Congress, I have been an ardent supporter of Federal aid to education, and played a significant role in the adoption of the Quality Education Amendment which added $364 million to the funding for educational purposes for 1972–73. Our schools must have adequate funding if they are to train our children to fulfill the great promise of our Nation.

However, I have sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States, and I believe that the system set forth in H.R. 16141 would violate the first amendment's requirement of separation of church and state. In order to meet the requirements of the Constitution in this regard, a program must: first, have a secular purpose, second, have a primarily secular effect, and third, not foster "an excessive governmental entanglement with religion." Only a few days ago, the Supreme Court decided that an Ohio program involving tuition reimbursement to the parents of children attending nonpublic schools, including parochial schools, was unconstitutional.

I do believe that some sort of aid is necessary. In accord with this belief, I have joined with a number of other Members of Congress in introducing a children's allowance bill (H.R. 17196). This measure would pay a family $600 a year for each child under 18. These funds could be used for the child's necessities, including school tuition, food, and clothing. This bill recognizes the need for additional money for the care and training of our children. Because it gives the parent a wide range of choice as to where he will spend the grant, and cannot be said to either advance religion or foster an "excessive governmental entanglement" with religion, it is, in my opinion, a constitutional bill, and I shall press for favorable action on it when the 93d Congress convenes in January.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, EMANUEL CELLER has had a distinguished tenure in this House, spanning nine presidencies, six decades, and perhaps more importantly, tremendous changes in the life and politics of this Nation. It is difficult to chronicle the achievements of a man, who as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, has been in the vanguard of every major fight for human rights and justice that has occurred in America since the 1920's. EMANUEL CELLER is a statesman in the highest meaning of the word. He has faithfully and tirelessly devoted his life to the service of the people whom he represents, and in fact the entire Nation. As every Member of the Chamber knows well, the Judiciary Committee is responsible for matters of great importance to the legal and social fiber of the Nation. EMANUEL CELLER, a great legal scholar and student of government, brought with him to the Judiciary Committee a respect and reverence for the laws and Constitution of our Nation which has served him well. He has authored more constitutional amendments than any other previous chairman of the Judiciary Committee. In so doing he has demonstrated his grasp of the American legal system, and his acute reasoning has more than once persuaded Members of this House that a particular course of action was more reasonable and prudent than another. Forceful and confident in his manner, yet conciliatory and cautious in his actions, he has brought to this Chamber an expertise and an instinctive ability to sort out the issues which has seldom been rivaled. I salute this remarkable servant of the people, and of the laws of our land. EMANUEL CELLER has carved for himself not only a place in the minds of every Member of Congress, but in the history books and ledgers of American political history. I extend to the chairman my best wishes for the future and my deep and sincere appreciation for the opportunity of sharing so many memorable experiences with him, both personal and legislative over the years.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, if one is lucky in his lifetime, he will run across someone who has devoted his entire life to public service—to serving the people at any cost, sacrificing his own time for the benefit of others. Such a man is Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL of Colorado.

It has been nearly 24 years since the good people of the Rocky Mountain State first sent WAYNE ASPINALL to Washington. At that time, WAYNE already had an illustrious career in public service, serving as president of the local school board in 1920–22, and also in the Colorado House of Delegates and State Senate, in leadership capacities in both houses

Congressman ASPINALL also had a meritorious military career, spanning both world wars.

He was certainly well-qualified to represent his constituents in the U.S. Congress, and he did so with valor and integrity. Everything that WAYNE ASPINALL did reflected honor on himself and his constituents.

WAYNE will not be returning to Capitol Hill for the 93d Congress. His services will be sadly missed.

WAYNE's dedication to the principles by which he lived, his prudence in governmental affairs, and his keen insight into the issues before us, will long be remembered by those of us privileged to serve alongside him. And his courageous and untiring leadership will not be forgotten by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which he chaired; nor the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on which he was a ranking Member.

WAYNE ASPINALL has earned for himself a reputation for which he can hold his head high. His qualities of courage, diligence and tenacity are well-known and well-founded. He has served his people with honor and distinction.

Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to call attention to the outstanding career of Congressman WAYNE ASPINALL, to congratulate him on his devotion and dedication to the cause of humanity throughout his lifetime, and to wish for him every happiness in the years ahead. He has left his mark on the U.S. Congress, and it shall not be left in vain.

THE BICENTENNIAL IS COMING

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the State of New Jersey, which was one of the Thirteen Original Colonies, will play an important role in the 1976 bicentennial celebration.

New Jersey in general, and Bergen County in particular, is replete with historical facts and figures during our Revolutionary War era.

I should like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very interesting story written by David Corcoran of the Bergen Record newspaper which places into proper perspective the historicity of New Jersey and its role in the upcoming bicentennial celebration.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

[From the Bergen County (N.J.) Record, July 3, 1972]

THE BICENTENNIAL IS COMING!

(By David Corcoran)

The Republic's first months were somber and desperate. The Continental Army lost Manhattan Island, then as now the gateway to the nation, in two swift, decisive battles in the fall of 1776. From a bluff atop the Palisades in Fort Lee, George Washington's soldiers could see British troopships cruising up the Hudson toward Closter Dock and Sneden's Landing. The only thing to do was get away. When Gen. Cornwallis arrived in the deserted American encampment at Fort Lee the cold, rainy afternoon of Nov. 20, the breakfast kettles were still boiling. Washington's troops were on their way to Pennsylvania.

To the west of [Fort Lee] Cornwallis, heavy of figure and awkward of gait, stood with his staff and his guides at the brow of the precipitous hill looking out over 20 miles of Dutch farmlands, laid out like a map below him. At his left, with the gray, cold rain clouds scudding overhead, was the wide sweep of the Hackensack marshes, stretching from the base of the hill to the southwest as far as the eye could see, cut by the winding Hackensack River . . .

He could see, through the rain, a low ridge of land—the settlements of Old Hackensack, Teaneck, and Schraalenburgh—running parallel to Overpeck Creek. Between that and the next ridge, his guides told him, the Hackensack River flowed . . . To the north and west, out of sight in the gray haze, were the foothills of the mountains, the First Mountains, the Ramapos, and the Hudson Highlands.

One could almost see, in the mind's eye, the whole of America from these conquered heights.—Adrian C. Leiby, "The Revolutionary War in the Hackensack Valley."

One hundred and ninety-six years have passed since Gen. Cornwallis stood at the crest of that hill, which now forms part of the boundary between Englewood and Fort Lee. Before the 200th anniversary of the capture of Fort Lee four years from now, a high-rise luxury apartment building probably will stand on the spot. Just this March bulldozers hired by the same developer obliterated the last traces of the American encampment at Fort Lee—stone ovens believed to have been used by the soldiers. They stood in the way of another high-rise.

"Bergen County is a historical hotbox," says Daniel J. Sheer, who as director of community affairs is for the moment in charge of Bergen County's celebration of the bicentenial. He's right, even though most of the history is forgotten and most of the sites have vanished. This is the story of how Bergen County and the State of New Jersey plan to make use of what's left.

TIME IS OF THE ESSENCE

You may wonder, four years before the event, why anyone is even thinking about the bicentennial celebration. Four years is a long time. Why, we'll be electing another President in 1976. The war in Vietnam may even have ended by then. Bob Dylan will be 35 years old.

Bernard Bush, the youthful-looking, 43-year-old executive director of the New Jersey Historical Commission, would urge you to think again.

"Four years is no time," he said in a recent interview. "Think of this; any decent-sized museum exhibit takes 18 months to prepare, and we're talking about putting exhibits on tour. Any publication or comprehensive bibliography takes time. So does road building, or any physical facility. We're planning a visitors' center in Trenton, and we'd like it ready by 1975.

"And it is always takes people longer to accomplish something than they think it will. I could have told you all this even two years ago."

THE BERGEN COUNTY CULTURAL AND HERITAGE COMMISSION

The State Legislature, in measures enacted chosen freeholders of the state's 21 counties to establish and fund commissions that would plan and promote exhibits, displays, programs, and—if they could scratch up the funds—restoration of historic sites. Naturally these commissions were to plan and coordinate county bicentennial observances.

Four years from the bicentennial, 16 counties in New Jersey have a cultural and heritage commission. Bergen County does not, although a measure to create one and name eight members to it is now pending before the freeholders.

Freeholder June Clark, chairman of the committee that supervises Sheer's department, says the board's objections have been more or less cleared up—she didn't elaborate—and that she hopes for action later this month.

If so, the cultural and heritage commission will be off the ground—or, as Sheer puts it, off the road—a little less than four years before the bicentennial, four years after the enabling legislation was enacted.

THE PHILADELPHIA STORY

About Philadelphia, Pa., the less said the better. It is, after many headlines and much wasted effort, not going to be the site of a world's fair in 1976. Indeed, the United States is not going to be the site of a world's fair in 1976.

Philadelphia—where the Declaration of Independence was signed, where one of the most successful world's fairs in history celebrated the contennial—seemed, at one time, the natural spot for an international bicentennial exposition.

Aware almost 15 years ago that it could stage a civic display that would bring it millions of dollars in tourist and tax revenues and a chance to revive its sagging municipal fortunes, Philadelphia behaved almost suicidally. After spending $3.5 million on salaries and consulting fees, the city found that the only site acceptable to all its feuding interests was a marshy 650-acre tract right next to, among other things, the airport and a big sewage treatment plant. Not only that, but Philadelphia would need $1.5 billion or so in federal funds to stage the world's fair on this unpromising piece of property.

The American Revolutionary Bicentennial Commission, the official national bicentennial agency, was horrified. It voted overwhelmingly this May not to endorse Philadelphia's plan; President Nixon, the final arbiter, ratified that decision shortly afterward.

Now, according to the ARBC's communications director, a 37-year-old Pennsylvanian named Daniel J. Buser, it is up to Philadelphia to come up with a plan for its own bicentennial celebration. It may receive federal aid, Buser said, but vastly less than it had in mind. It certainly won't be the site of any world's fair, and Buser said, "This commission must now come up with an alternate plan to involve international participation in the bicentennial."

OF VACUUM CLEANER HOUSING

Pennsylvania wasn't the only loser in the Philadelphia debacle. A good part of the business—and, under one plan, many of the buildings—from the world's fair involved the area in and around Camden. As late as last October it appeared that New Jersey would have most of the facilities, which would have been a tourist windfall to the state. That has now fallen through, of course, but the ARBC has developed plans that would reach all 50 states.

One of them was unveiled to the nation last Washington's Birthday and is now undergoing what Buser describes as an intensive cost and feasibility study by government experts.

It calls for a nationwide network of parks built with federal funds on 100- to 500-acre sites and donated by the federal government to most or all of the 50 states. Under the present timetable, the parks would be open to the public on April 1, 1976. The projected price is $1.2 billion—an appropriation that would, of course, have to be approved by Congress—and the states would be expected to maintain the parks after they are built.

New Jersey's probable contribution to this network is a 450-acre tract of state- and city-owned land right behind the Statue of Liberty in Jersey City. It was the site of the old Jersey Central yard, so it's now nearly vacant except for a jungle of unused railroad tracks.

From northern New Jersey's point of view, a bicentennial park in Jersey City (tentatively known as Liberty Park) would be ideal. For one thing, development of a park would clean up a major eyesore, and Jersey City needs all the help it can get in that direction. For another, its location a stone's throw from Miss Liberty makes it a natural tourist attraction. And it is immediately south of what was Paulus Hook, the site of a particularly surprising and encouraging American victory in the summer of 1779.

At the moment it is all you can do to get the state to admit it is maybe thinking about asking the ARBC to declare the Jersey City site a bicentennial park. That isn't necessarily bad news, however. State and Jersey City officials, who had planned to develop a park there anyway if they could ever scrape the funds together, say the ARBC has expressed initial interest in the site. They are now waiting with somewhat bated breath for word from Gov. Cahill, who also has other matters to think about.

If the Governor's response is positive, then the ARBC would have to reaffirm formally its initial interest; and its own nationwide plans would have to be accepted by Congress. If all that happens—we should all know more before the end of 1972, since the ARBC hopes Congress will act by Nov. 1—then Liberty Park would become a reality.

By contrast with the nightmarish Philadelphia experience, the ARBC plan for a network of bicentennial parks has been received warmly and seems to be moving right along.

Another good sign is the favorable re-

sponse from the news media. Although the bicentennial park model on display at the National Governors' Conference last February was dominated by a huge webbed structure that resembled the housing of a vacuum cleaner, it received a generally cordial review from the critics.

The ARBC prospectus says that every park would maintain its natural topological and ecological character—whoever wrote that obviously didn't have Liberty Park in mind.

OUR OWN REGISTER OF HISTORIC SITES

Most of Revolutionary War Bergen County has vanished, of course—the ovens in Fort Lee are only the most recent example—but a number of sites remain. George Washington really did sleep here, too—in the Van Allen House in Oakland, to name one that is still standing (barely: the Oakland Historical Society is urgently seeking funds to restore it).

No one is prepared to say exactly what will be done in 1976 with Revolutionary War sites here. One plan that does seem more than tentative is the Palisades Interstate Park Commission's proposed reconstruction of the American gun batteries at Bluff Point in Fort Lee, just south of George Washington Bridge.

Here are a few—by no means all—of the existing Revolutionary War sites in Bergen County. The first two are on the National Register of Historic Sites, a designation that protects them against all kinds of government encroachment but not against private encroachment. The third is on a similar list compiled by the state.

The Hermitage in Ho-Ho-Kus, a decaying gothic mansion built in 1845 on the ruins of an 18th Century inn. George Washington and Aaron Burr were a couple of the historical figures who stayed at the inn.

The Von Steuben House in River Edge, now the headquarters of the Bergen County Historical Society. Right next to New Bridge, a main avenue for both British and American troops during the Revolution, this house belonged to a noted Tory named John Zabriskie Jr. It was later given to Baron Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben in return for his service to the Americans during the war.

The Von Horn House on Ramapo Valley Road in Mahwah, now the home of Ramapo College President George Potter. It goes back to 1748, and Washington is said to have stayed there.

The Baylor Massacre. On Sept. 29, 1778, British troops surprised a regiment of American dragoons sleeping at the Haring Farm in River Vale. Between 40 and 80 of the dragoons, many in their teens, were killed; their grave was discovered on a weed-covered two-acre tract near the farm in 1967, and it's now being turned into a small county park. It's near the intersection of Red Oak and Rivervale roads.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

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

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

How long?

CONTINUING RESOLUTION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1973

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with my unanimous consent request of Saturday, October 14, 1972, to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain matters in connection with the continuing resolution, I am inserting a copy of the committee report on this continuing resolution with the intent that this report should be considered a part of the legislative history of House Joint Resolution 1331. Due to the time element involved, this report was unable to be filed before consideration of the joint resolution on the House floor. The report follows:

REPORT: FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred House Joint Resolution 1331, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes, report the same to the House without amendment and with the recommendation that the joint resolution be passed.

Extension of the existing continuing resolution (Public Law 92-334), which expires October 14, 1972, is required to provide further continuing appropriations for the activities covered by the pending Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriation Act. It now appears that the required authorization bill will not be passed before the sine die adjournment of the current session, necessitating deferral of final action on the appropriation bill until the 93d Congress convenes next January. The resolution extends the date of the current resolution until February 28, 1973, to permit an adequate opportunity to finalize action on both the authorization and the appropriation bills.

To date the continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1973 for activities for which provision was made in the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriation Act, 1972, have been subject to the provisions of section 101(b) of the continuing resolution which provides a rate for operations not in excess of the current rate or the rate provided for in the budget estimate, whichever is lower and under the more restrictive authority. However, to be more responsive to the most current actions to date by the Congress, a new section 108 has been added to the existing continuing resolution providing that obligations may not exceed the rate for operations, except as outlined below, provided for in the pending Foreign Assistance and Related Programs appropriation bill, 1973 (H.R. 16705), which has been passed by both Houses. Whenever the rate for operations as passed by the Senate is different from that contained in the House bill, the rate shall not exceed the lower rate.

In reference to certain programs pending authorization not included in the Senate version of H.R. 16705, including refugee relief assistance (Bangladesh), security supporting assistance, military assistance, regional naval training, and foreign military credit sales, the new section 108 provides that the interim rate for operation shall not exceed the rates which would be permitted under the pending authorization bill (H.R. 16029) as passed by the Senate. By referring to the rate for operations authorized by the Senate under H.R. 16029, the resolution does not incorporate the restrictive provisions (including earmarkings) set forth in that bill.

Section 108 also provides that restrictive provisions which are included in H.R. 16705 but which were not included in the 1972 Appropriations Act shall not be applicable unless included in identical form in H.R. 16705 as passed by both Houses. Any provision which is included in H.R. 16705 as passed by one House shall be applicable if it was included in the 1972 Appropriation Act.

By including these provisions in section 108, the committee intends to make available the same authority to obligate funds, and the same sources of funds, for all purposes including computation of rates for operation, as were available under the applicable Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1972, subject to the restrictions and limitations set forth in such act for fiscal year 1972.

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XIII—CLAUSE 3

The following is submitted in compliance with clause 3 of Rule XIII:

The accompanying House Joint Resolution would amend Section 102 of Public Law 92-334 by striking out (per brackets) and inserting (per italicized matter), as follows:

SEC. 102. Appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall remain available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution, or (b) enactment of the applicable Appropriation Act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) [October 14, 1972] *February 28, 1973*, whichever first occurs.

"Sec. 108. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, and section 10 of Public Law 91-672 and section 665(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, obligations may be incurred hereunder for activities provided for in the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1973, (H.R. 16705) as passed during the second session, Ninety-second Congress, at not to exceed the rate for operations provided for in such Act, but whenever the rate for operations for such activities in such Act as passed the Senate is different from that contained under such Act as passed by the House, the rate for operations shall not exceed the lower rate: Provided, That no restrictive provision which is included in such Act but which was not included in the applicable appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1972 shall be applicable to any appropriation fund or authority provided for in this section unless such provision shall have been included in identical form in such Act as passed by both the House and the Senate: Provided further, That any provision which is included in such Act as passed by one House and was included in the applicable appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1972 shall be applicable to the appropriations, funds or authorities provided in this section: Provided further, Notwithstanding the rates discussed above, the rate for obligations for refugee relief assistance (Bangladesh), security supporting assistance, military assistance, regional naval training, and foreign military credit sales may equal but shall not exceed the rate provided in the authorization bill for such assistance, training and sales for fiscal year 1973 as passed by the Senate during the second session, Ninety-second Congress."

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in saluting Congressman CHARLES H. GRIFFIN.

During his career in Congress, CHARLIE

GRIFFIN has displayed an avid interest in his work and a great dedication to the interests of the people in his district. It is with regret that we see him return to his beloved Mississippi at the end of this session, but he leaves with the proud knowledge of a "job well done" and I am sure that he will continue to contribute significantly to the well-being of the country.

I extend to him my sincere best wishes as he prepares to return to private life.

STAFF STUDY OF THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE McGOVERN DEFENSE BUDGET

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, from publicly available unclassified information, members of the staff of the House Republican Policy Committee in cooperation with minority staff members of the House Appropriations Committee have completed a State-by-State analysis of the economic impact of the McGovern defense budget.

The analysis is based upon the alternative defense budget proposed by Senator McGOVERN in January of 1972 and the subsequent analysis of that defense budget prepared by the Department of Defense on July 5, 1972, in response to requests of Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird by Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE and Congressman JOHN RHODES.

Certain assumptions were necessarily made with respect to this staff analysis. In each instance where Senator McGOVERN's alternate defense budget proposes a specific cut and where the impact of that cut is clearly identifiable, it is so noted in the study. For example, Senator McGOVERN has specifically said he would eliminate the B–1 bomber program. The direct result of that would be felt in defense procurement dollars and in those defense plants currently engaged in developing the B–1 bomber. That information—based upon an unequivocal pledge of Senator McGOVERN—is of course reported in this study as a certain cut. Elimination of the B–1, however, would have additional ripple effects on subcontractors, service industries and on support establishments, and would additionally have a program impact into the future in reductions of military personnel and bases. None of these effects have been included in the study, however, since they would require assumptions that could not necessarily be established with certainty.

It is not possible to report with precision the drastic impact of Senator McGOVERN's proposal to slash our carrier strength from 16 to six. Similarly, his proposal to reduce by 60 percent our strategic bomber forces has not been spelled out. Senator McGOVERN has not yet revealed how this miniaturized deterrent force would be deployed. It is clear, however, that the carrier reductions and the bomber reductions will force the closing of, or massive reductions in a number of, bases throughout the country. The summary, therefore, reflects these reductions accordingly.

The impact of the McGovern defense budget projected in the study on a State-by-State basis would be very severe. The certain cuts identified in the study have been determined by the most conservative guidelines; only in those instances in which Senator McGOVERN has named a specific cut and where that cut can be directly traceable to a defense contract or military installation does this report label the program impact as certain. In all others, the cuts are deemed to be only possible.

The alternate McGovern defense budget has proposed specific reductions; it has also projected percentage reductions in identifiable classes of defense expenditures. Where it has not been possible with certainty to determine a specific closing, the percentage cut proposed by Senator McGOVERN for the categories involved has been applied to the class of installations in question. Percentage cuts have been applied across the board to all installations relating to programs for which Senator McGOVERN has proposed a reduction. The percentages are based upon the same percentages proposed by McGOVERN for program reductions. For example, a percentage reduction has been applied to all tactical aircraft bases across the country. In reality, the actual cuts would probably not be made in that fashion. It would be more logical to assume that Senator McGOVERN's budgeteers would cut certain bases entirely, other bases very heavily and perhaps some bases only slightly. The equal across-the-board cut has been applied in fairness to Senator McGOVERN's proposals and because one cannot hypothesize which bases would be the most likely to close. If Senator McGOVERN will specify the bases to be cut in full, then of course this data can be revised to reflect the actual closings and what would be necessary to accomplish the total percentage reductions consistent with his budget.

Further, the assumption was made that all cuts would apply with approximately equal impact nationwide. Absent more specific information from Senator McGOVERN, there would be no way to reliably forecast the heavy impact in one region or State as opposed to another. It is apparent, however, from Senator McGOVERN's foreign policy pronouncements that the west coast impact would be much more severe than the impact on the east coast. Hence, it can be assumed that the data contained in the study for California is very conservative. In short, the staff hasn't tried to superimpose over the data in the attached the clearly stated intentions of the McGovern foreign policy doctrines. Illustrative of this is the fact that Senator McGOVERN has called for a virtual abandonment of the U.S. commitment to Asia while he has called for only a 60 percent troop cut in Europe. Clearly west coast military support operations would be drastically reduced and east coast support operations reduced to a lesser degree. Once again, no attempt has been made to hypothesize in this statistical analysis Senator McGOVERN's foreign policy intentions.

Hence, there would be regional variations for his proposed defense budget cuts if they are carried out in full and in many areas of the country the impact would be much more severe than reported; in a few areas of the country would the impact be less severe.

Perhaps in the remaining days of the campaign Senator McGOVERN will wish to clarify his specific intentions with respect to the major defense installations in this country. It is our view that he owes it to the American people to make clear not only what he would cut from the defense budget, but how he would cut it and what the full effect of those cuts could mean both to protecting the security of the United States and maintaining the economy of the regions of the country. Such a calamitous upheaval as that proposed by Senator McGOVERN warrants very careful examination.

The State-by-State analysis must be read in the context of the alternate McGovern defense budget of January 1972 and the Department of Defense letters of July 5 to Senator PROXMIRE and to me. I would note in passing that Senator PROXMIRE has in the past and in a book published today repudiated the more than $30 billion cut Senator McGOVERN proposes. In fact, Senator PROXMIRE in his book calls for a defense level of $70 billion, which is $15 billion higher than that proposed by Senator McGOVERN.

The study follows:

McGOVERN'S STATED "ALTERNATE PROGRAM"
FISCAL YEAR 1975 ACTIONS

1. 26% Reduction in military manpower:

Army from 841,000 to 648,000 (23%).

Greatest reduction is overseas—Europe, SE Asia and Korea.

Navy from 602,000 to 471,000 (22%).

Greatest reduction is in carrier force and associated air wings and escort vessels.

Air Force from 717,000 to 476,000 (33%).

Drastic reductions in SAC.

Marines from 198,000 to 140,000 (29%).

Primarily elimination of forces in Japan (incl. Okinawa).

Reduction in training bases.

Reduced procurement of supplies.

2. Reduce civilian employment from 1,036,000 to 761,000 or 26%.

Impact in all localities at level in proportion to FY 72 employment.

Major impact would be at industrial activities—depots, shipyards and aircraft rework plants.

3. Reduce total procurement of equipment supplies and services from $40.1B (FY 75 dollars) to $20.9B or 48%.

Impact on all Defense supplies at least in proportion to FY 72 levels.

Special impact on weapons systems suppliers.

4. Reduce training and support forces and installations.

Base closures and consolidations.

Heaviest impact on industrial activities—forced closures.

Absence of funding for supplies and services.

5. Reduce air defense missile batteries from 21 to 8.

Closure of numerous small activities, many in areas with little other military presence.

6. Reduction of Naval Forces:

Reduce carrier force from 16 to 6 with 2 Atlantic and 4 Pacific.

Continuous deployment requiring overseas homeporting.

Reduce escort ships from 207 to 130.
Reduce amphibious ships from 66 to 56 and concentrate in Pacific.
Close out Atlantic amphibious force.
Closure of several Naval Shipyards.
Reduce work in private shipyards.
Closure of some homeport sites.
7. Reduce Navy attack wings from 13 to 6.
Closure of Naval Air Stations.
Reductions or closures of Air Rework Facilities.
Reduced procurement of aircraft and spares.
8. Reduce strategic bombers from 511 to 200.
Closure of SAC bases.
Closure of AF repair depots.
Reduced business for supporting contractors.
9. Reduce Air Force tactical wings from 21 to 18 and air defense squadrons from 7 to 5.
Close TAC bases.
Reduction or closure of repair depots.
Reduced business for supporting construction.
10. Cancel Safeguard.
Stop action at North Dakota site.
No national capital site.
Terminate weapons contracts.
11. Retire Titan:
Base reductions or closures.
Terminate supporting contractors.
12. Halt Minuteman hardening and upgrade.
Terminate construction contracts at sites.
Terminate hardware contracts.
13. Cancel F–15 program.
Prime contractor employment.
Sub-contractor employment.
14. Cancel F–14 program.
Prime contractor employment.
Sub-contractor employment.
15. Cancel Patrol Frigate (PF).
Potential contractors impacted.
16. Cancel CVAN–70.
Potential contractors impacted.
17. Cancel B–1 bomber program.
Prime contractor impact.
Sub-contractor impact.
18. Halt Poseidon conversions.
Shipyards.
Weapon contractor and sub-contractors.
19. Cancel MIRV.
R & D contractor.
Hardware contractors.

PROGRAM ANALYSIS ASSUMPTIONS

1. In the absence of a special consideration, "certain" impact reflects pro rata reductions as follows: Army, 23%; Navy, 22%; Air Force, 33%; Marine Corps, 29%; Civilian, 26%.

2. Special considerations:

SAC Bases: "certain" is 61% reduction in military and 26% reduction in civilians.

TAC Bases: "certain" is 14% reduction in military and 26% reduction in civilians.

Navy Air Bases: "certain" is 54% reduction in military and 26% reduction in civilians.

Depots: "certain" is 26% reduction reflecting they are primarily civilian operations.

3. The "possible" column is restricted to comment on the most likely closures/consolidations/realignments.

Mr. Speaker, as the completed State-by-State analysis of the economic impact of the McGovern defense budget is, indeed, a voluminous document, being some 70 pages, I have elected not to ask that it be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the consequent cost to the taxpayer of $1,785. May I suggest, however, that copies may be obtained by contacting the House Republican Policy Committee, 1616 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515; or 202/225–6168.

ONE MAN'S OLYMPIC VIEW

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the recent showing of the U.S. Olympic team in Munich fell far short of the expectations of many American people. This may have come as a surprise to a great many, but not to Dr. Max M. Novich, M.D., an orthopedic surgeon who practices in Perth Amboy, N.J. Since 1964, Dr. Novich has been a physician with the International Amateur Boxing Federation, and has been in attendance at the last three Olympic games. In addition, he has assisted in numerous international boxing contests.

His candid, and frank observations about the U.S. Olympic team and international sports in general prove to be very enlightening and informative. To those of my colleagues who are genuinely interested in the future of the United States in international sports, I commend the reading of this article:

PART 2: ONE MAN'S OLYMPIC VIEW: U.S. AMATEUR BOXERS LEARNING, BUT—

(By Charles J. Read, Jr.)

The staccato sound of Howard Cosell hammered away, lecturing millions of television viewers that this was the finest showing of the United States of America Olympic boxers. It did appear that way for the first few days, but at the end the U.S. had one gold medal and three bronze.

In the 1968 Games the U.S. won two golds (seven medals in all). In 1964 one gold. The one in '64 was by Joe Frazier. One in '68 was by George Foreman. Both heavyweights. In this sprawling country, bigness is goodness. In the 1972 Olympics only heavyweight Duane Bobick was given a chance for U.S. victory. He was soundly beaten and received no medal.

Where does the United States stand in international boxing? Will this country ever show the power of the Soviet Union, Hungary, Cuba?

"The Olympics brought out something I've known for quite a while, Europeans are more serious about their sports than we are. Our great athletes are gobbled up by the pros."

Dr. Max Novich was talking, a veteran of three Olympic Games from ringside, plus international boxing tours through Germany, England, Italy, Russia, the Pan American Games and one of this country's real amateur boxing experts.

Despite a lack of American medals and despite peculiar judging which eliminated some U.S. boxers, sports fans who kept their eyes glued to the TV for over 60 hours were impressed and excited by amateur boxing. The same sports fans who would not pay a nickel to watch the present professional pugilists.

"Yes, amateur boxing is much faster, more exciting," said Dr. Novich. "I've always felt the pomp and ceremony of international boxing far exceeds anything professional boxing offers.

"We have to do more about it, but it costs a lot of money to bring a foreign team over here. Madison Square Garden tried it two years ago with the Italians and it flopped. That was due to glaring promotional defects. Last summer the Irish came to New York City and it was packed with several thousand people turned away. It had been played up every day beforehand, especially in the Daily News."

One area which has dropped the U.S. into the lower echelon of amateur boxing is the lack of college boxing programs.

"But now there are boxing clubs again at Lehigh, West Chester State, West Point and Annapolis. There are four universities on the west coast with boxing teams. This is a new thrust in amateur boxing," said Dr. Max.

And even though there was disappointment in Munich, U.S. boxers displayed far more familiarity with international rules and ability to score under Olympic methods than in past years.

"Yes, exactly," said Dr. Novich. "We have been working very hard with our boxers in America since the 1964 Games in Tokyo, where it was obvious our boys just didn't know how to conduct themselves under international rules."

The man behind this step forward is Col. Don Hull, executive director of the AAU, along with Dr. Ben Becker, chairman of the AAU boxing committee.

"A whole array of coaches, trainers and officials throughout the country held clinics to teach international rules. As a result we didn't have as much fouling as we used to. Our athletes have to know the rules or get thrown out.

"When I went on our European trip in 1968," said Dr. Novich, "George Foreman was disqualified in two fights. He was roughing up his opponents, looping punches and doing things they don't go for. He learned that European referees don't fool around and went on to win the Olympic title.

"The Russian, Cuban and European fighters have stand-up styles. We have the busy fighters and they don't particularly care for that in Europe.

"The Cubans are trained by a Russian. At the Pan-Am he was in the Cubans' corner. He had a gold tooth and was waving a towel between rounds—typically Russian. People began to say, 'Look, that's a Russian coach.' So he disappeared. He showed up again in Munich, but they also had a Cuban in the corner."

It was noticed that American boxers in the Olympics were very regimented. They would bow to each side of the ring following the bout and bow to the referee on a break.

"You must act like a gentleman at all times," Dr. Max explained. "The International Amateur Boxing Association considers boxing a sport where the boxers are sportsmen and it's all a part of the game to show you are a civilized boxer. You must have no animosity towards your opponent.

"It's part of our teaching program. We've gone overboard on this because we've been criticized for lack of rules before. It's not a bad thing for discipline. Of course many of our boys are in the Army and Air Force and are used to being disciplined.

"I like it. It shows we are dealing with athletes, not animalistic fighters."

Those working directly with the U.S. boxers were Sgt. Gene Cooper of the Air Force and Bobby Lewis. Each boxer had either Cooper or Lewis as his adviser and coach, "and they make a good team," Dr. Novich added.

On individual boxers, Dr. Novich had these comments.

"I felt Marvin Johnson (165-pounder from Indianapolis) was the best we had. No question about it. He has everything."

But the 18-year-old southpaw lost in the semifinals. Dr. Max said, "and he had beaten that guy in Russia. There's no doubt the Europeans train longer and are able to stand up under the Olympic schedule of five or six bouts in 11 days.

"Bobick was the biggest disappointment because he was so highly touted," the doctor said of the U.S. heavyweight. "Duane is a real gentleman, a fine young man. I think he was a little overwhelmed and read the press too much.

"I expected a bit more from Tim Dement (112 pounds from Bossier City, La.) but he

didn't have the ruggedness you have to have in the Olympics.

"Jesse Valdez (147-pounder from the Air Force) was not in the same class as Johnson, but a fine fighter and a very nice young man."

Concerning the only U.S. gold medal winner, 139-pound Ray Seales of Tacoma, Wash., Dr. Max said, "I certainly didn't think he was the best we had. He was fortunate on a couple of decisions, and he won, so he must have been doing something right."

Some improvement. Some hope. But still the U.S. is not in the same class as the Europeans.

"Russia particularly. On my trip to Europe I saw how they develop their super athletes," Dr. Novich said.

"The first time a boy shows aptitude for a sport he's advised to go to a sports complex. There are 10,000 such complexes in Russia with facilities for every sport except golf. Facilities both indoors and outdoors for swimming, track, tennis, boxing—you name it. A boy goes to the complex three times a week after school. He's assigned to a coach that takes care of four or five boys.

"All the coaches are master sportsmen who have won their spurs internationally; not coaches who've read it from books. They've been through it.

"The sports complexes all have hotels where an athlete can bring his family when preparing for the Olympics. You live your regular life, get paid your salary and you're training. So in effect they are professional athletes.

"In contrast, we have utter dislocation. An athlete has to leave his home, his family and pay his own way.

"The Olympic teams are not developed by the Olympic Committee in this country. They are developed by the AAU, by the NCAA and the military services. The Olympic Committee gives very little of its time or money to the actual development of teams. They take the athletes five or six weeks before the Games.

"There should be more money coming out of the Olympic development clinics for all sports, all over. The AAU goes broke training our athletes. The AAU gives its time and services free, does the real spade work to develop our athletes and is not given sufficient credit.

"The Olympic Committee gets plenty from the population because of the magic name 'Olympics.' Their coffers are filled but they don't spend it on development programs."

The big former amateur boxer shakes his head and says:

"America, you'd better wake up, because these Europeans are getting stronger and stronger."

RETIREMENT OF "MANNY" CELLER

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, shortly the curtain will fall on one of the finest careers of congressional achievement these halls have ever witnessed.

The most common adjectives fall short of truly describing the standard of excellence established by EMANUEL CELLER during his 50 years in the House.

I do not think it is being trite to say that when "MANNY" CELLER retires we will have lost a giant of a man whose record will be congressional legend.

This is the man who, as chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, shaped and guided the great civil rights bills through Congress during the 1950's and 1960's. He was responsible for four amendments to the Constitution. And he gave direction and leadership to hundreds of other bills as they wended their way through the intricacies of passage.

He is a brilliant lawyer, an eloquent speaker, and in the biblical sense, a great rabbi or teacher.

As day follows night, MANNY CELLER will be succeeded. But he will never be replaced.

I hope that his future endeavors are happy and successful ones.

MANNY CELLER—his career is one to envy, his record one to emulate.

TRIBUTE TO HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, to read the biography of WAYNE NORVIEL ASPINALL, starting from birth in the year that William McKinley won the Presidency over William Jennings Bryan, up to his election to this body in the year that Harry Truman defeated Thomas Dewey, one is compelled to conclude that his training and experience perforce destined him to be one of the great legislators of all time.

Indeed, that biography reads like the ideal curriculum of a preparatory school for leaders of the House of Representatives. Public schools, university, law school, teaching, private industry, law practice, school board, municipal government, State house of representatives, whip, floor leader, Speaker, enlisted serviceman in World War I, commissioned combat service in World War II, and membership in and service to more organizations than one could enumerate.

But this occasion is more to commend how that experience was translated into the work of the House of Representatives. No Member of this body in recent years has failed to appreciate the almost dogged thoroughness with which the legislation his committee reported was prepared. It has been long and well known that he was "unreachable" whenever any of his subcommittees were meeting, as he was attending that meeting, preparing for managing whatever the business might be on the floor later. I doubt seriously that any single Member of this body has ever accomplished more legislatively than WAYNE ASPINALL has.

In 1967, when the House created the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and honored me to Chair it, the House also chose WAYNE ASPINALL to be among those who would shape and guide it. Working with him on this committee has provided me with even greater respect for his fairness, candor, incisiveness, and fortitude. His presence will be sorely missed by the 93d Congress, but he will not go unremembered. His tenure has been a legislative monument, and his legacy is one for all to seek to emulate.

THE DRUG PROBLEM STILL GROWS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the failure of this country to stop or even slow the soaring rate of drug addiction has left it at the mercy of this cancerous habit which knows no mercy.

Heroin addiction is the greatest single cause of crime, and that problem too is worsening—up 33 percent in recent years. Heroin addicts spend more than $5 billion a year on their habit, making criminal narcotics traffic one of America's largest industries. That $5 billion is paid by the victims of the millions of burglaries, robberies and thefts committed by heroin addicts each year. It amounts to a "heroin tax" of $100 a year for every American family of four.

Heroin addiction is no longer isolated in the urban ghetto. It has spread to all parts of society. Nor is heroin addiction an isolated problem of the addicts. It is a serious problem that affects everyone who is a victim of their crime.

Heroin addiction has spread to epidemic proportions. In late 1969, the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs estimated the number of heroin users in the United States to be 315,000. At the end of 1971, the estimate was 560,000.

A year ago the BNDD estimated that 5 to 6 tons of heroin were being smuggled into the United States each year. Today their estimate is 6½ to 10 tons.

A major reason for the failure of the war on drugs has been the Nation's failure to prevent Southeast Asia from emerging as a major source of heroin. One quarter to one third of the heroin entering the United States comes from Southeast Asia. If present trends continue, Southeast Asia will replace Turkey as the major source for heroin entering this country.

The reason that this Nation has been unable to prevent this is that our allies in Laos, Thailand, and South Vietnam are involved in the narcotics trade. The United States does not crack down on them because officials have placed the need for airbases in Thailand, Lao mercenaries and Vietnamese soldiers over the safety of this Nation's population from the drug invasion.

While a law that I authored enables aid to be cut off to countries that refuse to stop contributing to our drug problem, columnist Jack Anderson, in a column which appeared in the New York Post on Friday, October 13, points out that classified CIA documents give evidence that Southeast Asian leaders are either protecting drug smugglers, or are, themselves, participating in the traffic in illegal drugs to America.

More than $200 million in military aid annually goes to the Souvanna Phouma government in Laos. Yet one CIA document quoted by Anderson said:

A broad spectrum of Lao society is involved in the narcotics business, including generals, princes, high-level bureaucrats and province governors.

Laotian generals, it seems, are providing the transportation for drug smug-

glers. Ironically, according to the reports in Anderson's possession, the planes and trucks to transport the America-bound narcotics are paid for by the U.S. military programs which Congress has said should be cut off in just this kind of situation.

This secret report goes on to say, according to Anderson, that the difficulty of cutting off aid is great since "the risk of jeopardizing some part of the military is high."

Our $240 million aid to Cambodia goes to help support one of the major shipment points for Southeast Asian heroin and the unstable corrupt government that protects this operation.

Anderson goes on to quote from the report:

If U.S. aid were withdrawn, the government's ability to withstand Communist aggression would be weakened to the point of collapse.

Are we to believe that the prospect of the collapse of a tiny corrupt government on the other side of the world is more important than the deaths of hundreds of our young people, black and white, because of heroin?

The story is no better in South Vietnam. While the Thieu regime has mouthed promises to stem the flow of heroin from its mountainous areas, Anderson quotes this report as saying, "the corruption among government, civilian, military and police officials, some of whom have been participating in the narcotics traffic themselves" makes the prospects of stopping South Vietnamese heroin traffic without drastic action very dim.

As for these drastic actions, the report is further quoted to say:

It is not in the U.S. interests to implement an air cut-off, even to punish Vietnam for failure to control drugs.

Thailand and much of South America repeat this same depressing story. Obviously, the war on drugs has become the victim of the war in Southeast Asia.

Up to 100,000 American GI's sent to fight in Vietnam since 1969 became addicted to heroin produced and marketed by our Southeast Asian allies. This same heroin is now taking its toll in our own country.

Claims of impressive seizures, important arrests, and international cooperation can simply not hide the failures. Ridding America of the heroin plague should be a seriously pursued national goal. When we spend $60 billion to fight North Vietnam and less than $1 billion to fight drug addiction, the priorities are anything but correct.

In September 1970, a leading Federal narcotics officer said:

Every time one addict is cured, more take his place because of the ever-increasing amounts of heroin available.

A year ago, the American people were told that opium production was being phased out in Turkey—which had in the past accounted for 80 percent of the heroin being smuggled into the United States.

For Americans today, this elicits several questions which should be asked.

If opium production in Turkey is being phased out, how can heroin importation—and addiction—be increasing?

And why is the overall problem worse than ever after all the calls for special action?

The answer, again, lies in the region known as the Golden Triangle where the borders of Thailand, Burma, and Laos converge. One year's crop of 700 to 1,000 tons can be refined into enough heroin to supply America's addicts for 10 years. More and more of this heroin is reaching the American market.

Southeast Asia has been a major producer of opium and has had opium addiction problems of its own for some time. But only in 1969 did the white pure No. 4 heroin prized by American addicts begin to be produced in Southeast Asia.

When it appeared, it appeared in earnest. John Ingersoll, Director of BNDD, said:

Our first indication of the presence of (No. 4) heroin in Southeast Asia came in December of 1969. In 1970, the trickle turned into a stream, and in 1971, the stream turned into a torrent of heroin pouring out of the "Golden Triangle."

Since there was no indigenous demand for No. 4 heroin anywhere in Southeast Asia, its appearance signified an intention to supply the U.S. market. The first victims were our soldiers in Vietnam.

Now that many of our GI's have come home and the market for No. 4 has diminished in Southeast Asia, Southeast Asian heroin is being marketed in America.

The United States has always tolerated corruption on the part of our allies in the war in Southeast Asia as long as they fight at least part of the war and follow at least some of our policies. Black marketeering, stealing U.S. aid, currency manipulation and smuggling are tolerated and all are rampant. Narcotics trafficking has not been treated any differently.

A vast military and political apparatus was built up in Indochina by the United States. We ignored the fact that virtually every link in that apparatus was simultaneously becoming part of a vast opium producing, refining, and smuggling apparatus which today is well on the way to replacing Turkey as the major source of heroin entering the United States.

The basics of the development of the Southeast Asian opium and heroin trade are these:

In Laos, opium is grown by the Meo tribesmen we organized into General Van Pao's "secret army." In fact, once the United States began providing them with liberal food supplies to assure their allegiance, many of them were able to switch to opium as virtually their only crop.

In Burma, opium is grown by the Shan rebels, the biggest opium growers in the world. They are armed with American weapons provided by the CIA or which were acquired by trading opium with government officials in Laos and Thailand for guns supplied by—and stolen from—the U.S. military aid program.

Opium is also grown by hill tribesmen in Thailand.

Opium from Burma is transported into Thailand by remnants of the Nationalist Chinese—KMT—forces driven out of China in 1949. These forces are armed with U.S. weapons and have been supported by the CIA. The Thai Government now uses them to patrol its rugged northern frontier with Burma and to help suppress the growing insurgency in northern Thailand.

Opium is transported by the Royal Laotian Air Force and the South Vietnamese Air Force, which have been organized, financed, and supplied by the United States, and on local commercial flights as well.

Opium and morphine-base—which is transformed into opium—are transported from Thai ports in fishing trawlers to clandestine laboratories in Hong Kong. This could not happen without government complicity.

Heroin is refined in laboratories in Thailand, Laos, Burma, and Hong Kong. In the quantity and quality of its output, Hong Kong now rivals the refining capacity of Marseilles.

From Southeast Asia, heroin has been smuggled to the United States via many routes. There have been seizures of heroin sent to the United States from Southeast Asia via the military postal system. Southeast Asian heroin is reaching the United States by way of Latin America, as well as France.

A courier ring was uncovered smuggling Southeast Asian heroin to the United States via the Philippines. Another ring was uncovered this year operating through Bangkok. Seamen from Hong Kong are also increasingly participating in the smuggling.

We ignored the drug problem in Southeast Asia until 1971, when heroin use reached epidemic proportions among our GI's in Southeast Asia. By then, it was too late. Our allies in Southeast Asia had developed a vast opium network while the United States, with its great power in Southeast Asia, patrolled the air, land, and sea, organized armies, created and destroyed governments, promoted intrigue, but ignored the opium trade.

Important members of the armed forces and governments of South Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand are raking in big profits from the drug trade. They are not about to forgo these profits, at least not of their own accord.

The U.S. Army provost marshal in South Vietnam, in a 1971 report, stated that the opium trade in South Vietnam is controlled by a four-tiered pyramid. At the top are "the powers behind the scenes who can manipulate, foster, protect and promote the illicit traffic in drugs." The people comprising this group, the report stated, "may be high-level, influential political figures, Government leaders, or moneyed Chinese members of the criminal syndicates now flourishing in the Cholon section of the city of Saigon."

The provost marshal identified Tran Thien Khoi, chief of the South Vietnamese customs fraud repression division and brother of Prime Minister Tran Thien Kheim, as a "principal" in the opium traffic.

General Ngo Dzu, II Corps commander in South Vietnam and a stanch supporter of President Thieu, was identified

last year as a major narcotics trafficker. Thieu promoted him after a whitewash investigation.

Gen. Ouane Rattikone controlled the largest heroin laboratory in Southeast Asia during his tenure as chief of staff of the Royal Laotian Army—the only army other than that of the United States that is completely financed by the U.S. taxpayer. This laboratory was the major supplier of heroin for U.S. forces in South Vietnam at the peak of the heroin epidemic.

NBC News reported on July 15, 1971, that both President Thieu and Vice President Ky were financing their election campaigns from the narcotics traffic and labeled President Thieu's chief intelligence officer "the biggest pusher in South Vietnam." Quang's involvement in the heroin trade has been confirmed by other sources.

The Filipino courier ring broken up by BNDD in 1970 had smuggled approximately 1,000 kilograms of Southeast Asian heroin into the United States in the previous year. That was enough to supply 15 to 20 percent of the estimated U.S. consumption at the time.

On April 5, 1971, 7.7 kilos of Double U–O Globe brand Laotian heroin—the same brand produced in Gen. Ouane Rattikone's laboratories—were seized in Fort Monmouth, N.J.

On November 11, 1971, 15.5 kilos of the same brand of Laotian heroin were seized in New York City.

The new Laotian Ambassador to France was caught in April 1971 when he arrived in Paris with 60 kilograms of heroin in his suitcase. That is enough to supply 5,000 addicts for a full year.

In January 1972, U.S. customs inspectors in Honolulu broke up a smuggling ring and arrested three couriers body-carrying heroin from Bangkok to buyers in San Francisco and New York.

On April 5, 1972, a seaman was arrested in Miami with 10 kilos of Double U–O Globe brand Laotian heroin and on April 11, another seaman was arrested in New York with another 5 kilos of Southeast Asian heroin.

And on August 23, 1972, the BNDD announced the seizure of 9 kilograms of Southeast Asian heroin in New York City and the uncovering of a smuggling ring. The BNDD noted that there had been another seizure of Southeast Asian heroin in the same area the month before.

These seizures are only the tip of the iceberg. John Ingersoll of BNDD told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on June 27 that—

> We have reason to believe that certain ethnic Chinese criminal elements in America have geared up an operation to take advantage of the heroin availability in Southeast Asia . . . The evidence points to the establishment of a new pattern which affects places never previously of any significance to the drug traffic. As the result of actual seizures and our intelligence, we believe these shipments have come in through such diverse seaports as Norfolk, Charleston, Miami, New Orleans, Seattle, Vancouver, New York, and the Great Lakes port of Chicago.

As one Republican Congressman has said:

> Vietnam is truly coming home to haunt us. No matter what they say, . . . the first wave of this material is already on its way to our children in high school.

It is impossible to be sure just how much Southeast Asian heroin is now entering this country. NBC's estimate in a recent special broadcast was that one-third of heroin entering this country now comes from Southeast Asia. A recent report by the Strategic Intelligence Office of BNDD stated:

> More of the heroin reaching the U.S. is from this area than conventional knowledge has recognized. A recent study by BNDD chemists, involving 109 traceable heroin samples, revealed 28 (or 25.7 percent) to be of Southeast Asian origin.

The percentage of heroin entering this country that comes from Southeast Asia is increasing; the Golden Triangle region of Laos, Burma, and Thailand clearly has the potential of replacing Turkey as this country's major heroin supplier. Whether that potential is realized will depend on how the United States responds to the problem. So far, the United States has met this challenge with half measures and coverups.

Optimism in this area was counterbalanced by a Cabinet-level report dated February 21, 1972, prepared by officials from the CIA, the State Department, and the Department of Defense. According to the New York Times of July 24, the report stated that "there is no prospect under any conditions that can realistically be projected" for stemming the smuggling of narcotics in Southeast Asia.

The Cabinet level report stated:

> The governments in the region are unable and, in some cases, unwilling, to do those things that would have to be done by them if a truly effective effort were to be made. . . . The most basic problem, and the one that unfortunately appears least likely of any early solution, is the corruption, collusion, and indifference at some places in some governments, particularly Thailand and South Vietnam, that precludes more effective suppression of traffic by the governments on whose territory it takes place.

Nelson Gross, of the State Department insisted that there were only "unsubstantiated allegations" implicating Gen. Ouane Rattikone in the drug trade. However, General Rattikone has acknowledged his complicity, and John Warner, chief of the Intelligence Office of BNDD, has since confirmed Rattikone's complicity.

In July 1971 a congressional committee was told that—

> U.S. military authorities have provided Ambassador Bunker with hard intelligence that one of the chief traffickers is General Ngo Dzu, the commander of II Corps.

The U.S. Embassy permitted the late John Paul Vann, the senior U.S. adviser for II Corps, to respond:

> There is no information available to me that in any shape, manner or fashion would substantiate the charges.

He also indicated that General Abrams had no such information. General Dzu was then promoted. The Washington Post later obtained the secret documents whose existence had been denied and published them in June 1972.

Nelson Gross denied there was a serious problem. In a letter to the Senate committee he said: "Southeast Asia is not a major source of heroin on our market" and that "only 5 percent" and "certainly no more than 10 percent" of heroin used in the United States comes from Southeast Asia. But it was pointed out above that a survey of 109 seizures of heroin in this country by BNDD found that 26 percent came from Southeast Asia.

The Washington Evening Star-Daily News on August 19, 1972, reported on secret intelligence summaries compiled by CIA and BNDD that contain some of the facts that the administration will not acknowledge in public. The summaries stated that—

> Officials of the Royal Thai Army and Customs at the several checkpoints along the road to Bangkok are usually bribed and "protection" fees prepaid by the smuggling syndicates or by the driver at the checkpoints.

The summaries also clearly explain why the United States has been unable to deal effectively with the Southeast Asia drug trade. They state:

> Priorities related to requirements of the Vietnam war may limit pressures that can be applied.

The "war on drugs" has become a casualty of the war in Indochina.

Our political and military commitments to the governments of Southeast Asia have prevented any effective action to stop the narcotics traffic. These commitments are the result of our determination to fight the war in Indochina. We have allied ourselves with corrupt governments that are complicit in the drug trade and this fact is coming home to haunt us.

Ending the war in Vietnam will free us to make the narcotics traffic our number one priority in the region.

Heroin addiction in our country has brought living death to hundreds of thousands of Americans. It is a major force behind our intolerable crime rates. It is fueling the activities of organized crime.

We can no longer tolerate the narcotics traffic and we can no longer support the corrupt governments of Southeast Asia that profit from it.

In the following ways, Congress' determination to continue the war in Vietnam has prevented us from being able to crack down on the Southeast Asian heroin trade.

First. We cannot cope with the situation without admitting the depth of corruption of our allies in Laos, Thailand, and South Vietnam who are supplying heroin to the U.S. market. If these facts are admitted, support for the war would dry up immediately. Many members of Congress, and much of the rest of the Nation, have chosen, therefore, to ignore this part of the heroin problem.

Second. Congress has voted money to prop up these weak corrupt Southeast Asian governments. Exposing the scandals would threaten their fragile existence and lessen their ability to fight the war.

Third. We can never bring the necessary pressures to bear on these govern-

ments as long as we need Vietnamese soldiers, Lao mercenaries, and Thai air bases to fight this war.

The best case in point is Thailand. As a major opium grower and the conduit through which Burmese opium is smuggled, Thailand is increasingly the key to controlling the Southeast Asian drug trade.

At the same time, as we increase our reliance on air power, shift troops from South Vietnam to Thailand, and reopen air bases in Thailand, this nation becomes crucial to our warmaking effort. The war is also dependent on Thai mercenaries in Laos and South Vietnam.

As long as the United States is relying on mercenaries and air bases that are available only with the approval of the Thai Government, obviously there is a limit to how much pressure we can bring to bear on them. The war gives the corrupt Thai Government a veto power over American policy. As long as the war continues, we will never be able to pressure the Thai leaders to give up the enormous profits that they are making from the opium trade.

In the following ways, ending the war will facilitate controlling the Southeast Asian heroin trade:

First. The end of the war will free us to make a crackdown on narcotics the top priority of our relations with the nations of this area.

Second. Political settlements at the end of the war are likely to lead to the emergence of new governments in Laos and South Vietnam that would be less likely to support the opium trade. The people and governments of Laos and South Vietnam are likely to realize that, if they are serious about rebuilding their countries, they will have to root out corruption and curb the growing drug problems that are ravaging their societies; and

Third. The end of the war would completely turn the tables in Thailand. We would no longer be dependent on the Thai Government for the war effort; instead, they would be dependent on our economic aid to bolster their top heavy economy. A threat to cut off aid would, then, give us tremendous leverage.

The Thai Government could seal off the Thai-Burmese border, if they were determined to do so. Virtually all of the Burmese opium passes through Thailand. Most of it carried in large mule caravans by the KMT. Some is carried by the Burmese Shan rebels, but the KMT units tightly control the border and tax every pound of opium that crosses into Thailand. This shows that the border can be controlled. If the opium is taxed, it can be stopped. But it will require a vigorous effort by the Thai Government. The United States must pressure the Thai Government to make that effort.

The Government of Burma is unable to stop the opium traffic because the opium growing areas are controlled by rebel bands armed with American weapons—they obtain those weapons by selling opium to corrupt Thai and Laotian officials. When the war ends and the United States stops sending arms into the area, the flow of arms to the rebels will be disrupted. If corruption in Laos and Thailand were controlled and if the borders were sealed, the Burmese rebels would find it difficult to market their opium or to obtain weapons. With a shortage of weapons and money, the rebels would be weakened and it would be easier for the Burmese Government to regain control of the opium growing areas. In the past, the Burmese Government has cracked down on opium traffic when it has been able to.

In addition, ending the Vietnam war, and reorienting our foreign policy may improve our relations with Burma and make cooperative efforts more likely.

These points must be placed in the context of a full program to stem the international narcotics trade. Such an effort must include four components. There is nothing mysterious about these recommendations. Some are official administration policy and all have been discussed and advocated for a long time. But these recommendations are meaningless as long as the war continues and the Southeast Asia narcotics trade continues unchecked.

First. Direct diplomatic pressure. The United States should exert maximum pressure on other governments to crack down on the illicit production and smuggling of opium. This effort must be placed at the top of the agenda of our foreign relations. Every possible diplomatic lever, including possible reduction or cessation of foreign aid, must be brought to bear.

In this effort, the United States must use the carrot as well as the stick. Other countries, too, have an interest in halting the drug trade. They have their own opium and heroin problems. If given a realistic alternative to involvement in the drug trade, foreign countries may well find it in their interest to cooperate in international control efforts.

Unfortunately, the opium trade is an important source of income to hundreds of thousands of farmers around the world, and, in some cases, to entire national economies. Consequently, the United States must be prepared to assist in making sure that realistic alternative sources of income are available. This should include price support payments and, in the long term, investments in the areas affected to help create alternative sources of income.

Second. International cooperation. U.S. action is needed at once, but the proposed U.S. actions would be more effective if taken by an international organization. The U.S. should attempt to organize the international community to pressure offending nations to clamp down on the narcotics trade. The International Narcotics Control Board should have authority to investigate alleged noncompliance with international obligations in any nation that is a party to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs. Economic sanctions, including the withholding international development funds, and possible trade restrictions, should be available as a tool of last resort in the event of persistent failure by any nation to cooperate. An effective program of economic assistance to opium producing areas converting to other crops should be developed under international auspices. So far only a tiny step has been taken in this direction.

Third. U.S. agencies. We should strengthen the U.S. agencies that are responsible for controlling the international narcotics trade. An additional $40 million should be appropriated for the Customs Bureau and the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs for hiring and training specialists in drug law enforcement.

A conflict of jurisdictions between BNDD and the Customs Bureau has undermined the effectiveness of Federal control efforts. We cannot expect other nations to take us seriously when we urge cooperation if we are unable to coordinate our own efforts. Yet we have been unable to gain control over this conflict between two Federal agencies, and the conflict has repeatedly jeopardized important cases. BNDD should be assigned primary responsibility in controlling the international trade.

Fourth. Finally, increased research efforts can contribute to improving our ability to control the illicit narcotics traffic. The development of cheap, nonaddictive synthetic pain killers could make it possible to completely outlaw opium production throughout the world. If legal crops for medicinal purposes can be marked with practical tracer elements, this would make it much easier to detect opium diverted into the illegal market. And there are even indications that remote sensor devices can be developed that would permit direct detection of heroin shipments. All of these possibilities should be vigorously pursued.

The international law enforcement strategy is clearly not the total solution to the drug addiction problem. A two-pronged approach is needed—rehabilitation of those who are now addicted and law enforcement and education to prevent the spread of heroin addiction. Here are some of the elements of a total approach to drug addiction:

REHABILITATION OF ADDICTS

Any serious assault on the drug addiction problem must include an extensive rehabilitation program. A broad range of treatment facilities excluding heroin maintenance, must be available; we must seek to guarantee that any addict seeking treatment can gain access to a suitable modality of treatment. Vocational training and counseling and other supportive services must be available and we must attempt to eliminate unfair job discrimination against ex-addicts. Today there are waiting lists in our methadone programs; methadone is frequently the only treatment available—although, for many addicts, such as young veterans who have been addicted only a short time, methadone may not be suitable—and supportive services are frequently absent. Even if it were possible to suddenly stop the flow of heroin into this country and prevent more people from becoming addicted, there are already more than a half million heroin addicts in our country who need treatment.

DOMESTIC LAW ENFORCEMENT

Domestic law enforcement efforts must be pursued as an adjunct to the inter-

national control effort, to make it as difficult as possible for the heroin traffickers to operate. Law enforcement efforts should be directed not at the street level pushers who are usually addicts themselves but at those who organize, promote, and profiteer from the spread of heroin addiction.

Even if the domestic and international control efforts cannot eliminate the heroin traffic, it is reasonable to hope that they can reduce heroin availability on the street and curtail experimentation and thus help stop the spread of addiction— although confirmed addicts will still do whatever is necessary to obtain the drug.

DRUG EDUCATION

Like the law enforcement effort, drug education programs that frankly and openly present the facts about various drugs can help discourage experimentation with heroin among youths.

We have heard that drug education is the highest priority of this government. Yet the drug education budget for fiscal 1972 in the Office of Education was $13 million—one fourth the cost of one C–5A transport.

OTHER DRUGS

International enforcement efforts must not be limited to heroin. Other drugs, including cocaine, methadone, and barbiturates, must be included; they are problems now and could become more serious if heroin becomes scarce. Synthetic drugs equivalent to heroin may also become available. Control efforts must be pursued now before these problems grow.

UNDERLYING SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Solving basic problems of poverty, alienation, and lack of opportunity will be the key to a long range solution of our drug problems. Until the underlying social causes of drug abuse can be cured, drug abuse cannot be completely eliminated. As long as the belief persists that it is possible to solve problems by taking drugs, it will always be possible that a new drug problem could emerge.

These considerations, however, should not discourage us from making an immediate effort, pursuing every possible avenue, to cure the heroin plague. Heroin overshadows all other drugs in its disastrous impact on our lives. Heroin is responsible for much of the crime, violence, and insecurity that haunt urban life; heroin addiction has destroyed the lives of hundreds of thouands of addicts; and heroin trafficking has fueled the growth of organized crime. Heroin is our worst drug problem and solving it would immensely contribute to improving the quality of our lives.

The effort to solve the heroin problem must cease to be fragmented and haphazard. We must pursue it with the same determination and seriousness of purpose that we invested in the Manhattan project and the space race.

CONCLUSION

The difficulties in attempting to control the international narcotics trade are obvious. Opium is grown in many countries and total U.S. consumption is small compared to worldwide production. The intention in this presentation is not to propose panaceas or to paper over problems but rather to clarify some of the reasons for past failures and to point the way toward a more realistic effort. International enforcement efforts are not the full answer to the drug problem nor is Southeast Asia the only opium-growing area that could replace Turkey in supplying the U.S. market. But our failure to face up to the problem in Southeast Asia has been on major reason for the failure of the "total war" that was declared on heroin. The Nation must face up squarely to the fact that Southeast Asia is fast becoming this Nation's major heroin supplier.

It would be wrong to see only the problems that beset the international control effort. There are also some important facts which indicate that an international control strategy will have some reasonable prospect of success. The poppy has a long growing period and is easily detected from the air or by satellite. Poppy cultivation is possible only in certain fairly restricted climates. Cultivating the poppy is exceptionally demanding: few who are not accustomed to that life would be willing to adopt it. Consequently, the international syndicates will not easily be able to persuade farmers elsewhere to cultivate the poppy, if they lose their source of supply in the Golden Triangle.

In the 1950's Iran was able to gain control over remote hill tribes and halt opium production. Indian and China have had considerable success in controlling the ilicit production of opium and preventing diversion into illegal channels. Turkey's recent agreement to terminate opium production—culminate a decade of negotiation and pressure—illustrates what can be achieved, when narcotics control is made a top priority. It is now time to place cracking down on the heroin trade at the top of the agenda in our relations will all of the nations involved. No objective we are pursuing in Vietnam is so important as to justify jeopardizing our efforts to control the heroin trade.

JOHN McMILLAN

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine regret that I realize that our good friend and colleague from South Carolina JOHN MCMILLAN, will not be with us in the new Congress. Through the years I know of no public servant who has rendered more conscientious service, who has been a better spokesman for his district and for his Nation, than has JOHN.

He has never been too busy to deal with the problems of his constituents before committees, on the floor, and elsewhere. Through that period of time he has carried lots of extra work here in the Congress and, truly, we all are indebted to him for many of the good things that have happened in our Nation; and I say, too, that a number of those things with which many of us are not too pleased have come over his objection and over his opposition.

Mr. Speaker, it seems we are losing a far greater percentage of our solid, reliable, and dependable Members than during any Congress I recall. Certainly, JOHN MCMILLAN is to be listed in that group.

His wife, Margaret, is deserving of real recognition for the part she has played, not only in JOHN's career, but in service to his district. To both JOHN and Margaret we extend our very best wishes for many active and happy years.

THE ANTIHIJACKING ACT OF 1972

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I voted for H.R. 16191, the Antihijacking Act of 1972, and I believe this legislation ought to be enacted into law as soon as possible. Aircraft piracy must be stopped and the criminals who engage in it must be brought to justice.

Ever since the hijacking of aircraft began, I have felt that stronger laws and stiffer penalties would be necessary if we were going to put a halt to this crime. The problem was complicated by the fact that seizures of aircraft owned and operated by American airlines and the consequent danger to American citizens could occur while the planes were flying over foreign countries or over the oceans, thus being beyond the jurisdiction of the United States. In an attempt to deal with the problem, I cosponsored H.R. 16342, the provisions of which were embodied in H.R. 16191, the bill that passed this body by the nearly unanimous vote of 354 to 2 on October 2.

Besides incorporating the security provisions of the Convention on International Civil Aviation into the legal code of the United States, the House bill would, if it becomes law, strengthen domestic statutes on the subject of air piracy. The President will have the power to suspend the right of any domestic or foreign air carrier to operate to and from a foreign country that is acting in a manner inconsistent with the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft. He will also have the power to suspend the operations of any foreign air carrier between the United States and a foreign country which continues air commerce between itself and a country which is acting inconsistently with that convention.

Under the bill passed by the House, the Secretary of Transportation will, if he secures the approval of the Secretary of State, have power to withhold, revoke, or impose conditions on operating authority of the airlines of a nation that fails to meet the security measures at or above the minimum standards of that convention. This power, like the power given to the President, is permissive.

The House measure also provides civil penalties up to $1,000 per day for viola-

tions of suspensions imposed by the President and authorizes the Attorney General to seek judicial enforcement of such suspensions.

The bill passed by the other body contains a second title that is not included in the House version of the legislation. Title II, the Air Transportation Security Act of 1972, which appears only in the Senate measure, provides for the screening of passengers in air transportation and for an air transportation security force, besides dealing with such matters as authority to refuse transportation—to those who refuse consent to searches of their persons or property—and carrying weapons aboard aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the legislation which was passed by this body would have been improved and strengthened by the inclusion of the provisions added by the Senate bill. A stronger law is imperative if we are going to prevent more and worse crimes in the air and I deeply regret that the House and Senate conferees could not agree on a final bill. I sincerely hope that prompt action will be taken when the 93d Congress convenes.

RICHARD BRADEE'S LESSONS IN SILENCING YOUR CONGRESSMAN

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Richard Bradee, Washington reporter for the Milwaukee Sentinel, had some handy suggestions in Monday's paper for his readers who may not quite know how to bring a conversation with their Congressman to a close. Unfortunately, in observance of parliamentary rules, I must delete—— some of the more delightful parts of his witty item:

CONGRESSMEN CAN BE SILENCED

(By Richard Bradee)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Since congressmen probably will be heading for home this week, chances are that you will see your man in Washington at a coffee hour, union meeting, political rally or plant gate in your district soon.

To cope with one of the problems that plagues all these encounters—how to end them—we've collected some questions that are likely to be greeted with stony silence in conversations with congressmen.

Try this, for example, if your man is a Republican:

"How about those two pandas that Red China gave us in exchange for Taiwan—how are they doing?"

If your man is a Democrat:

"How come the Committee to Re-elect the President gives away free tapes of Sargent Shriver's speeches?"

Some questions are bipartisan. If you see your man on Monday or Tuesday, you could ask:

"What are you doing here? I thought Congress was still in session."

Set up some questions with sweet talk.

"Congressman, I sure appreciate your sending me that US Department of Agriculture yearbook every year. If I had to buy it, it would cost $3.50. This year, though, I'd like a book that only costs $1. Could you give me the profile on you by the Ralph Nader Congress Project?"

"Your campaign is running like clockwork. Who pays the salary of that fellow you sent out here from Washington to get things in order?"

"Those shoes you're wearing must have cost $45. I can remember when you did your shopping at the Salvation Army store. By the way, what's your net worth?"

"You're right on target when you talk about all those special interests getting their way in Washington while we pay for it at the grocery store. Why, I heard that the price of milk is going up because the federal government raised milk support prices. How'd you stand on that?"

"You fellows sure were busy the last few days. Didn't anything happen the first nine months of the year?"

Some questions will require some homework. Looking up a congressman's voting record, for example, is time consuming and, if you are interested in some of the legislative clinkers that dropped through the grates in the final days of the session, virtually impossible.

Here's an example. In the middle of the night on Oct. 6, the House passed the highway bill that, among other things, would have called for more billboards than there are now and would have banned the use of highway funds for mass transit. The vote was 263 to 30.

Of the Wisconsin congressmen, only Democrats Henry S. Reuss and Les Aspin voted "no."

The question, "Why do you want more billboards?" might get an answer about how you have to take the good with the bad. If so, try again by asking why no record was made of the 46 to 18 vote (about 370 not voting) on an amendment to take out the blessing for billboards.

If your congressman is Reuss, try this:

"... ?"

And, for Aspin:

"... ?"

Sometimes, you can halt a congressional conversation by asking a question that will make him wonder how much you know. You might ask Rep. Vernon W. Thomson (R-Wis.), for example:

"... ?"

Or Rep. Glenn R. Davis (R-Wis.):

"... ?"

You could try this on Rep. Alvin E. O'Konski (R-Wis):

"... ?"

For Rep. William A. Steiger (R-Wis.):

"... ?"

Members of Congress pride themselves on keeping in touch with the people who send them to Washington. They say they will be glad to take the pulse of their public.

Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.) wrote in his book, "Uncle Sam, The Last of The Big-time Spenders," that:

"Unlike most senators, I don't go home to speak to my constituents—except when the speaking engagements are unavoidable. They feel they hear too much of me on television anyway. I go home to hear them, to listen to them."

Most people can think of their own hard questions to ask Proxmire. You might try to think of something he is not often asked, like:

"... ?"

BUSING ISSUE STILL ALIVE: HOUSE RESPONDED TO AMERICAN PEOPLE BUT SENATE DID NOT

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, thanks to the U.S. Senate, the 92d Congress is closing with no substantive legislative action taken on banning busing of schoolchildren for racial reasons.

It is generally admitted this topic has been more controversial and divisive and wracking than any domestic issue in the last 100 years. I have spoken in the past in the House of Representatives, registering my strong and unyielding opposition to busing. The first major speech was on July 30, 1969, entitled "Education or Social Experimentation?" and the second came on October 7, 1970, called "Classroom for Chessboard: Pupils for Pawns."

My 1971 public opinion poll did not ask the question, but I was amazed at the tremendous number who wrote either in letters or on the poll cards concerning their opposition. In fact, I could say it was unanimous. On October 19, 1971, I summarized the poll returns and gave the balance of the remarks over to the issue of busing.

In 1972 I did include it on the poll. The returns were, in percentages of those responding to that question, 96–4 in opposition.

In the poll return for 1972, I briefly sketched the legislative history of busing legislation for 1972. In the summer of 1972 a bill dealing with higher education had some good, strong antibusing amendments attached to it in the House. I had voted "yes" on these amendments. It must be noted that in some other respects pertaining to education itself the bill also left much to be desired and had the strong opposition of many university and college presidents.

The House's antibusing amendments were badly weakened in a House-Senate conference committee to the point where one Capitol Hill expert called it a probusing bill. I voted against the conference version on final passage.

On Thursday, August 17, 1972, the Equal Education Opportunities Act came before the House. It was a good bill, banning long-distance busing through the sixth grade. Courts were forbidden from ordering any busing for such students beyond the closest, or next closest, school to their home. For students beyond the sixth grade, busing was to be only a last resort. The White House, which had asked for antibusing measures, found the bill went even beyond what they had requested, but they did support it. Amendments to this measure forbade courts from ordering long-distance busing for high school and elementary students both. It also allowed reopening of previously decided court cases where busing had been ordered. I voted "Yes" on both amendments, and "Yes" on the final passage.

Yet another amendment that failed—stronger than the other two—would have banned all court-ordered busing for anything resembling racial purposes. This would have meant the closest school for pupils; nothing else. It failed 211 to 174; I voted "Yes" on this amendment.

I said at the time, and I quote:

What we have here, in these actions by the House, is a symbol of democracy in action. A large majority of the American people, both black and white, have made it absolutely clear that they want an end to busing, for once and for all. Congress must and did act in response to and in accordance

with the wishes of the people. It is now up to the Senate to follow the example of the House.

The Senate did not. The bill died in the Senate on October 12, 1972. Pressure from the President, and a mandate expressed in the House, was ignored. The bill's supporters knew if the bill came to a vote, it would pass. It was literally talked to death, in a Senate filibuster. Senate rules allow unlimited debate. However, cloture may be invoked to cut off debate and to bring the bill to a vote, if two-thirds of those present and voting so indicate.

There were three attempts at cloture. The first, on October 10 was 45 to 37—10 short of the necessary two-thirds—on October 11, it was 49 to 39—10 short—and on October 12, 49 to 38—nine short. It is certainly unfortunate that the Senate so disregarded the clear mandate of the people in this most important matter.

In a legislative sense, then, antibusing legislation is dead for the 92d Congress. However, as was noted often during Senate debate, it will certainly come up again in the 93d Congress, 1973–74.

A good summation of the issue was contained in a lead editorial in the Wall Street Journal of October 11, 1972. The Journal editorial was not exactly in favor of the bill as it stood; yet, and I quote:

The worrisome thing, rather, is the spreading tendency to set quotas, to rule that all schools or most schools must conform to the racial distributions of the district, or the metropolitan area, or whatever strikes the fancy of a particular district judge.

As we hope is becoming clear in the ongoing debate over hiring practices, legally enforced quotas have no place in the American tradition. We are not trying to create a society where an individual is judged on the basis of whether he fills a given percentage. We are trying to create a society where an individual is judged as an individual, regardless of membership in any racial or ethnic group.

This is no small matter, and eventually it may have to be dealt with through constitutional amendment. Amendments have been proposed to specify that no child shall be assigned to any school on the basis of race, creed or national origin. That is something far more worthy of extended Senate debate than anything like the next-nearest rule. . . .

I concur with these sentiments 100 percent. It is insulting and degrading to both blacks and whites to treat them as anything but what they are: individual human beings. It is equally insulting and degrading to insist that only through some weird formula of racial mix will individuals—children or adults—of either race be able to realize their full potential.

I sponsored a constitutional amendment, such as that referred to, in the 92d Congress. It never came to the floor of the House for a vote, having been held in committee.

The issue is not dead, that is for certain. It will be revived again in the 93d Congress. Those in opposition to busing for racial purposes must, once again, through contacting their Congressman Senators, make their wishes known.

The House responded this past year; the Senate did not. But the question will come up again and again until the will of the majority of the American people is acknowledged in the Halls of Congress, and the matter is resolved.

REPORTS TO INDIANA CONSTITUENTS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include reports of special interest to the residents of the Ninth District of Indiana. It is my intention to distribute the following items to constituents following adjournment:

REPORT TO INDIANA CONSTITUENTS

SMALL BUSINESSMEN

DEAR FRIEND: Several pieces of legislation of interest to small businessmen have been enacted by the 92nd Congress.

Among the measures considered were these:

1. Two bills to substantially increase the SBA and SBS lending authority.

2. A bill which:

Re-establishes the 7-percent investment tax credit and expands its applicability to used property, and

Speeds up tax deductions for capital investment in machinery and equipment.

3. A bill authorizing loans to small businesses in order to help them meet pollution control standards.

4. An exemption from the new occupational health and safety standards for firms with three or fewer employees.

I will continue to support legislation to help small businessmen, and I would welcome your advice and comment.

RURAL RESIDENTS

DEAR FRIEND: While 1972 has not been a major year for farm bills in the Congress, 1973 will be.

With the expiration on December 31, 1973, of the omnibus farm act, the Congress will be debating the future shape of federal farm programs.

The Congress has, however, enacted this year several pieces of legislation of special interest to farmers. The measures will:

Make available federal crop insurance to persons between 18 and 21 years of age;

Expand the size and coverage of the Farmers Home Administration loan authority for individuals and businesses in rural areas;

Expand federal flood control efforts, and

Regulate the manufacture, distribution and use of pesticides.

Another important measure which has my support, but which will not see final action this year, would enable farmer-elected marketing committees to bargain and negotiate with processors and other buyers on a commodity-by-commodity basis.

I will continue to support legislation to help farmers, and I would welcome your advice and comment.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

DEAR FRIEND: The second session of the 92nd Congress has taken several steps to help federal employees, but much more needs to be done.

Legislation has been enacted to establish a revised system for adjusting and increasing pay rates for prevailing rate federal workers.

Other important measures still pending in Congress, which have my support but which are not likely to see final action this year, are:

A bill to gradually increase the federal government contribution to the cost of health benefits for federal employees to 75 percent;

A bill to insure protection for employees from invasion of privacy by federal officials, and

Legislation providing that an employee who leaves federal service after attaining an age and years of service totaling at least 80 is entitled to an annuity.

Because of the many complaints about the activities of the Postal Service and the Civil Service Commission, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has begun a study of the activities of these organizations.

In addition, under the provisions of a recent Congressional act, the President will recommend a federal employees' pay raise effective January 1, 1973.

I appreciate the work you do for the federal government and would appreciate your views on legislation of interest to you.

CITIZEN CONSERVATIONISTS

DEAR FRIEND: Several important pieces of environmental legislation have been enacted by the 92nd Congress.

Chief among them are bills to:

Require greatly improved water quality and increase Federal assistance in the construction of waste treatment plants.

Curtail and tightly regulate ocean dumping.

Improve the protection of marine mammals and prohibit the importation of endangered species.

Strictly regulate the manufacture, distribution and use of pesticides.

Other important bills were not enacted this year, but I hope will be approved in 1973, including bills to:

Establish a new Congressional Joint Committee on the Environment, and

Strengthen and coordinate Federal efforts to control noise pollution.

I will continue to support legislation to protect and conserve our environment. I appreciate your concern for the environment and I welcome your comments.

VETERANS

DEAR FRIEND: Several important pieces of legislation of interest to veterans have been enacted by the Congress in 1972.

Chief among them were bills to:

Increase by 10 percent the rates of compensation for disabled veterans.

Increase veterans' appropriations by $1 billion over last year, including $400 million more for medical care.

Raise the monthly allowance under the GI bill by approximately 25 percent.

Provide for the training of additional personnel for the V.A. medical system.

Extend V.A. hospital and medical benefits to dependents and survivors of veterans totally disabled or who have died because of a service-connected disability. This bill also expands the V.A. outpatient hospital care program.

Provide an additional $250 plot allowance for veterans buried in private cemeteries, create a new National Cemetery system, and direct the V.A. to conduct a study of the entire national cemetery system.

Other important bills were not enacted this year, but I hope will be approved in 1973, including bills to:

Extend life insurance coverage for veterans after separation from the service, and

Increase the availability of drug treatment and rehabilitation programs for veterans.

I will continue to work for the passage of legislation of interest to our nation's veterans. I appreciate your concern for the veterans and I welcome your comments.

EDUCATORS

DEAR FRIEND: The second session of the 92nd Congress has enacted important legislation to improve the quality of education.

Amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965 will:

Extend the authorization for higher education financial assistance through 1975, and establish a major new program of direct federal assistance to needy students and institutions of higher education,

Extend the authorization for vocational education programs until 1975,

Create a National Institute of Education to promote educational reform and experimentation, and

Authorize $2 billion in emergency school aid for school desegregation.

Other legislation will:

Increase education appropriations by $600 million over last year,

Extend Medicare coverage to teachers not presently covered,

Liberalize the tax code concerning the treatment of retired teachers.

I will continue to work to improve our nation's educational system. I appreciate your interest in education and I would welcome your comments.

THE ELDERLY

DEAR FRIEND: The Congress has taken several significant steps to help older adults in 1972.

Chief among them were bills to:

1. Increase social security benefits by 20 percent, effective in September, 1972, and provide for an automatic cost of living increase in the future.

2. Increase to $2,100 the amount a social security beneficiary under 72 may earn in a year and still receive full benefits.

3. Increase widows' benefits to 100 percent of their deceased husbands' benefits.

4. Extend Medicare protection to those now receiving disability benefits under social security and railroad retirement programs.

5. Establish a daily nutrition program for needy older Americans.

6. Create a federal institute to conduct research into the diagnosis, prevention and treatment of arthritis and metabolic diseases.

7. Improve the scope and coverage of community services, including transportation and health, for older Americans.

I will continue to support legislation to help older adults. I appreciate your concern for their problems and I welcome your comments.

LOW-INCOME RESIDENTS

DEAR FRIEND: Several pieces of legislation of interest to low-income individuals have been enacted by the Congress in 1972.

Chief among them were bills to:

Extend for three years present programs administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity, as well as programs for manpower training and project Headstart. New programs for rural housing and community development were also created.

Continue and expand programs of federal aid to colleges and to needy students, and for vocational education.

Extend and improve child nutrition efforts, such as the school breakfast and lunch programs.

Strengthen the powers of the federal government to prevent discrimination in hiring.

Other important bills were not enacted this year, but I hope will be approved in 1973, including measures to:

Reform the federal welfare system and establish an assistance "floor" for needy families.

Establish federal programs of day care for the children of working mothers.

Increase the minimum wage.

Much more needs to be done. I appreciate your concern for low-income individuals, and I would welcome your comments.

HIGHWAY BILL DELAY

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last week, the conference committee endeavoring to adjust the differences between the other body and the House bill allowed the highway trust fund dispute to postpone the much needed highway legislation until the next session of the Congress.

When the people of this country realize that this unnecessary delay was caused by a fund accumulated of almost $4 billion, the Senate and House conferees can be greatly condemned for their action in delaying highway construction including funds for mass transit.

Mr. Speaker, I am including with my remarks an editorial from the Hammond, Ind., Times of last Friday, October 13, criticizing the delay of highway legislation.

The editorial follows:

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND SHOULDN'T BE SACRED

If the federal Highway Trust Fund were hurting for money, House refusal to let it be tapped for financing sorely needed mass transit facilities in metropolitan areas would make some sense.

But the fund is bursting at the seams with cash. Last year it showed a $3.6 billion surplus. By 1977 it is expected to show a $10 billion surplus.

Yet the highway lobby and its camp followers utter cries of anguish when a congressional move is afoot to divert the fund's resources. Their claim is that the money is required for road construction. But is so huge a surplus necessary to assure such projects?

If most of the country's population were spread out, preserving the fund inviolate to mass transit use might make sense. But 70 per cent of the people live in urban areas. Moreover, they live on only 10 per cent of the nation's land. More and more concrete can hardly benefit them where they need it most—getting to and from work, getting about their urban confinements.

Mass transit can provide that benefit. Building more expressways only means destruction of more property and a decline in tax revenues. Besides additional expressways don't offer insurance of permanent adequacy.

Much of Chicago's expressway system is near, at or exceeding capacity. Because of this, the rush hour driver is slowed to a crawl at a time when he needs to move quickly and without interruption. All the billions in the Highway Trust Fund can't possibly help him. He's not getting his fair share of the federal gasoline tax he pays, or of the other automotive related levies he pays.

Because the day-to-day expressway-user isn't getting his money's worth, he logically should favor one of two things: Opening the Highway Trust Fund to mass transit use or decreasing the taxes he pays into the fund.

The latter choice is the more logical until the highway lobby is reduced in influence with Congress. It's this special interest plus the average driver's mistaken belief that gasoline taxes should be preserved entirely for highway purposes that have kept the Highway Trust Fund intact.

Meanwhile, the best alternative in the long run will be the creation of a single fund from which to draw federal aid for all forms of public transportation. Whether by car, truck, bus, rail or plane, all transportation is inter-related. There is no sound reason why one should profit at the expense of the other.

EPA CHIEF URGES NIXON SIGN WATER BILL

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the importance and urgency of cleaning up our streams and water supply, and providing adequate waste disposal treatment is recognized by virtually everyone. The following article from the October 17, 1972, Washington Post outlines the support for this measure given by President Nixon's Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, William D. Ruckelshaus.

When presidential advisers such as John D. Ehrlichman take to the television airwaves to say that those who will criticize the President for refusing to sign this needed clean water bill are unfair or guilty of demagoguery it simply highlights a lack of understanding of the content and need for this legislation. And, if urging the President to sign the clean water bill is demagoguery, Mr. Ehrlichman could find some of it without leaving the President's Cabinet room. The article follows:

EPA CHIEF URGES NIXON SIGN WATER BILL

(By Elsie Carper)

The Nixon administration's chief environmental enforcer has urged the President to sign the $24.6 billion water pollution bill although it exceeds the amount that Mr. Nixon requested to clean up the nation's waterways.

The President's fiscal advisers have described the bill as "inflationary" and have hinted that the President may veto it. The deadline for the President to act is midnight tonight, 10 days (excluding Sundays) after he received it from Congress.

William D. Ruckelshaus, administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, said in a recent press conference in Atlanta that he had advised the President to sign the bill.

Ruckelshaus reportedly also has written a letter to Caspar Weinberger, director of the President's Office of Management and Budget, urging that the bill be signed and noting that the President need not commit all of the money provided by the legislation.

The letter also warns that the administration could be "embarrassed" if there is no water pollution bill this year, pointing out that the present program to control industrial wastes initiated by the President has been brought to a standstill by a court decision.

The water bill is one of three environmental measures whose fates may depend on just when Congress adjourns. The others are bills to control noise and to prevent highly toxic substances from entering the environment.

The noise and toxic substances bills are caught up in House-Senate disagreements.

In the case of the water legislation, the President must act by midnight to veto the bill if Congress is in session. Otherwise it

becomes law. If Congress has adjourned, the President can "pocket veto" it.

A copy of the Ruckelshaus "executive communication" to Weinberger is circulating on Capitol Hill.

It notes that the White House has the authority to impound funds in the bill for grants to localities to build waste treatment plants.

The bill authorizes the EPA to enter into contracts totaling $18 billion over the next three years for construction of the plants. The federal government would pay 75 per cent of the cost of the projects.

The administration had sought $6 billion with the federal share at 50 per cent of the cost.

There would be "no appreciable" increase outlays in the current fiscal year above what is in the President's budget and outlays next year could be held to $33 million, the communication concludes.

The major increase would occur in the latter half of this decade and into the 1980s.

It warned that unless the bill becomes law, the President's program for requiring permits for industrial wastes "probably will be destroyed." Issuance of permits under the 1899 Refuse Act was suspended by a court ruling nearly a year ago—shortly after it was started.

"The administration will be embarrassed for having initiated a highly publicized and initially controversial program which ended up in total failure and we will in effect simply throw away over 20,000 permit applications prepared at great expense and effort by industry," the communication said.

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I well remember when President Kennedy asked us to pass the Community Mental Health Centers Act in 1963. At Rutgers University in Piscataway, N.J., we have just opened a Community Mental Health Center which this Congress made possible by its commitment to our mentally ill.

I know we have acquired some wonderful people from all over to staff this center, and I want to wish them the very best of luck in the years to come as they serve over 250,000 persons in the area. On this site we will also build a $45 million hospital which has just been approved by the State of New Jersey. Our people should know that we always have about 25,000 of our fellow citizens confined in State mental hospitals.

The new facility will carry on research, and it is my hope that the result will be a decrease in the number of individuals we need to confine in our State institutions. We are told here in Washington that some progress is already being made as a result of the centers.

I would like to take this opportunity to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article on the functions of a community mental health center. It was written by Dr. Herbert Boehm, the very able director of neuropsychiatry at Perth Amboy General Hospital in New Jersey who also serves as associate attending neuropsychiatrist at Goldwater Memorial Hospital, University Division, in New York. He certainly speaks with authority, and I commend his article to all who would learn more about the role of these centers in our communities.

FUNCTIONS OF A COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTER

(By Dr. Herbert Boehm)

In 1945, Robert Felix, the Director of National Mental Health, introduced a bill to Congress which became known as the National Health Act. Passed in 1946, it provided aid for research relating to causes, diagnosis and treatment of neuropsychiatric disorders. It also provided funds for the training of professional personnel. In 1949, it was replaced by the National Institute of Mental Health. Various community mental health service bills were passed in New York, California, Minnesota, New Jersey and Vermont.

In 1963, Congress passed the Community Mental Health Center Act which also included research and treatment facilities for the mentally retarded. This Act became operative in 1964.

Community psychiatry includes responsibility for prevention, treatment and rehabilitation of mental disorders in a population living in the locality. The community psychiatrist, as a member of a group of community agents, fulfills his responsibilities. The group of community agents also includes psychologists, social workers, psychiatric and mental health nurses, health educators, clergymen, policemen and public health nurses. The community psychiatrist must be a competent clinician. He has to accept some measure of responsibility for the Community Mental Health Center. This may also include discovering and arranging clinical treatment for as many as possible of those who are judged to have mental disorders.

He must anticipate with other professional and non-professional community workers in helping those who deviate from normal behavior, such as drug addicts, alcoholics, psychiatric, neurotic and childhood and adolescent problems. He will collaborate with other workers in helping people to cope with the crises of everyday life, this in the framework under the community services auspices. The psychiatrist will have the traditional responsibility for his own patients. If he handles deviants, he will collaborate with lawyers, teachers, policemen, nurses and general practitioners. He will try to improve the adjustment of his patients by improving living conditions, through city planning.

The Community Mental Health Center psychiatrist will be called upon by community leaders to play a part in helping to solve community problems referring to mental illnesses. The psychiatrist of the Community Mental Health Center must play an active role in the community, with his professional knowledge, and with the help of the community leaders, in order to alleviate and improve the sufferings of the mentally inflicted.

In treating disturbed children, parents may be interviewed at the Center and receive counseling. It is of utmost importance to investigate the child-parents relationship. Many times, parents may be urged to obtain individual therapy in order to help understand the child.

The essential elements of a comprehensive mental health service for an individual community include:

Emergency services day and night; Consultation and education services available to community agencies and professional personnel; Partial hospitalization service, which may include day hospital, out and in-patient service. Referral and direct service are to some extent discouraged. Workers are taught techniques of crisis intervention and counseling. The Center will face a shortage of personnel to deal with intensive in-patient care. State hospitals will have to improve custodial facilities and establish satellite clinics or convert them into Community Mental Health Centers.

The community and society must be helpful in developing Community Health Centers and see that through their success, the patients will receive the best possible care in their community. The programs of some later Centers offer all elements of service under one administrative sponsorship, but most funded programs are provided by at least two agencies, usually a general hospital and a mental health clinic.

The combining of two or more autonomous agencies, each with its own special interest, can of course produce problems. In the North West area, in 38 community agencies, both governmental and voluntary groups formed a special corporation that contracted for service with a local voluntary hospital and the mental health out-patient clinic of the health department.

The hospital applied independently for a construction grant, which is made to the property owner, but the staffing grant was made to the corporation. It is important that the organizational structure of a center must support the objectives of the program and at the same time be compatible with the needs of the several agencies involved in the Center.

Bringing together several separate and autonomous organizations into one coordinated program can be only effective if the parties involved feel that it is of benefit to each agency and its patients.

PSYCHIATRIC SERVICES IN NEIGHBORHOOD HEALTH CENTER

Experience has led to the conclusion that psychiatric services can be incorporated into a comprehensive medical care program. Although it was first felt that the family health worker could be of unique help in assisting patients, it is shown that the non-psychiatric staff could be of value in this regard. The family health worker looks to the nurse for the supervision, and the nurse looks to the physician for leadership and direction. Non-professional workers may be of value in mental health programs. The training of a non-professional therapist may take months, and the departure to use non-professional workers for psychotherapeutic treatments is a partial solution of our manpower crisis.

In the prevention of mental illness, organic illness, such as general paresis and Pellagra, can be treated and prevented. In these diseases, the causative factor has been found and can be eliminated. In recent years, information has been slowly accumulating about hereditary defects especially in the field of mental retardation.

Here, too, preventive measures in the form of consultation to prospective parents can be effective. We have only limited knowledge about schizophrenia and the affective psychoses, which are major psychiatric problems in terms of incidence, incapacitation and chronicity. In the past two decades, we were able to move from custodial care of these patients affected to an active rehabilitation program.

This was connected with great expense for the facilities involved, especially for the individual and group therapy programs, the somatic and drug therapies which in other words form the concept of a therapeutic community. The enlistment of large numbers of professional and non-professional workers, as well as community support, have been

carried out with dedication and determination.

The primary aim of the Community Mental Health Center must be to render treatment to all mentally ill patients who are in need of treatment, day and night. Here is where crisis intervention steps in. The Center staff should be prepared for a variety of treatment approaches to meet the needs of all classes of patients involved. Long-term psychotherapy, or short-term and group therapy may be effective. Long-term individual therapy should be used only in selected patients.

An attempt has been made to describe the primary objective to provide much needed clinical care of patients in the Medical Health Center. This is followed by a natural development of consultative and educational community programs.

The development of clinical and consultative programs depends to a large extent on the population in the catchment area and its peculiar problems in resources.

REFERENCES

Bellak, L. and Barton, H. H. Progress in Community Health. Grune & Stratton, 1969.

Bindman, A. J. and Spiegel, A. D. editors. Perspectives in Community Mental Health. Aldine, 1969.

Brand, C. W. National Mental Health Act of 1946. Hist. Med. 331, 1965.

Caplan, G. Principles of Preventive Psychiatry. Basic Books, New York, 1964.

Deutsch, A. The Mentally Ill in America. Columbia Press. New York, 1945.

Dimensions of Community Psychiatry. GAP Report No. 60 (Vol. 6) Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry. April, 1968.

Fairweather, G. W. and others. Community Life for the Mentally Ill: An Alternative to Institutional Care.

Gottesfeld, H., Rhee, C. and Parker, G. A Study of the role of para professionals in community mental health. Community Mental Health J. 6: 285–291, 1970.

Hutcheson, B. R. and Krause, E. A. Systems analysis and mental health services. Community Mental Health J. 5: 29–45, 1969.

Joint Commissions on Mental Illness and Health. Basic Books, New York, 1961.

Leeds, A. A. and others. Planning for Mental Health. Community Mental Health J. 5: 206–214, 1969.

Meyers. The Collected Papers of Adolph Meyers. Vol. 4, p. 30. Baltimore, 1952.

Roberts, L. M., Halleck, S. L. and Loeb, M. B. editors. Community Psychiatry. University of Wisconsin Press, 1966.

Shore, M. F. and Mannino, F. V. Mental Health and the Community: Problems, Programs and Strategies.

Williams, R. H. and Ozarim, L. D. Community Mental Health. An International Perspective. Jossey-Bass, 1967.

Zusman, J. Design of catchment areas for community health services. Arch. Gen. Psychiatry. 21: 568–576, 1969.

IMPACT OF DRUG ADDICTION

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the real impact of drug addiction on our young people can be noted by a statement of Dr. David J. Myerson, director of the Boston State Hospital Drug Rehabilitation Center, when he said:

The average addict we treat started at 13 or 14 and dropped out of school by the 10th grade—that is the real tragedy of the drug scene today.

KEY ECONOMIC ISSUES—1972 CAMPAIGN

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican Conference was recently privileged to hear remarks by a distinguished economist, Dr. Pierre A. Rinfret. Dr. Rinfret is serving on an unpaid volunteer basis as Special Economic Adviser to the President. He is the principal economic spokesman for the campaign. Dr. Rinfret's analysis of the key economic issues in this election year is in my opinion worthy of consideration. The text of his remarks are as follows:

ECONOMIC PRESENTATION TO MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE

(By Dr. Pierre A. Rinfret)

To put it very simply, here are the four key economic issues in the 1972 campaign.

Number One. McGovern's economic program is a socialist economic program, socialist in concept, socialist in execution.

Number Two. It is an inflationary economic program—substantially inflationary.

Number Three. It will produce either stagnation or a serious recession in the United States, starting practically from the moment it's implemented, and as a result will produce unemployment.

Number Four. It will bring down on the United States all the negative aspects the stagnant English economy has developed during the past 25 years.

When President Nixon says there is a clear-cut choice, that applies directly to the economic field. There is indeed a very clear-cut choice between President Nixon's goal of continuing expansion in the American economy under a system of free enterprise while driving for full employment without inflation, or Senator McGovern's objective of a stagnant system of economic enterprise which is socialist in character, Government-dominated and egalitarian in income distribution.

Let me try, very briefly, to give you some background on where we are and how we got to where we are. We have problems in this country today, some very serious economic problems. But let's see where they came from.

From 1946 to 1965, our country had the best inflation record of any country in the postwar period—consumer prices in the U.S. went up by only 1½ to 2 percent a year. No major industrial country in the world could match that record. In Europe it was normal to have a compound rate of growth of inflation of 4, 5 and 6 percent a year. When did our inflation start? Inflation began to spiral in this country in the fourth quarter of 1965, and it kept spiraling as the war effort escalated. The war and inflation were tied together.

When Mr. Nixon went on the campaign trail in 1966, his major economic issue was inflation. And the voters agreed that inflation was the key issue, because they sent a number of Republicans to Congress that year. When the President took office in 1969, this country's rate of inflation had risen from a low of 1½ to 2 percent a year to the 6-to-7 percent level; in fact it was getting close to 8 percent. We had the highest level of interest rates in the history of the United States—in 1970, money rates hit the undreamed-of peak of 9½ percent. The President then used fiscal and monetary restraints to try to solve the inflation problem. Let me remind you of one fact: in 1969 and 1970, practically no one of any repute in economics or finance, Republican or Democrat, disagreed with that policy. I disagreed, but I didn't hear Walter Heller, Arthur Okun, Otto Eckstein or any other economist in the Democratic camp—except John Kenneth Galbraith—say one word against the use of fiscal and monetary controls to stop inflation. On the contrary, their criticism was that the controls weren't tight enough. There were a few in Congress who spoke out. But in general the President was reinforced by a consensus which said that the way you stop inflation is to slow down Government spending, minimize the deficit, and slam on the monetary controls.

But by the Fall of 1970 the President realized that he had a major unemployment problem on his hands. Let me remind you about that one too. I don't know of any Democratic economist who, in 1970, pointed to the unemployment problem as serious. In fact, we Republicans were the first to point it out as a serious, developing problem. Go read the newspapers, look at the record. Nobody spotted that problem except us. That's why the President developed the full-employment budget in the Fall of 1970.

Now let's look at what he did in August 1971. Again, let me remind you of something. Where does the 7 percent investment tax credit come from—this great "loophole" and giveaway that McGovern is attacking today? Who invented it? Walter Heller and Arthur Okun, Democratic economists and advisors. President John F. Kennedy then advocated the investment tax credit and it was passed into law by Congress in 1962. Who advocated enactment of personal and corporate income tax cuts to stimulate economic expansion? President Johnson in 1964. If you look at the record, you will see that there were precedents for President Nixon's moves in August 1971—precedents that had previously been advocated by the Democrats. In the summer of 1971, who was the foremost public advocate of reestablishing the investment tax credit? Congressman Wilbur Mills. Who was the foremost public advocate of raising the personal income tax base? Congressman Wilbur Mills. Who advocated closing the gold window? Congressman Henry Reuss. Who advocated enactment of the border tax? Congressman Wilbur Mills. Who advocated wage and price controls? Everybody I know of—but particularly the Democrats, Senator Proxmire, economist Galbraith and all the rest. So the President proposed an economic program that was largely Democratic in origin. But the moment his proposals were enacted, and the moment they began to work, every Democrat turned critical.

Has the President's economic program worked? Very simply—yes, like a charm. In the second quarter of 1972 this country's gross national product increased at a real rate of growth of 9 percent. In July 1972, we had 3 million more people at work—in new jobs—than we had a year ago. In June, when the unemployment rate dropped to 5.5 percent, the Democrats said that was a statistical fluke—it would go up in July. As we know now, it didn't go up. In fact, between July 1971 and July 1972 we had put more people to work in new jobs than in any 12-month period in the postwar history of our country. Most of this gain was in the private sector—2.7 million new jobs in the private sector, the rest in the public sector.

The economic program is working, inflation is coming down. Where are those new high rates that we were supposed to get? We haven't got them. As you may have noted, today there was another cut in the prime rate. So we've got an expanding economy with substantially reduced inflation, relatively low interest rates, ready availability of credit, and we are creating new jobs to the tune of 3 million a year. Is the program working? Like a dream.

Now let's look at some McGovern economics. Let's look at a few very basic principles. And let me cite something from the work of Joseph Schumpeter, an economic historian formerly on the faculty of Harvard University. Schumpeter was a student of comparative economic systems, so I looked up what he had to say about socialism, communism, capitalism, etc. How does he describe socialism? According to this eminent scholar, socialism is the use of redistributive taxation to redistribute income in order to arrive at an egalitarian society. Now if that doesn't describe McGovern's economic proposals, I don't know what does. Redistributive taxation—take it away from one part of the population, give it to another, make everyone's income as equal as you conceivably can to everyone else's. Let me make one philosophical point to you: when you do that, you destroy the whole concept of individual initiative, individual freedom, individual drive, individual incentive—because what's the point of it? If you can't keep what you're going to make, who cares? McGovern is also advocating elimination of the right of inheritance, elimination of the right to pass on to future generations what earlier generations have worked to build up for them. If that's not socialism, I don't know what is.

So, *first*, the McGovern philosophy is a socialist economic philosophy, it has no place in a free enterprise economy. It is totally alien to our economic system.

Second, the McGovern program will lead to recession. Why? For one thing, he says he's going to raise corporate taxes by $17 billion. Now I'm not uncritical of the corporations. I think some of them are selfish, they grab—and some of labor does the same thing. But the corporations perform a vital function—they invest money. What do the corporations do with the money they earn and keep? According to some people, corporations just pocket that money. Well, they don't—they make capital investments. And capital investment is the major driving force in economic expansion. If you raise corporate taxes by $17 billion, as Senator McGovern proposes, one thing will happen—capital investment will collapse.

Where is our unemployment concentrated? Where was it in 1970 and 1971? Why did the President go for the investment tax credit? Because he knew one fact. Unemployment was concentrated in the capital goods-producing cities—Bridgeport, Cleveland, Cincinnati, etc. If you want to reduce unemployment, you must have capital goods expansion.

Now we've just asked American industrialists a very simple question: What will you do in 1973 if Senator McGovern is elected, and if he implements his economic proposals—if he eliminates the investment tax credit, accelerated depreciation, and depletion allowances? We've got the first statistical answer to McGovern's economic proposals, and the answers are strikingly clear: American industry says it will reduce its capital investment in 1973 by 5½ percent—down $5 billion, which means down 11 percent in volume.

This would be the second-largest capital spending decline in 25 years. And we've never had a decline in capital spending without a recession—*never*. In 1970 we had a recession, and capital spending was up 2 percent in dollars—but down 4 percent in volume. If capital spending goes down 5½ percent in dollars and down 11 percent in volume, we are going to have a recession in this country.

You may not be aware of the fact that the U.S. has the lowest ratio of capital investment to total production of private industry of any industrial nation in the world—we have the lowest percentage of private capital expenditures to GNP of any industrial country in the world. From 1962 to 1966, when we had a capital spending boom in this country, we were investing 6.6 percent of real GNP. Do you know what the Japanese were investing? Twenty-nine percent! That is why productivity is soaring in the rest of the world but not here. If you want to know why they are making the progress we should be making, it's because we haven't stimulated capital investment sufficiently. Now, capital investment has moved forward since the President's August 15, 1971 program, and it has been a main force in our economic expansion. But what is going to happen when you take the stimuli away? Capital investment is going to go down. And when that happens, we're going to have a recession—and new unemployment.

Third, McGovern's program is inflationary. Why is it inflationary? Let me ask you a very simple question. If you increase corporate taxes by $17 billion, what do you think corporations are going to do? Well, they can do many things, but I'll tell you one thing they're going to do—they're going to raise prices. They are going to try to make up for the tax increase and the resulting loss of revenue by means of price increases. If you increase taxes on individuals by $72 billion, what is labor going to do? Do you think labor is going to say, "We're willing to pay another $72 billion in taxes no matter what that does to our take-home pay"? No, sir! Labor is going to drive for wage increases of 14, 18, 20 percent a year. No matter how you look at it, McGovern's increased tax burden will ultimately show up in the price structure. You will see both industry and labor driving to offset his tax increases by means of price and wage increases.

So, when the President says there is a clear-cut choice, that's absolutely true. There *is* a clear-cut choice between continuing the dynamic, vigorous expansion we're getting under President Nixon and our free enterprise system—or risking McGovern's socialist, inflationary, recessionary, stagnant economic set of proposals.

We now have an economy that is moving forward and creating new jobs. In May and June 1972, the American worker achieved the highest level of real take-home pay in the entire history of the United States—he went home with more buying power than he's ever had before. If McGovern gets elected, people should get their money out of this country, because we're in for four years of stagnation. If President Nixon is reelected, people should do everything they can in order to participate in the economic prosperity that is coming.

That's the clear-cut choice.

TRIBUTE TO HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my happy privilege to join with my colleagues and pay tribute to one of the outstanding Members and committee chairmen of the House of Representatives. Chairman McMILLAN was a Member of the House when I came to Washington and it has been my privilege since that time to call him my friend.

His has been one of the most difficult tasks of a committee chairman that there has been in Congress during my membership. With all of the criticism, harping, and unpleasant situations resulting from people with a great lack of understanding, he went quietly his way and discharged his responsibilities as he honestly considered them.

His friendly personality, commitment to duty and courtly manners have endeared him to all of us. I personally wish him and his loved ones well in the days ahead. His district, the District of Columbia, and the Nation generally are his debtors.

AFTER THE WAR—WHAT THEN?

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, although a foreign aid bill was not passed in this session of Congress, I would like to call attention to two amendments appearing in both the House and Senate bills. One amendment would have provided funds for the Center for Plastic and Rehabilitative Surgery in Saigon—a hospital for burn victims. The second amendment would have provided care for orphaned and abandoned children. It would have also provided for the expeditious handling of adoption.

These amendments are directed to the heartrending matters raised by Victor Zorza in his Washington Post October 18 column which follows:

AFTER THE WAR—WHAT THEN?

(By Victor Zorza)

Sometimes a column really touches the reader—when it tells him, for instance, that the war in Vietnam is virtually over, as this column has been saying. The war has been with us so long that many people find it difficult to adjust to the idea that it might soon be finished.

"But suppose you are right," they say, "what do you think will happen next?" And they expect some profound truth about the cease-fire terms, or the domino theory, or the international balance of power.

But this is where the commentator's instant wisdom leaves him and despair takes over. Their questions—your questions—show how the war has perverted us all, how the politics of the war has hardened our hearts and closed our minds to the things that really matter.

What is going to happen next? Americans are not used to dealing with the aftermath of war in their own homes. They fight other peoples' wars, in other peoples' homes, they make sure that the powers of light triumph over the powers of darkness—as in World War I, in World War II, as in Vietnam, maybe—and they go back to America.

What is going to happen next in Vietnam? Each of us has his own secret dread, a shameful recollection, his own troubled conscience. The GIs who came back from the war in Europe, and those now coming back from Vietnam, had to kill people—and no one ever forgets an experience like this.

My experience in World War II was different. I found myself in Europe, as a boy of 14, driven back and forth by the tides of war, fighting desperately to stay alive in the mass of humanity that was being ground to dust. I learned to lie, and to cheat, and to steal, not from the rich and the mighty, but from poor unfortunates like myself who were also lying, cheating, and stealing from me so that they might survive.

It wasn't pretty.

This is what the war did to children, and what it is doing to them today in Vietnam, and will go on doing to them long after the

fighting is over. Orphaned children, abandoned children, lost children. Refugee children. The children of Mylai after the GIs have done shooting, the children of Hue after the VC have done shooting. Bombed out children, maimed children, blinded children. Broken children—broken in spirit.

It isn't pretty.

There will be swarms of children—outcasts, rejected, unwanted, uncared for. The war will end, life will begin to return to normal. The beggar children, the urchins, the thieves, will see other children leading normal lives, with parents going to school, playing childrens' games, eating their fill—yes, eating without apparently worrying where the next meal is going to come from.

You don't know how important food can be, and a place of your own at school, and a clean shirt. No, not a change of shirt every day, just once a week. You don't know how important it is to have some one say a friendly word to you, perhaps smile, treat you as a human being.

How can one convey the depths of misery to people who have never known it? How can one tell what it's like to be hungry to a man who has never been hungry? How can one explain what pain is to some one who has never felt pain?

But it is in your power, in the power of every one who reads this and stops to think about it, to do something to mitigate the misery, to feed and clothe the hungry child to give it an education of sorts, to help it unlearn the lying and the stealing and the cheating that has become part of so many childrens' lives in Vietnam.

The task of reconstruction and rehabilitation in Vietnam is huge. Many governmental and international agencies will devote themselves to it. But there will not be enough money to do all that is necessary. There never is.

Giving money to mitigate the misery which will engulf many thousands, perhaps millions, of children in the aftermath of the war will never eliminate the pain and the suffering. It is not conscience money, unless you are looking for an easy way out. But it could help.

HAP MILLER

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, October 10 marked the end of an era for Idahoans, and for thousands of people throughout the United States who have had the privilege over the past 40-plus years to enjoy the toe-tapping music of Hap Miller in the Duchin Room at Sun Valley, Idaho. It is hard to imagine what the place will be without him, for Hap is the Duchin Room. Let us hope that affection and nostalgia will bring him back often. Following is an article by Pat Thornton about Hap which appeared in the Sun Valley Sun September 30, 1972:

HAP MILLER

(By Pat Thornton)

Hap Miller is trading his baton for a golf club and fishing pole. His last night in the Duchin Room Lounge will be Tuesday, Oct. 10, when he calls it quits after working 48 years as a professional musician.

Shocked? Yes, everyone is, including Miller. "I woke up the other night," he says, "and thought 'my gosh, what did I do'?"

Actually, he and his wife, Arvilla, have been considering the move for quite some time. "The main thing about retiring," he says, "is that Arv and I have been married 37 years and during that time she has sat at home and I've been in the glamorous spots.

"She wouldn't let me retire if that were the only reason. But I can't fight the calendar forever and I don't want to switch a piano bench for a wheelchair."

Hap and Arv bought a home at Willow Valley, Ariz., on the Colorado River about 10 miles north of Needles, Calif., where they plan to spend the winter. "I want to take up sports and do a little traveling," he says. "I play golf five days a week now, and I want to make it seven!"

Miller is a native of Massillon, Ohio, and is one of nine children. The entire family liked music, but Hap is the only musician. He started playing at five years of age. When the family returned from church, he would pick out the hymns on the piano.

Because his parents were afraid lessons would spoil his ear, he had no formal training for another seven years. Then, at age 12, Hap knew music would be his career and that it was necessary to be able to read music.

Hap Miller started playing professionally when he turned 16 and was still in school. He was graduated from high school in 1931 and joined Harl Smith's traveling society-hotel dance band when it was playing in Kansas City. Miller recalls his trip from Ohio as the first time he had been away from home. He also remembers that Eddie Duchin's band was playing nearby and that Duchin and Smith and all of the musicians were good friends.

In 1936, Averell Harriman wanted Duchin to open Sun Valley. The pianist declined because he was booked into the Persian Room at New York City's Plaza Hotel, but recommended Smith's band in his stead.

"We were booked into the Dunes at Palm Springs for the winter," Miller says, "but Eddie's manager finally convinced Harl we should open Sun Valley. I remember finding a map and looking for Idaho. Of course, Sun Valley wasn't shown and the closest point we could find was Shoshone. We were all looking forward to Palm Springs and the sunshine and we ended up in the snowy mountains of Idaho that winter. But it was the best move we ever made."

So Harl Smith's Band, with Hap Miller at the piano, did open Sun Valley at Christmas time, 1936, and played in the Duchin Room until the resort closed the next April. And Eddie Duchin and his band never did play Sun Valley. The room was named, incidentally, not for Eddie, but rather for his first wife, Marge, a relative of Harriman who did the interior decorating for the lounge.

For the first few years, Sun Valley was open winters only. The year 1939 was the first year the resort was open in summer, and Smith's band played on the Terrace and in the Duchin Room, thus beginning a two-season cycle that continued until Smith retired in 1952. The band became Hap Miller's Orchestra, and continued the cycle.

Miller, who has done all of the orchestra's arrangements since joining Smith, says he has added 15 to 20 new songs a year to the group's repertoire, that includes a lot of the old standards that have been around for many years. "We try to keep the band at the same style. We add to, not change," he says.

Hap says he would like to say he has a favorite song, "but I just don't. But I will tell you the most requested—'It Happened in Sun Valley'—without a doubt. There have been some great hits the past 10 or 12 years, but year-after-year, night-after-night we have two or three requests to play 'It Happened in Sun Valley." The melody and lyrics for that song were done by Harry Warren and Mack Gordon, who wintered at the Valley to get the feeling of the resort for the film "Sun Valley Serenade."

Down through its history, Sun Valley has drawn some of the world's famous people, and Miller has met most of them. "I feel fortunate," he says, "because we played for people from all over the world. Lots of very famous people. And also, we've met a lot of people whose names you may not recognize. But they're all wonderful. It's been an adventure."

Some of the incidents he recalls involve the antics of probably the funniest foursome ever to hit the Sun Valley Golf Course—Jack Benny, Phil Harris, Pro Huck Florence and Hap Miller.

He also recalls the night Bing Crosby, who usually refuses to sing "offstage," was dancing in the Duchin Room and, as Hap says, "we tricked him into his first song. But then he sang for an hour."

The Shah of Iran and his then wife, Princess Saroya, visited the Valley twice during Miller's tenure and wouldn't go anywhere without the Miller Orchestra. "I remember one night," Hap says, "he had a party at the Roundhouse and all the fellows had to carry their instruments up on the ski lift. We didn't have a piano up there, but he wanted me there anyway. It was fun.

"The shah said he was going to build a ski lift in Iran and open it with a Sun Valley party. He wanted to fly us over to play at the opening, but it never materialized because of a revolution."

Miller says he was a skier, and doesn't know why he quit. But he has been a starter and race official for 17 years. He has also been the organist and pianist at the Presbyterian Church in Ketchum for 20 years and served on the Presbyterian Church Session 18 years. He is the first and only president of the 100-member Sun Valley Musicians Association, affiliated with the American Federation of Musicians, since its founding 24 years ago; and has been president of the Sun Valley Credit Union for eight years.

Forty-eight years is a long time to do just one thing, but Miller says his job has never been dull. "Every night is different. In the trade we call it 'reading the room.' We watch the dancing the first few minutes and most of the time you get a feel for what they want. During the evening we try to play at least one or two things everyone likes. That's what you strive for . . . trying to squeeze all these things in so everyone hears something he likes.

"You know you've succeeded the last four or five minutes when you start playing the 'good night songs.' The men who have been dancing with all the women in the room dance with their wives and they dance a little closer. It makes everything right."

So Oct. 10, Hap Miller will play those 'good night songs' for the last time before he and his high school sweetheart head for Arizona for the winter.

A tear starts to glisten in Hap Miller's eye. He shakes his head slightly and says, "You know, the last night is going to be just as exciting as the first."

And he means it.

TRIBUTE TO HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it has been a great honor and a privilege for

me to serve on the Banking and Currency Committee with CHARLIE GRIFFIN since his entry into the Congress. CHARLIE GRIFFIN has made a genuine contribution to our country during his service in the Congress, and he will be sorely missed by me and other members of the Banking and Currency Committee.

During his service in the Congress, my wife, Mary, and I have come to know CHARLIE and his charming and attractive wife, Angie, as personal friends, and I take this opportunity to wish them well as they reenter private life.

NAILING OUR COLORS TO THE MAST

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reiterate my support for passage of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972. I voted for passage of the original bill. Today I supported repassage of this bill over a Presidential veto.

The President's veto of this legislation is both shocking and inconsistent with his stated commitment to environmental quality.

In President Nixon's first state of the Union message on January 22, 1970, he stressed pollution control and pledged to submit to Congress "the most comprehensive and costly program in America's history." And when he signed the bill creating the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 the President said:

> The 1970's absolutely must be the years when America pays its debt to the past by reclaiming the purity of its air, its waters and our living environment. It is literally now or never....

I applauded those statements. I agreed with them. I still do. Yet today we were faced with a Presidential veto of a bill that sets a goal of eliminating all pollutant discharges into U.S. waters by 1985. Why has the President abandoned this cause?

He tells us it is too costly and therefore inflationary. But evidently it is not inflationary when we are asked to support a 1-year package of economic and military aid for other countries with a price tag of $4.20 billion. Why not? For 12 years I have talked against, and voted against, this massive pouring of tax dollars down the drain. And it is beyond me to understand why and how the administration can support this nebulous and highly questionable spending of the taxpayer's dollar in a time of inflation, and yet reject spending those same dollars for the construction of badly needed sewage treatment plants and sewer systems here at home.

The President's veto of the water pollution bill supports my conclusion of last week to vote against handing over to the Executive the power to cut congressional appropriations whenever and wherever the administration pleases. The President's priorities, any President's priorities, are not always my priorities. In view of this veto and the administration support for foreign aid I must conclude that domestic needs take second place to foreign requests.

In this veto the President has also overridden the recommendations of his own chief adviser on environmental quality, Mr. William Ruckelshaus, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

I wish to congratulate Mr. Ruckelshaus on his continuing support for water pollution control. I agree with him that the water pollution control bill need not have a significant impact on Federal spending until fiscal 1975 when the Government would start paying off the contracts. I also agree with his argument that the Appropriations Committee of the Congress can control the actual spending and outlays even after passage of the bill. Moreover, as Mr. Ruckelshaus pointed out the bill was written so as to allow the President flexibility on spending. The authorizations for obligational authority are "not exceed" $18 billion over the next 3 years. Also, "all" sums authorized to be obligated need not be committed, though they must be allocated. These two provisions were suggested to give the administration some flexibility concerning the obligation of construction grant funds.

It is ironic to me that this Congress has been asked to spend on numerous programs aimed at adequately celebrating the 200th anniversary of this Nation's birth in 1976. I cannot think of a program more fitting to that celebration than the one embodied in the water pollution control bill, a bill endeavoring to salvage what can be saved to our water quality before it is too late. Our ancestors bequeathed pure lakes and rivers to us. Should we not pass on some of this heritage to those who come after us?

Personally I cannot equivocate on this issue. I cannot promise to do all that I can to eliminate air and water pollution and then refuse the funds necessary to accomplish this aim. I have said time and again that cleaning up our environment would be costly. But that the losses we suffer if we do not act now are irreparable. We cannot replace our physical environment. I have said and I say again that we will have to pay for the necessary antipollution measures. But I believe the taxpayers would rather pay for this, with results they can measure and enjoy, than for questionable military and economic aid programs abroad.

On one point in his veto remarks I thoroughly agree with the President. I too have "nailed my colors to the mast on this issue." And like the President I am willing that "the political winds can blow where they may." I had hoped that the President would be with us on this issue. With us or not I must support water pollution control.

A RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the 92d Congress has an outstanding record. Much of the legislation it has passed, despite the opposition of the Nixon administration, has meant immediate benefits for a great many of our people.

At this time I enter into the RECORD a newsletter I am sending to my constituents about the work of this Congress:

THE 92D CONGRESSS A RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C. October 1972.

DEAR FRIEND: The 92d Congress has come to a close. I want to report to you on its work during 1971 and 1972.

This Congress has compiled a record of outstanding achievements.

Seasoned observers have described the 92d Congress as productive, constructive and hardworking.

A look at the record makes it easy to agree with this judgment.

We made major advances in the fields of education, health, crime control, programs for older Americans, environmental protection and campaign reform. And we passed several measures aimed at coping with the continuing problems of high unemployment and soaring inflation.

This report reviews only the highlights of the legislative achievements of the 92nd Congress.

When the 93rd Congress convenes in January, the problems facing our nation will still be with us, for there are no instant solutions or overnight cures. But we will be building on a solid foundation laid down during the past two years.

I pledge you my continuing effort to work for the goals all Americans share: a strong and free, a just and prosperous nation in a world of peace.

Sincerely,

JOSHUA EILBERG,
Member of Congress.

NEW PROGRAMS HELP STUDENTS FROM PRESCHOOL TO COLLEGE

Young people throughout the nation will benefit from these historic education measures:

Omnibus Education Act of 1972 is the most significant advance for higher education since Abraham Lincoln signed the Land Grant College Act over a century ago. This measure extends all existing aid to higher education programs and creates important new ones, including:

A new system of *Basic Educational Opportunity Grants*, entitling every college student to an annual grant of $1400, less the amount his parents can contribute;

A new program of direct institutional aid for colleges and universities;

Help for occupational and vocational education;

A *National Institute of Education* to develop better ways of teaching and learning at every level—preschool through graduate school.

Expanded Head Start Program to enable children of working families as well as the poor to participate in this voluntary day care program.

National School Lunch Act Amendments provide free and low price meals for needy children.

Vietnam Veterans Education Assistance means a major increase in aid for education and vocational rehabilitation for returning veterans.

A 32-PERCENT SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE LEADS LIST OF ELDERLY BENEFITS

For older Americans, this has been one of the great Congresses in history—and the 32% Social Security increases passed in 1971 and 1972 are but the tip of the iceberg.

Here are some of the many benefits our

20 million senior citizens will realize from Congressional initiatives:

Nutritional meals for those who need them—even shut-ins.

Low-cost transportation.

Job training and employment

Community centers.

Pre-retirement training.

Health and education services.

Gerontological centers to study the variety of problems older Americans face.

A new *National Institute of Aging* to conduct research on the aging process and the special health problems of the elderly.

Congress also overrode a Presidential veto of a 20% increase in *Railroad Retirement benefits.*

Note: the major legislation passed for America's older citizens during 1971–72 originated not in the White House, but in Congress. This legislation represents a lasting commitment to every American over 65.

NEW ACT REFORMS CAMPAIGN SPENDING

At a time when the costs of campaigning have skyrocketed, the Congress passed the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

This historic act:

Limits the amount of advertising spending in campaigns.

Requires broadcasters, newspapers and magazines to sell advertising to candidates at the lowest commercial rate.

Requires campaign committees to report contributions and expenditures of $100 or more.

Limits the amount a candidate or his family can contribute to his own campaign.

REVENUE SHARING AIDS STATE, LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

In response to pleas from hard-pressed states, counties and cities, Congress this year enacted a $30.1 billion revenue sharing bill.

State governments will receive one-third of the funds; local governments the other two-thirds. The money is expected to be spent on such high priority items as:

Public safety
Environmental protection
Public transportation
Health
Recreation
Libraries
Social services for the poor and aged

NEW CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS ON FOREIGN, MILITARY POLICY

Among the several actions of the 92nd Congress in foreign and military policy are:

SALT Agreements To Limit Strategic Weapons: Congress approved a five-year U.S.-Soviet accord limiting offensive nuclear weapons.

ABM Treaty With Soviet Union: The Senate approved a treaty with the Soviet Union limiting the number of ballistic missiles.

Military Draft: Congress amended the Selective Service Act to:

Extend the draft to June 1973.

Grant student deferments.

Increase military pay in order to encourage voluntary enlistments.

A GREAT CONGRESS FOR VETERANS

Many observers are calling the 92nd Congress the greatest Congress for veterans in history. In the past two years, we have passed major laws to educate our veterans, to provide them better treatment in VA hospitals, and to liberalize burial allowances for veterans.

New GI bill

This landmark measure increases educational allowances for Vietnam veterans by 25 percent. Fulltime students will now receive:

Single students: $220 a month.

Married students: $261 a month.

Married and one child: $298 a month.

Each additional dependent: $18 a month.

National cemetery bill

This law—

Transfers to the VA responsiblity for administering all national cemeteries.

Increases burial allowances for veterans who die from service-connected disabilities, and

Provides an additional burial allowance for veterans who do not wish to be buried in national cemeteries.

VA Medical School Act

To help meet the nation's medical manpower shortage—and to improve VA medical care—this pilot program authorizes the establishment of eight new medical schools in veterans' hospitals across the nation.

Veterans medical care

This new act will vastly improve the entire VA medical care system. To ease crowded hospital conditions, veterans with non-service-connected medical problems can now be treated as outpatients. Some families of permanently-disabled veterans or their survivors can also now receive hospital care.

Disabled veterans' benefits

Provides a 10% boost in benefits for disabled veterans.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION GIVEN HIGH PRIORITY

Clean air and water, and the conservation of our resources and wildlife have been chief concerns of the 92nd Congress. This Congress has taken important action to protect the nation's environment.

Water Quality Standards Act provides $24.6 billion to clean up the nation's waters and control water pollution. The goal of this, the most far-reaching water pollution bill ever passed, is to end all discharges of pollutants into navigable waters by 1985.

Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act will help protect man and our environment, while permitting farmers to use pesticides to grow food and fiber.

Wildlife Hunting from Aircraft is prohibited, protecting certain wild birds, fish and other animals.

Youth Conservation Corps—To extend and expand this pilot youth conservation program.

CONGRESS ACTS TO MEET HEALTH CARE CRISIS

Quality health care—at prices people can afford—is one of the major problems facing Americans today. As a nation, we have slipped from 13th to 22nd place in male life expectancy, from 6th to 21st in infant mortality. Doctor bils and hospital costs have skyrocketed, yet 36 million Americans under age 65 are not covered by private health insurance. Moreover, the nation is suffering from a critical shortage of doctors and other trained health personnel.

The 92nd Congress has taken the initiative to meet the crisis with several important measures:

Medical Personnel—Two new laws provide nearly $4 billion to train more family doctors and nurses.

Conquest of Cancer Act—Sets aside $1.5 billion to find cures for cancer.

National Cooley's Anemia Control Act—A national effort to prevent and treat this blood disease which affects some 200,000 persons in the U.S., mostly children.

Multiple Sclerosis Research—Creates a National Advisory Commission to help find the cause of M.S. and develop cures.

Communicable Disease Control Act—Helps states and localities control the spread of communicable diseases.

National Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung and Blood Act.

Rehabilitation Act—An extension of the 50-year-old Vocational Rehabilitation Act, adding major new programs to aid the severely handicapped and other disabled persons.

Black Lung Benefits—To make it easier for coal miners, stricken by black lung disease, to receive benefits.

CONGRESS FOCUSES ON CONSUMER PROTECTION

In recent years, Congress has passed a host of measures on behalf of the American consumer. Truth-in-lending . . . wholesome meat and poultry . . . truth-in-packaging . . . auto, tire and toy safety . . . fair credit reporting . . . these are a few.

The 92nd Congress has expanded this record:

Flammable Fabrics Amendments of 1971 require manufacturers to certify that their products meet stringent anti-fire requirements.

Consumer Product Safety Act of 1972 assigns the Federal government a major role in protecting the consumer from unreasonable risks of death, injury or illness caused by consumer products. A new Consumer Product Safety Agency will set mandatory safety standards and remove products from distribution when necessary.

The Automobile "Bumper Bill" directs the Secretary of Transportation to fix minimum standards for bumpers to halt or reduce auto damage in low-speed collisions. The bill also outlaws tampering with mileage gauges.

NEW BILLS TO FIGHT CRIME AND DRUGS

Every public opinion poll of recent years shows that crime and drug abuse are major concerns of the American people. The 92nd Congress continued to face up to mounting problems in these crucial areas:

Crime

Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act. This major law provides $150 million over two years for—

Education and counseling health services and recreational facilities for potential juvenile delinquents, and

Training personnel in the juvenile delinquency field.

Drug abuse

Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act. This new law provides over $6 billion to—

Establish a National Institute on Drug Abuse;

Increase funds for special drug projects under the Community Mental Health Centers Act;

Help states develop drug abuse program; and

Require federally funded health facilities to offer needed treatment to drug addicts.

Foreign Shipments of Narcotics. Gives the President power to halt foreign aid to countries which allow shipments of narcotics into the U.S. or allow the continued flow of drugs to our servicemen overseas.

Addiction of Servicemen. Another new law requires the military to identify drug-dependent servicemen and to treat them.

Rehabilitation of Addicts. A third measure creates new programs to encourage the employment of rehabilitated addicts, with special preference for veterans.

CONGRESS AIDS RURAL AREAS

Too many rural Americans are denied the basic necessities of modern life. That's why many migrate to the large cities.

With passage of the *Rural Development Act of 1972*, Congress sought to improve the conditions of rural living, especially by increasing job opportunities on farms and in small towns.

The new law provides help for rural communities for housing water quality management, pollution control and farm credit.

NEW AMENDMENTS BROADEN RIGHTS

The 26th and 27th Amendments to the Constitution were passed by this Congress to guarantee the vote to 18-year-olds and to end discrimination based on sex.

18-year-old vote—This Amendment, first proposed in World War II, extends the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older

in all elections. It was quickly ratified by the states and signed in July 1971. Because of it, eleven million more voters are eligible to vote in the Presidential election this year.

Equal rights for women—Throughout history, our laws, attitudes, regulations and customs have often discriminated against women. Numerous distinctions based on sex still exist in law. For example:

Twenty-six states prohibit women from working in certain occupations.

Thirty-seven states have fair employment practice laws, but only fifteen prohibit discrimination in employment based on sex.

Some communities still have dual pay schedules for men and women public school teachers.

To end discrimination, the Equal Rights Amendments says: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex."

Twenty-one states have already ratified the amendment; thirty-eight are required.

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS TROUBLE CONGRESS

Since January 1969, unemployment in the U.S. has climbed to over 5½ percent. The 1969 dollar has lost 12½ cents in value. The number of Americans on welfare has doubled. Business is off, profits are down and government tax revenues have dropped sharply. The Federal budget continues to show record deficits.

So one of the top priorities of this Congress was to help put people back to work. We passed the *Accelerated Public Works Act of 1971*, authorizing $2 billion to create 170,000 jobs in the public sector. (President Nixon vetoed this bill.) We then passed the *Emergency Employment Act* authorizing $2 billion for transitional public service jobs and special state employment assistance programs. We also earmarked $275 million for additional *unemployment benefits and allowances.*

Congress also—

Extended the President's authority to establish controls on prices, rents, wages and salaries;

Increased the personal income tax exemption per taxpayer and dependent to $675; and

Came to the aid of small business by increasing the amounts of Federal loans and guarantees.

Finally, Congress acted to hold down record budget deficits by cutting the fat out of the Administration's budgets, while seeking to meet the nation's genuine needs. During the past three years, Congress has cut a total of $14½ billion from the Administrations requests—and the total appropriations this year will again be below the President's budget.

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, we will miss SY HALPERN here in the Congress. His office is just down the hall from ours, and we will miss his friendly greeting as he passed on his way to the House floor. SY has served as a dedicated member of the great Committee on Foreign Affairs. He sponsored an annual "Congressional Bike-In" to promote the idea of bicycling as a means of non-polluting commuting and as a wonderful form of recreation. SY has countless friends and admirers on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, the entire Congress admired his courageous recovery from a serious accident. Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for SY HALPERN and his lovely wife continued success, every happiness and the best always.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT ABOLISHED IN MARYLAND

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the latest twist on abolition of capital punishment came with the report from nearby Maryland that a murder trial would not be held because the county lacked funds.

Many will agree with the Maryland county fathers. There is little to be accomplished in a murder trial investment under the recent Supreme Court decision except to confine a convicted murderer at further expense to the taxpayers.

But, at least this is the newest wrinkle on abolition of capital punishment, that is, the public pleads poverty.

A related newspaper clipping follows:

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

COUNTY TOO POOR FOR MURDER TRIAL

PRINCESS ANNE, MD., October 17.—Officials in this rural Eastern Shore area of Maryland say they have no funds to spare for the trial of a Virginia man charged with murder in the slaying of a Florida woman.

Major crimes are rare or nonexistent in Somerset County, an area of farms and seafood harbors, County Commissioners contend. They say they are not prepared to fund the estimated $25,000 or more it might cost to prosecute the "sleeping bag murder case" if it requires extended proceedings.

The homicide case came under the jurisdiction of the county's state attorney, Robert D. Horsey, when Ina Stephanie Weiner was found murdered in a sleeping bag near a roadside rest area near here Sept. 8.

The 20-year-old woman had been reported missing from her Miami home Sept. 1, reportedly headed for Montreal in a van owned by her mother.

Last week, state police from Maryland arrested a Cheapeake, Va., man, Henry L. King, 23, on the homicide charge after he had been found driving the van in Indiana. He is being held without bond in Somerset County jail until grand jury proceedings are held. The next regular session of that panel is not until February.

Horsey says the prosecution will require witnesses from several states and possibly Canada and additional investigation in Florida and elsewhere. So far, he has been allotted $500 for the task.

County commissioners say they have little more funding to give him.

"A case like this could very easily cost $25,000 and might well cost $100,000," said R. C. (Biggy) Long, a county commissioner. "It's impossible to meet expenses now."

The county, which has one of the lowest tax bases in Maryland, has checked with Maryland State Police for funding of their investigating work but has been told that the state absorbs only minor expenses for day trips but no major funding for plane fares, overnight expenses and extensive investigations.

Horsey has taken his problem to the Maryland attorney general's office. It has not yet issued a final decision on the request but, unofficially, a spokesman for the office said, "There aren't any funds for this sort of thing as far as is known."

THE HONORABLE WAYNE NORVIEL ASPINALL

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, Shakespeare said:

I do desire that we may be better strangers.

The U.S. House of Representatives is a fraternity of strangers, a brotherhood of diverse, often antagonistic, interests. Its problem is to gain a consensus on a given issue. It can do so only because of the innate character of some, if not all, its Members. Those who are successful possess in high degree those traits which enable them to transmute strangers into fraternity brothers.

This accounts for the career of our highly respected and well-loved brother, the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL. "Born for success he was," of pioneer parents in the remote—from Washington, that is—valleys of Colorado. First a businessman, he chose law as an outlet for his pioneer energies. Soon he was a member of the Colorado Legislature, where he attained the rank and the dignity of Speaker. Next we find him in the Colorado Senate, and in the great Democratic upheaval of 1948 it was only natural that his people should send him to Washington.

Success in Washington depends upon the possession of the requisite talents, as has been stated. A legislator rises to positions of prominence and influence because he is a successful legislator. What is commonly called power is not the ability to enforce conformity to his will, but the ability to take positions which seem just, reasonable and in line with what most people recognize as good judgment.

In leaving Washington, WAYNE ASPINALL leaves behind him a remarkable record of achievement. As guardian of the public domain, it was his task and his opportunity to choose what part of that domain might be developed for its economic importance, and what might be left as a heritage of the past for coming generations. The future will judge that he chose wisely and well. His work will long remain as a monument to his ability, his integrity, and his love of his native land.

Wrote Carlyle:

Nothing that was worthy in the past departs; no truth or goodness realized by man ever dies, or can die; but is all still here, and, recognized or not, lives and works through countless changes.

Such shall it be with our friend and brother, WAYNE ASPINALL.

Maybe the many years which we trust lie ahead be filled with the sunshine of happiness and satisfaction for him and for all whom he holds dear, and may the Angel of God watch over him in all his endeavors.

NORTHERN IRELAND

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Fred O'Brien is currently working on materials for publication concerning the situation in Northern Ireland. He has done considerable research on the subject and has several times visited Northern Ireland within recent months to observe the development of events in that troubled sector of the world. Fred O'Brien is also a citizen of the Irish Republic, which provides him with a unique access to the people involved in the present conflict. I am submitting for the RECORD part of the material assembled by Fred O'Brien chronicling selected events in the recent troubles in Northern Ireland, representing his views on the causes and possible resolution of the problem.

The material follows:

NORTHERN IRELAND

The Government of the Republic of Ireland believed that the situation in Northern Ireland was deteriorating at the start of 1971 despite claims to the contrary by the British Government. Gun battles broke out in Belfast, the North's capital city, on February 5, 1971 and prompted Mr. John Lynch, the Irish Prime Minister, to give a periodic appraisement of the Northern crisis as more violence was anticipated. Lynch claimed the responsibility for the deterioration was due to political mistakes and tactical errors on the part of the Provincial Stormont Government in Belfast. His major areas of concern are as follows:

1. The decision by the Northern Government to permit the formation of rifle clubs whose membership was secured by the inclusion of ex- B Specials (Protestant Armed Militia used against the Catholic Minority) at a time when every effort needs to be made to eliminate arms in the North.

2. The insensitivity in dealing with the Minority and the failure to provide for reasonable consultation between the security authorities and local community leaders in order to diminish tension and eliminate tactical errors (tactical errors included killing people in the Minority by mistake).

3. The failure to be non-discriminatory in carrying out arms searches. (Searches were directed only at Catholics)

4. The persistent demand for law and order by action against the Minority who still await equal treatment as guaranteed by the Downing Street Declaration. (Britain passed reforms to guarantee equality after the terrible sectarian riots of 1969 which brought world attention to the problems in Northern Ireland.)

5. The affront showed the Minority politicians for conducting constructive debates for their issues and the blame for disruption of Northern society placed entirely on the Minority community.

Prime Minister Lynch, always on the political tightrope, tried to give objective criticism where he felt it was necessary and still maintain reasonable relations with the United Kingdom. The objections Lynch had towards the policies of Britain in regard to the North are legitimate, but he attempts impartiality in one sense by stating that he cannot condone violent methods in obtaining political objectives. This is a direct reference to the IRA (Irish Republican Army). He would rather not mention them specifically because they are held in high esteem by the Majority of The Irish Republic and to desecrate Irish Freedom Fighters, as they are looked upon by many, could mean political disaster for Lynch if he blatantly persecuted them. The Prime Minister has to speak out against injustice in the North as it is the assumed duty of every Irish Government to see reunification of the whole nation. This pursuit is a built in part of the foreign and domestic policy of any person holding power in Dublin. The pursuit of this goal and the degree the Government will extend itself is another matter. It is always an election weapon for the out power in Dublin. The one political party whose existence is basically the reunification of all Ireland is SINN FEIN (the political wing of the IRA). They would have the Irish Republic invade the North and take back what is rightfully theirs by destiny. Most political parties would utilize peaceful means to accomplish this goal, but unfortunately only violence has worked in Irish history.

YOUNG CONSTITUENTS OF RICHMOND, VA.

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, when the House of Representatives concludes its legislative business today, and we depart for our districts, we will all have one thought in common: When we return in January and are joined by our new colleagues, each will represent a district in greater or lesser degree different from that we now have the honor to represent.

I count myself fortunate in that the Fifth District has had added to it some of the fine people who have been ably represented by the Honorable Richard H. Poff, the Honorable WATKINS M. ABBITT, and the Honorable DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III. Among those represented by the latter gentleman is the family of Mr. and Mrs. Richard James Frank, Jr., of 801 Ewell Road, Richmond, Va.

Mr. and Mrs. Frank are the proud parents of two young sons—Richard James, Jr., who is 8 years old and known to his friends as "Chip," and Todd Christopher, who is 2 years old.

From what I know of the Franks, they are the stuff of which great nations are made, and I am especially proud of Chip who, in addition to pursuing his studies at Crestwood Elementary School, maintains an active interest in Indian Guides, football, hiking, and putt-putt.

Right now, it is a little early to predict Todd's interests, but I suspect he will follow in his big brother's footsteps.

In any event, I am delighted to represent these two young men in the Congress.

RACIAL CONFRONTATIONS WREAK HAVOC WITH MILITARY CAPABILITY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the public opinion-molding machinery continues to attack defense spending and our national defense programs while the internal sabotage which daily erodes discipline, morale, and the fighting capabilities of our front line of defense as well as endangering the personal safety of our fighting men receives little, if any, exposure in the news. I refer to confrontations in our military establishments caused by forced intermixing of the races, equal employment interference, and racial percentage allocations.

The first 3 weeks of this month have already resulted in at least three serious racial confrontations with injuries to our military personnel and irrepairable damage to the effectiveness of their missions.

On October 1, the *Newport News*, the largest U.S. cruiser afloat was compelled to abandon the Vietnam war zone because 19 sailors were killed in the explosion of an 8-inch gun turret. While the Navy has termed the explosion accidental, an investigation is underway.

On October 13, the aircraft carrier *Kitty Hawk* interrupted its mission in the Tonkin Gulf because of a fight aboard involving black and white sailors which left 33 men injured, two so seriously they needed to be evacuated to shore hospitals.

On October 17, a racial battle occurred aboard the *Hassayamea* while in port at Subic Bay in the Philippines. Reportedly, four white crewmen were injured.

Thus, the total American casualties from known racial confrontations aboard U.S. vessels in the first 3 weeks of October are reported to be 50, which competes with the number of combat casualties sustained in the war in Vietnam.

It would seem by now that some of our military leaders would have become aware that the pressure from below—the infiltration and racial agitation—is as detrimental to our Military Establishment as the pressure from above by the constant bombardment of attacks against military spending and the military industrial complex.

Some military commander might even reserve the power or right to select his men if he is to perform the responsibility of carrying out his mission with the greatest esprit de corps and safety.

Some military leader might even report to the Chief of Naval Operations that the humbug of racial percentages is not working and that if the Navy is desirious of maintaining a combat-readiness and efficiency, they should provide for segregated crews.

Who ever heard of racial disturbances aboard the vessels of John Paul Jones or during World War I or World War II?

The question is, Are the taxpayers and the citizens, through their military investment to be given a first rate fighting force or are conventional defensive military units to be exploited as sociological experimental training laboratories to satisfy the personal whims of a handful of ideologists and egalitarians?

The stain on the honor of the U.S. Navy grows greater, not because the racial programs have not worked, but because the naval leadership has allowed itself to be so used.

There are more ways than one to destroy a military force.

I insert the related newsclippings:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 14, 1972]

RACIAL CLASH INJURES 33 ON CARRIER

HONOLULU, Oct. 13.—A fight involving black and white sailors aboard the attack aircraft carrier Kitty Hawk off Vietnam Thursday left 33 men injured, three seriously, the Pacific Fleet Command reported today.

Two of the injured were flown to shore hospitals for treatment and another was scheduled to be flown ashore, a Navy spokesman said.

The remainder were treated for minor injuries aboard the ship and returned to duty, he said.

The Navy said "order has been fully restored" aboard the carrier and that it is "continuing to perform its mission at Yankee Station" in the Tonkin Gulf.

The Kitty Hawk's commanding officer, Capt. Marlin W. Townsend Jr. of Washington, D.C., and the executive officer, Cdr. Benjamin W. Cloud of El Cajon, Calif., have talked to the crewmen about the incident in hopes of learning what caused it and to prevent a recurrence, the spokesman said.

Other Navy officials are also investigating.

Further details on the incident were not immediately available, the spokesman said.

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

RACE FIGHTS INJURE 50 ON U.S. SHIPS

HONOLULU, Oct. 17.—A bloody racial battle has erupted on a second Navy vessel in the Pacific, it was reported today.

A spokesman for the commander-in-chief of the Pacific fleet said four white crewmen aboard the oiler Hassayampa were injured Monday at Subic Bay in the Philippines while the 665-foot ship was in port.

Eleven blacks "have been placed in the base correctional center at Subic for legal processing," he said in a prepared statement.

Some 100 men aboard the aircraft carrier Kitty Hawk engaged in hit-run race fights while the ship conducted air strikes against targets in North Vietnam a week ago. Forty-six men were injured.

The Navy said the fighting on the Hassayampa occurred while it was at Subic Bay for a "routine visit." Afterwards, it departed on its regular mission.

The oiler left Pearl Harbor, its home port, on April 27 for a normal rotational tour of duty in the Western Pacific.

The Navy said the outbreaks of violence aboard the Hassayampa and Kitty Hawk were the first and there had been no prior inkling of racial trouble aboard them.

[From the Evening Star and Daily News, Oct. 12, 1972]

SHIP BLAST LIFTS WEEK'S CASUALTIES

SAIGON.—The gun explosion aboard the heavy cruiser Newport News pushed U.S. combat casualties in Vietnam last week to their highest total in more than a year, the U.S. Command announced today.

The Command said 19 of the 21 Americans killed in action last week and 37 of the 53 wounded were on the cruiser when a shell exploded in one of the big guns.

Although the Navy labeled the Oct. 1 explosion an accident, a spokesman for the command said the casualties were listed as combat losses because the ship was firing on enemy positions in Quang Tri Province. The reporting week runs Sunday through Saturday.

The combat toll was the highest since the week of Sept. 26–Oct. 2, 1971, when 21 GIs were killed in action and 117 were wounded. A month ago the U.S. Command announced the lowest weekly casualty total since such records were started in January 1965, 7 American wounded and 4 missing or captured.

Last week's casualties also included one death from nonhostile causes. Eight more American airmen were listed as missing or captured.

The South Vietnamese command reported 406 of its troops were killed and 1,707 wounded last week. A South Vietnamese communique claimed 2,043 North Vietnamese and Viet Cong were killed.

A POLICEMAN SPEAKS OUT

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday October 18, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following letter was received by me not long ago, from Mr. Paul Fagin, of Indianapolis, a reserve deputy with the Marion County Sheriff's Department.

His simple yet eloquent words tell it as a policeman sees it. I commend it heartily:

DEAR MR. BRAY: I am not a writer, nor am I an expert on criminal justice but I do feel the need to express my feelings on a few items. I believe most people and all my colleagues will agree that a drastic change needs to be made in our criminal justice system.

In the last couple of years, I have seen many, many cases go through our courts. One observation I have made is the fact that if a man has the money to obtain a good lawyer, he will nearly always leave the court with a lesser sentence than the poor man who has a lawyer appointed for him by the state. Therefore, two men with charges of exactly the same crime will not be punished equally which I feel they should be.

I get sick to my stomach when I see a man who is charged with a serious crime be let go out on the streets because a good lawyer pleaded "temporary insanity." I have no facts to support me but I would bet 9 out of 10 are as sane as you or me.

I definitely do not feel the death sentence should be abolished. If for no other reason as a thought in the back of a would be murderers mind. I have heard of arrests that have been made where the accused person just laughs at the arresting officer and says so what, I'll be out in a few months. What really hurts is that in truth, they probably will be!

What else can be said for the man who puts his life on the line for $7,200.00 a year. I have been to several funerals of fellow policemen who died in the line of duty for so small, small a sum. Most police have to work several jobs just so they can live a reasonably comfortable life. I also have seen good policemen that we needed quit their jobs because a factory pays more. Police have to be more educated and higher paid in the next few years because most criminals are not ignorant in any sense and they are getting more intelligent as the years pass. The dumb cop is gone forever.

Well, as you can tell, I get carried away with the subject so thank you for listening.

PITTSTON, PA.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for nearly a quarter century it has been my pleasure to represent the city of Pittston, Pa., in this House.

The story of Pittston from World War II until today, can be almost summed up as one of "rags to riches." At the end of the war, the coal mining industry which kept many towns in my district alive for over a half century, was beginning to die. Pittston was no exception. But it refused to die.

Concerned and dedicated officials, centering around the chamber of commerce, set out to carve a new future, and hold down the diminishing population figures, declining because its residents were forced to move to other States where there was an abundance of employment. Pittston survived its "depressed area" tag which it wore for so long during the 1950's, and today its economy and work force are a model example of how the chamber of commerce, cooperating with the various forces that go into making up a healthy community economy, can be successful in picking a town up by its boot straps, actually bringing it back to life.

The Pittston Chamber of Commerce leaders built up a great diversified economy, and made certain that the demise of a mother industry would never again cause near economic collapse. The Pittston chamber was the first such organization to build and finance a "shell" plant, and turn it over to a new industry locating within its economic confines. This project set the pace as a model for other chambers throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I could not mention here the names of all the concerned community leaders responsible for this great success story. I would be remiss, however, if I did not note the contribution of Roy Stauffer, a car dealer who dedicated three decades of his life to Pittston's rebirth, along with Walter Margie, organizer and president of the Pittston Area Industrial Development Fund—PAID—which raised thousands of dollars for financing of new industries. There were others over the years who played a great part in making the Pittston area a greater place to live, including the late Attorney Thomas Burke, and the organization's dynamic past president, Paul Cadden. Floyd Evans, the current chamber president, is continuing with Mr. Cadden's leadership traits.

If I had to cite one individual, Mr. Speaker, who perhaps more than any other was responsible for what has happened in Pittston, it would be Vincent O'Hara, the Pittston chamber executive director.

Vince O'Hara has been many things to the Pittston chamber, and many things to the Pittston area economy. He has been the prime mover, the innovator, the inspiring force and chief technician as he led the committee of people who helped create this economic success story.

Mr. Speaker, Nation's Business, the official chamber of commerce publication, in a recent edition paid tribute to the Pittston story. It cited Pittston as one of the three cities in the country which "refused to die," and Nation's

Business put it in the "big leagues," with Houston and Milwaukee.

Mr. Speaker, I present the "Pittston Story" from Nation's Business:

THE PITTSTON STORY

If you happen to be driving on Suscon Road a few miles east of Pittston, Pa., in the rolling countryside leading to the Pocono Mountains, you'll come to the home of Chester J. Gall at the foot of a hill.

If you stop about even with Mr. Gall's mailbox, put your transmission in neutral and take your foot off the brake, your car seems to be rolling uphill.

Greater Pittston, residents say, presents a picture just the opposite of this famous local optical illusion.

Its economy should be racing downhill—but actually it's really climbing.

Few areas have faced greater odds against making the grade.

For a hundred years, piles of black slate refuse from anthracite coal mining—culm piles, they're called—were Greater Pittston landmarks.

When the anthracite industry was at its peak in the early '20s, it provided 17,890 jobs in the 87-square-mile area, with only another 800 jobs in a handful of small industrial plants.

The culm piles made the city of Pittston and 12 surrounding boroughs and townships midway between Scranton and Wilkes-Barre in the Susquehanna River's Wyoming Valley look like a potential training ground for moonbound astronauts.

Then anthracite—the area's once-rich deposits were already dwindling, anyway—gave way to petroleum and gas.

By all rights, says Greater Pittston Chamber of Commerce President Paul Cadden, Pittston and its smaller neighbors should have become ghost towns in the late '40s.

NO EULOGIES

However, as Vincent T. O'Hara, the Chamber's executive vice president for 25 years, puts it: "These towns refused to die."

It wasn't the first time that people were ready to say eulogies for the area.

In 1778, the Battle of Wyoming took the lives of 228 settlers from Connecticut, who either were slain during the fighting or massacred by British-led Seneca Indians after surrendering.

The Wyoming Valley emptied. But settlers returned, and made the valley an enclave of New England amidst the Pennsylvania Dutch. Later came waves of Irish, German, Italian, Polish and Russian immigrants to work the rich lodes of hard coal.

In 1940, the area's population was about 71,000. But the anthracite's day was done, and thousands who left for defense jobs during World War II did not come back.

At the close of the war in 1945, a group of businessmen led by the Chamber of Commerce and sparked by Chevrolet dealer Roy Stauffer, decided to try to pump life into the economy by attracting new industries.

The Chamber that year sold 4 per cent debentures to raise $175,000, and constructed a 30,000-square foot shell building in West Pittston, leasing the property to a canvas-making firm. The building has since been expanded several times.

Although neighboring Scranton is often given credit for pioneering the concept of community-financed industrial development, Pittston boosters firmly lay claim to getting there first. Mr. Stauffer suggested to the Scranton Chamber of Commerce in 1946 that it might want to try what had been done in West Pittston.

The Greater Pittston Chamber made two more bond offerings following the 1945 bond sale, and provided more space for industry, but the big breakthrough in financing came in the fall of 1966 when the Pennsylvania Power and Light Co. loaned the Chamber $600,000—interest-free.

That financing enabled the Chamber to become the area's largest landowner. It purchased 700 acres suitable for industrial development, and leased another 600 acres with options to buy.

POSTERITY AND THE PRESENT

"With 1,300 acres, we're set," says Mr. Cadden. "We can take care of posterity."

Meantime, the present is being taken care of. Industry after industry has come in. The population—55,800 in the last census—is no longer declining, Mr. O'Hara says.

Even the "bad case of visual pollution" that Mr. O'Hara says the culm piles gave the area is being cured. The piles are being leveled to make way for shopping centers, residential areas and factories. Only a few of the unsightly black heaps remain (there's talk of keeping one as a reminder of the past, but that's not likely—the piles rise over prime industrial land).

Undoubtedly, the industrial influx has been partly spurred by a 1966 study for the Commerce Department which concluded that when the Interstate Highway system is completed, four major arteries would intersect in the Greater Scranton and Wilkes-Barre region.

They would, noted the consultants who conducted the study, provide "hitherto-unavailable high-speed road access to all the large metropolitan centers on the East Coast."

The recommended Yatesville, in the Greater Pittston area, as a regional distribution center.

Today there are some 110 manufacturers in the area, turning out TV picture tubes, telescope lenses, bubble gum, comic books, toilet tissue, dump truck bodies, vinyl wall covering, acoustical tile, furniture, chains and sprockets, Easter egg baskets, artificial flowers, trailers, mobile homes, rubber products, cigars, fabric, battery cables, and men's, women's and children's apparel.

There's no coal being mined today in the Greater Pittston area," Mr. O'Hara points out. "And since we don't have any defense-related industries the recent cutbacks in that activity didn't affect us."

Nor, particularly, did the recent general recession. Only one plant closed in highly diversified Greater Pittston, resulting in the loss of 180 jobs—temporarily.

SLAPPED BY AGNES

Even the area's most recent test—Hurricane Agnes—had far less effect than an outsider might have expected. Though the rain-swollen Susquehanna spilled over its banks as it raced through the area, flooding some business districts and residential areas, only one industrial plant was under water. Nearly all the industrial sites are high enough to be immune from river flooding.

Companies have come to the Pittston area from far and wide. Recently, Bridon-American Corp., a British manufacturer of wire cable, announced plans to move into the lone plant that shut down during the recession, and eventually to employ some 200 Pittstonians.

Bridon will be the second foreign firm to settle in the area. In 1969, Germany's Schott Optical Glass Corp. chose Pittston for a plant site to produce glass for camera lenses, telescopes and other uses.

Hans Moeller, executive vice president of Schott's Pittston operation, says "a good piece of property was available at a reasonable rate and we felt we could find the labor we needed here because the availability of labor is the best on the East Coast."

Mr. Cadden, who is manager of the local office of the Pennsylvania Bureau of Employment Security, as well as Chamber president, notes: "We've been able to staff all industries that have come to the area."

Says James O. Brown, a frozen-food broker who moved to the area seven years ago, has expanded his facility each year and also has become a private industrial park developer: "The people of Pittston have a reputation for hard work and want to work more than people in other areas."

For the future, Greater Pittston is aiming for more diversification and setting its sights on becoming the distribution center of the Northeast Corridor.

Samuel L. Valenti, president of MarVal Industries, a lustily growing manufacturer of custom nonresidential trailers, sees the area as a natural for mobile home and trailer makers. "Pittston is the hub of the East Coast, a fantastic place for the trucking business," he says.

You only have to look at the mammoth cloverleaves where the busy Interstate interchanges uncoil to see the big diesels moving the inventories of commerce.

"Over there on Suscon Road," says Mr. O'Hara, "you're really going downhill when it looks like you're going uphill. But that's the only place in the area where it's like that. Everywhere else in Greater Pittston it looks like we're going uphill. And we really are."

THE NEED FOR HIRING STANDARDS AT GAO

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of recent Congressional Black Caucus hearings on governmental lawlessness, I was dismayed to hear case after case about inequitable personnel policies rampant throughout the Federal bureaucracy.

The following study of the GAO continues the research initiated by those hearings, and I ask permission to have it inserted into the RECORD at this point.

EXCEPTS FROM GAO STUDY

In order to achieve a realistic goal of 10% minorities and 10% women in all professional grades within the next year, the agency would have to significantly increase upgrading of present minorities and women into higher professional slots. To do this, career ladders have to be established to move non-professionals into professional positions. Also, special effort must be made to recruit minorities and women for high positions in the agency as there are no black or female division directors or regional directors within the GAO.

Special attention should be given to GAO's non-action program for its regional offices. The fact that GAO does not apply the same requirements to its regional offices as it does to its headquarters implies that it condones violations of equal employment opportunity in those regions, in spite of the fact that they are federal offices covered by the same laws which apply to Washington agencies. Regional Offices should be required to adhere to the same schedule developed for GAO Headquarters. Regionalization and decentralization of federal agencies can not be used as an avenue for bypassing equal protection of the law.

OBJECTIVE III—"DEVELOP AND CONDUCT AN EVALUATION PROGRAM COVERING EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITIES OF PERSONNEL WHO SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETE OFFICE CAREER DEVELOPMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS IN THE SUPPORT SERVICES AREA."

The GAO career development program (which only covers a few sections of GAO

Headquarters) is a failure and has embittered employee participants. "Career ladders" result in one-grade increases into dead-end jobs. Employees participating in the job-rotation portion of the career development program say they have no greater chance of being promoted than if they had remained in their permanently assigned positions. A number of employees have informed us that the job-rotation system actually hinders their advancement, because they lose 270 days of experience in their own sections, while rotating to other assignments, and other non-rotated employees reach their level of job knowledge during their absence. Employees feel they are forced to participate in the career development program because they have been informed they have no opportunity for promotion unless they participate, yet there is no guarantee for advancement even after rotation.

Some employees resent the fact that such "training categories" as "business English" or "English style practices" are required as part of the career development program, especially when these employees are American citizens, have been in the agency for ten years or more, and speak perfectly good English. In fact, employees have become so frustrated and humiliated by the program many are now refusing to participate in it.

The present career development program should be abandoned and replaced by a program which is developed with the assistance of employee groups and the EEO Advisory Council. The program should offer true career ladders at all levels and in all divisions of the agency and the regional offices. The Advisory Council should continually review and evaluate the new program to determine that it is not simply another "showpiece" which offers no promise for advancement. It ought to be possible for any employee of the GAO to do what former Comptroller General Frank Weitzel did—rise from the lowest position in the agency to the top. Today, race and sex discrimination makes that opportunity not open to every GAO employee.

OBJECTIVE IV—INCREASE BOTH THE USE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF EEO COUNSELORS

This is another important objective, and the 1973 Plan should summarize any progress made in this area. However, the action plan for this section is extremely weak and does not intend to correct major deficiencies in the use and effectiveness of EEO counselors. For example, it does no good to facilitate the ready availability of Counselors or to encourage employees to consult Counselors if the employees have no faith in the abilities or understanding of the Counselors.

Counselors should be elected by the employees or at least selected with the approval of the EEO Advisory Council. In addition, the counselors selected should logically come from minority groups and women within the agency and should not be predominantly white males. Employees having complaints should be given the opportunity to select the counselor they prefer to handle their complaints.

The counselors within GAO have never participated in an EEO training program, nor have they ever met together to discuss EEO matters (as called for in the 1972 Plan). Even sympathetic counselors can do little to assist the aggrieved employees, since the counselors themselves do not know what action to take on a complaint. Written records are not kept by the counselors on individual complaints, an omission which is harmful to employees if they wish to appeal agency actions or decisions and which violates GAO's own manual of EEO regulations. Actions to remedy this situation must be included in the 1973 plan and implemented immediately by the agency.

OBJECTIVE V—"INCREASE THE PARTICIPATION OF EEO OFFICERS IN EEO MATTERS"

GAO presently has a part-time Acting EEO Director who also serves as Deputy General Counsel of the Agency. The Advisory Council has requested that a *full-time* EEO Director be named who is preferably Black and who is not presently on the GAO staff. The EEO Director should be selected with the approval of the Advisory Council and should be given authority to effect changes needed to implement an effective EEO program within GAO. Beyond this there is need for a general shakeup in the Office of Personnel Management to assure that the work of the EEO Director is not thwarted by old-line personnel administrators.

OBJECTIVE VI—"INCREASE AWARENESS IN THE FIELD OF THE HIGH PRIORITY WHICH THE OFFICE ACCORDS ITS EEO PROGRAM"

Simple platitudes of "reaffirming" to regional employees GAO's "commitment" to equal employment opportunity serve no useful purpose, and indeed appear to condone the blatant race and sex discrimination practices within the regions. A "non-action" program such as this has no place in an EEO Plan and should be interpreted for what it is—a statement which authorizes each regional office to do or not do what it pleases in the area of civil rights enforcement. Instead of increasing "awareness of EEO," why doesn't someone increase enforcement of EEO in the regional offices? The Civil Service Commission should review carefully the EEO Plan submitted by each of the 15 regional GAO offices. The same EEO standards and timetables must be applied to the regions as are applied to the GAO Headquarters.

OBJECTIVE VII—"REDUCE THE POTENTIAL FOR ALLEGATIONS BY EMPLOYEES AND THIRD PARTIES THAT EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY IS BEING DENIED IN CERTAIN VULNERABLE AREAS OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT"

Certain portions of the "Action Program" under this objective are cause for grave concern. The program appears to be developed for the benefit of GAO management rather than for the benefit of employees and in reality amounts to an EEO repression plan. It should be noted that GAO continually has covered-up allegations that equal employment opportunity is being denied employees within the agency. It has accomplished this by failing to require counselors to write down employee complaints, by failing to keep promises to employees that remedial action will be taken if no complaint is filed, and by reclassifying written complaints received as "grievances." Thus, the number of EEO complaints reported to the CSC by GAO have been reduced to a token one or two a year, although the EEO Coordinator alone receives approximately 20 verbal complaints daily!

Section B of the Action Program permits the EEO Director to recommend the transfer of an employee who has complied with the "informal counseling process *upon the request of management*" (emphasis ours) or upon petition of the employee. Such a recommendation will be made for the transfer of an employee to another division or subunit within the Office "when the Director, EEO, determines that it would serve the best interests of both the Office and the individual employee . . ."

Comment: This type of action does nothing to remedy the problems within the division or sub-division in which the complaint occurred. Furthermore, it undoubtedly will discourage employees from participating in the "informal counseling process" if an employee does not wish to transfer or to be transferred into a dead-end job. Many employees justifiably interpret this section as a device for punishing individuals who seek assistance from EEO counselors, and as a thinly disguised threat that he who complains may actually be the most inconvenienced by the "remedy."

Section C of the Action Program permits the EEO Director to be present when rating supervisor and employee meet to discuss an effectiveness appraisal having a rating which "might reasonably provoke subsequent allegations of discriminatory practices."

The section states, "The EEO Director's attendance at such a meeting would be solely for the purpose of gaining insight into the underlying situation involved and not for the purpose of questioning the judgment of any of the parties."

Comment: In the past, GAO employees have viewed the effectiveness appraisal as a key vehicle of discrimination within the agency. Frequently, minority and female employees have received ratings which prevent them from achieving placement on promotion lists by a mere one of two points. Many feel that this is no coincidence. The appraisal form permits a supervisor to rate an employee "excellent" in all categories but not "outstanding"—i.e. sufficient for promotion, thereby subtly masking discrimination without appearing to downgrade the employee. Although this makes it difficult to prove that supervisors are deliberately rating some employees in a manner which would prevent their promotion, there are steps which could be taken to help alleviate this situation:

The CSC should require the GAO to advise each employee of his or her anticipated appraisal at least 30 days before the appraisal is to be accomplished.

Each employee should be given the opportunity to meet with the rating supervisor along with the EEO Director *and* a representative for the employee who has been selected by the employee to discuss the rating.

The employee should be given the opportunity to appeal any rating which he or she determines to be unfair or discriminatory; and provisions for such an appeal process should be spelled out in the plan.

Section E of the Action Program states that persons in management and supervisory positions who are indicated as being repeatedly the subjects of employee complaints of discrimination shall be required to participate in "appropriate counseling or training as necessary." If it is determined that these persons have not benefited from such counseling or training, they shall be considered for reassignment to a position "with a less demanding EEO environment" (one of the all-white regional office perhaps?)

Comment: The transfer of a supervisor who continually discriminates against minority employees or women does little to rectify the problems of discrimination within GAO. The Plan does not consider the problems employees will encounter in the division to which an offending supervisor will be transferred. *Disciplinary action—fines, suspensions, demotion, or firing—should and must be taken against supervisors who continually violate the mandates of the EEO Act of 1972.* Not to do so is to condone the action of those officials who practice discrimination.

OBJECTIVE VIII—"INCREASE SERVICES SUPPORT STAFF BY CREATING NEW SUPPORT JOB CLASSIFICATIONS."

The fact that this objective and the subsequent action program are included in the EEO Plan indicates that some employees are performing tasks which should be performed by lower grade-level personnel. Conversely, a number of minority and women employees are performing tasks generally assigned to individuals several grades above their own level. Frequently we have noted that minority and female employees have been assigned the tasks of training their own supervisors!

The GAO should be required to identify divisions in which this situation has arisen and to take immediate action to remedy such inequities.

Care must also be taken by the EEO Advisory Council to make sure that the creation of new "support service" jobs is not used to prevent a more basic EEO objective: to open up new professional jobs for blacks and women by establishing "bridges" from non-professional career ladders into professional career ladders. GAO ought to be formulating ways to facilitate entry of minorities and women into professional series jobs through agency-sponsored training courses or through agency-financed outside training programs.

OBJECTIVE IX—"ESTABLISH AN ANNUAL EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY AWARD."

Such a superficial objective has no place in any serious EEO Plan. However, if the GAO wishes to proceed with this public relations gimmick, it should at least permit the Advisory Council to approve the recipient. Equal publicity should be given annually to the official(s) who do the most to hinder effective enforcement of EEO, that they might also be identified clearly—this could be called the "GAO Annual Employment Discrimination Award."

OBJECTIVE X—"ESTABLISH AN EFFECTIVE MEANS OF REGULARLY INFORMING ALL EMPLOYEES OF INTERNAL EEO MATTERS AND RELATED OUTSIDE DEVELOPMENT."

The Action Program under this objective calls for the inclusion of EEO matters in existing publications or the publishing of an independent EEO newsletter. The EEO Director will be "the sole editor of the material to be published."

If such material is to be published, it should be accompanied with the assistance and the approval of the EEO Advisory Council. Minutes of EEO Advisory meetings and Steering Committee meetings should be published within a week after each meeting—this has been prevented in the past by the EEO Director or Director of OPM.

OBJECTIVE XI—"INCREASE EMPLOYEE CONFIDENCE IN THE OFFICE MERIT PROMOTION PROGRAM."

The Action Program states that GAO will "Establish a plan for prominently posting announcements for filling all clerical, administrative and technical vacancies in grades GS–2 through GS–14 which are subject to competitive promotion action." In addition, the Program states that "Advice will be obtained from the EEO Advisory Council with respect to various elements of the plan."

The Advisory Council has offered suggestions for improving elements of this Plan, but these suggestions have not been acknowledged or acted upon by GAO management. The Council has recommended that announcements be posted in prominent locations (as called for in the plan), rather than in such poor locations as the freight elevator area, and that the announcements be placed in glass cases to prevent them from being ripped down.

It should be noted that the EEO Advisory Council is mentioned only twice in the entire GAO 12-point action program (the other reference to the Council is made in Objective IX—the EEO Award—permitting the Council to submit five nominations to the EEO Director for his consideration in making his recommendations to the Committee on Staff Development and Awards). The fact that the advice of the EEO Advisory Council was not considered in the manner of posting promotion announcements indicates that GAO is unwilling to involve the Council even to the minor extent that such involvement is spelled out in the 1972 Plan.

OBJECTIVE XII—"IMPROVE THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT OF CERTAIN WORK AREAS HAVING A SUBSTANTIAL CONCENTRATION OF MINORITY GROUP EMPLOYEES"

Sections of the GAO Transportation and Claims Divisions are so bad physically that they approach sweat-shop proportions. The GAO has been acutely aware of these conditions for several years, but has done nothing to relieve the crowded and hazardous working conditions of these sections, which have a heavy concentration of minority and female employees. Many of GAO's older employees work in the "Snakepit" section of the Transportation Division, yet the floor covering of a main corridor leading through the section has cracked and chipped off, forcing employees to block off a section in order to prevent accidents. Employees inform us that this one hazard has existed for more than two months, and they have received no indication that GAO management intends to repair it in the near future.

The GAO must be required to renovate and partition working areas of the Transportation and Claims Divisions immediately. Repair of hazardous areas such as the flooring in the Snakepit" should be given top priority. Renovations of other floors of GAO Headquarters should not be undertaken until conditions have been substantially improved on the 5th floor. To wait until 1974 to accomplish these goals as outlined in the Plan is to permit the continuation of unbearable and unsafe working conditions for hundreds of minority and female employees. Employees tell us that improvements have been made in one area of the 5th floor, with the result that a new group of predominately white higher GS level employees were brought into the renovated are from another floor!

NIX STATEMENT ON LATEST NADER FIASCO

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I herewith place the following statement in the RECORD:

Congressman Robert N.C. Nix of Philadelphia said today that "Nader's School for Scandal now expects to be the only organization in America making wholesale profits from this years national political campaigns."

Their graduation ceremonies are, I understand being held today when a 20 page diatribes will be published attacking incumbent Congressmen. They are selling at $1.00 a set, with cut rate prices for those who wish to distribute such material on a door to door basis."

"I expect particular attention from this summer school for scandal because I refused to answer their 600 questions." I also embraced their attacks on Congressional Redress of Grievances for constituents by stating I spent twice the time on congressional casework than other Congressmen they criticized.

"I am sure", Nix continued, "that treating this paste up scrapbook of old political charges by Nader with less dignity than that accorded pulitizer prize winners has infuriated him and those vacationing snobs from exclusive schools who glued together their imaginary scoops".

In conclusion, "I can only say that I hope my detractors are foolish enough to purchase large quantities of this material at a dollar a copy". It is trash and demeans the job done by old opponents in attacking me over the years, since Nader's work is so badly done."

INFORMATION ON DRUGS

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following information provided for my office by Mr. Ross A. Deardorff of the Century Pharmaceuticals, Inc. merits the perusal of every Member of Congress:

PRESENTATION TO REPRESENTATIVE JACOBS
CENTURY PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,
Indianapolis, Ind.

F.D.A. is taking upon itself to impose The 1962 Drug Law upon pre-1962 drugs to require proof of efficacy. A great unnecessary expense and financial burden would be and is placed upon large and small companies to prove a mute question. Also, the general public suffers from possible alternatives: a.) Additional research proves efficacy—the consumer pays the ultimate cost through higher prices; b.) Company discontinues product due to uneconomical return for research—consumer loses because the product is not available; c.) Assume the product is not effective—it would not have stood the test of time in the market place (no consumer repeats a purchase of a worthless product).

I would request legislation exempting "grandfather" drugs from "effective" requirement of the 1962 Drug Law. The 1962 Drug Law doesn't require proof of efficacy for previous drugs, this is a court interpretation following F.D.A. proposals. Reason for exempting: Methodology is non-conclusive and scientific evidence, or man power, is readily available to prove beyond a shadow of a doubt the true efficacy of a particular drug. Please note that many of today's studies by latest scientific methods yield non-duplicative answers.

The pre-1962 drugs are deemed "guilty" (or not effective) until they are proven "innocent" (by efficacy studies), instead of innocent until proven guilty by studies showing lack of efficacy. This is clearly not the American Way. Again, this obviously is a very expensive and unnecessary expense which I would object to as being poor usage of my tax dollar, and consumer dollar.

F.D.A.'s policy will not accept mathematical statistics (mass usage of a drug) not private or clinical practical (actual firing line) usage of the drugs in question as evidence of effectiveness.

F.D.A. misused the National Academy of Science—National Research Council, Drug Efficacy Study Group Evaluations of examined limited data of many drugs. One panel member stated that their evaluations would have been quite different had they known the application that F.D.A. would be making of their findings.

Assuming a perfect expensive scientific study proves a drug has a 70% effectiveness in fulfilling a drug claim (say, headache relief), is this drug effective? By whose judgment and compared to what? Can it be marketed? Shouldn't anything that works to a greater degree than a placebo be marketed? Can a 50% effective rate product be marketed? (Maybe 30% of the people who didn't respond to the 70% effective drug do respond in the 50% effective drug group.) Isn't honesty the real issue? If a drug works 70% of the time—fine!—use it with a 70% expectancy relief rate. Use a 20% rate drug with a 20% expectancy rate, etc. Why shouldn't they

both be marketed and the educated practitioner exercise his desires. (Maybe a cancer drug with a cure rate of 10% is the best available today, fine—10% is better than Zero!

What decision should be made concerning a drug where proof of efficaciousness is contradictive among experts in the field and proof is not conclusive? Should a drug be banned even if proven safe? Flouride in prenatal vitamins is an example—there are two schools of thought by experts. Proof is very expensive, requires long periods of time, and so many human variables practically eliminate a study without unknowns of direct cause and effect relationships. Meanwhile, the same flouride is added to most major public water systems in the U.S. and, therefore, supplied to young and old and pregnant in unlimited, and unlabeled amounts. (Since about 1965, Flouride has been prohibited in a prenatal tablet.)

Another problem before the small drug company is the method which F.D.A. uses in controlling the sale of a drug by a small company which is more effective than the patent. This is the method of making a drug a "new drug". Although by definition a "new drug" is any drug not generally recognized—among experts (qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of drugs)—as safe and effective for use under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling. In addition, a drug that has been recognized as safe and effective for use under certain conditions as a result of clinical investigations, but that has not been used to material extent or for a material time under such conditions, will still be regarded as a "new drug". Combinations of approved drugs or of old drugs may be regarded as new drugs even though the individual components are not new drugs.

Drugs, such as meprobamate and chloropromazine, are popular, well-known drugs—hence, do not fit the definition of a "new drug". Chloropromazine has been a "new drug" for the 17 years of its patent, and remains a "new drug today, thereby restricting its marketing by both large and small companies. One year has passed since F.D.A. caused several manufacturers to withdraw chloropromazine which was marketed under U.S.P. standards. (If we need new standards, then insist upon publication in black and white so that any trained pharmaceutical entity can manufacture and market these items according to a published standard.) This time has been spent satisfying F.D.A. requirements. Meanwhile, the consumer is forced to pay prices of from two to seven times the prices charged by the generic manufacturers compared to the company patentholder of chloropromazine.

F.D.A. has, in recent years, reclassified many "old" drugs to the "new drug" status. (Vitamin B–12, as well as other injectible vitamins, the simple, well-known antihistamine, chlorpheniramine, are examples.) The decisions to make "new drugs" or old ones are arbitrary and not based upon any new scientific knowledge or any new side effect or previously unknown adverse effect—which should rightfully be cause to reclassify, or control, or remove a drug from the market. F.D.A. has made the procedure to market some "new drugs" somewhat easier and less expensive—but, it still takes time and expense—unnecessarily—by allowing "Abbreviated New Drug Applications". (This does not require animal or clinical proof that a particular drug works—since this information has already been available to F.D.A.). It does, however, require in many cases a blood or urine level comparison, which is most expensive for a small manufacturer.

I wish to point out that if a problem has arisen on a particular product, all companies, large and small, would be interested in correcting this problem, running any and all tests or developing pertinent tests to overcome the problem. However, these test and restrictive requirements are being placed upon drug after drug, company after company, one by one without any specific causative problem.

A current problem, needing immediate attention, is the F.D.A. attitude on combination drugs, which is not backed by any law. Combination drugs are on the "chopping block" by F.D.A. F.D.A. is declaring many combination drugs as "not effective" and in the same breath declaring the very same ingredients given separately as "effective". The criticism is placed on the combination because it is a fixed ratio. The fact that a combination is a fixed ratio doesn't prohibit a prescribing doctor from giving the very same drugs separately in any ratio he may wish. But on the other hand, if the consumer and physician wished to save money, save confusion, lessen misunderstandings, have convenience, and use a fixed ratio combination, he would be prohibited from doing so if F.D.A. policy prohibiting combination drugs is permitted. The fact that 40–50% of all drugs marketed at this time are in combination very vividly shows the popularity, usefulness and desirability of these products. No individual is forced into a combination drug. However, elimination of combination drugs would force use of individual drugs upon those 40–50% of drug users who prefer combinations. Again the consumer would lose due to increased cost. (Drug reactions are cited as problems of combinations, however, multiple single drugs contain the identical side effect problems.) F.D.A. has set up rules to look at drug evidence to determine if a hearing is allowable concerning a drug action. This, of course, precludes "due process" and gives a prejudiced opinion.

Objection is raised to the "Voluntary Drug Inventory" and proposed compulsory "inventory law" to be imposed upon industry. This is a very time consuming and unnecessary request and proposed requirement. The actual drug information is already in F.D.A. possession via catalogs, labels, etc. of marketed products. There is much more information requested which doesn't relate to the safety or efficacy of the marketed drug which is burdensome upon the drug industry to fulfill and infringing upon company trade secrets.

In reality the Food and Drug Administration writes, administers, enforces and judges the drug laws in the United States. The F.D.A., being "expertise" in the drug field, is consulted and promotes laws affecting "their field-drugs". Although congress actually passes the law, F.D.A. has had a very large influence in formulating the law. By law, the F.D.A. is charged with administering and enforcing these very laws they have requested to be passed. The F.D.A. also judges which violators and/or violations are acted upon and to what degree. The highest degree, of course, is by court action. Here again, the F.D.A. wields a great deal of influence in the judgment of an accused violator or regulation, and/or law. The judge (and jury), not being scientifically trained or having scientific background, is reluctant to make scientific or technical judgments and, therefore, rely heavily upon the F.D.A. (as the governmental protector of the people).

Batch Certification of every single batch of drugs is also being proposed by law. If this law is passed, additional and unnecessary cost will be imposed upon drug manufacturers—without releasing them from liability or the need to test their own drugs. The huge cost of time delay to receive test results would be another unjustified cost passed on to the consumer.

Individual code numbers stamped upon each and every tablet and capsule, for identification, is an additional proposal which would cause unnecessary additional cost to the consumer. Products are at present identified in their containers. (Manufacturers bottles as well as retail prescription in the hands of the consumer.) Anyone wishing to destroy the identification of a "stamped" or "decal" number on a tablet illegally in his possession may do so simply with a little fingernail effort.

In conclusion, a fairer interpretation of present laws is urgently needed. The limited resources of the American people placed in the hands of F.D.A. should be applied in the real problem areas—where problems manifest themselves. Many question newer effectiveness requirements for newer drugs since 1962, but products on the market prior to 1962 which have shown no toxicity, or health problems should remain free of the new laws. If this takes a new law to protect the pre-1962 drugs, I urgently request it. The free enterprise system is being unnecessarily challenged, and burdened with excess state control.

I have briefly brought to light many problems and would be happy to provide documentation and greater depth of discussion on any one or all of these problems.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSS A. DEARDORFF,
President.

GREECE OF THE JOURNALISTS: A REVIEW OF TWO BOOKS

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, Dr. George Anastaplo, a distinguished scholar who is both a lecturer in liberal arts at the University of Chicago and a professor of political science at Rosary College, has written an article which I would like to share with my colleagues.

Dr. Anastaplo's article first appeared in the Saturday Review in February, 1972, as a book review and as an analysis of the political turmoil of Greece in 1967.

The article follows:

(NOTE.—The review was published, in a somewhat edited form, in the *Saturday Review*, February 12, 1972, pp. 79–80.

(The reviewer, George Anastaplo, who was born in St. Louis and now lives in Chicago, is Lecturer in the Liberal Arts, The University of Chicago, and Professor of Political Science, Rosary College. He is the author of *The Constitutionalist: Notes on the First Amendment*, published in 1971 by the Southern Methodist University Press.

(Dr. Anastaplo has been declared *persona non grata* by the Greek government because of his articles about American policy in Greece. Citations to those articles may be found in the *Congressional Record*, vol. 117, pt. 16, pp. 20709–20713. See, also, *Congressional Record*, vol. 118, p. 889 (Jan. 24, 1972), p. 24990 (July 24, 1972.)

GREECE OF THE JOURNALISTS: A REVIEW OF TWO BOOKS

(By George Anastaplo)

The two books reviewed on this occasion are John A. Katrie's *Eyewitness in Greece: The Colonels Come to Power* (St. Louis: E. P. Dutton Co., 1971; 317 pages, $9.95), and Bayard Stockton's *Phoenix With a Bayonet: A Journalist's Interim Report on the Greek*

Revolution (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Georgetown Publications, 1971; 306 pages, $7.95).

Both of these excessively partisan books can be useful for the discerning American reader. Bayard Stockton, an American free-lance journalist living in Greece, attempts to make a case for the Greek colonels who seized power in Athens in April 1967. John A. Katris, a Greek journalist with a very good reputation (who now lives in Minneapolis), states the case against the United States which will probably be accepted some day by most Greeks, a case which sees the colonels as little more than American agents. Perhaps, indeed, that day has already come.

The Stockton book, despite its effort to say all that can be said for the colonels—and, even more significant, despite its willingness to ignore much of what can be said against them—has not been received altogether enthusiastically in Athens. Mr. Stockton remains enough of a journalist to reveal here and there (often almost inadvertently) marked deficiencies in the regime he defends. In addition, one can deduce the colonels' shortcomings by noticing the subject skirted by their apologist.

Most revealing may be the manner in which the longstanding torture charges are handled by Mr. Stockton. He will not say outright that there has not been widespread deliberate recourse to torture as official government policy. Rather, he argues that such charges cannot be "totally proved or disproved" and then proceeds to treat them as frivolous, if not even fraudulent. P. 144. The colonels themselves have been obliged to admit, both by the vituperative denials they issue and by the reprehensible deeds they conceal, that neither their program nor their country's plight has justified reliance on the torture which is alleged by their critics.

Had Mr. Stockton been willing, in assessing the torture charges, to apply the standards and accept the kind of evidence he relies upon to condemn the misdeeds of the colonels' predecessors, he would have been obliged to recognize the existence since 1967 of systematic torture unknown in any West European country today and unprecedented in peacetime Greece.

Had he been willing to conduct the inquiries which *foreign* journalists can still make in Greece, he could easily have confirmed dozens (if not hundreds) of cases of savage torture, cases which have been documented in even greater number in James Becket's *Barbarism in Greece* (New York: Walker and Co., 1970) and in the thousand-page report (issued in 1970) of the Commission on Human Rights of the Council of Europe. For anyone to attempt by equivocation and sophistry to dismiss so much available evidence is to raise serious doubts about his reliability. The reader should be reminded of the kind of perverse self-deception, if not even dishonesty, which permitted intelligent men to ignore for so many years Stalin's barbarities.

Recourse has been had to torture and to continued repression because the colonels have not been able, in their five years in power, to secure more than the sullen acquiescence of the Greek people. The United States has been gulled into its unseemly support of the regime by repeated assurances of a speedy return to constitutional government and free elections.

It should be evident that the colonels have neither the intention of ever giving up power voluntarily nor the ability to retain it constitutionally. Certainly, one does not need much personal exposure to these unfaithful army officers to realize they are crude opportunists who are ruthless, self-righteous and dangerous. "We have all learnt, we all know," George Seferis (the Nobel Laureate poet) observed in Athens in March 1969, "that in dictatorial regimes the beginning may seem easy, yet tragedy waits at the end, inescapably. . . . The longer this abnormal situation lasts, the greater the evil."

The colonels were able to seize power in 1967 because of the imprudent and irresponsible feuding among the recognized politicians in Greece during the preceding decade. This feuding, which was magnified with the aid of an excitable press into a prolonged constitutional crisis in 1965, is exhibited in the Katris book. Mr. Katris's disregard of the practical consequences of what he writes is an instructive sample of the public folly in which Greek politicians and journalists indulged before the colonels struck. His intemperate denunciations of the Greek monarchy can only impede the forging of an effective alliance among the many honorable men, royalists and republicans alike, who now find themselves in opposition to the colonels.

How unrealistic his program is may be seen in the conditions he lays down for the replacement of the colonels by an acceptable regime: there is about such pronouncements considerable fantasy, as if the colonels' opponents are now able to decide who will govern Greece. It does not seem to be realized, that is, that the colonels are likely to remain in power for a generation, barring chance developments or a serious international crisis.

Mr. Katris's insistence that the American C.I.A. is really behind the colonels does not recognize that such control need not be posited in order for one to understand what happened in Greece in April 1967. To insist upon the C.I.A. as decisive is to underestimate the shortcomings of Greeks of all parties. It is to be a prisoner of that taste for the conspiratorial and the dramatic (with its depreciation of the role of chance in human affairs) which can make Greeks both so engaging and so exasperating. It ignores, furthermore, the growing realization among Greeks of all persuasions (at least among those who have remained in Greece) that something was seriously wrong with the old way of doing things, that leaders of all parties contributed to the suicidal irresponsibility and posturing which permitted barbarians in khaki to install themselves as the saviours of their troubled country.

The most obvious feature of the Stockton book for Americans should be its display of how barbarians can be prettied up as patient, well-meaning and determined protectors of law and order. It is to the credit of Greek politicians and journalists that no one of stature among them can be recruited by the dictatorship to serve as its apologist. Thus, however irresponsibly passionate they have been, they do retain the sense of honor which often accompanied such passion. Would a similar regime among us remain unable for five years to attract any serious support from established leaders and writers?

The colonels and their associates, usually the most disreputable elements in the army and out, realize they face imprisonment or execution if they should surrender power. That is, they realize that propaganda barrages have not secured for them genuine popular support.

It is significant, for instance, that the newspapers which are described by Mr. Stockton as most closely identified with the colonels are found (elsewhere in his book) at the bottom of the list of circulation figures for Athens the concern of the colonels themselves that their regime not be identified publicly with executions. There would be much more violent resistance to the colonels among disaffected Greeks today but for the tacit agreement on all sides that the ferocious vendettas of the 1940s should not be revived.

The only prospect for dislodging the colonels, once entrenched, depended upon judicious support by the United States of the Greek people in their desire to rid themselves of their tyrants. But the influence of the United States has been fading, and with this the colonels have dared become more open in their contempt for the free world, its institutions and its concerns. I have, since 1967, seen at close range all the principal Greek political figures who are alive today as well as all the principal members of the colonels' conspiracy.

I myself would much prefer to have any one of the former (e.g., King Constantine, P. Kanellopoulos, C. Karamanlis, G. Mavros, C. Mitsotakis, A. Papandreou, G. Rallis, O. Vidalis, H. Vlachou) as my governor than any or all of the colonels. The best known opponents to the colonels seem to me, as an American, to have much more in common (such as a genuine respect for civilization) than any of them have in common with the colonels now in power.

Who is really responsible for the emergence of these colonels? Mr. Stockton virtually ignores the notorious role of the United States in the making and unmaking of Greek governments since the Second World War. He recognizes that virtually all the leading men in Greek political life between 1965 and 1967 (including the King) refused to do the sensible thing, which would have been to publicly compromise their constitutional differences.

Mr. Katris's emphasis, on the other hand, is upon the failings of the Right and upon the decisive interventions of the United States. He does not appreciate the extent to which frequent street demonstrations and public-service strikes in 1965, and 1967 (for which the Center and the Left were largely responsible and of which he now writes with nostalgic approval) also helped prepare the way for the colonels. Many apprehensive Greeks, albeit mistakenly, saw these disturbances as harbingers of a breakdown of civil order and of a return to the civil war of a generation before. Mr. Katris virtually ignores that war and its traumatic effect upon contemporary Greece, an effect which may be seen both in the reluctance of the King to permit blood to be shed in resisting the colonels and in newspapers. P. 164.

Even he recognizes (almost as an aside), "The danger to the future of Greece lies in the fostering of apathy and sterility in a citizenry no longer used to the flexibility of free thought. If the Revolution prevails, its drive for conformity could produce a generation too sheltered to be fully responsible." P. 223. (That which the colonels call a "revolution" is called by their opponents a "military takeover" or a "hijacking.")

The colonels do not, and indeed cannot, solve any of the serious problems of their country. Instead, chronic ailments are concealed; bombast and deception are substituted for much-needed reforms; and the future is casually mortgaged to the desperate efforts of opportunists to do what they can to perpetuate themselves in power. Shameless apologists for the colonels should be reminded of the military regime in Pakistan which was long extolled as a competent government but which was eventually revealed as having merely postponed (and hence made even more difficult) responsible treatment of problems of longstanding seriousness.

One need not assume, in order to anticipate that Americans will be discredited for a long time to come in Greece, that the United States covertly engineered the colonels' coup. Our public conduct since April 1967, in supplying the colonels arms and other testimonials of legitimacy and even of approval, suffices to earn for us a legacy of potentially explosive bitterness of which Mr. Katris's book is but a warning.

Greek conservatives and royalists will dispute Mr. Katris's explanation of what happened in Athens before 1967; but they will not want to challenge his denunciations of what the United States has and has not done since the colonels seized power. The most prudent course for the United States in the

years ahead, in an area so important to the interests of the free world, may be to encourage Greece to insulate itself against further American bungling by moving into closer political and economic association with Western Europe. Perhaps such an association can help supply that constitutional moderation which a faction-ridden Greece has all too often lacked. *Federalist No. 10* comes to mind.

THADDEUS KOSCIUSZKO NATIONAL HOME

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased that the Congress has taken affirmative action to establish the Kosciuszko home as a historic site.

The passage of this legislation to designate Kosciuszko's home at 301 Pine Street, Philadelphia, Pa., is the culmination of combined efforts of several dozen Members of Congress to honor a great Pole.

Almost every American student who studied American history knows the story of this great Polish patriot who came to our shores to fight for America's freedom during the Revolutionary War. Kosciuszko was a hero of the Revolutionary War battles of New York and Yorktown and was made an American citizen by a grateful Congress for his war deeds.

The Congress, in its wisdom, rejected the recommendation of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments that the Kosciuszko home was not qualified for designation as a national historic landmark. The primary reason for rejection seemed that General Kosciuszko lived in the house some time after the Revolutionary War and only for a period of about 6 months. Also, that the house had been altered since the time of Kosciuszko's residence there.

I could not accept the theory that Kosciuszko's short stay in the home at 301 Pine Street disqualified it from being considered as a historic site and so stated in my letter to the Department of Interior written March 9, 1972.

I was pleased to testify in support of this legislation before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. At that time I pointed out that the Polish-American citizens in general were vitally interested in the preservation of the only dwelling in America associated with Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

Mr. Speaker, this building was saved from the demolition crews so that all Americans, including Americans of Polish descent, could honor this great man. The residence is fortunately located near the Philadelphia Society Hill project, where many other colonial homes are being restored for posterity. The inclusion of Kosciuszko's residence as a national historic site in this project will be a magnificent and totally appropriate addition.

In paying tribute to General Kosciuszko in this way we are doing more than honoring one of the military geniuses of the American Revolution. We are doing more than officially recognizing the contributions of a beloved son of Poland. We are honoring a man whose entire life was a testimony to the freedom for which he fought both in America and in his native Poland.

The passage of this legislation is a great victory for Mr. Edward J. Piszek, the present owner of the Kosciuszko House, who backed the move to declare this building a national shrine in memory of the Polish engineer who fought side by side with General Washington in the American Revolution.

It is my hope that this Kosciuszko House will be restored completely to its original state so that it can be a focal point during the Nation's celebration of its 200th anniversary in 1976.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it was on this day nearly five centuries ago that a bright and shining New World unfolded before that great Italian explorer and adventurer Christopher Columbus. For, as any schoolchild can tell you, it was on October 12, 1492, that he and his crew of hardy pioneers from the ships the *Niña*, the *Pinta*, and the *Santa Maria* first set foot on what Columbus had then thought was a new trade route to bridge Western Europe with the eastern Orient but which was in fact an entirely new hemisphere—indeed, a New World.

But in honoring Columbus for the successful completion of this voyage of tremendous discovery, we even more importantly honor a concrete testimonial to that perpetual and persistent yearning in man's spirit throughout the ages which continually would have us all seek to try the difficult and tear away at the unknown and in so doing expand the knowledge which can come to the human race as a whole. Indeed, like his modern-day counterpart, astronaut Neil Armstrong, Columbus too could have said on that October day so long ago that, "This is one small step for a man and one giant leap for mankind."

We have—in so many ways—come a long way since Columbus' discovery. How truly stupendous, for example, has been the flood—in sheer numbers—of the countless people from all of the world's countries that have come to America since that first Italian immigrant reached our shores. How tremendous, too, has been the expansion of first our agricultural and natural resources and then our industry and technology that have also occurred.

And with the intricate and delicately balanced Government that we have since devised to help harness and channel all of these resources, the total accomplishment in prosperity and influence that have since then accrued to us would, no doubt, truly astound our discoverer if he were alive today.

Italian-Americans, of course, can take particular pride in Columbus' great accomplishment—especially since this second annual national commemoration of his feat is most special. For there is, in fact, only one other person—George Washington, the father of our country—who is specifically honored in some way on our national list of holidays.

And, fittingly enough too, since we should never forget that it was Columbus—and men like Columbus—that helped blaze the trail for all of the rest of us.

AIR FORCE EDUCATION AND TRAINING CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE CIVILIAN ENVIRONMENT

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks I have had an opportunity to review some of the significant contributions to the improvement of education being made by our Armed Forces. In many instances, the military services have provided important leadership in the development of new education concepts and techniques that have resulted in direct and substantial benefits to civilian educational institutions.

I would like to share with my colleagues a summary I have prepared outlining the results of my findings with respect to the Air Force contribution to education.

INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION AND THE SYSTEMS APPROACH TO EDUCATION

Starting in the early 1950's, the Air Force conducted extensive research that significantly advanced the technology for specifying the precise content of training courses. Pioneering research and development efforts were conducted in the areas of individualized instruction, self-instructional techniques, teaching machines, and automated instruction.

As this research progressed, it led to the systems approach to training. Ideas and techniques were developed, demonstrated and promoted by the Air Force that have been adopted by many researchers, technicians, and practitioners in the civilian sector. Air Force efforts have been widely cited in the technical literature, and Air Force procedures have been used directly by industry, educational institutions, and government agencies. Examples of specific reference to Air Force contributions are:

First. Galanter, E. (editor). "Automatic Teaching: The State of the Art." New York: Wiley & Sons, 1959.

Second. Taber, J. I. Glaser, R. & Schefer, H. H. "Learning and Programmed Instruction." Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1965.

Third. Lumsdaine, A. A. & Glaser, R. B. (Editor). "Teaching Machines and Programmed Learning." A Source Book. National Education Association, 1960.

Fourth. Glaser, R. B. (editor). "Teaching Machines and Programmed Learn-

ing: Data and Directions." National Education Association, 1965.

DRIVER TRAINING

The Air Force developed training devices that served as examples for those who developed the devices to give young people practice in the essential skills required in driving an automobile. Also, the Air Force testing and use of such devices contributed to the development and use of such trainers by many driver training programs in the public schools.

AUTOMATED INSTRUCTION AND TEACHING MACHINES

The Air Force conducted the first major demonstration and evaluation of automated teaching devices. The Air Force showed that such devices could be used to teach vocational and technical subjects such as electronics. The knowledge gained by the Air Force has been transferred and used by the vocational and technical educational institutions in the United States and in some NATO countries.

COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION

In 1958, the Air Force initiated one of the first studies exploring the economic feasibility of using computers to teach the intellectual, cognitive, academic skills. In 1966, the Air Force initiated pioneering efforts to have computers interact with students in relatively unconstrained natural English. That is, ways of having computers interact with students similar to that used by a tutor. Although the ultimate benefits of this computerized skill are perhaps 5 to 10 years away, the Air Force efforts have generated productive efforts by many individuals and educational researchers.

EVALUATION OF VOCATIONAL TRAINEES

In 1968 the Air Force assessed the state of the art in evaluating trainees in technical and vocational courses. The assessment has been of significant use by the vocational education departments of several States.

Mr. Speaker, the Air Force objective to obtain maximum performance from each individual is in complete harmony with current national attitudes and priorities. Efforts toward this objective are aimed at the reduction of the numbers of people in training at one time and direct costs while significantly increasing total military effectiveness and efficiency. Advances in Air Force instructional technology have resulted in progress toward the achievement of this objective and have benefited the Nation.

Programed, automated, and individualized instruction were pioneered and developed in the services. This technology has reduced costs of many Air Force courses and has been adopted by industry and civilian educational institutions. Air Force computer-based simulation of flight and missile operations found wide use in civilian airlines and other critical industries.

The Air Force formally implemented programed learning by a policy letter from Headquarters U.S. Air Force to all major Air Force elements on October 30, 1961, and shortly thereafter established a special assistanct for training methods—Col. Gabriel D. Ofiesh. Colonel Ofiesh, now retired, is a prominent leader in educational technology nationally and internationally. Through cooperative efforts of the Air Training Command, the Training Research Division of the Human Resources Laboratory and various other operational elements of the Air Force, experimental demonstrations and evaluations were conducted. In one typical course—administrative specialists—the uses of programed learning materials reduced the course from 11 weeks to 7 weeks.

The cost to develop the materials was $100,000. The savings per year were $1 million. Programed learning in the Air Force has evolved into a systems approach to training and education—AFM 50–2, Instructional Systems Development. The difference is significant. The latter concept is based on real world performance requirements and incorporates effective use of a wider range of techniques. These systems continue to offer direct savings in the order of 10 to 30 percent.

The Air Force contribution to this technology has spin-off benefits beyond their programs. The initial stimulus, guidance and development of this technology has benefited industry, educational institutions and other Government agencies. Upon request the Air Force has always shared its expertise, methods, media and instructional materials with other Government agencies and public school systems. To assure this continued cooperation against a backdrop of reduced manpower and material resources, the Air Force has cooperated with the Aerospace Education Foundation, an affiliate of the Air Force Association, to provide materials for a systematic review of Air Force instructional systems which can be used in civilian vocational and technical education. As a result of this project funded by the Office of Education, a system has been developed for a nonprofit collection, reproduction, preview and dissemination of these materials.

This project represents the culmination of 5 years of Air Force/Aerospace Education Foundation cooperation to make this vast instructional resource available to the public school systems. More than 26,000 hours of validated Air Force courses have been identified as applicable to public education. The Aerospace Education Foundation can make these available—after mastering costs of about $40 per hour—at an average cost of $6 per hour which is about one-tenth the cost of developing 1 hour of new curriculum.

In addition to this systematic review of all Air Force courses for public school relevance, the Air Force maintains a Training and Education Activities Clearing House—TEACH—to assure that its organizations are kept apprised of the latest instructional innovations within the Air Force, the services and the public sector. This activity is responsive to about 400 inquiries for information, guidance or assistance per year. In a typical year the source of these requests were:

Sources and numbers of requests

Non DOD government agencies	126
Nonprofit organizations	77
Schools and universities	68
Major commands	69
Individuals	46
Air staff	25
Congressional	8

Air Force personnel are currently participating as members of the Civil Service Commission Inter-Agency Group No. 294 Conference Committee task force to plan and implement a workshop for all Government agencies to professionally upgrade the training and educational functions.

Air Force personnel have played and are continuing to play a leadership role in the National Security Industrial Association ACT—Applications of Computers to Training—committee. The purpose of this special committee is to identify the various applications for which computers could be utilized in training; develop a means to disseminate information on this subject; establish communications with the Defense Department, industry, and the educational community; and to identify and specify the role of hardware and software in the training process.

The Air Force hosted the Third National Security Industrial Association Seminar on the application of computers to training at Keesler Technical Training Center during the second week of February 1972. The theme of the conference was "Technical Training Systems of the Future." There was a hand-on demonstration of the computer depicted training system which allows Air Force personnel specialists trainees to learn on the job through a Computer Assisted Instruction—CAI—program which uses the terminal at one job location and the computer which supports the personnel data requirements. This application of CAI will save the Air Force about $2 million and serves as a prototype for other applications.

With considerable and well-justified pride, the Air Force can claim a major role in conceiving and developing programed learning, automated instruction, the systems approach to training and an "advanced instructional system" now under development at Lowry Air Force Base, Colo. The spinoff benefits of these developments to the public sector are immeasurable.

We searched for examples of Air Force training where we prepare people for certain jobs whose skills are used or are in demand in the civilian environment. We contacted the Department of Labor and the Air Force Project Transition personnel to see if they had information on the number of prior Air Force people currently working in civilian occupations using their military skills. Neither agency had such information.

The only information found on this subject was in a speech given by the Secretary of the Air Force to the Air Force Association, Boston Chapter, April 23, 1971. It was stated that over 90 percent of the young men and women in the Air Force learn a skill that has some direct civilian utility. Moreover, while training these people, a great deal is learned

about the process of teaching that can be transferred to civilian education.

Further, the Air Force is looking for even more ways to adapt training to civilian employment needs. For instance, the Air Force is paying particular attention to the shortage of trained men and women in the civilian health occupations. The Air Force Medical Service School at Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas, produces about 5,000 graduates each year in specialties such as X-ray technicians, medical lab technicians, diet specialists, medical corpsmen and pharmacy specialists.

The Air Force is contributing to the civilian economy through its educational and training programs. Skills taught to Air Force men and women are being used in civilian jobs, and instructional methods and materials developed for Air Force training and education are also being used in civilian education and the foundation and the Government of playing a vital role as a national resource in this Nation's growth and development.

AMERICAN IRISH FOUNDATION

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker when my late friend, our great President John F. Kennedy made his celebrated journey to Ireland, the land of his ancestors, shortly before his death, he met several times with that dear and beloved man, Ireland's President Eamon de Valera. In the course of their conversation at the President's home in Phoenix Park, Dublin, the leaders of both nation's decided that an effective coordinating force should be forged, to carry on the great tradition of the relationship between both nations, and the great feeling of mutual respect and admiration that peoples of both countries held for each other.

Out of these discussions grew the American Irish Foundation, which is headed today by its president, Mr. John P. Cosgrove of Washington. Mr. Cosgrove, many Members of this House know him well, is a past president of the National Press Club, distinguished newsman and former publishing executive. He is a native of Pittston, a great community in north Luzerne County, Pa., which I have been privileged to represent in the House for a quarter century.

The American Irish Foundation has made great strides in recent years, and this is due in no small measure to its distinguished president, who seems to lend the "Midas Touch" to his undertakings, all of which have earned a good measure of success. Mr. Cosgrove, I might add, is executive director of the Honor America Day Committee, which has brought greater meaning and significance to our Nation's birthday, July 4.

During the past summer, Mr. Cosgrove, together with American Irish Foundation officials, along with our Ambassador in Ireland, Mr. Moore, and their American Ambassador, Mr. Warnock, led a distinguished group of Foundation members for a 2-week visit to Ireland, where the working relationship between the foundation and the Government of Ireland was greatly fortified.

It is my pleasure to submit herewith the foundation's report:

REPORT OF AMERICAN IRISH FOUNDATION

AN HISTORIC RETURN

The first meeting of the American Irish Foundation held in Ireland was attended by 160 American business, professional and cultural leaders. The group left New York City on May 26, 1972, and returned June 7; these two weeks were extraordinary not only because of the promise they hold for the fulfillment of the Foundation goals, but also for providing an Irish experience of rare and warm memory.

County Clare

The first gathering at Dromoland Castle was welcomed by Foundation President John P. Cosgrove, Host John A. Mulcahy, the United States Ambassador to Ireland, Hon. John D. J. Moore, and the Irish Ambassador to the United States, Hon. William Warnock, all members of the Foundation board.

The Chief Justice of Ireland, Hon. Cearbhall O'Dalaigh, spoke eloquently of the relationship which has bound Ireland and the United States through the past two centuries.

At Dromoland, too, the nightly tradition of a hoolie was inaugurated by the internationally acclaimed Shannon Castle Entertainers and by Balladier Terry Wilson. Bob Hope, who with Mrs. Hope joined the party at Dromoland, provided a special American dimension to the celebration.

At Kilfrush House, where President Nixon had planted a California Sequoia when he was the guest of Mr. Mulcahy, all were enchanted by County Clare's young dancers.

County Kerry

Amid Killarney's Lakes the guests heard Dr. Patrick Hillery, Minister of Foreign Affairs, speak of the new Ireland and the potential which its membership in the European Economic Community holds for that country. Also, a tour of Muckross House was led by Foundation Director A. W. B. Vincent, whose family gave the House and the Bourn Vincent National Park to Ireland.

Waterville

The Foundation group participated in another and most pleasurable first: they were the initial guests of Mr. Mulcahy at the new Waterville Lake Hotel, the first to golf on its championship course, and enjoy the cuisine of the Hotel.

Columnist Bob Considine, arriving from Moscow, recounted to fellow guests his experiences during President Nixon's trip to Russia. Mr. George Colley, Minister for Finance and the Gaeltacht, discussed Ireland's position as a base for United States industrial products with a European market horizon. Two other governmental leaders, Mr. Michael Killean, of the Irish Industrial Development Authority, and Mr. Thomas Garvey, of the Export Board, further described the aspirations and the spirit of the new Ireland.

Here, too, the richness of Ireland's cultural past and present was recognized by the presentation of the first American Irish Foundation Literary Award to Austin Clarke.

All were able to come to know and never forget Kerry, its peace and beauty.

Dublin

Foundation guests had the special privilege of a visit with President Eamon de Valera at Arus an Uachtarain in Phoenix Park. He spoke warmly of his own American and Irish heritagle and of his hopes for the Foundation and its promise for strengthening the ties between the two countries.

The final dinner in the Gresham Hotel was addressed by Mr. Erskine Childers, Tanaiste and Minister for Health, who suggested many projects of great importance to the people of Ireland which the Foundation could foster.

Grants in Ireland

$60,000—The Central Remedial Clinic, which offers a broad range of services to children and adults suffering from severe physical handicaps.

$3,000—Kilarney Bach Festival, a second grant to provide support for this program which won praise of audiences and critics.

$6,000—The National Gallery for acquisitions of works for the American Wing.

$1,500—Extern Training Grant to assist two Irish extern students to improve medical skills in institutions in the United States.

The Board of Directors also visited schools in Shannon and Limerick to which teaching equipment had been given last year, and the Royal Irish Academy in Dublin, which had received a grant of $25,000 for its undertaking to provide an authoritative history of Ireland.

In addition to this, two important medical fellowships were established for Irish physicians. Dr. Howard Rusk, Director of the Institute of Rehabilitation Medicine, New York University Medical Center, announced that the Institute would provide a two-year fellowship in rehabilitation medicine. Mr. Patrick Frawley provided a fellowship in alcoholic rehabilitation education.

President Cosgrove also announced that $70,000 in gifts had been received to support future projects of the Foundation.

New directors

Three directors were elected to the Board of the Foundation at its meeting in Ireland. They are Admiral John J. Bergen, New York City, Mr. William T. Brady, Beverly Hills, California, and Mr. Wallace E. Carroll, Lake Forest, Illinois. All are members of a number of corporate and civic boards. Adm. Bergen is the honorary Chairman of Madison Square Garden Corporation, New York City; Mr. Brady is the honorary Chairman of the Board of CPC International, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey; and Mr. Carroll is Chairman of the Board of Katy Industries, Elgin, Illinois.

Foundation President Cosgrove joined with Ambassador Moore and Ambassador Warnock in welcoming these three respected leaders to the Board.

Foundation goals

It is the continuing goal of the Foundation to reflect the concern and the appreciation of Americans of Irish descent for the land of their forefathers and to provide a national organization for all Americans who wish to share in strengthening the Irish heritage. It was founded in 1963 at the time of the historic visit of President John F. Kennedy to Ireland in response to stated hopes of President de Valera. The two Presidents served as the Foundation's first honorary co-chairmen. Both the U.S. Ambassador to Ireland and the Irish Ambassador to the United States are members of the present Board of Directors. The Foundation endorses and supports a broad program of cultural, educational, and scientific activities.

Following are excerpts from William Shannon's Presentation Speech on June 3, 1972, at Waterville, County Kerry:

In your travels this last week, you have seen many different aspects of this country. You have seen scenic Ireland with its incomparable beauty. You have fished and golfed in sporting Ireland. You have listened to musical Ireland. In the address of the Chief Justice, you have heard about Ireland's place in history. In the address of Dr. Hillery, the Foreign Minister, you have

heard about the determination of Irish Statesmen to lead this country into a United Europe and to find in a wise and responsible way a peaceful solution to the crisis in the North. In the industrial development and handsome new housing around Shannon Airport, you have caught a glimpse of a booming, go-ahead country with a rapid economic growth rate. In short, you have seen an Ireland in rapid transition from a rural past to a dynamic and creative present and future. In the last half century, and particularly in the last 20 years, Ireland has shaken off the crippling effects of military defeats and centuries of colonial bondage. A moment's reflection makes clear that there is intrinsically no good reason why Irish people, who have shown themselves in the United States of America to be keen businessmen and highly talented professionals in law, medicine, banking and other fields, could not put the same abilities to use in this country if only they had been given the opportunity.

Now that opportunity is theirs and they are making good use of it. The last generation and the younger generation of today are changing the face and spirit of Ireland.

But tragic though Ireland's history has been for several hundred years, there is also much in that heritage worth preserving and remembering—the music, the literature, the good talk, the traditions of neighborliness and hospitality which can make a visit to Ireland such a warm experience. No nation can cut itself off completely from its deepest roots and hope to flower.

The American Irish Foundation is dedicated to a two-fold task. We assist the new Ireland that is rapidly emerging. We have donated the teaching machines to Irish schools and helped finance pioneering programs in medical research and physical rehabilitation which Dr. Howard Rusk praised in our meeting at Dromoland Castle. The other half of our task is to rescue the usable past and to nurture Irish culture. That is why we have financed the publication of the first comprehensive, scholarly history of the nation, a vast scholarly enterprise now well advanced. That is why we support cultural projects like the Killarney Bach Festival. These scholarly and artistic undertakings are rarely, if ever, financially self-supporting. If there is not a foundation to subsidize them, they wither and die.

Ireland is famous for its literature. But in any country, the best writing often sells slowly in a writer's own lifetime. Yet literature is the indispensable memory of a people. To help the always hazardous enterprise of literature, the Foundation established the annual American Irish Foundation Literary Award.

Mr. Speaker, I present herewith the names of the directors of this distinguished foundation:

President John P. Cosgrove, 943 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

Vice President & Secretary Edward A. McDermott, Hogan & Hartson, 815 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Treasurer T. Kevin Mallen, Sutro & Company, 460 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, California.

Hon. John D. J. Moore, United States Ambassador to Ireland, 42 Elgin Road, Dublin, Ireland.

Hon. William Warnock, Ambassador of Ireland to the United States, 2234 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Rear Adm. John J. Bergen, USNR (Ret.) Honorary Chairman, Madison Square Garden Corp., Two Pennsylvania Plaza, New York, New York.

William T. Brady, Honorary Chairman, CPC International, 430 Trousdale Place, Beverly Hills, California.

Wallace E. Carroll, Chairman of the Board, Katy Industries, Inc., 853 Dundee Avenue, Elgin, Illinois.

Joseph Gannon, 77 Franklin Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

H. Thomas Hallowell, Jr., Chairman of the Board, Standard Pressed Steel Co., 916 Benson East, Jenkintown, Pennsylvania.

Charles Lucey, Route 2, Thurmont, Maryland.

John A. Mulcahy, Quigley Company, Inc., 235 East 42nd Street, New York, New York.

Donald O'Toole, President, Financial Management Associates, Inc., 2400 95th Street, Evergreen Park, Illinois.

William V. Shannon, Editorial Board, The New York Times, 1920 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

James Johnson Sweeney, 120 East End Avenue, New York, New York.

A. W. B. Vincent, 155 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, California.

Executive Secretary Thomas F. Jordan, 81 Shore View Avenue, San Francisco, California.

STATISTICS ON GAO MINORITY EMPLOYEES

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, a current analysis of General Accounting Office personnel policies clearly indicates the degree of inequity in hiring by this important agency.

As an indication of this bias, I now insert into the RECORD some charts which clearly show the personnel hiring patterns of GAO:

GAO MINORITY REPORT—FULL TIME CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, FIELD OPERATIONS DIVISION

[Issued May 31, 1972]

Region	Total all employees	Black	Spanish surnamed	American Indian	Oriental	None of these
Headquarters	8	0	0	0	0	8
Atlanta	125	0	0	0	0	125
Boston	104	0	0	0	0	104
Chicago	109	3	0	0	0	106
Cincinnati	125	6	1	0	0	118
Dallas [1]	156	0	6	0	0	150
Denver	120	3	3	0	0	114
Detroit	127	6	0	0	0	121
Kansas City	130	0	2	0	0	128
Los Angeles	117	4	5	0	2	106
New York [2]	101	4	0	0	0	97
Norfolk	73	0	0	0	0	73
Philadelphia	131	1	0	0	0	130
San Francisco	116	3	2	0	8	103
Seattle [3]	102	2	0	0	1	99
Washington, D.C. [4]	164	7	0	0	1	156
Total, field operations division	1,808	39	19	0	12	1,739

[1] The Dallas region covers the States of Mississippi, Louisiana, Kansas, and Texas.
[2] The New York regional office has only 1 black professional on its staff.
[3] The 2 black employees in the Seattle regional office are a GS–1 and a GS–2.
[4] The Washington, D.C., regional office is located in Falls Church, Va.

U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE—OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE EMPLOYEES—FIELD OPERATIONS DIVISION, BY GRADE AS OF JUNE 30, 1970

Grade	Regional offices																	Military branches						Total all FOD
	Hqs.	Atl.	Bos.	Chi.	Cin.	Dal.	Den.	Det.	K.C.	L.A.	N.O.	N.Y.	Nor.	Phi.	S.F.	Sea.	F.C.	Total	AF	Army	Navy	M.C.	F.C.	Total	
GS–01																1		1							1
GS–02							1											1		4				4	5
GS–03				1		1	2		1	4	2	1	1	2	2	1	3	21	3	2				5	26
GS–04		4	2	3	4	2	2	4	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	4	5	41	1	3	1			5	46
Total, 1–4		4	2	4	4	3	5	4	3	5	3	2	3	4	4	6	8	64	4	9	1			14	78
GS–05	1	2	3	3	1	2		3	2	1	1	2		2	2	1	3	29	2	1	2			5	34
GS–06		1	1		1	1	1			1		1	1	1	2	1	1	13							13
GS–07	1	2	3	1	3	2	4	4	2	1	2	2	1		1	2	5	36					6	6	42
GS–08	1																	1	8	4	9		1	22	23
Total, 5–8	3	6	7	4	5	5	5	7	4	3	3	5	2	3	5	4	9	79	10	5	11		7	33	112
GS–09		1	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	3	1	4	3	2	1	1	6	32							32
GS–10																			1				1	2	2
GS–11							2	2		1		3	1		1	3	3	16						1	17
Total, 9–11		1	1	1	1	1	3	4	3	4	1	7	4	2	2	4	9	48	1		1		1	3	57

Grade	Regional offices																Military branches						Total all FOD
	Hqs.	Atl.	Bos.	Chi.	Cin.	Dal.	Den.	Det.	K.C.	L.A.	N.O.	N.Y.	Nor.	Phi.	S.F.	Sea.	F.C.	Total	AF	Army	Navy	M.C.	F.C.	Total	
GS-12																	2	2							2
GS-13																									
Total, 12-13																	2	2							2
GS-14																									
GS-15																									
Total, 14-15																									
GS-16																									
GS-17																									
GS-18																									
Total, 16-18																									
Total, all grades	3	10	10	9	10	9	13	15	10	12	7	14	9	9	11	14	28	193	15	14	13	8	50	243	

H.R. 1: SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICAL ASSISTANCE, AND OTHER AMENDMENTS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the passage of H.R. 1 by Congress this week will make many changes in the social security, medicare, medicaid, and other federally assisted programs. A number of these enact into law provisions which I have introduced as individual bills.

First, increase in widow's and widower's social security benefits from 82½ to 100 percent of the spouse's entitlement;

Second, increase in the earnings permitted a social security beneficiary without penalty from $1,600 to $2,100, with a benefit reduction of 50 cents for each dollar earned over $2,100—I wanted to increase to $9,000;

Third, elimination of the support requirements for divorced women receiving social security benefits;

Fourth, reduction of the duration-of-relationship requirements for social security eligibility;

Fifth, automatic enrollment in part B of medicare unless the enrollee expressly turns it down and total repeal of the arbitrary 3-year limitation on part B enrollment; and,

Sixth, provision that no one be rendered ineligible for medicaid by virtue of the 20-percent social security increase taking effect October 3, 1972, and provision that the first $4 per month of that increase not be subtracted from old age assistance—I fought, together with Congressman JONATHAN BINGHAM and New York State Assemblyman Al Blumenthal, to require that all of the 20-percent increase be disregarded in computing old age benefits, food stamp eligibility, eligibility for surplus agricultural commodities, rents in public housing, and subsidies of mortgages and rents under title II of the National Housing Act.

There follows a detailed memorandum covering a number of the significant changes wrought by H.R. 1:

SUMMARY OF MAJOR POINTS OF H.R. 1, THE "SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1972" AS APPROVED BY THE CONGRESS

I. SOCIAL SECURITY CASH BENEFIT PROVISIONS

1. Special minimum cash benefits

The bill would provide a special minimum benefit of $8.50 multiplied by the number of years in covered employment up to 30 years, producing a benefit of at least $170 a month for a worker who has been employed for 30 years under social security coverage. This benefit would be paid as an alternative to the regular benefits in cases where a higher benefit would result.

Under this provision, the new higher minimum benefit would become payable to people with 20 or more years of employment; at that point, the special minimum benefit would be more than the regular minimum—$85 as compared to the regular minimum benefit of $84.50 payable under present law. A worker with 25 years of employment under social security would thus be guaranteed a benefit of at least $127.50; while one with 30 years would receive at least $170 a month. Minimum payments to a couple would be one and one-half times these amounts.

Years of covered employment:	*Special minimum*
19 or less	(1)
20	$85.00
21	93.50
22	102.00
23	110.50
24	119.00
25	127.50
26	136.00
27	144.50
28	153.00
29	161.50
30 or more	170.00

[1] Regular $84.50 minimum applies.

Effective date.—January 1973.

2. Increase in widow's and widower's insurance benefits

Under present law, when benefits begin at or after age 62 the benefit for a widow (or dependent widower) is equal to 82½ percent of the amount the deceased worker would have received if his benefit had started when he was age 65. A widow can get a benefit at age 60 reduced to take account of the additional 2 years in which she would be getting benefits.

The bill would provide benefits for a widow equal to the benefit her deceased husband would have received if he were still living. Under the bill, a widow whose benefits start at age 65 or after would receive either 100 percent of her deceased husband's primary insurance amount (the amount he would have been entitled to receive if he began his retirement at age 65) or, if his benefits began before age 65, an amount equal to the reduced benefit he would have been receiving if he were alive.

Under the bill, the benefit for a widow (or widower) who comes on the rolls between 60 and 65, would be reduced (in a way similar to the way in which widows' benefits are reduced under present law when they begin drawing benefits between ages 60 and 62) to take account of the longer period over which the benefit would be paid.

Effective date.—January 1973.

3. Increased benefits for those who delay retirement beyond age 65

The bill includes a provision which would provide for an increase in social security benefits of 1 percent for each year after age 65 that the individual delays his retirement.

Effective date.—For computation and recomputation after 1973 based on earnings after 1973.

4. Age 62 computation point for men

Under present law, the method of computing benefits for men and women differs in that years up to age 65 must be taken into account in determining average earnings for men, while for women only years up to age 62 must be taken into account. Also, benefit eligibility is figured up to age 65 for men, but only up to age 62 for women. Under the bill, these differences, which provide special advantages for women, would be eliminated by applying the same rules to men as now apply to women.

Effective date.—The new provision would become effective, starting January 1973 and become fully effective in January 1975.

5. Liberalization of the retirement test

The amount that a beneficiary under age 72 may earn in a year and still be paid full social security benefits for the year would be increased from the present $1,600 to $2,100. Under present law, benefits are reduced by $1 for each $2 of earnings between $1,680 and $2,800 and for each $1 of earnings above $2,880. The committee bill would provide for a $1 reduction for each $2 of all earnings above $2,100, there would be no $1-for-$1 reduction as under present law. Also, in the year in which a person attains age 72 his earnings in and after the month in which he attains age 72 would not be included, as they are under present law, in determining his total earnings for the year.

Future increases in the amount of exempt earnings would be automatic as average earnings rise.

Effective date.—January 1973.

6. Dependent widower's benefits at age 60

Aged dependent widowers under age 62 could be paid reduced benefits (on the same basis as widows under present law) starting as early as ago 60.

Effective date.—January 1973.

7. Childhood disability benefits

Childhood disability benefits would be paid to the disabled child of an insured retired, deceased, or disabled worker, if the disability began before age 22, rather than before 18 as under present law. In addition, a person who was entitled to childhood disability

benefits could become re-entitled if he again becomes disabled within 7 years after his prior entitlement to such benefits was terminated.

Effective date.—January 1973.

8. Eligibility of a child adopted by an old-age or disability insurance beneficiary

The provisions of present law relating to eligibility requirements for child's benefits in the case of adoption by old-age and disability insurance beneficiaries would be modified to make the requirements uniform in both cases. A child adopted after a retired or disabled worker becomes entitled to benefits would be eligible for child's benefits based on the worker's earnings if the child is the natural child or stepchild of the worker or if (1) the adoption was decreed by a court of competent jurisdiction within the United States, (2) the child lived with the worker in the United States for the year before the worker became disabled or entitled to an old-age or disability insurance benefit, (3) the child received at least one-half of his support from the worker for that year, and (4) the child was under age 18 at the time he began living with the worker.

Effective date.—January 1973.

9. Nontermination of child's benefits by reason of adoption

Under the present law, a child's entitlement to benefits ends if he is adopted unless he is adopted by (1) his natural parent, (2) his natural parent's spouse jointly with the natural parent, (3) the worker (e.g., a stepparent) on whose earnings the child is getting benefits, or (4) a stepparent, grandparent, aunt, uncle, brother, or sister after the death of the worker on whose earnings the child is getting benefits.

Under the bill, a child's benefits would no longer stop when the child is adopted, regardless of who adpots him.

10. Elimination of the support requirements for divorced women

Under present law, benefits are payable to a divorced wife age 62 or older and a divorced widow age 60 or older if her marriage lasted 20 years before the divorce, and to a surviving divorced mother. In order to qualify for any of these benefits a divorced woman is required to show that: (1) she was receiving at least one-half of her support from her former husband, (2) she was receiving substantial contributions from her former husband pursuant to a written agreement, or (3) there was a court order in effect providing for substantial contributions to her support by her former husband. The bill would eliminate these support requirements for divorced wives, divorced widows, and surviving divorced mothers.

Effective date.—January 1973.

11. Waiver of duration-of-marriage requirement in case of remarriage

The duration-of-marriage requirement in present law for entitlement to benefits as a worker's widow, widower, or stepchild—that is, the period of not less than 9 months immediately prior to the day on which the worker died that is now required (except where death was accidental or in the line of duty in the uniformed service in which case the period is 3 months)—would be waived in cases where the worker and his spouse were previously married, divorced, and remarried, if they were married at the time of the worker's death and if the duration-of-marriage requirement would have been met at the time of the divorce had the worker died then.

Effective date.—January 1973.

12. Reduction in waiting period for disability benefits

Under the bill, the present 6-month period throughout which a person must be disabled before he can be paid disability benefits would be reduced by 1 month (to 5 months).

Effective date.—January 1973.

13. Disability benefits affected by the receipt of workmen's compensation

Under present law, social security disability benefits must be reduced when workmen's compensation is also payable if the combined payments exceed 80 percent of the worker's average current earnings before disablement. Average current earnings for this purpose can be computed on two different bases and the larger amount will be used. This bill adds a third alternative base, under which a worker's average current earnings can be based on the 1 year of his highest earnings in a period consisting of the year of disablement and the 5 preceding years.

Effective date.—January 1973.

14. Duration-of-relationship requirements

Amends the provision of present law which reduces from 9 months to 3 months the duration-of-relationship requirement when death is accidental or in line of duty in the Armed Forces so that there would be no duration-of-relationship requirement in cases of an accidental death if it is reasonable to expect that in a period consisting of the year of disablement and the 5 preceding years.

Effective date.—January 1973.

II. MEDICARE-MEDICAID AMENDMENTS

1. Medicare coverage for the disabled

Effective July 1, 1973, a social security disability beneficiary would be covered under medicare after he had been entitled to disability benefits for not less than 24 consecutive months. Those covered would include disabled workers at any age; disabled widows and disabled dependent widowers between the ages of 50 and 65; beneficiaries age 18 or older who receive benefits because of disability prior to reaching age 22; and disabled qualified railroad retirement annuitants. An estimated 1.7 million disabled beneficiaries would be eligible initially.

2. Hospital insurance for the uninsured

The bill will permit persons age 65 or over who are ineligible for part A of medicare to voluntarily enroll for hospital insurance coverage by paying the full cost of coverage (initially estimated at $33 monthly and to be recalculated annually). Where the Secretary of HEW finds it administratively feasible, those State and other public employee groups which have, in the past, voluntarily elected *not* to participate in the Social Security program could opt for and pay the part A premium costs for their retired or active employees age 65 or over. Enrollment in part B of medicare would be required as a condition of buying into the part A program.

Effective date: July 1, 1973.

3. Part B premium increases

The bill will limit part B premium increases for fiscal years 1974 and thereafter to not more than the percentage by which the Social Security cash benefits had been generally increased since the last part B premium adjustment. Costs above those met by such premium payments would be paid out of general revenues in addition to the regular general revenue matching.

Effective date: July 1, 1973.

4. Part B deductible

Beginning with calendar year 1973, the bill increases the annual part B deductible from $50 to $60.

5. Automatic enrollment in part B

Effective July 1, 1973, the bill provides (except for residents of Puerto Rico and foreign countries) for automatic enrollment under part B for the elderly and the disabled as they become eligible for part A hospital insurance coverage. Persons eligible for automatic enrollment must also be fully informed as to the procedure and given an opportunity to decline the coverage.

6. Cost sharing under medicaid

The bill made the following changes with respect to premiums, copayments, and deductibles under medicaid.

1. It requires States which cover the medically indigent to impose monthly premium charges. The premium would be graduated by income in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary.

2. States could, at their option, require payment by the medically indigent of nominal deductibles and nominal co-payment amounts which would not have to vary by level of income.

3. With respect to cash assistance recipients, nominal deductible and co-payment requirements, while prohibited for the six mandatory services required under Federal law (inpatient hospital services; outpatient hospital services; other X-ray and laboratory services; skilled nursing home services; physicians' services; and home health services), would be permitted with respect to optional medicaid services such as prescribed drugs, hearing aids, etc.

Effective date: January 1973.

7. Protection against loss of medicaid because of increased earnings

An individual or member of a family eligible for cash public assistance and medicaid who would otherwise lose eligibility for medicaid as a result of increased earnings from employment would be continued on medicaid for a period of 4 months from the date where medicaid eligibility would otherwise terminate.

8. Optometrists under medicaid

The bill requires States, which had previously covered optometric services under medicaid and which, in their State plans, specifically provided for coverage for eye care under "physicians' services," which an optometrist is licensed to provide, to reimburse for such care whether provided by a physician or an optometrist.

Effective date: Enactment.

9. Beneficiary liability under medicare

The bill would, with respect to claims for services provided after the date of enactment, relieve beneficiaries from liability in certain * * *.

10. Limits on payments to skilled nursing facilities and intermediate care facilities under medicaid

Effective January 1, 1973, Federal financial participation in reimbursement for skilled nursing facility care and intermediate care per diem costs would not be available to the extent such costs exceed 105 percent of prior year levels of payment under the provision (except for those costs attributable to any additional required services). The provision would except increased payment resulting from increases in the Federal minimum wage or other new Federal laws.

Payments to health maintenance organizations

Authorizes medicare to make a single combined Part A and B payment, on a capitation basis to a "Health Maintenance Organization," which would agree to provide care to a group not more than one-half of whom are medicare beneficiaries who freely choose this arrangement. Such payments may not exceed 100 percent of present Part A and B per capita costs in a given geographic area, and the exact amount of the payment would be dependent on the efficiency of the HMO.

The Secretary could make these arrangements with existing prepaid groups and foundations, and with new organizations which eventually meet the broadly defined term "Health Maintenance Organization."

Effective date: July 1973.

12. Termination of payment to suppliers of service

Under the bill the Secretary would be authorized to suspend or terminate medicare payments to a provider found to have abused the program. Further, there would be no Federal participation in medicaid payments which might be made subsequently to this provider. Program review teams would be established in each State to furnish the Secretary with professional advice in discharging this authority.

Effective date: January 1973.

13. Elimination of requirement that States move toward comprehensive medicaid program

The bill repeals Section 1903(e) which required each State to show that it was making efforts in the direction of broadening the scope of services in its medicaid program and liberalizing eligibility requirements for medical assistance.

14. Elimination of medicaid maintenance of effort

The bill repeals Section 1902(d). Under Section 1902(d) a State could not reduce its aggregate expenditures for the State share of its medicaid program from one year to the next.

Effective date: Enactment.

15. Customary charges less than reasonable costs under medicare

Effective for accounting periods beginning after December 31, 1972, the bill provides that reimbursement for services under medicaid and medicare cannot exceed the lesser of reasonable costs determined under medicare, or the customary charges to the general public. The provisions would not apply to services furnished by public providers free of charge or at a nominal fee. In such cases reimbursement would be based on those items included in the reasonable cost determination which would result in fair compensation.

Effective date: January 1973.

16. Prohibition against reassignment of claims for benefits

Effective January 1, 1973, the bill prohibits payment to anyone other than the physician or other person who provided the service, unless such person is required as a condition of his employment to turn his fees over to his employer.

17. Notification of unnecessary hospital and skilled nursing facility admissions

The bill requires notification to patient and physician and a payment cut-off after 3 days, in those cases where unnecessary utilization is discovered during a sample review of admissions to medicare hospitals or skilled nursing facilities.

18. Penalty for fraudulent acts and false reporting

The bill establishes penalties for soliciting, offering or accepting bribes or kickbacks, or for concealing events affecting a person's rights to benefit with intent to defraud, and for converting benefit payments to improper use, of up to one year's imprisonment and a $10,000 fine or both. Additionally, the bill establishes false reporting of a material fact as to conditons or operations of a health care facility as a misdemeanor subject to up to 6 months' imprisonment, a fine of $2,000, or both.

19–22. Skilled nursing facilities under medicare and medicaid

19. Conforming standards for extended care and skilled nursing home facilities.—The bill would establish a single definition and set of standards for extended care facilities under medicare and skilled nursing homes under medicaid. The provision creates a single category of "skilled nursing facilities" which would be eligible to participate in both health care programs. A "skilled nursing facility" would be defined as an institution meeting the present definition of an extended care facility and which also satisfies certain other medicaid requirements set forth in the Social Security Act.

Effective date: July 1973.

20. "Skilled care" definition for medicare and medicaid.—The bill would change the definition of care requirements with respect to entitlement for extended care benefits under medicare and with respect to skilled nursing care under medicaid. Present law would be amended to authorize skilled care benefits for individuals in need of "skilled nursing care and/or skilled rehabilitation services on a daily basis in a skilled nursing facility which it is practical to provide only on an inpatient basis." Coverage would also be continued during short-term periods (e.g. a day or two) when no skilled services were actually provided but when discharge from a skilled facility for such brief period was neither desirable nor practical.

Effective date: January 1973.

21. 14-Day transfer requirement for extended care benefits.—Under existing law, medicare beneficiaries are entitled to extended care benefits only if they are transferred to an extended care facility within 14 days following discharge from a hospital. Under the bill an interval of more than 14 days would be authorized for patients whose conditions did not permit immediate provision of skilled services within the 14-day limitation. An extension not to exceed 2 weeks beyond the 14 days would also be authorized in those instances where an admission to an ECF is prevented because of the non-availability of appropriate bed space in facilities ordinarily utilized by patients in a geographic area. *Effective date:* Enactment.

22. Reimbursement rates for care in skilled nursing facilities.—The bill amends title 19 to require States, by July 1, 1976, to reimburse skilled nursing and intermediate care facilities on a reasonably cost-related basis, using acceptable cost-finding techniques and methods approved and validated by the Secretary of HEW. Cost reimbursement methods which the Secretary found to be acceptable for a State's medicaid program could be adapted, with appropriate adjustments, for purposes of medicare skilled nursing facility reimbursements in that State.

23. Federal financing of nursing home inspections

The bill authorizes 100% Federal reimbursement for the survey and inspection costs of skilled nursing facilities and intermediate care facilities under medicaid, from October 1, 1972, through July 1, 1974.

24. Prohibition against institutional medical care payments under cash welfare programs

The bill precludes Federal matching for that portion of any money payment which is related to institutional medical or remedial care.

25. Determining eligibility for medicaid for certain individuals

Individuals eligible for medicaid in September 1972 could not lose their eligibility because of the recent 20% social security benefit increase until October 1973.

26. Physical therapy services and other services under medicare

Effective July 1973, the bill would include as covered services under part B, physical therapy provided in the therapist's office pursuant to a physician's written plan of treatment.

It also authorizes a hospital or extended care facility to provide outpatient physical therapy services to its inpatients, so that an inpatient could conveniently receive his part B benefits after his inpatient benefits have expired.

Benefit payments in one year for services by an independent practitioner in his office or the patient's home could not exceed $100. Effective January 1973, reimbursement for services provided by physical and other therapists would generally be limited to a reasonable salary-related basis rather than fee-for-service basis.

27. Coverage of supplies related to colostomies

The bill provides for medicare coverage of the costs of supplies directly related to the care of a colostomy.

28. Coverage prior to application for medicaid

The bill requires, effective July 1, 1973, all States to provide medicaid coverage for care and services furnished in or after the third month prior to application to those individuals who were otherwise eligible when the services were received. Included as eligible under the three-months retroactive coverage requirement would be deceased individuals whose fatal condition prevented them from applying for medicaid coverage but who would have been eligible if application had been made.

States are expected to modify their provider agreements where applicable so as to permit the application of appropriate utilization control procedures retroactively in these cases to assure that appropriate and necessary care was delivered.

29. Hospital admissions for dental services under medicare

The bill authorizes the dentist who is caring for a medicare patient to make the certification of the necessity for inpatient hospital admission for noncovered dental services under the above circumstances without requiring a corroborating certification by a physician.

This provision would be effective with respect to admissions occurring after the second month following enactment of the bill.

30. Extension of grace period for termination of supplementary medical insurance coverage where failure to pay premiums is due to good cause

The bill extends the 90-day grace period for an additional 90 days where the Secretary finds that there was good cause for failure to pay the premium before the expiration of the initial 90-day grace period.

This provision would apply to such cases of nonpayment of premiums due within the 90-day period preceding the date of enactment.

31. Extension of time for filing claim for supplementary medical insurance benefits where delay is due to administrative error

The bill provides that where a claim under supplementary medical insurance is not filed timely due to error of the Government or one of its agencies, the claim may nevertheless be honored if filed as soon as possible after the facts in the case have been established.

This amendment would apply with respect to bills submitted and requests for payment made after March 1968.

32. Waiver of enrollment period requirements where individual's rights were prejudiced by administrative error or inaction

The bill authorizes the Secretary to provide such equitable relief as may be necessary to correct or eliminate the effects of these situations, including (but not limited to) the establishment of a special initial or subsequent enrollment period, with a coverage period determined on the basis thereof and with appropriate adjustments of premiums.

This provision would apply to all cases which have arisen since the beginning of the program.

33. Elimination of provision preventing enrollment in supplementary medical insurance program more than 3 years after first opportunity

The bill eliminates the 3-year limit with respect to both initial enrollment and re-

enrollment after an initial termination. Enrollment periods would remain as presently defined and the restriction limiting individuals who terminate enrollment to reenroll only once would be retained.

This provision would apply to all those who are ineligible to enroll because of the 3-year limit in effect under present law.

34. Waiver of recovery of incorrect medicare payments from survivor who is without fault

The bill permits any individual who is liable for repayment of a medicare overpayment to qualify for waiver of recovery of the overpaid amount if he is without fault and if such recovery would defeat the purpose of title II or would be against equity and good conscience.

35. Requirement of minimum amount of claim to establish entitlement to hearing under supplementary medical insurance program

The bill requires that a minimum amount of $100 be at issue before an enrollee in the supplementary medical insurance program will be granted a fair hearing by the carrier.

The provision would be effective with respect to hearings requested after the enactment of the bill.

36. Provide that services of optometrists in furnishing prosthetic lenses not require a physician's order

The bill would recognize the ability of an optometrist to attest to a beneficiary's need for prosthetic lenses by amending the definition of the term "physician" in title XVIII to include a doctor of optometry authorized to practice optometry by the State in which he furnishes services. An optometrist would be recognized as a "physician" only for the purpose of attesting to the patient's need for prosthetic lenses. (Of course, neither the physician nor the optometrist would be paid by medicare for refractive services when the beneficiary has been given a prescription by a physician for the necessary prosthetic lenses.) This change would not provide for coverage of services performed by optometrists other than those covered under present law, nor would it permit an optometrist to serve as a "physician" on a professional standards review organization.

37. Exemption of Christian Science sanatoriums from certain nursing home requirements under medicaid

The bill exempts Christian Science sanatoriums from the requirements for a licensed nursing home administrator, requirements for medical review, and other inappropriate requirements of the medicaid program.

Such sanatoriums will be expected to continue to meet all applicable safety standards.

38. Coverage of chiropractic services under part B of medicare

The bill broadens the definition of the term "physician" in title XVIII to include a licensed chiropractor who also meets uniform minimum standards to be promulgated by the Secretary.

The services furnished by chiropractors would be covered under the program as "physicians' services," but only with respect to treatment of the spine by means of manual manipulation which the chiropractor is legally authorized to perform. Claims for such treatment must be verifiable with a satisfactory X-ray indicating the existence of a subluxation of the spine.

The amendment would become effective with respect to services provided on or after July 1, 1973.

39. Chiropractors' services under medicaid

The bill conforms the coverage of chiropractic under medicaid with the provision conditioning eligibility of such services included in the amendment adding chiropractic coverage to Part B of medicare except for the requirement that an X-ray show the existence of a subluxation.

40. Direct laboratory billing of patients

The bill provides that, with respect to diagnostic laboratory tests for which payment is to be made to a laboratory, the Secretary would be authorized to negotiate a payment rate with the laboratory which would be considered the full charge for such tests, and for which reimbursement would be made at 100% of such negotiated rate. Such negotiated rate would be limited to an amount not to exceed the total payment that would have been made in the absence of such rate.

41. Clarification of meaning of "physicians' services" under title XIX

The bill defines a physician, under Title XIX, for purposes of the mandatory provision of physicians' services as being a duly licensed doctor of medicine or osteopathy.

42. Limitation on adjustment or recovery of incorrect payments under the medicare program

The bill would limit medicare's right of recovery of overpayments to a 3-year period (or a 1-year period) from the date or payment where the beneficiary acted in good faith; would permit the Secretary to set a time between 1 and 3 years within which claims for underpayment would have to be made.

43. Speech pathology services under medicare

The bill would cover under medicare the costs of speech pathology services where such services are provided in clinics participating in the program as providers of covered physical therapy services.

44. Repeal of section 1903(b)(1)

The bill deletes the requirement that States spend at least as much for care of individuals who are 65 or over in mental hospitals as in fiscal year 1965.

45. Coverage under medicaid of intermediate care furnished in mental and tuberculosis institutions

The bill provides that intermediate care can be covered for individuals age 65 or older in mental institutions if such individuals could also be covered when in mental hospitals for hospital or skilled nursing facility care. *Effective date*: Services furnished after December 31, 1972.

46. Treatment in mental hospitals for medicaid eligibles under age 21

The bill authorizes coverage of inpatient care (under specific conditions) in mental institutions for medicaid eligibles under age 21. *Effective date:* January 1973.

47. Public disclosure of information concerning survey reports of an institution

The bill requires the Secretary to make reports of an institution's significant deficiencies or the absence thereof (such as in the areas of staffing, fire safety, and sanitation) a matter of public record readily and generally available. Such information would be available for inspection within 90 days of completion of the survey.

48. Family planning services mandatory under medicaid

(1) The bill authorizes 90% Federal funding for the costs of family planning services under medicaid and title IV.

(2) Provision requires States to make available on a voluntary and confidential basis such counseling, services and supplies, directly and/or on a contract basis with family planning organizations throughout the State, to present, former, or likely recipients who are of child-bearing age and who express a desire for such services.

(3) The Federal share of AFDC funds would be reduced by 1%, beginning in fiscal 1974, if a State in the prior year fails to inform the adults in AFDC families of the availability of family planning services or if the State fails to actually provide or arrange for such services for persons desiring to receive them who are applicants or recipients of cash assistance.

49. Penalty for failure to provide child health screening services under medicaid

The bill would reduce the Federal share of AFDC matching funds by 1%, beginning in fiscal 1975, if a State—

(a) fails to inform the adults in FDC families of the availability of child health screening services;

(b) fails to actually provide or arrange for such services; or

(c) fails to arrange for or refer to appropriate corrective treatment children disclosed by such screening as suffering illness or impairment.

50. Home health coinsurance

Effective January 1973, the bill eliminates requirement of coinsurance payment under Part B of medicare for home health services.

51. Medicare appeals

The bill clarifies present law that there is no authorization for an appeal to the Secretary or for judicial review on matters solely involving amounts of benefits under part B, and that insofar as part A amounts are concerned, appeal is authorized only if the amount in controversy is $100 or more and judicial review only if the amount in controversy is $1,000 or more.

52. Medicare: Coverage of persons needing kidney transplantation or dialysis

The bill provides that fully or currently insured workers under social security and their dependents with chronic renal disease would be deemed disabled for purposes of coverage under parts A and B of medicare. Coverage would begin 3 months after a course of renal dialysis is begun.

III. SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME FOR THE AGED, BLIND, AND DISABLED

The bill would replace the present State programs of aid to the aged, blind, and disabled, effective January 1, 1974, with a new wholly Federal program of supplemental security income.

National supplemental security income; disregard of social security or other income

Under the bill, aged, blind, and disabled persons with no other income would be guaranteed a monthly income of at least $130 for an individual or $195 for a couple. In addition the bill would provide that the first $20 of social security or any other income would not cause any reduction in supplemental security income payments.

As a result, aged, blind, and disabled persons who also have monthly income from social security or other sources (which are not need-related) of at least $20 (would, be assured total monthly income of at least $150 for individual or $215 for a couple.

Earned income disregard

In addition to a monthly disregard of $20 of social security or other income, there would be an additional disregard of $65 of earned income plus one-half of any earnings above $65. This will enable those aged, blind and disabled individuals who are able to do some work to do so and in the process give them a higher income in addition to supplemental security income.

In addition, as under present law, any income necessary for the fulfillment of a plan for achieving self-support would be disregarded for persons qualifying on the basis of blindness. A savings clause would assure that blind persons would not receive any reduction in benefits due to these provisions.

Definitions of blindness and disabilty

Under present law each State is free to prescribe its own definition of blindness and

disability for purposes of eligibility for aid to the blind and aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

Under the new supplemental security income program, there would be a uniform Federal definition of "disability" and "blindness."

The term "disability" would be defined as "inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 months." This definition is the same as that now used in the Social Security disability insurance program.

The term "blindness" would be defined as central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye with the use of correcting lens. Also included in this definition is the particular sight limitation which is referred to as "tunnel vision."

A blind or disabled person who was on the rolls in December 1973 and met the State definition for blindness, disability as defined in the State plan in effect October 1972 would be considered blind or disabled for purposes of this title so long as he continues to be blind or disabled.

No disabled person would be eligible if the disability is medically determined to be due solely to drug addiction or alcoholism unless such individual is undergoing appropriate treatment, if available. Payments for addicts or alcoholics would only be made to third parties as protective payments.

Other Federal eligibility standards

Eligibility for supplemental security income would be open to an aged, blind or disabled individual if his resources were less than $1500 (or $2250 for a couple). In determining the amount of his resources, the value of the home (including land surrounding home), household goods, personal effects, including an automobile, and property needed for self support would, if found to be reasonable, be excluded. Life insurance policies would not be counted if the face value of all policies was less than $1,500. (Current recipients under State programs with higher resources limits would retain their eligibility.)

State supplementation

States wishing to pay an aged, blind or disabled person amounts in addition to the Federal supplemental security income payment would be free to do so. The bill would permit States to enter into agreements for Federal administration of State supplemental benefits. Under these agreements supplemental payments would have to be made to all persons eligible for Federal supplemental security income payments except that a State could require a period of residence in the State as a condition of eligibility.

Ineligibility for food stamps

Individuals in the Supplemental Security Income program would not be eligible for food stamps or surplus commodities.

Medicaid coverage

Under present law, the States are required to cover all cash assistance recipients under the medicaid program. The bill would exempt from this requirement newly eligible recipients who qualify because of the new provision for a $130 minimum benefit with a disregard of $20 of social security or other income.

Social services

States would be authorized to continue programs providing social services to aged, blind, and disabled persons. These services are currently provided under the welfare programs for the aged, blind, and disabled which would be replaced by the new Federal supplemental security income program. There would be 75 percent Federal matching for the services provided, subject to the overall limitations established by the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act.

Amendments to present law for aid to aged, blind, and disabled persons (effective until January 1, 1974):

Separation of social services not required

Separation of social services and eligibility determination is specifically not required.

Cost for providing manuals

At its option, the State may require a charge for reasonable cost of providing manuals and other policy issuances.

Appeals process

The bill provides that the decision of the local agency on the matter considered at an evidentiary hearing may be implemented immediately.

Absence from State for 90 days

The bill provides that the State may make any person ineligible for money payments who has been absent from the State over 90 consecutive days until such person has been present in the State for 30 consecutive days in the case of an individual who has maintained his residence in the State during such period or 90 days in the case of any other individual.

Rent payments for public housing

Permits the States, if they elect to do so, to make rent payments directly to a public housing agency on behalf of a recipient or a group or groups of recipients.

Safeguarding information

The bill permits the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants or recipients to public officials who require such information in connection with their official duties.

Passalong of social security increases

Present law requires State programs of aid to the aged, blind, and disabled to assure that the total income of recipients who also get social security are at least $4 higher as a result of the 1969 social security benefit increase. The bill would add an additional $4 "passalong" related to this year's 20 percent social security increase and would make both "passalong" provisions applicable until January 1974.

IV. CHILD WELFARE SERVICES AND SOCIAL SERVICES

Grants to States for child welfare services (including foster care and adoptions)

The committee adopted an amendment increasing the annual authorization for Federal grants to the States for child welfare services to $196 million in fiscal year 1973, rising to $266 million in 1977 and thereafter. For fiscal year 1973, this is $150 million more than the $46 million which has been appropriated every year since 1967. It is anticipated that a substantial part of any increased appropriation under this higher authorization will go toward meeting the costs of providing foster care which now represents the largest single item of child welfare expenditure on the county level. The bill, however, avoided earmarking amounts specifically for foster care so that wherever possible the State and counties could use the additional funds to expand preventive child welfare services with the aim of helping families stay together and thus avoiding the need for foster care. The additional funds can also be used for adoption services, including action to increase adoptions of hard-to-place children.

Social services

Provides a saving provision to the limitation on expenditures for social services contained in the State and Local Assistance Act of 1972 so that States for the first quarter of fiscal 1973 will be reimbursed as they would have been under previous laws. This saving provision would be applicable only to the extent that the resultant Federal funding for this quarter does not exceed $50 million.

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my best wishes to one of the longtime Members of this body, the Honorable WILLIAM M. COLMER, who will be retiring at the end of this session.

Aside from his able chairmanship of the Rules Committee and his many legislative achievements, BILL'S career in the House of Representatives spans four decades and that of itself is quite an accomplishment as well as an indication of the very high esteem in which he is held by the residents of his district.

It is my understanding that BILL'S constituents have planned a testimonial in his honor next week to give public recognition to his long and devoted service. Without a doubt, the gratitude and appreciation that prompted this tribute is well-deserved.

SCHOOLING FOR AUTISTIC CHILDREN

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, there is no panacea for mental illness. Mental illness, like physical disease, takes many forms; its causes as varied as its symptoms. Perhaps one of the most tragic forms of mental illness is childhood autism. Youngsters who retreat from, or who are unable to cope with reality, are known as autistic.

The autistic child, like all children, needs affection, a sense of security, and a feeling of personal significance. He also needs the chance to learn and to become aware of the world around him.

The following article, "Schooling for Autistic Children," which appeared in the booklet "Autism," by Lorna Wing, describes educational opportunities presently available for autistic children. Although there are many programs designed to help the autistic child, there is an urgent need to establish more educational facilities and to provide the necessary funds for adequate care and treatment for autistic children.

The article follows:

SCHOOLING FOR AUTISTIC CHILDREN

With most autistic children it is obvious, even before they are 5, that education is going to present problems. If they are brought to the attention of the local authority they may be "assessed" to see if they are suitable for education. The decision is based on the results of a statutory medical examina-

tion and psychological tests, plus whatever information can be obtained from other professional workers (e.g. doctors, teachers, educational psychologists, psychiatric social workers, speech therapists, etc.) who may have had dealings with the child. The full medical examination is the only essential part of the assessment process. Information from other sources can be, and usually is, taken into account, but this is not a legal necessity.

The parent has a legal right to be present during the statutory medical examination, and during psychological (intelligence) tests if they are given by the examining medical officer as part of the medical examination. However, if an educational psychologist gives the intelligence tests, this is not regarded as part of the medical examination, and the parent is not legally entitled to be present.

If the child is found to be 'unsuitable for education' he becomes the responsibility of the local health authority. He may then attend a training centre or a special care unit, but would not be able to receive education of any kind from the education authority (e.g. at school, home tuition, or tuition from the education authority in association with any other treatment provided at a hospital). Parents may appeal against the decision within twenty-one days and at yearly intervals afterwards. Appeals should be sent to the Secretary of State for Education and Science, who took over the functions of the Minister of Education in April 1964.

The system of assessment of suitability for education was originally devised to overcome the problems of providing for children who were severely mentally handicapped. At that time, education was considered to be mainly a matter of the three Rs, leading on to further academic work, and it was felt that children below a certain Intelligence Quotient (IQ) were quite unable to benefit from this approach.

Recently, however, ideas have changed considerably. Firstly, many workers now doubt the value of IQ tests for predicting the future development of any child, and especially one who is autistic. Secondly, the concept of education has been widened to include the development of social skills, as well as more conventional subjects.

At the same time, interest in the education of the handicapped child has grown rapidly. Teachers who are trained in this work have found that with the right approach even children with very difficult behaviour problems can eventually be integrated into a class with other children. Education cannot cure a mental or physical handicap. It cannot dissolve away the basic causes of, for example, autistic behaviour, just as it cannot regenerate wasted muscles or restore hearing. What it can do is make the best use of faculties which are intact, develop latent skills, and in doing this make the child concerned happier, interested in life and much easier to live with.

Experiments in the education of all kinds of handicapped children are being carried out in many different types of schools, by teachers with a variety of different approaches. The results are encouraging enough to suggest that the provisions for severely subnormal children and autistic children should be re-examined. It seems a pity that that the Royal Commission on the Law Relating to Mental Illness and Mental Deficiency did not recommend a change in the law, at least to bring England and Wales into line with Scotland, where training centres are under the local Education Authorities. However, the present intense interest in the importance of education gives hope for the future. Schools suitable for children with all degrees of handicap would be needed, but the first steps towards this are already being made by teachers, with the backing of doctors and educational psychologists.

Assuming that an autistic child is called suitable for education the next thing is to find the right school. Teachers in different kinds of schools are becoming interested in the problem, and may in some cases be willing to include one or two in a class with other children. Parents must make inquiries about the policies of the schools in their areas.

The following are the kinds of school which have taken these children—they may be state or private, day or residential.

1. Schools for normal children. (There are some private schools with small classes who take normal children who are rather slow in learning. Some children with mild autistic symptoms fit well into this kind of environment.)
2. Special schools for delicate children and physically handicapped children.
3. Special schools for children who are educationally subnormal.
4. Special schools for maladjusted children.
5. Special schools for children with speech defects.
6. Special schools for children suffering from more than one handicap (one of these accepts children who are maladjusted and who have difficulties in communication.)
7. Hospital special schools.
8. Specialized private schools—for example, those of the Rudolf Steiner organisation, who will accept children with many different kinds of handicaps.

In a number of schools scattered throughout the country, specialised classes for various types of handicapped children have been started. These may be found attached to any of the first four kinds of schools mentioned above, and some of them are suitable for autistic children.

In addition, there are also units or classes taking handicapped children, loosely referred to as schools, but which do not (at least at present) come within the definition of a school as used by the education authorities. These include:

1. A few small groups, run by teachers, which specialise in autistic children, and those with allied disorders. Most of these have been started by the National Society for Autistic Children.
2. Teaching units attached to children's psychiatric hospitals.
3. Teaching units attached to mental subnormality hospitals—a few of these will take daily attenders living at home.
4. Some education authorities have "remedial classes" for children with special problems. Children can attend part time (the rest of the time being spent at normal school) or full time if necessary. At least one unit of this kind is doing excellent work with autistic children.

Finally, it should be mentioned that in some cases local education authorities have provided home teachers for autistic children, to help them prepare for school attendance.

For the future, it is to be hoped that more schools at all levels will take autistic children. They need much individual attention, especially at first, plus special teaching geared to their individual handicaps. They also need to mix with children who communicate and play, to improve their social relationships. Special small groups inside schools catering for other kinds of children would achieve all these aims.

RETIREMENT OF ED GARMATZ

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, this Chamber soon will lose one of its best-liked and hardest working Members when EDDIE GARMATZ retires.

The strong-willed Marylander has much to be proud of in his 25 years of service to his constituents and the Nation.

His wisdom and efforts have been a shot in the arm to the Nation's merchant marine and fishing industries. In turn, the entire country has profited from the boost in water transport and fishing activities.

His work as chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee is a record of achievement and success. Yet he has never shirked his other responsibilities despite the overwhelming demands of a full committee chairmanship.

I know EDDIE as a faithful and able member of the Government Operations Committee.

I only hope that his next 25 years are as productive and satisfying as the past 25 he put in as a Member of Congress. And I wish him the best of luck in whatever he pursues.

PRESIDENT NIXON SHOULD ADVISE THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT OF AMERICAN CONCERN OVER REPRESSIVE SOVIET EMIGRATION PRACTICES AGAINST SOVIET JEWS

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on September 28, 1972, I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I wrote President Nixon urging him to request the Soviet authorities to rescind their outrageous ransom demands imposed upon their Jewish citizens for visas to leave the Soviet Union.

The reply I received from the White House was almost a total dismissal of my request. There was no explanation of the White House position or any affirmation that the President had ever taken the matter up with the Soviet Government.

Meanwhile, the outrageous Soviet visa practices continue to lay a heavy hand upon Soviet Jews who want to leave the Soviet Union. Each day the visa requirements become more onerous and repressive. It is perfectly clear that the Soviet authorities are paying little attention to any representations that this administration may have made on the subject.

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is not to forget the matter or to dismiss it as this administration seems to have done. That would be exactly what the Soviet Government would want. Rather, the answer is to pursue the issue with determination so that the Soviet Government cannot mistake the fact that the U.S. Government is interested in the plight of the Soviet Jews, and that our Government is noting carefully the restrictions imposed by Soviet authorities in denying visas to its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, that is what I have re-

quested President Nixon to do in a second letter I have written to him. I hope and trust it will move him to take the steps which will persuade the Soviet Government that this administration is concerned with the continued and mounting violations of human rights perpetrated by the Soviet Union upon its citizens of Jewish faith.

Mr. Speaker, I attach to my remarks copies of my correspondence with the President.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1972.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Reference is made to my letter to you of September 28, 1972, in which I respectfully suggested that you raise your voice in protest to the shocking ransom demands being imposed by the Soviet Govment upon its Jewish citizens who had applied for visas to leave the Soviet Union. I said that "silence by you at this time would be taken by the Soviet Government as acquiescence in its latest moves."

I must say, in all frankness, that the reply I received from the White House, dated October 5, 1972, and signed by Richard K. Cook, Deputy Assistant to the President, a copy of which I am enclosing, exhibits a demeaning and disdainful treatment of a Member of Congress and amounts to little less than an outright dismissal of a most urgent matter. You have only to look at the reply to note its almost total inappropriateness.

The plight of Soviet Jewry is even more desperate now than when I last wrote to you. Gavril Shapiro, whose case is well known to you, and 20 other applicants for visas have lost their jobs and have been approached by the Soviet militia with the demand that they find employment or face trial as economic parasites. Within the last seven days new and more onerous requirements have been heaped upon prospective emigrants, which are calculated to confuse and shame them.

For example, applicants, no matter what their age, even adults, are now required to obtain the permission of their parents in connection with their application for a visa. As a part of the documents supporting the application, the parents must obtain from their employers an acknowledgement that the employer has been told by the parents that their child wants to leave the Soviet Union, a procedure obviously calculated to hold them up to ridicule and embarrassment, not only by the employer but by the parents' fellow employees.

Thus, it becomes more and more apparent that the Soviet Government has not been impressed by any representation that has been made to them on the subject by this Administration, for it is proceeding as though none was made. If the matter was discussed with Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko on the occasion of his recent visit, and words of assurance he may have uttered are certainly not being observed or followed by the Soviet authorities.

Again, I respectfully suggest that your silence at this time, in the face of continued and increasing harassment by the Soviet authorities of visa applicants will be taken by them to be acquiescence in their actions.

I would respectfully urge that you make known to the Soviet Government that its desire for favored nation treatment in its trading relations with the U.S. may stand in jeopardy as long as the Soviet Government insists upon maintaining its outrageous visa demands. You will be sustained in this position, knowing it has very substantial support in the Congress, as is indicated by the fact that there are now 76 co-sponsors of the so-called Jackson Amendment in the Senate and 131 co-sponsors of a companion measure in the House.

Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that such action taken by you at this time will give hope and courage not only to the Jews of the Soviet Union, but to oppressed peoples everywhere.

I would appreciate your response to the suggestions I have made.

Respectfully yours,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., October 5, 1972.

Hon. SIDNEY R. YATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. YATES: I wish to acknowledge and thank you for your September 25 letter to the President with which you forwarded Mr. Leonard W. Schroeter's report from Jewish Leadership in the Soviet Union.

I note that a copy of this report has been previously delivered to Mr. Leonard Garment and I will be pleased to express to him your interest in it. You may be assured your views will be fully reviewed.

With cordial regards,

Sincerely,

RICHARD K. COOK,
Deputy Assistant to the President.

HON. MARGARET HECKLER

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, MARGARET HECKLER, has recently been the subject of a story in McCall's magazine concerning women in politics. The article examines the way in which women in public life combine their many roles in order to answer the needs of both their families and constituencies.

Certainly, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) exemplifies the best image of a woman committed to public service. She has served the needs of the Nation in her advocacy of day care centers, better housing, and improved assistance for senior citizens. She has served the needs of her district by her constant presence and her willingness to fight for her constituents. In addition to all this, she is a devoted wife and mother and makes extra sacrifices to insure that she has time with her family.

I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues as a fine tribute to Congresswoman MARGARET HECKLER:

MARGARET HECKLER: A TINY DYNAMO WHO SPEAKS UP TO PRESIDENTS

As a vote getter, Congresswoman Margaret Heckler, 41, has a remarkable track record. She is a Republican in a district that is predominantly Democratic. Her first time out, in 1966, she attracted national attention by beating former Speaker of the House Joe Martin in the Republican primary. She not only won the election, but has become so firmly established that this year she is running unopposed. Her noncampaign schedule, however, is just as full of meetings, lunches, press conferences and visits with constituents as it would be if she had an opponent. "I love to meet people," she says, "and I feel I can learn as much from a factory worker as from the company's president. Personally, I find politics very satisfying."

Margaret Heckler's district includes the bedroom suburb of Wellesley, as well as the industrial cities of Fall River, Taunton and Attleboro, and her constituents range from Harvard professors to lobstermen. She likes to keep up what she calls a "continuing dialogue" with the people of her district, and sends out questionnaires regularly, asking their opinions on a variety of issues. She maintains three offices in her home district, where constituents come in with suggestions, complaints and even with personal and family problems.

Margaret finds herself involved with the interests of a wide variety of groups, from senior citizens to unemployed veterans. She's concerned with consumer problems, with the shortage of housing in her district and with the improvement of Fall River's harbor facilities. And she has an uncanny knack for putting federal monies where her mouth is: In three terms she has brought her district approximately $60,000,000 in government funds.

Getting adequate day-care facilities is another major concern. She was, in fact, cosponsor of the day-care bill that President Nixon vetoed, but she hasn't given up on the issue. "There are those who think that day care will destroy the family," she says. "Realistically, it can save the family." She points out that 70 percent of the workers in Fall River's garment industry are women, and most of them have to work in order to keep the family income about the poverty line. "And day care can give children, particularly underprivileged children, a valuable education experience." While she's a staunch Nixon supporter, she's disappointed with his stand on this issue. "It's your job, Margaret," her friends tell her, "to set the President straight on that one." Which she may do: She has spoken up to Presidents before.

During her first term she turned down five consecutive invitations to Congressional receptions at the White House. Finally President Johnson said, "Margaret, how come you never visit me?" "Because," she said, "you never invite me to anything good." The next invitation was to a State Dinner.

John Heckler, Margaret's husband, is an investment counselor, and they have three children—Belinda, 15, Allison, 13, and John, 12. The Hecklers maintain two houses—one in Wellesley and one in McLean, Virginia—and they spend a great deal of time in airplanes. They're a well-matched pair, both dynamic, outgoing personalities. John, who is also Margaret's campaign manager, thoroughly enjoys political life.

UNITED NATIONS

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, we have been aware in recent years of the growing disenchantment felt by many people with the work of the United Nations. Especially within the United States increasing questions have been raised about the efficacy and usefulness of the world organization.

Despite its disappointments and shortcomings, however, I am convinced that the United Nations is indispensable. There is literally no alternative if we are to meet successfully the diverse economic, social and political problems which confront all nations of the world. It is essential to have the institutional

foundation for a durable structure for peace.

Two articles which recently appeared in the Christian Science Monitor point out the importance of the organization to both developed and developing countries. They depict the strong commitment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Kurt Waldheim, to the principles and objectives of the world body.

A dynamic individual, Secretary-General Waldheim is seeking to restore confidence worldwide in the United Nations ability to resolve problems. Convinced that multilateral cooperation and assistance are essential in a world which grows closer each year, Mr. Waldheim has dedicated his efforts to strengthening the role of the United Nations.

I personally believe there is a real need for a more active and effective world body in the years ahead, and I commend these articles to the attention of my colleagues.

U.N. EFFECTIVENESS UNDER QUESTION

(By David Winder)

The strong winds that frequently rattle against the tall exposed United Nations building on the East River, whipping its flagpoles, and swirling around the beautifully simple free-form Barbara Hepworth sculpture are symbolic of political winds buffeting the UN these days.

The world body's effectiveness has never been challenged as it is today—following its inability last year to stop the India-Pakistan war.

UN prestige is at stake. And the Secretary-General's public remarks about restoring international credibility in the UN show that the problem is acknowledged.

Those at UN headquarters hope the lack of credibility is only a passing phenomenon. Reassuring them is the hope that the world is entering a new era in which the UN must play an enlarged role.

Exploration of the moon, protection of ocean resources, control of environmental degradation—all these point to the need for a global organization that can formulate an international code of behavior.

PRISONER ON PLANET

As Ambassador Christopher Phillips, the United States' No. 2 man here, says, "The notion that the astronauts brought back of a planetary society is absolutely relevant to us. We are increasingly prisoners on this small planet."

For the moment, though, disenchantment with the United Nations runs deep in Western Europe, and even deeper in the United States.

Gallup Polls indicate how far the UN has fallen in its appeal to Americans. The U.S. public overwhelmingly supported the world body in 1945, but only 35 percent of the population believed the UN was doing a good job in 1971.

Several factors account for Americans' disenchantment:

A. Initial overselling of the United Nations as an organization that could wave a magic wand over world problems and summarily remove them.

B. The evolution of the UN from a small and fairly homogeneous group of nations with built-in, pro-Western bias to a much larger organization in which the U.S. can no longer push through decisions.

C. The U.S. experience in Vietnam which has resulted in Americans looking inward toward themselves and their problems at home.

But a purely West European or American assessment of the UN is necessarily a one-sided view. It doesn't take into account the fact that for countless millions of Latin Americans, Africans, Asians, and Middle Easterners, the UN is a necessity.

For these countries, the United Nations is the international forum where they can prick rich nation's consciences. It is their means of winning trade concessions and getting aid, economic assistance, and emergency relief. In the UN they can make big powers more responsive to the problems of disarmament and racial discrimination. Above all, for the small and weak the UN is a safety valve.

As one delegate of a prominent third-world country puts it: "We have no napalm. No tanks. No platform. The UN is the only place where we can talk about our problems to reach agreement."

UN CALLED INDISPENSABLE

For an ambassador from a small African nation the UN is indispensable: "They talk about downgrading the UN, but we wouldn't know what to do without it."

Is the UN, then, vital only to the underdeveloped world, and irrelevant or of limited value for big-power nations?

That question was underscored by one American who said she could sum up U.S. reaction in the UN thus: "I am bored with the UN. It's all right for that half of the world that is underdeveloped and illiterate. But what's in it for me?"

Andrew W. Cordier, an executive assistant to two former secretaries-general and an American himself, believes the value of the UN to the U.S. is very clear cut.

For him, whenever tensions in the world are alleviated at the UN through worldwide discussions—to that extent is the U.S. saved from military and diplomatic involvement that could lead to further aid and expenditure.

Secondly, says Dr. Cordier, "We gain as people in the broader fields of improving standards of living of the peoples of the world. We cannot forever expect as a rich nation to live in a world of splendid isolation while the rest live in poverty."

ECONOMIC FREEDOM NEEDED

On this economic and social front, the UN has scored outstanding successes that are not generally appreciated by the public.

Says Ambassador Mooki Molapo of Lesotho, "We are heavily dependent on the UN. Its assistance is vital and indispensable to the government's development policies."

The point UN officials make is that political independence for emerging countries is worthless unless accompanied by economic independence.

Beyond these economic benefits are larger questions of international security not necessarily expressed in political conflicts between nations.

Without the preparatory work that went into UN disarmament debates, it is doubted here whether there would have been such accomplishments as the 1963 Partial Test Ban Treaty or the progress recorded in previous SALT talks.

Despite all these gains a certain exasperation exists at UN headquarters because the public—as UN officials see it—overestimates the power of the organization.

True, the UN has some of the attributes of a world government in embryo. But it has no prime minister, cannot levy taxes, and cannot raise an army without its members volunteering the troops.

In a word, the UN has no executive powers—it has only moral authority.

Very often problems come to the UN precisely because all other efforts at mediation have been exhausted.

As Sir Colin Crowe, Britain's permanent representative to the UN points out, "We've get stuck with all the horrors—Middle East, Korea, and Cyprus—the ones that defy bilateral settlement."

This is not to suggest that the UN is free of imperfections. Far from it.

Critics feel that the UN gives itself a bad name by responding sluggishly or by not responding at all to gross violations of human rights—either for reasons of political expediency, or because members find it convenient to hide behind Article 2.7 of the UN Charter which upholds national sovereignty.

Reformers would like to see the UN place more stress on peacemaking rather than peacekeeping, on establishing research centers throughout the world that could quickly pinpoint trouble and find ways of resolving it; and on establishing within the Security Council small conciliation groups that could work out solutions for major world problems, out of the harsh glare of the public eye.

The UN, it is said, can go only as far as its members will let it—consensus not majority decisions being the rule.

Until countries can subordinate selfish national interests for international good, the UN will be stuck with its obvious limitations. But, say observers here, to declare it irrelevant or of minimal worth is not only unfair, but also a distortion of its record.

KURT WALDHEIM'S SURPRISING DIPLOMATIC ACTIVISM

An innovative, active, outspoken international civil servant does not make, in the eyes of the big powers, a good secretary-general. Too much risk of rocking the diplomatic boat.

When the big powers set about selecting a new secretary-general late last year the tall Austrian diplomat with polished manners and Savile Row-style suits seemed a safe enough choice. Kurt Waldheim was seen variously as bland, colorless, passive and, coming from a neutral country, probably indecisive.

"When they found out he was not a noodle, but a man with a backbone, they became furious," says one UN official. "They also thought Hammarskjold was just a clerk, and U Thant a schoolteacher."

All of this might suggest that either the big powers seriously underestimated the man they chose for "the most difficult job on earth," or that the man himself grew to fill those very large secretary-general shoes.

Whatever the reason, Mr. Waldheim has dispelled the myths about him.

HURTLES AROUND GLOBE

Since taking office nine months ago, he has become an express train of activist diplomacy, hurtling around the globe in record time and visiting more than 25 countries—sometimes temporarily lost in dark political tunnels only to emerge in the case of Cyprus of South-West Africa with modest but significant successes.

Mr. Waldheim's visit to Cyprus helped spark the resumption of lapsed inter-communal talks. His trip to Namibia, as the UN calls South-West Africa, resulted in the mutually agreed upon decision to appoint a UN representative to work with the Pretoria government on moving the vast desert land toward independence.

At home the Secretary-General has pruned administrative deadwood, frozen staff hiring, saved $6 million, and thus brought smiles to the budget-minded Americans.

A fast-running world traveler who seldom leaves his 38th floor UN office before 9 p.m., Mr. Waldheim's activisim is breathless.

That he could have been seen as anything less than dynamic surprises him.

Those who know him, he says, know "I am full of dynamism and I am a hard-working man. I am definitely not an easy man who just accepts what others say. I have my own views and I have very outspoken opinions. And if I am convinced that I am right, I go through with it whether others like it or not."

Working associates say the Secretary-General is like a terrier scrapping with a bone, and that it is this determination and perseverance, rather than any great intellectual capacity, that stamps Kurt Waldheim's character.

AWARE OF LIMITATIONS

Despite such activism and determination, Mr. Waldheim has no illusions about his job. He is acutely aware of his limitations under the UN Charter.

Mr. Waldheim's dilemma, then, is how to act and when to act when working with 132 member states.

The answer to that dilemma apparently is found in a German word—"Fingerspitzengefuhl"—finger-tip sensitivity that tells when a solution seems right. Diplomatic training and experience—Mr. Waldheim was formerly Austrian Foreign Minister—are not excluded from his decisionmaking process.

The Secretary-General's critics suggest that some of his "Fingerspitzengefuhl" was lacking when he warned of the dangers of possible U.S. dike bombings in North Vietnam.

Washington erupted, to Dr. Waldheim's surprise. He had thought his remarks were sprinkled with sufficient qualifications to fall short of direct accusation. But the White House view was less charitable. The Nixon administration thought Mr. Waldheim was badly misinformed and badly advised.

With time, it is thought, the storm will blow over and Mr. Waldheim will continue with his main preoccupation: restoring the confidence of the world in the political capability of the UN to solve problems.

His optimism in that direction is boundless.

"I am confident that the UN has a future because there is no alternative. Believe me. Even with all the bilateral diplomacy, which is quite in order—and I have certainly nothing against it—this alone is not enough in this age. You need multilateral cooperation and the best forum for this is the UN."

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN BYRNE AT THE DEDICATION OF ST. JOSEPH'S GARDENS

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, this past summer St. Joseph's Gardens in front of Old St. Joseph's Church, the oldest Catholic church in Philadelphia, was dedicated. At this great memorable occasion, the Honorable JAMES A. BYRNE, Member of Congress, a close devoted friend to the church, gave the main address. The master of ceremonies was the Honorable Michael Bradley, a former Member of this body.

The address by our dear friend and colleague, JIMMY BYRNE, deals with the early efforts toward tolerance and the principle of religious freedom in America and I commend it to my colleagues. I include it at this point in the RECORD.

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

This is a very welcome day and it gives recognition to a very historic edifice, whose history has been closely related to our Country's history since the earliest days. Old St. Joseph's Church was founded in 1733 by the Reverend Joseph Greaton, a Jesuit Father.

It was here that the principle of religious freedom in America was first definitely established. In 1734, Patrick Gordon, the Colonial Governor of the Pennsylvania Colony, endeavored to apply the discriminatory laws of Great Britain existing at that time in order to prevent public religious services at Old St. Joseph's. However, the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania, which was dominated by the Quakers, refused his demand to prohibit these services and it was because of the courageous, charitable, and tolerant action of the members of the Society of Friends that freedom of religion was maintained in the Pennsylvania Colony and this inspired and developed support for this doctrine throughout the thirteen original Colonies and resulted in this principle being embodied in the Constitution of the United States.

Many men, prominent in the struggle for our independence, worshipped here, among whom were Commodore John Barry, father of our Navy, Major General Stephen Moylan, who was also aide-de-camp to George Washington, Thomas Fitzsimmons, signer of the Constitution and who, as a member of Congress was the author of the first Tariff Act. Archbishop John Carroll, a close associate of Benjamin Franklin, and also founder of Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., once lived in the present St. Joseph's rectory. John Adams, when he was in Philadelphia, was a frequent visitor to the Church.

I was very happy, acting at the request of former Congressman Michael J. Bradley, to introduce the legislation which authorized and secured the appropriation for the purchase of the ground for this garden by the National Park Service. There were many obstacles to overcome to secure the passage of my Bill and many parliamentary maneuvers were necessary. But it was finally enacted into law in September of 1959. This garden is now a part of the Independence National Historical Park. In these turbulent days when respect for religious and moral values has diminished, when materialism seems to have permeated into every facet of our lives, it is well for us to recall the reliance which the Fathers of our Country placed upon spiritual values.

It is well also to single out the places associated with our early history and to put them in their proper perspective in relation to the events, the circumstances and the sacrifices which insured our freedom and brought about our origin as an independent Nation.

This garden is a fitting adjunct to Old Saint Joseph's Church, which has also been designated as a National Shrine. It will be a continued recognition of the right to religious freedom and it will serve to inspire all people who visit here to support and defend all of our American institutions and our democratic way of life.

SOUTH KOREA—ANOTHER FREE WORLD CASUALTY OF NIXON'S DISENGAGEMENT POLICIES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, with the report that the government of South Korea has now suspended constitutional government and proclaimed martial law, the list of free world casualties under President Nixon's new American Revolution continues. Abdication of our free world leadership to embrace the international Communist movement must be considered as the direct and overriding cause of the unprecedented actions by constitutional leaders to protect their country from Communist subversion within.

Today, South Korea has joined an ever-lengthening list. Before Korea, it was the Philippines, Uruguay, Nationalist China, Turkey, and even our neighboring friends of Canada under the leadership of their New York City puppet, Mr. Trudeau.

The price free people are being forced to pay for the new international politics of the Nixon administration will not look good in history and is a disgrace to the honor of the American people. What other former ally will next join the list? How long before we of the United States experience internal insurgency as a result of our political financiers courting communism for profit?

I ask that a related newsclipping follows:

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

SOUTH KOREA CHIEF SETS MARTIAL LAW

SEOUL, October 17—President Chung Hee Park proclaimed martial law in South Korea today, asserting that political parties could not be trusted to push unification talks with North Korea.

In a surprising move, the former four-star general dissolved the National Assembly, suspended parts of the 1962 constitution and imposed domestic press censorship. He also closed all colleges and universities "for the time being."

Park promised to restore constitutional rule by the end of the year, "at the latest." It was the third time he has proclaimed martial law since he took power in a bloodless military coup 11 years ago.

In Washington, State Department spokesman Charles Bray made clear U.S. unhappiness with Park's move. He said that the United States, which has 43,000 troops in Korea and a massive aid program "was notified only very shortly before the announcement was made. We were not consulted about the decision and quite obviously we were not associated with it."

At another point, Bray said, "It is not easy to draw any satisfaction from this situation as a philosophical question."

Park, addressing his nation by radio, said he would propose constitutional changes by Oct. 27 and submit them to a referendum a month later. The changes, he said, would permit South Korea to face the transition from years of cold war to the present atmosphere of detente, which includes moves toward reunification with North Korea.

Park said if his constitutional changes are rejected in the referendum, he will take this as an expression of the will of the people against the North-South dialogue and will make a different approach to national reunification. He did not elaborate.

Park said his measures would bring South Korea into line with present-day realities and "would be best suited for backing up the active pursuit of the South-North dialogue and for coping successfully with the rapidly changing situation surrounding us."

He accused the nation's political parties of being "obsessed with factional strife and discord" and responsible for disorder and inefficiency.

"The irresponsible political parties already have lost the sense of national mission." Park said. "Also referring to the National Assembly, he said: "What would we really expect from these political parties and from the representative institution? Could they be entrusted with the national task of peaceful unification?"

Immediately after the proclamation, armed troops and armored vehicles moved into position around the Parliament building. The one-house National Assembly was in recess and no lawmakers, were inside.

Park's references to South Korea's "changing situation" apparently includes recent moves toward rapprochement with China by the United States and Japan.

After a quarter-century of hostility, the North and South Korean governments announced agreement in July to seek peaceful reunification and avoid tensions on the Korean peninsula. The agreement followed secret contacts between the two governments.

Red Cross talks aimed at reuniting families separated by the 27-year-old partition of Korea have been under way for some time.

Park said his reforms would "pave the way for peaceful reunification and prosperity, adding: "I am also doing so to back up the South-North dialogue on the basis of a strong and viable democratic institution."

South Korea has already been under a state of national emergency, since Dec. 5, to cope with what Park called "a grave situation faced by the nation as a result of changes in the international situation and North Korea's aggressive designs." The emergency declaration was made under Parks' responsibility for national security and fell just short of imposing martial law.

Earlier this year, North and South Korea began preliminary contacts between their Red Cross representatives at the neutral truce village of Pammunjom to alleviate the plight of an estimated 10 million families separated since 1945.

Park, meanwhile, sent Lee Hu Rac, director of South Korea's Central Intelligence Agency, to the North in May. Lee's secret mission led to a joint communique July 4 in which North and South pledged to work peacefully for national reunification.

The major opposition party, the New Democratic Party, which had 89 seats in the 203-member assembly, was critical of the president's conduct of the North-South dialogue, without directly opposing it. The party maintained that the dialogue should be pursued on a nonpartisan basis. The opposition wanted a voice in the contacts.

South Korea is the second Asian ally of the United States to declare martial law in less than a month. President Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippines suspended 26 years of democratic government in his nation Sept. 30 following widespread rioting and guerrilla fighting.

Washington Post staff writer Stanley Karnow reported the following reaction and interpretation among U.S. officials in Washington:

Beyond their expressions of "considerable chagrin and dismay" at Park's action, U.S. officials here speculated that the South Korean president's decision to declare martial law stemmed essentially from his desire to tighten his authority over the country.

According to these officials, Park apparently believes that he must consolidate his power for the possibility that the North-South talks may eventually edge toward more plausible proposals for the unification of Korea.

Park faced some dissidence from students and domestic political rivals shortly before his declaration of a state of national emergency last December.

Some sources in Washington suggest that Park may also be concerned about the possibility of a U.S. force reduction in South Korea although there are no plans to withdraw any of the 43,000 American troops from the country in the coming year.

Park warned yesterday that "we must guard ourselves against the possibility that . . . smaller countries might be sacrificed for the relaxation of tension between big powers," but U.S. and Korean sources in Washington tend to discount the role that international developments played in his decision.

It is nevertheless believed that Park was worried by the establishment of diplomatic relations between Japan and China after the detente between Washington and Peking.

WAYNE ASPINALL

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in warm admiration and respect for our beloved colleague Chairman ASPINALL. All over the face of our beloved country there are fine national parks and wildlife preserves which would not be there except for this able man and his leadership here in the House of Representatives. I feel deeply grateful for his help to me in everything that I have ever contacted him about. All of our Nation should have a great sense of gratitude for the splendid works that he has accomplished for this generation, and generations yet unborn.

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI'S RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, over the years I have gotten to know and respect my friend and colleague, Congressman HENRY HELSTOSKI. Indeed, he is the best Representative the Ninth Congressional District has had in Congress over the years.

Through redistricting, I lost three of my towns, but I am more than pleased that these towns were put in Congressman HELSTOSKI's district because I know that he will continue to represent the people in a sensitive and effective manner.

I and many of my colleagues have come to know through the years that when we needed support on legislation which was of benefit to the people, we could always count on HENRY HELSTOSKI.

Through his former positions as superintendent of schools and mayor of a south Bergen community, Congressman HELSTOSKI brought to Congress a keen insight into the needs of the people in all walks of life. In his unassuming pedagogical manner, he has listened to the problems of the young and old, the blacks and whites, the Cuban refugees, and other Spanish-speaking people, the working man and the businessman, the municipal, county, and State officials, and a host of other people, and in an equally strong and effective manner, he went to work solving those problems.

We all know that Congressman HELSTOSKI has the highest rating on environmental issues and he has worked hard on curbing water and air pollution and solving other ecological and environmental problems. He has been rated 100 percent by labor groups and by consumer groups for his voting record. He is consistently on the side of the people on the issues before Congress.

I am proud that many of the bills which I initiated and saw enacted into law over the years had the strong endorsement and support of HENRY HELSTOSKI. I am glad that in many cases he has initiated important legislation. Some of the significant bills which have moved through the Congress and which Congressman HELSTOSKI initiated and supported are:

The Cuban refugee education program, which provides Federal funds to aid the children of Cuban refugees in schools which have had to absorb these children, particularly in Union City and West New York; the bilingual education program, which provides Federal funds to hire and train English-speaking teachers to speak Spanish; the North Hudson community action program, which provides for a Neighborhood Youth Corps program, provides community service programs working on concentrated unemployment problems, particularly for high school students and dropouts; the Construction Safety Act which provides safety requirements on Federal construction; the Youth Conservation Corps which provides jobs for young people between the ages of 15 and 18 to work in the national park system, our national forests, wildlife refuges, and other public land and water areas.

Congressman HELSTOSKI has worked in seeking passage of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1967 which provides assistance for senior citizen programs; enacting legislation to set up the White House Conference on Aging; the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1967 and 1968, which required an extension of services for the handicapped regardless of residence, liberalized services and expanded construction facilities for these people; the Handicapped Children's Assistance Act of 1968 provided for 70 to 100 model educational centers to aid the handicapped. Congressman HELSTOSKI supported the Library Services Amendments of 1967 which continued the Federal share of funds for State libraries and provided library services for the physically handicapped.

HENRY HELSTOSKI has always supported measures which benefit our civil service employees such as the Annuity Adjustment Act, which increased annuities for civil service employees and accelerated the automatic cost-of-living adjustment to a more sensitive price index indicator. He supported the Improved Retirement and Health Benefits Act, which allows optional retirement of civil service employees on full annuity at age 55 with 30 years of service, voluntary retirement at age 60 after 20 years of service, and survival annuities for students and children up to age 22.

He supported measures to increase by 10 percent a spouse's annuity, and an increase in the Federal Government's share of health insurance premiums. He also supported an increase in the amount of life and accident insurance which the Government would help Federal employees finance, and raising the legal maximum on the amount of insurance available; also, placing the life insurance program on a sound actuary basis and establishing new optional life insurance program for employees who desire to purchase additional protection out of their own funds.

In the 91st Congress, Mr. HELSTOSKI

supported the retirement financing bill, which completely revamps the retirement financing system of the civil service, which protects not only present pensions but future pensions by putting the retirement system on a sound financial basis. Also during this Congress he supported the Health Benefits Act, which increased the Federal Government's contribution for health insurance to 40 percent and liberalized the program as to the number of people who are eligible, and the Survival Benefits Act which corrected the inequities by an increase in the number of women who could file claims and receive benefits under the survival benefits program.

He supported the important Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act and the accelerated public works program to provide more jobs.

HELSTOSKI was a strong supporter of the Occupational Safety and Health Act, which provided for safer working conditions for the millions of working men and women throughout the United States. He was a strong supporter of an expanded minimum wage bill and has initiated legislation to provide for pension reform so that millions of Americans would have the protection and the guarantee of a pension for which they have paid. Just recently his help assured passage of the important Longshoreman's and Harbor Workman's Compensation Act amendments.

On these and various other measures which HENRY HELSTOSKI has initiated and supported which benefit the young and old, the veterans, the schools and teachers, the poor and handicapped, the working men and women as well as professionals, and local and State officials, we can, indeed, be proud that the people of the Ninth District continue to send to Congress a man like HELSTOSKI, who has a solid record of achievement, and who will continue to build upon that record as a Representative of all the people.

Indeed, without the highly active work, tireless effort and support of HENRY HELSTOSKI, many important bills may not have seen the light of day. It is this type of loyal and dedicated servant which makes a Member of the House of Representatives a person who is closest to the people. He is a man of the people who works for the people.

Mr. Speaker, in the last few months many constituents as well as members of the press have requested information from me concerning labor legislation in which I have been interested and taken an active part. I am therefor inserting in the RECORD a summary of some of the major legislation in which I have been interested and in which I played a substantial role in passing. The summary follows:

MAJOR LEGISLATION DEVELOPED BY THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, DOMINICK V. DANIELS, CHAIRMAN *

OLDER AMERICANS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Became Law on July 1, 1967.

Introduced by Mr. Daniels, the bill passed the House unanimously under suspension of the rules.

The amendments extended many grants and authorized funds for state grants. They gave continued support for many current projects and additional funds for 240 to 300 new ones. Money for the administration of state plans was increased and general appropriations were extended for three more years.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Became Law on September 28, 1968.

A Daniels bill that passed the House unanimously.

This law ordered the Secretary of HEW to conduct a conference on the problems of the aging in 1971. Technical advisory committees and state conferences were also formed, and $1.9 million was provided.

The Conference was held last winter and many recommendations for improvements in and expansion of programs for the aging were transmitted to the President and Congress. As a result, appropriations by Congress for older Americans are at a new high and nutritional programs were recently enacted.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Became Law on October 3, 1967.

Daniels' Subcommittee held hearings and he introduced legislation that passed the House unanimously.

The changes extended and made improvements in provisions giving assistance for services to handicapped persons. An additional year of appropriations were added along with: a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults; extended vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped migratory agricultural workers and members of their families; and required extension of services without regard to the residence of a handicapped individual.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1968

Became Law on July 7, 1968.

Daniels introduced his own bill and held hearings on it. Later reported from the Full Committee amended, it then passed the House unanimously.

This law liberalized the definition of those to be served and greatly expanded construction of facilities, innovative programs, and staff training. The federal share of funds to the States was also increased.

A major part of the law established new support for the disadvantaged and for mentally and physically handicapped persons.

HANDICAPPED CHILDREN'S ASSISTANCE ACT

Became Law on September 30, 1968.

Daniels introduced and held hearings on his own bill which later passed the House unanimously.

The law will provide 70 to 100 model educational centers to aid the handicapped. Only 2 million of the 5.5 million disabled children could reach special education programs.

LIBRARY SERVICES AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Became Law on November 24, 1967

Daniels held hearings in the Select Education Subcommittee.

Instead of reducing the Federal share in new State Library Programs, as contemplated in the 1966 amendments, this law continued the share as 100 percent, for one more year. Special library services for the physically handicapped persons were included.

MINERS' COMPENSATION

Became Law on December 30, 1969

Daniels wrote the House bill after holding hearings in his Subcommittee, reported it to the Full Committee amended. Congress passed it and incorporated it into the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act.

Since there are a significant number of coal miners who have experienced death or disability due to pneumoconiosis, few states provide benefits for miners or their survivors. The Secretary of Labor has now promulgated standards for determining presence of the disease. The Social Security Administration is administering the receipt of applications for benefits which are currently at $170–180 per month plus 50 percent of that in addition for one dependent child, 75% in addition for 2 dependent children, or 100% in addition for 3 or more dependent children.

Eventually the states and the coal operators will have to change their laws and assume the cost of benefits. These provisions have been incorporated as title IV of the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act.

New Jersey residents have filed the largest number of claims for benefits other than the coal mining states.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Became Law on August 13, 1970

Daniels held hearings in his Labor Subcommittee and co-sponsored the final version with Congressman Meeds.

The Corps is administered jointly by the Department of Agriculture and Interior as a three-year pilot project for youths aged 15 to 18 to work in the National Park System, National Forest System, Wildlife Refuge System, and other public land and water areas for 90 days during the summer months. It is funded at $3.5 million annually. Enrollees receive transportation, lodging and a salary. The Corps is open to both sexes and to all races and economic groups.

The objectives of the program are to: provide summer jobs to a group often left wandering the streets during the summer; help correct the manpower shortage needed to maintain our rapidly deteriorating public lands and recreation areas, and instill a sense of appreciation for natural resources and an attitude of conservation toward them.

Daniels held hearings this month on the possibility of expanding the Corps. Both Agriculture and Interior Departments have lavishly praised the program. Last year over 25,000 applications were received for only 2,200 positions.

EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT

Became Law on July 12, 1971

Daniels introduced the House bill which contained the Special Employment Assistance funds for aid to pockets of chronic unemployment that exist in an area with a low employment rate. This bill was reported to the Full Committee opposed by Republicans who attempted to substitute manpower revenue-sharing instead. Daniels managed the Floor fight and again defeated attempts to substitute revenue sharing bill.

The Emergency Employment Act created a 2-year public employment program in states and local government to give jobs to some of the unemployed. The program is triggered on when the national unemployment rate reaches 4.5 percent or higher for 3 consecutive months.

Also, with the current economic crisis, many local governments are facing a cutback in community services when more are needed. This manpower addition helped ease these shortages in services. Approximately 150,000 persons were put to work nationally. Jersey City and the rest of Hudson County have been given for fiscal '72, 1074 jobs and about $6.5 million has been provided for them.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

Became Law on December 29, 1970

Daniels held 16 days of hearings in Washington, D.C. and San Francisco, California. He wrote a bill that was reported strictly on a partisan basis from the Subcommittee after Republican attempts to boycott committee meetings failed to prevent the bill being reported.

The bill was amended with minor attachments in the Full Committee and voted out on a partisan basis. His bill was defeated on the House floor by a Republican substitute. The Senate took the Daniels' bill and based Senator Williams' version on it. The final law was the draft of Daniels' bill and

* Chairman, 1965–1968.

was passed in the Conference committee of which Daniels was a member.

The Occupational Safety and Health Act is the first and only comprehensive safety law covering all workers engaged in interstate commerce except those who are, in a patchwork fashion, covered by other federal safety laws. About 4 million workplaces and 57 million persons fall under its coverage. The law is unique in that it makes the safety and health of a worker expressed national policy and details a large number of rights for workers to insure implementation of this policy on a day-to-day basis.

The Act requires the Secretary of Labor to promulgate interim, permanent and temporary emergency safety and health standards with the help of advisory committees and under an informal rule-making procedure. Interested persons are allowed to participate in the process. The Secretary also has the option of granting variations or exemptions to certain employers.

The Secretary shall also require inspections of workplaces to determine compliance and the keeping of records of accidents and deaths of workers. Penalties can be assessed for certain violations. An independent review commission hears contests of citations that have been issued against employers.

Provisions of the law also include: option for a state to take over its own plan for safety and health with federal assistance to up to 50 percent of the operating costs; development of safe exposure criteria for harmful industrial agents; a commission to study and recommend improvements in state workmen's compensation laws; and the establishment of the National Institute of Occupational Health in the National Institutes of Health to do research on occupational diseases.

CONSTRUCTION SAFETY

Became Law in August 9, 1969.

Daniels sponsored the House bill that was reported from his Subcommittee, passed without opposition, co-sponsored by 31 of the 35 members of the Full Committee, and reported from there with no objection. The bill was amended only slightly on the House Floor and then passed unanimously, with Daniels as manager. The Senate accepted Daniels bill with only slight technical amendments.

Every year workers in construction suffer the highest death rate of any industry in the United States. Their accident rate is twice as high as workers in manufacturing. This is reflected in the cost of workmen's compensation premiums paid by construction companies—it is three times that paid by manufacturing firms.

The Construction Safety Act (amends the Contract Work Hours Standards Act) was intended to lower accident and death rates and ease the economic burden of lost wages, high insurance costs and lost days. The Secretary of Labor is required to formulate and enforce safety and health standards for working conditions. As advisory Committee of workers and employers must consult with the Secretary in setting standards. The Secretary may go into the District Court to gain compliance and the abatement of a dangerous condition. After repeated negligence of the employer the Secretary may have a contractor or subcontractor blacklisted with government agencies. The Act applies to all contractors and subcontractors in all federal and federally-financed or federally assisted construction projects and covers about 4 million construction workers. The Occupational Safety and Health Act later covered work done on all private projects.

MANPOWER PROGRAMS IN HUDSON COUNTY, N.J., FISCAL YEAR 1972

Federal manpower legislation authorizing the following programs in Hudson County, New Jersey, is under the jurisdiction of the House Select Subcommittee on Labor, *Dominick V. Daniels, Chairman.*

1. Neighborhood Youth Corps Out-of-School Program, Jersey City. $430,850—serves 110 people.
2. North Hudson CAP—Neighborhood Youth Corps Out-of-School Program—West New York. $105,560—serves 30 people.
3. Neighborhood Youth Corps In-School Program, West New York. $15,617—serves 111 people.
4. Neighborhood Youth Corps In-School Program, Jersey City. $96,850—serves 130 people.
5. Neighborhood Youth Corps In-School Program Bayonne. $41,720—serves 56 people.
6. Neighborhood Youth Corps In-School Program, Hoboken. $26,820—serves 36 people.
7. Operation Mainstream—Jersey City. $102,400—serves 39 people over age 55.
8. Concentrated Employment Program (CEP), Hoboken. $1,700,000—serves 1,000 people.
9. CAMPS—Jersey City. $58,470—planning.
10. WIN—located in Jersey City, serves all of Hudson County. $281,568—serves 500 people.
11. MDTA Multi-Skill Center, Jersey City. $1,088,430—serves 310 people.
12. Emergency Employment Act (authored by Dominick v. Daniels), Section 5, Jersey City. $1,897,500—serves 310 people.
13. Emergency Employment Act, Section 5, Hudson County. $2,224,200—serves 395 people.
14. Emergency Employment Act, Section 6, Jersey City. $987,000—190 people.
15. Emergency Employment Act, Section 6, Hudson County. $1,247,868—serves 179 people.
16. JOBS Program, Hudson County, New Jersey:
$230,163—serves 153 people.
$270,291—serves 84 people.
$70,463—serves 36 people.
$43,799—serves 15 people.
$29,970—serves 11 people.
$51,280—serves 20 people.
$432,809—serves 150 people.
$523,565—serves 155 people.
$95,988—serves 48 people.
$66,478—serves 26 people.
17. JOBS Program (Jobs Options), Hudson County:
$93,750—serves 125 people.
$100,000—serves 100 people.
$8,160—serves 16 people.
$8,400—serves 15 people.

MAJOR LEGISLATION DEVELOPED BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT, INSURANCE, AND HEALTH BENEFITS UNDER THE CHAIRMANSHIP OF THE HONORABLE DOMINICK V. DANIELS

THE 89TH CONGRESS

Annuity adjustments—P.L. 89-205

The Daniels Act of 1965 granted annuity increases ranging from 6.1% to 15%, with the larger increase given to those having the smallest annuities. The bill also accelerated the automatic cost-of-living adjustment feature of the retirement law to a more sensitive price index indicator.

Improved retirement and health benefits—Public Law 89-504

The Subcommittee joined with the Subcommittee on Compensation in the public hearings and executive sessions on general salary and fringe benefits legislation. Among the benefits of this law are provisions to allow optional retirement of employees on full annuity at age 55 after 30 years' service; voluntary retirement on full annuity at age 60 after 20 years' service; payment of survivor annuities of student-children to age 22; retirement, life insurance, and health benefits coverage for certain employee-organization officers on leave without pay; continuance of payment of spouses' benefits upon remarriage after attaining age 60 and resumption of payment upon termination of a remarriage entered into prior to age 60; a 10% increase in the spouses' annuities that were based upon the death or retirement of an employee prior to October 11, 1962; and an increase in the Government's share of the subscription charges for health benefits from an average of 28 percent to 38 percent of the total costs.

THE 90TH CONGRESS

Life insurance—Title IV of Public Law 90-206

This legislation increased the amounts of life insurance and accidental death and dismemberment insurance which the Government will help its employees to finance, raises the legal maximum on the amount of insurance made available, places the life insurance program on a sound actuarial basis, and establishes a new optional life insurance program for employees who desire to purchase additional protection with their own funds.

All employees are given entitlement to minimum life insurance and accidental death and dismemberment insurance of $10,000 up to a maximum of $32,000. Employees earning more than $8,000 annually are entitled to a flat $2,000 additional insurance. All employees are given the option to purchase $10,000 additional insurance for which they will pay the entire premium. The new optional insurance will depreciate by 2% for each month after age 65 or retirement, whichever is later, in the same manner as does the regular insurance.

The title repeals the present 25 cents and 12.5 cents employee and Government contribution rates, established by law when the program was instituted, and requires that the combined employee-Government contribution equal an amount necessary to cover the full costs of the insurance. The Civil Service Commission is authorized to adjust contribution rates as required to accomplish this purpose with the present 2-to-1 cost-sharing ratio preserved.

91ST CONGRESS

Retirement financing—Public Law 91-93

The Daniels Act of 1969 represents the most positive plan of action ever developed during its history to improve the financial condition of the Civil Service Retirement System.

Title I authorizes annual payments directly from the Treasury to the civil service retirement and disability fund equal to the "lost interest" on the existing unfunded liability of the fund created by the Government's failure in the past to contribute sufficient amounts, the gradual increase in liability caused by past increased retirement benefits and salary increases; and authorizes transfer from the Treasury annually of funds sufficient to pay the cost of annuity payments based on military service.

Title I also provides that unfunded liabilities resulting from future benefit increases and future salary increases be paid for by amortizing the cost in equal installments over a 30-year period. This will authorize appropriations by the Congress, not direct transfer of money.

Title I also increases both employee and agency contributions from 6½% of payroll to 7% of payroll, effective January 1, 1970. Contributions by employees of the Congress are increased to 7½%, and contributions by Members of Congress are increased to 8%. These rates will cover the normal cost of present benefits.

Title II increases benefits under the Retirement Act:

1. Uses "high 3" years of average pay instead of "high 5" for computing civil service annuities;

2. Permits adding sick leave accumulated at time of retirement or death to the computation of annuity;

3. Adds 1% to cost-of-living increases for annuitants;

4. Makes the remarriage provisions of the 1966 act partly retroactive;

5. Improves survivor benefits of spouses of employees who die in service or after disability retirement, and all surviving children's benefits; and

6. Permits an employee of the Congress to receive 2½% credit for all years of congressional employment rather than limiting such 2½% credit to 15 years, and limits creditable military service under this formula to 5 years.

Health benefits—Public Law 91–418

The Daniels Act of 1970 requires the Government contribution to be 40% of the average of the high-option premiums charged by six of the largest plans for the type of enrollment—self-only or family—but not more than 50% of the premium charged for the particular enrollment. New contribution is effective in January 1971.

Other provisions:

The survivor-annuitant of an employee who dies after September 25 with as little as 18 months of service may retain the employee's health insurance coverage, if he had a family enrollment.

Federal employees in the Panama Canal Zone who are not U.S. citizens are now eligible for coverage under both the Federal Employees Health Benefits program and the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Program.

Beginning January 1, 1971, certain retirees who retired before July 1, 1960, will be eligible for a Government contribution toward the premium cost of Part B (medical insurance) of medicare.

Survivor benefits—Public Law 91–658

The Daniels-McGee Act of January 8, 1971, was directed to the inequities faced by an ever-increasing proportion of women—mostly widows—and the policies that perpetuate them required the consideration of legislation to alleviate the economic difficulties thus encountered. This legislation:

1. Extends to a spouse acquired after retirement the survivorship protection the retiree accorded the spouse to whom married at time of retirement, provided the post-retirement spouse is married to the retiree for at least 2 years or is the parent of a child born of the marriage;

2. Permits a retiree who was unmarried at time of retirement to subsequently elect a reduced annuity upon marriage and, thus, provide a survivor annuity for a spouse acquired after retirement;

3. Permits an unmarried retiree who elected a reduced annuity with benefit for a person with an insurable interest to substitute a spouse acquired subsequent to retirement as the survivor-annuitant;

4. Allows the use of supplemental annuity earned by re-employment to increase the potential survivor's rate of benefit;

5. Removes the dependency requirements heretofore applicable to surviving widowers of female employees, thus according them the same treatment accorded widows of deceased male employees;

6. Allows retirement service credit for periods of separation during which an employee received compensation benefits as a result of a work-related injury or illness.

92D CONGRESS

Air traffic controllers—H.R. 8083—Public Law 92–297

As a result of Congressman Daniels' efforts in the 91st Congress, the Full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service developed legislation to establish a career program for air traffic controllers in the Department of Transportation. This legislation contains the following provisions:

1. Training program for air traffic controllers who have at least 5 years of air traffic controller service, and who are determined by the Secretary of Transportation to be unable to effectively continue their job responsibilities.

2. Involuntary separation for retirement of air traffic controllers is allowed the Secretary of Transportation, if the air traffic controller is eligible for immediate retirement and the Secretary of Transportation determines the separation is in the best interest of the service and the air traffic controller

3. An impartial board is established to review and make a final decision on any determination of the Secretary of Transportation.

4. Mandatory separation of air traffic controllers at age 56. However, the Secretary of Transportation is granted the authority to exempt a controller until age 61, if the controller is deemed to possess exceptional skills and experience.

5. Immediate entitlement to an annuity is accorded any person after completing 25 years of service as an air traffic controller, or after becoming age 50 and completing 20 years of such service, with a minimum 50 percent basic benefit. There is no reduction in the annuity for air traffic controllers under age 55.

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to say goodby to my friend JOHNNY BYRNES and to express my regret that this body is losing one of its most qualified Members, the very distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

I had the very fortunate personal experience of being able to work closely with JOHN BYRNES during my first term and the early months of my second term when the issue of the creation of a medicare program was one of the most important before the Congress.

Even though I was a comparatively junior Member of the House, JOHN BYRNES was willing to take the time to listen to my ideas and suggestions on this vital subject. He was most receptive and the result of his efforts on medicare was the so-called Byrnes bill which contained a broader base of benefits and a better financing mechanism than the bill which was enacted.

In many ways, I believe the members of the Ways and Means Committee have learned now that they should have followed Mr. BYRNES' advice. Had they done so they would have avoided the very serious problem of escalating medical costs which could have been prevented or kept in check.

Those of us who were involved in the Byrnes effort are eventually going to prevail since the program of national health insurance will be built upon the foundation we developed back in 1965. This is going to be a forthcoming tribute to JOHN BYRNES to match the many others he has received during his service in the Congress on the basis of his many legislative accomplishments.

Often others get the credit but those of us who have been close to the legislative process are fully aware of the Byrnes impact on every major piece of legislation that comes from the Ways and Means Committee.

I have enjoyed working with JOHN through the years on major issues such as the airport and airways trust fund, continuing improvements to the highway trust fund and enhancement of the social security program.

When JOHN BYRNES takes the floor of the House in debate every Member present pays attention. JOHN BYRNES has something to say. He is going to be missed but I want to take this opportunity to wish him a fruitful and rewarding retirement. I trust he will make his expertise available to us from time to time.

DR. ROBISON D. HARLEY AND THE FIGHT FOR SIGHT

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, we have been endowed by our creator with six senses which we take for granted and use without particular thought. Undoubtedly the one that is most precious and most sensitive is that of sight. Think what it would be like not to be able to see the beauty of spring flowers or autumn leaves; to look upon your loved ones and behold joy. Such is the plight of those who are blind.

Fortunately, there are those who are concerned with this plight and its causes. One of the leaders in this effort is Dr. Robison D. Harley, of Germantown, Pa.

Dr. Robison, director of the Children's Eye Clinic and the Pediatrics and Motility Department of Wills Eye Hospital, will receive the Fifth Annual Dora Bornstein Memorial Award at the 1972–73 Campaign Kick-Off Luncheon of Fight for Sight of Greater Philadelphia, on Wednesday, October 25 at the Warwick Hotel, it was announced by Harold Landesberg, campaign chairman.

Dr. Harley will also serve as the keynote speaker for the afternoon.

Fight for Sight is dedicated to raising funds for research into the causes and cures of blinding eye disease and for the Fight for Sight Children's Eye Clinic at Wills Eye Hospital.

The luncheon will also host 7-year-old Jacquelin Murtagh, the 1972–73 Fight for Sight Child, and a fashion show, coordinated by Fran Kramer, will be presented.

In addition to his position at Wills Eye Hospital, Dr. Harley is professor and chairman of the department of ophthalmology at Temple University Medical Center. He is an attending surgeon at Wills Eye Hospital, Temple University Hospital, and Saint Christopher's Hospital for Children.

Dr. Harley is on the faculty of the American Academy of Ophthalmology for post graduate medical education and he serves as associate secretary for Continuing Education in Ophthalmology for the Academy.

He is a three-time recipient of the Sci-

entific Achievement Award presented by the Atlantic Hospital, and named Physician of the Year by the Atlantic County Medical Society of which he is a past president.

The author of 65 publications in ophthalmic journals and books, Dr. Harley is a Fellow in the American Academy of Ophthalmology and Otolaryngology, as well as the past president of the New Jersey Ophthalmological Society.

It is most fitting that Dr. Harley be thus honored for he has given the only true gift one can give to another and that is a portion of one's self.

We offer our congratulations and thanks to Dr. Harley for his service.

DISCRIMINATION AT THE GAO

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of talk lately about quota systems and promotion based on "merit." But with all the talk scoring quota systems and advocating promotion based on merit, several points seem to be overlooked.

First, contrary to the popular notion that blacks have never had it so good and that you have to be a woman or a minority member to be accepted at school, secure a job or a promotion, the facts indicate that discrimination is alive and well. While a few blacks, Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, Indians, and women have been promoted and put in the show window the vast majority of all of these groups are right where they have always been, unemployed, in low-paying dead-end jobs, or working at jobs that are not commensurate with their training and abilities.

I have noticed that in the discussions of promotions based on "merit" the implication is that minority members are being given preference in jobs over whites with superior capabilities. In fact the opposite has been the case. Minority employees with training, experience, and seniority—all of the ingredients for a merit promotion—are passed over.

Recently the Citizens Advocate Center offered testimony at a hearing sponsored by my fellow Black Caucus member, Delegate WALTER E. FAUNTROY, concerning the phenomenon of discrimination within the GAO.

I am asking that a portion of a letter to the Civil Service Commission summarizing this testimony be placed in the RECORD today because while Members of Congress are quick to criticize the executive branch we frequently are not as critical of our own operations.

The GAO is responsible to Congress and the record is clear that their affirmative action program leaves much to be desired.

For example, the Citizens Advocate Center study indicated that in spite of an increase in the number of employees at the GAO there had been a reduction in the number of black employees, and a decrease in the percentage of minorities and women in professional level grades.

It was also noted that the GAO has a marked tendency to force women and blacks into the lowest level jobs. For example, although the percentage of minorities and women has decreased since 1969, the percentage of those employees in the lowest grade levels—GS–1 to 4—has increased. The most recent figures indicate that 78 percent of all employees in GS–1 to 4 positions are black and 81 percent of all employees in GS–1 to 4 positions are women.

I shall not quote anymore statistics because you can review the summary report yourselves. However, it is clear that the Members of this body have a responsibility to review this evidence and to see to it that we have an effective affirmative action program instituted at the GAO immediately.

The article follows:

CITIZENS ADVOCATE CENTER,
Washington, D.C., October 6, 1972.

Hon. ROBERT HAMPTON,
Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission:

The purpose of this letter is to call to your immediate attention the deplorable conditions of race and sex discrimination at the General Accounting Office. The Citizens Advocate Center has monitored GAO's minority employment statistics over a five year period and has conducted an intensive review of the entire agency over the past two years. Our findings, based on GAO's own statistics, our interviews with employees and top agency officials and our visits to various divisions of the agency, were presented in testimony September 20, 1972, before Delegate Walter Fauntroy's Ad Hoc Hearings on Federal Employment Discrimination.

This letter presents a brief summary of our testimony before Delegate Fauntroy's committee (a copy of which is attached) and reviews the GAO Equal Employment Opportunity Plan submitted to the Civil Service Commission on May 31, 1972. We feel that a comprehensive study of deficiencies in the 1972 EEO Plan is essential, since it undoubtedly will serve as the foundation of GAO's 1973 EEO Plan. You should be aware, then, of the fact that the 1972 Plan does not propose to correct major deficiencies in the GAO EEO program. Portions of the Plan would actually have a *negative* impact on equal employment opportunity within the agency. Here are a few of our observations:

The Plan violates equal protection standards of employment by presenting a *double standard* of enforcement—one for GAO Headquarters, another for Regional Offices (see Objectives II and VI). Regional Offices could fail to place minorities on their staffs and still be in technical compliance with the Plan!

One section of the Plan (Objective VII, Section B) outlines a procedure which could actually *punish* employees who seek relief from employment discrimination by transferring them to other agency divisions. This type of discriminatory action has been widely practiced by government agencies in the past, but never before have we seen it blatantly outlined in an EEO Action Plan!

The Plan ignores the EEO Advisory Council, which was established to "provide assurance that the voice of the rank and file employee is heard," and fails to include provisions for open elections to the Advisory Council.

The Plan does not propose to correct some of the most serious conditions which have fostered employment discrimination within the agency—recruitment at predominantly white colleges and universities, discriminatory practices by supervisors in submitting "effectiveness appraisals" on employees, promulgation of a "Career Development Program" which actually hinders employee's advancement, failure to establish career ladders from non-professional to professional positions, and the promulgation of an EEO complaint procedure which even the EEO Counselors and Officers do not understand.

Finally, it is possible for GAO to meet all of the provisions of the Plan and *still continue its backsliding of minority and female employment.* By promulgating percentage targets for recruitment of minorities and women but remaining silent on percentages of minorities and women in each professional grade level, it is possible that the percentage of minorities and women in professional grades could *decrease* rather than increase.

Our findings presented before Delegate Fauntroy's committee confirmed the deeply disturbing facts of race and sex discrimination in the General Accounting Office. A small portion of our statistical data is presented below:

Since 1969, the percentage of minority and women employees in GAO actually has decreased. Moreover, in the past year the total number of black and women employees at GAO has decreased.

While the perentage of minorities and women has decreased since 1969, the percentage of those employees in the lowest grade levels (GS 1–4) has increased. Our most recent figures indicate that 78% of all employees in GS 1–4 positions are black and 81% of all empolyees in GS 1–4 positions are women.

Although the number of positions in grades 9 through 11 increased 11% over 1971, there has been a net reduction in the percentage of blacks in these positions, from 4.57% in 1971 to 4.30% this year.

The number of female professional employees at GAO actually decreased during the most recent year, for which figures are available. As of October 31, 1971, there are 128 female professionals at GAO compared with 2,898 male professionals.

We presently are conducting a statistical review of minority and female employment in the various divisions of GAO Headquarters and in each of the 15 regional offices. Our preliminary findings are even more shocking than our statistical data for the agency as a whole. For example, the Atlanta, Boston, Dallas, Norfolk and Kansas City regional offices, have no blacks—professional or non-professional—on their staffs. Regional office breakdowns are attached Appendix 1.

In addition to our statistical findings, we have noted the following conditions at GAO which help perpetuate the climate of race and sex bias:

The physical working environment in some divisions of GAO having large numbers of minority employees approaches sweat-shop conditions. Sections of the Transportation Division are so bad that employees refer to them as "The Snakepit" and "Resurrection City." A portion of the "Snakepit" was renovated, partitioned and carpented last year—and then was turned over to a predominantly white division for its use.

Following protests by 150 black employees of the Transportation Division in March 1971, the GAO established a "Career Development Program" for that division. Employees now are calling for the abolition of the program, stating that it is both humiliating and ineffective in helping them secure promotions.

The GAO "EEO Program" is totally ineffective. The "elected" Advisory Council has no voice and is denied pertinent information; the EEO "counselors" have received no training and are generally distrusted by employees; the EEO Director (who is white and who has an all-white staff) also serves as Deputy Director of the GAO General Counsel's Office; the EEO Coordinator (who is black and who has no staff) has no policy-making re-

sponsibilities and is often excluded from high-level meetings on EEO matters.

Important "action" designs in the GAO EEO Plan submitted to CSC in 1970 have not been implemented.

The 1970 Plan was transmitted to the regions on September 1, 1970 but has clearly not been enforced or followed up at the regional level.

GAO submitted no EEO Plan to CSC in 1971.

GAO's 1972 EEO Plan (which was not submitted to CSC until May 31, 1972) delays implementation of action plans until 1973 for some categories stated for "immediate action" in the 1970 Plan. It also omits important categories set forth in the 1970 Plan.

It is clear that the Civil Service Commission has been lax both in requiring timely submissions of affirmative action plans and in reviewing statistics submitted periodically by the GAO which reflect a shocking pattern of back-sliding on minority hiring and promotion. Our recommendation to Delegate Fautroy's Committee called for immediate and corrective action by the Civil Service Commission:

"1. That GAO Equal Employment Action Plans be given careful scrutiny by the Civil Service Commission as to timeliness of submission, adequacy of past performance, and conformance with CSC requirements for specificity in promises, of future action and timetables for such action, and that the appropriate Committees of Congress exercise diligent oversight of CSC's own enforcement of EEO statutes as they affect GAO.

"2. That the CSC open now an immediate investigation into personnel practices in the General Accounting Office, including but not limited to administration of the EEO Program, on the basis of what appears to be a serious collapse of affirmative action toward equal employment opportunity within the GAO."

We strongly recommend that such an investigation of GAO by the Civil Service Commission be initiated prior to the November 1, 1972 deadline for submission of GAO's 1973 EEO Plan to CSC. It is important that CSC be fully informed of the extent of the problems both at the GAO Headquarters and in the GAO regional offices before completing its review of the 1973 Plan. In conducting its investigation, CSC should seek out rank and file GAO personnel rather than having GAO managment steer the investigators to certain "dependable" employees who are fearful of losing their status by exposing the most serious conditions. Employees who have submitted complaints and grievances to EEO counselors should be contacted as well as members of the EEO Advisory Council, the Black Caucus, and the two employee unions. Investigators should tour the "Snakepit" and sections of the Claims Division. Regional Offices must also be inspected by Civil Service investigators.

Strong enforcement of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 and CSC requirements for implementation of this act can have a significant impact on civil rights within the GAO. No longer can GAO claim "congressional agency" exemption from the EEO requirements of the civil service; no longer can GAO's EEO Plans be expressed in vague generalities; no longer can employees be ignored in the promulgation and review of such Plans. According to the new requirements, adequate staff and financing must be provided for the agency's EEO program.

The 1973 EEO Plan submitted by GAO probably will build upon the 1972 Plan which the agency filed with CSC on May 31st of this year. We have revieved the 1972 Plan in detail, and have discovered that portions of the Plan would actually have a *negative* effect on GAO's EEO Program. Objectives set forth in the Plan which could have a positive effect, if implemented, lack strong affirmative action plans. Timetables for action are set in the distant future, although many of these objectives were previously stated in the 1970 EEO Plan.

In its review of GAO's 1973 EEO Plan, the Civil Service Commission should pay particular attention to the inclusion of "affirmative action plans" similar to those submitted by the GAO in past years. The 12 "objectives" listed in the 1972 Plan and "action plans" for their implementation have done nothing to enhance equal employment opportunity within the GAO, and in some cases have even discouraged employees at the lower levels from participating in Career-Development Programs. Our study of the May 31, 1972 Plan reveals major deficiencies in each of the 12 objectives:

Objective I—calls for the recruitment of minorities and women at colleges, private businesses, and government institutions.

This is an important objective, yet GAO's Action Program is worded to ensure that the goal of recruiting a significant number of minorities and women is never realized. Section C of the Action Program states that GAO will "Develop a program for aggressive recruiting of minority and female members *at institutions presently in the recruiting schedule*" (emphasis ours). The Civil Service Commission should obtain a list of colleges and universities presently on the recruiting schedule.

In the past, these lists have included only institutions whose curricula placed heavy emphasis on accounting and business administration. These institutions Rarely include significant numbers of minority and women students on their student bodies, since the field of accounting has been closed to minorities until recently and is still virtually closed to women. (See Journal of Accounting, Oct. 1969 "The Black Minority in the CPA Profession," by Bert Mitchell). Institutions having large minority and female student bodies have to be included on the recruiting schedule. Since the GAO itself has indicated it is making an active effort to recruit professionals from disciplines other than just accounting, there is simply no excuse for the omission of such institutions at this late date.

The Action Program states that GAO will evaluate and redesign its recruiting materials to make them more effetcive for recruiting minorities and women. It does not specify what changes are to be made. Although the plan states that minorities and women will be consulted on recommendations for changes in the recruiting materials, there is no mention of any participation by the EEO Advisory Council. The Advisory Council must have an active role in the design of these new materials.

Timetables for action on this objective are not geared to reach the 1973 graduating classes. The deadline for producing and distributing new recruiting materials is May 31, 1973; the deadline for developing a program for the recruitment of minorities and women is September 30, 1973. Any benefits which might result from the new recruiting program thus could not be realized until June, 1974!

Objective II—"Achieve an annual goal of obtaining at least 10% of professional recruits from among minority group members and at least 10% from among female members. These goals will apply to each organizational element of the Office on a Division basis except for the Field Operations Division which will strive to meet the goals on a Regional Office basis" (emphasis ours).

These goals are totally inadequate for any federal agency situated in Washington, D.C., and particularly for GAO, which falls far below the government norm for minority and female employment in professional grade levels. Furthermore, it is quite possible that *GAO could meet these modest goals and still continue its back-sliding on overall employment of minorities and women in professional positions.* Consider the following factors:

Even if these goals were met, more than 80% of the *newly recruited* Headquarters professional staff could be white males, and this figure could reach 90% if all minority professionals recruited were also women. The goals permit Regional Offices to maintain professional staffs of 100% white males.

Coupled with the number of promotions within the agency, the percentages of minorities and women in each professional grade slot could actually decrease under this objective. For example, suppose the percentage of minorities in GS–9 professional grades is 8%. The following year, 50 additional slots are created at the GS–9 professional level. Twenty new employees are recruited from outside the agency (two of whom are minorities to meet the 10% minority recruitment goal) and 30 employees are promoted to GS–9 levels within the agency (only one of whom is non-white). Thus, 3 or 6% of the 50 employees in these new slots are minorities, decreasing the total percent of minority employees in the GS–9 professional category to less than 8%.

Most new recruits will be concentrated in the entry-level positions for professionals (GS 7–9). The percentages of minorities and women in the GS–11 and above categories could remain stagnant or even decrease under this plan.

The GAO should be required to make a concentrated and continued effort to increase the percentages of minorities and women in *each professional grade level.* Goals should be set not only for the percentages of minorities and women *recruited,* but also for the percentages of minorities and women attained *at each grade level* in each agency division of GAO Headquarters and Regional Offices. Long-range goals (3–5 years) should also be specified in order to ensure an ascending rate (relative increases as well as absolute increases) of minority and female employment at professional levels, rather than merely a stable rate or even a descending rate.

HON. CLIFFARD CARLSON

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to take a few moments to pay tribute to a fellow Illinoian who has served both his state and his country well during his brief tenure as a Member of this body.

When the Honorable Charlotte Reid was appointed to the Federal Communications Commission, her departure left a vacancy in the ranks of the Illinois delegation. CLIFFARD CARLSON came to Washington to fill the breach. My distinguished colleague grasped the complexities and intricacies of the legislative process and quickly proved his ability to ably represent his constituency.

During his service on the Education and Labor Committee, Congressman CARLSON exhibited diligence and attention to duty, winning the respect of those with whom he associated. I have had many occasions over the past year to consult with him on pending legislation and have been both impressed and gratified by his response.

Coupled with Congressman CARLSON'S ability, his winning personality earned him a host of lasting friends who will

remember their association with fondness and respect.

I have recently been informed that you, Mr. Speaker, have appointed CLIFFARD CARLSON as congressional adviser to the U.S. delegation to the 17th general conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization convening this week in Paris. This appointment is certainly a fitting tribute to his distinguished service.

I am sure that I speak for my colleagues from the State of Illinois and the entire House of Representatives in thanking Congressman CARLSON for his contributions and in bidding him farewell as he continues to serve Illinois and the country in other capacities.

THE LATEST SOVIET TRADE DEAL

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the new Congress of 1973 will be faced with the decision of whether or not to finance the administration's new Communist subsidy program of trading with the Soviet Union.

Included in the deal is reportedly cheap credit terms to be given the Soviets through the taxpayer subsidized Export-Import Bank which received additional funding under the continuing appropriations bill for foreign aid which passed the House Saturday, October 14.

With the President announcing the scheduled deal at this time, it is obvious that he intends to make it a political issue, not as much for his election on November 7, but for approval of the trade agreement with the new Congress in 1973.

How many Members will be independent enough to vote for the American working people and taxpayers by opposing such a bill in the face of a reelected President who can claim that his reelection constituted endorsement of trade with Russia by the U.S. voters?

I insert the related newsclipping:

[From the Evening Star, Oct. 18, 1972]

UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA AGREE ON LEND-LEASE, TRADE

(By George Sherman)

The United States and Soviet governments today signed two major agreements setting out a broad new trade relationship between the two superpowers.

The White House announced that agreement had been reached on settlement of Russia's $2.6 billion lend-lease debt owed from World War II. At the same time, an accompanying new trade pact, including new tariff treatment for Soviet imports into the United States is to be signed.

The announcement signalled the end of negotiations which began in earnest with President Nixon's summit meetings in Moscow last May. It also signalled the end of a 24-year impasse over the Soviet lend-lease debt and the first breakthrough toward normal trade with the Soviet Communist state.

White House press secretary Ronald L. Ziegler had no details about either dollar figures or the terms of the new agreement in his first announcement. He said only that Secretary of State William P. Rogers is to sign the lend-lease agreement with Soviet Foreign Trade Minister Nikolai S. Patolichev, and that Commerce Secretary Peter G. Peterson is to sign the trade pact also with Patolichev.

Patolichev, who arrived in Washington last Wednesday, was also to be at the White House later today accompanied by Soviet Ambassador Anatoly F. Dobrynin. White House aide Peter M. Flanigan also is participating.

According to informed sources, the lend-lease debt is computed on the basis of the Russians still owing $500 million to the United States. But on to that is also to be added interest payments computed over a 30-year period.

The Soviet government, it is understood, rejected spelling out how much interest was to be paid. So an overall figure is to be used including the basic $500 million plus the computed interest payments, and then divided into annual payments through the year 2001.

Under the lend-lease agreement, as previously in the settlement of the British lend-lease debt, the Russians are to be allowed a certain number of postponements of annual payments. The exact number was not immediately given, but was believed to be three.

Both the lend-lease agreement and the trade pact, Ziegler said, would need congressional approval. White House aide Henry A. Kissinger, after his trip to Moscow in September, indicated that the administration would be asking Congress for enabling legislation early in its next session.

The trade agreement is understood to call for giving the Russians so-called "most-favored-nation" treatment in their exports to the United States—that is, Soviet goods in the United States would receive the same tariff treatment as good from other countries.

Both the Nixon administration and the Soviet government have tied the lend-lease and trade agreements tightly together. Nixon has argued that Congress would not approve improved tariff treatment for the Soviet Union without a lend-lease settlement, and the Russians have argued they could not pay the debt without increasing trade to the United States.

The two agreements follow closely on the maritime agreement between the United States and Soviet Union signed last Saturday. That agreement set the framework for increasing trade, opening 40 major ports on each side to the shipping of the other.

The trade agreement now provides a comprehensive framework for conducting that trade. According to informed sources, it has three principal guarantees to American businessmen in their dealings with state enterprises of the Soviet Union.

1. That Soviet goods will not be dumped at below-market prices on the American market, disrupting the U.S. economy.

2. That a system of neutral arbitration is set up to work out disputes between American businessmen and the government-owned enterprises with which they must deal.

3. U.S. business will receive greatly expanded office and communications facilities inside major Soviet cities to conduct their trade.

Under the agreement, it also understood that the U.S. will facilitate trade and investment with the Soviet Union through cheap credit provided by the federally-owned Export-Import Bank.

The key problem has been finding products which the Soviet Union can sell to the United States. They are mainly natural resources, particularly natural gas from Siberia, but U.S. officials acknowledge that trade in these raw materials will take a huge American investment for exploitation and transportation.

HON. THOMAS ABERNETHY

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in saluting Congressman THOMAS ABERNETHY, who has made the decision to retire from Congress after 30 years of dedicated service as U.S. Representative from the State of Mississippi.

Since TOM came to Washington in 1942, he has witnessed many great moments in legislative history and can reflect with great personal satisfaction on his own contributions and accomplishments during that time. Although he will be missed by all who have come to know him over the years, his retirement is indeed well-earned.

My every good wish for happiness in the years ahead goes with him as he prepares to return to his beloved State.

ST. LUCAS COMMEMORATES CENTURY OF SERVICE

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, a 6-month celebration marking a century of dedicated service was begun on Friday, October 13, by St. Lucas Evangelical Lutheran Church in my home district of Milwaukee. Guest preachers at a special commemorative service on Sunday, October 15, were Pastor Oscar Naumann, president of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod, and Pastor George Boldt, president of the southeastern Wisconsin District.

As noted in the article from the South Times Star which follows: St. Lucas Church was founded to serve German immigrants who settled in the Bay View area of Milwaukee. Over the years it has maintained that founding spirit of dedicated response to the needs of the people.

Now the largest congregation of the Wisconsin Synod in the Milwaukee metropolitan area, St. Lucas symbolizes the churches of America who give meaning to the claim that our country is one founded under God.

To the pastors, the Rev. Robert C. Johnston and the Rev. Carl S. Leyrer, and all the parishoners of St. Lucas go my congratulations and best wishes.

The article follows:

ST. LUCAS COMMEMORATES CENTURY OF SERVICE

A six month celebration of the 100th anniversary of St. Lucas Evangelical Lutheran church at 2605 South Kinnickinnic Ave. will begin Friday at 7 p.m., October 13, the actual centennial date, with a song festival of favorite old hymns.

On October 15, commemorative services will be held. Pastor Oscar Naumann, President of The Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod will preach at 8, 9:30, and 11 a.m. Pastor George Boldt, President of The South-

eastern Wisconsin District will preach in the afternoon service starting at 2:30 p.m.

It was on October 13, 1872 when St. Lucas, the first Evangelical Lutheran church in Bay View was organized. The building was built on ground donated by the old Milwaukee Iron Company (at that time known as The Rolling Mills). Milwaukee Iron Company donated this plot of ground so that the German immigrants who settled in Bay View and worked at the mills, would have a church in their area.

The present church edifice was erected at a cost of $16,000 in 1888, which dominates the skyline of Bay View. In 1891 the congregation purchased a plot of ground on the north side of Dover Street and a four room school was built at a cost of $8,000.

The year 1910 proved to be a momentous one in the history of St. Lucas congregation. It was decided to organize a cemetery. An 11 acre plot previously known as The Mosher Farms was purchased. Woodlawn Cemetery, as it is still known at East Howard and South Pine Streets, is still owned and operated by St. Lucas congregation.

The congregation in 1901 purchased 3 bronze church bells and tower clocks. These magnificent bells still are used every Sunday for the call to worship.

The 75th anniversary in 1947 a major renovation was undertaken. Included in the project was a new church entrance, church parlors, kitchen facilities and an outside bulletin board. In 1961 the old school was razed and a new school was erected at a cost of $215,000. The new building was dedicated June 3, 1962.

For St. Lucas, "A Century at His Feet" the centennial slogan, the exterior of the church was sand blasted to clean and bring out the color of the Milwaukee Cream brick. The clocks in the church tower were electrified and the complete interior of the church was renovated, total cost $120,000.

St. Lucas is the largest congregation of the Wisconsin Synod in the Metropolitan area of Milwaukee.

The present Pastors are Robert G. Johnston and Carl S. Leyrer.

SOCIAL SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it was a special pleasure for me to vote for and support the great improvements in the social security program we have just passed. This is one of the most important and historic social security improvements in history. Among other features, Mr. Speaker, the bill will increase to 100 percent the amount of their late husbands' social security that can be collected by widows. Outside earning limitations are raised for 1.2 million retirees. Medicare is extended to disabled people under age 65. The Federal Government will assume responsibility for welfare programs for the aged, blind, and the disabled.

This legislation has been long needed Mr. Speaker, to provide special assistance to older Americans who worked with such devotion and dedication in developing this Nation at a time when a dollar was still worth a dollar. Inflation has cruelly affected older Americans, and the improvements in this legislation are a great step forward in assuring that these citizens can live with dignity and respect.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a tribute to the great Committee on Ways and Means. Chairman MILLS and the committee time and again have fulfilled their responsibility; the House passed H.R. 1 long ago, but action was delayed by the other body. Finally, however, the other body acted and we have been able to give final approval to this bill which will mean so much to all Americans.

PLIGHT OF OLDER AMERICANS

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the plight of many older Americans today is drawing increased attention from responsible persons throughout the United States. As a direct result of the 1971 White House Conference on Aging, which the Congress in 1968 directed the administration to hold, the city of North Bergen, N.J., is now conducting a similar conference under the direction of its mayor, the Honorable Peter Mocco.

Mayor Mocco honored me with an invitation to address the North Bergen Conference on Aging. Because of the tremendous importance of this issue, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my remarks to conference delegates.

The remarks follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE DOMINICK V. DANIELS TO THE NORTH BERGEN CONFERENCE ON AGING

First let me congratulate Mayor Mocco for this Conference and for the opportunity to meet with you on the critical problems of Older Americans.

Before discussing some of the issues concerning older Americans, I would like to announce that in the next few weeks I shall issue a series of position papers on the major and critical issue we Americans will face in the coming years. Because of its primary critical importance the first of these position papers will deal with the same subject as this Conference on Aging and will offer for consideration a "Bill of Rights for Older Americans."

All of us here are aware of the needs of the elderly in American life—

Adequate retirement income

Decent health care

Sound nutrition

Recreational and community service opportunities.

Housing

Transportation

Education and employment; to cite the most obvious.

And we are aware that these problems affect a significant segment of our society. There are today some 20 million Americans aged 65 and over. During the years that the total U.S. population has tripled, the older population increased sevenfold. By 1990 the Census Bureau estimates there will be over 27 million older persons in America.

Congress recognized these problems and the fact that they would only increase in the decades ahead. We passed back in 1965, The Older Americans Act, which provided grants to New Jersey and other States to assist in developing new and improved programs to help older persons, and for an Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In 1967, we realized that we needed a still more comprehensive national approach to the pressing problems of the elderly. I sponsored and Congress passed amendments to the Older Americans Act which increased the authorization for the state and community programs for the aging, and provided more money for research and development and training projects for programs for our older citizens.

While I might go on at great length describing the successful programs made possible by the Older Americans Act, you know and I know, that many problems are still crying out for solution.

In 1968 several of my colleagues joined me in introducing a Resolution ordering the President to call "The White House Conference on Aging". I stress the fact that the President *was required by the Congress* to call this conference to correct a misleading commercial by a certain political committee to re-elect a certain political person to a high national office. This marvelously successful conference developed an extremely effective dialogue between people affected by Fderal aging programs and those responsible for administering them.

As a result of monitoring that conference Congress has taken the initiative and is on the verge of completing work on major recommendations of the conference. Those recommendations not passed in this Congress will be the first order of business in the 93rd Congress.

Before I describe some of the provisions of the comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972, let me just ask you to recall the April 1970 words of President Nixon when he told us:

"For too long we have lacked a national policy and commitment to provide adequate services for older people."

Yet, all of you in this room will be astonished to learn that when Bill Hutton, your Executive Director of the National Council of Senior Citizens testified before Congress on the plight of older Americans, particularly those living in poverty, he said:

"What has the Nixon Administration done for these unfortunate men and women since they came into office three years ago? In all honesty I want to say they have done absolutely nothing."

Now I really do not wish to appear partisan today—although you know that I am perfectly capable of being so! But the facts speak for themselves.

If only the White House paid more attention to the advice of Republican Senator Charles Percy, to my good friend in the House from Idaho, Republican Orval Hansen, and the good counsel of other distinguished Republican and Democratic Senators and Congressmen, neither Bill Hutton nor I would have to offer such criticism.

I honestly and sincerely believe that the major initiatives for Federal programs to make life better for older people of our country have in the last 4 years not generated from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. The initiatives have come from Senators and Congressmen—both Democrats and Republicans—working in coalition on a wide variety of key legislative measures.

The recent increases in Social Security benefits, improved nutrition services for the elderly, the outstanding work by Representative David Pryor in alerting the nation to the scandalous nursing home standards, and the White House Conference on Aging were only a few of the measures initiated and passed by Congress, often in spite of intensive adverse White House lobbying efforts.

The Comprehensive Older Americans Service Amendments I mentioned earlier will prove to be a landmark measure in providing assistance to America's older citizens.

Passed by the House in July and a similar version by the Senate this week, the measure proves the strong Congressional interest of older Americans. It was approved in the House by a vote of 351–3, and in the Senate by 89–0.

Here are only some of the key features of the Bill:

It establishes a 15 member Federal Council on the Aging within HEW to promote the interests of older Americans on matters relating to their special needs and to Federal programs affecting them.

Provides grants to states to support model projects—to expand or improve social services to older persons in:

Housing, low-cost transportation, employment, education, pre-retirement training, and improved systems of delivering services to older citizens.

Assist communities in establishing senior centers.

Extends foster grandparents program.

Establishes community service jobs for the over 55 low-income older persons.

Provides $100 million for manpower training and related services for unemployed and underemployed persons 45 years of age or older through existing programs.

These provisions are aimed at insuring that the rhetoric about the problems of our elderly citizens is translated into effective *action*.

Senator Ted Kennedy, I should tell you, in supporting these provisions told the Senate and I agree that:

What is perhaps even more of an indication of our failure to show a national sensitivity to the needs of these older workers is the recent report from the Bureau of the Census. They show that some 6.18 million persons aged 55 and older are living in poverty. 25 percent of the nation's 25.9 million poor . . . and the lack of income heightens the difficulties faced by older Americans in providing for their basic needs.

As Chairman of the House Select Subcommittee on Labor, I fully support these measures, and can assure you that these significant measures, aimed at ensuring a dignified and decent living standard for older citizens, will be a reality.

Let me conclude then, with some words of a distinguished champion of the cause of the older Americans, Adlai Stevenson. They are words which frequently come to my mind as I consider measures to improve the quality of life for all Americans:

". . . What a man knows at 50 that he did not know at 20 is, for the most part, incommunicable. The knowledge that he has acquired with age is not the knowledge of formulas or forms or words, but of people, places, action—a knowledge not gained by words but by touch, sight, sound, victories, failures, sleeplessness, devotion, love—The experience and emotions of this earth and one's self and of other men and perhaps too, a little faith and a little reverence for the things you cannot see."

The kind of reverence, the kind of knowledge, the kind of faith which characterizes the older people of our society is too scarce, too precious in this great nation of ours to be wasted, or worse, ignored.

Thank you.

JOHN H. TERRY

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, while I have known JOHN TERRY for only a short time since his joining the House, I have been singularly impressed by his ability and competence. He is a man of remarkable legislative capabilities and the House will be greatly diminished by his retirement.

JOHN TERRY has chosen to return to private life, abandoning a successful political career, to spend more time with his family. This was a decision requiring tremendous courage and sacrifice. I am sure that every Member of this House commends JOHN for his actions, and wish him well in his new endeavors.

I know that his decision to leave Congress came only after the most careful consideration. But he has received the respect and admiration of Members from both sides of the aisle in deciding to place his family first. I extend my personal best wishes to JOHN and will always deeply treasure my association with him in this body.

THE AIR TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM OF TOMORROW: FLYING PLAIN OR FANCY

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edward J. Driscoll, president of the National Air Carrier Association, recently appeared before the International Aviation Club in Washington and addressed this organization on the subject of "The Air Transportation System of Tomorrow: Flying Plain or Fancy."

As a part of these remarks, I include Mr. Driscoll's speech with the knowledge that my colleagues will find it of interest.

ADDRESS BY EDWARD J. DRISCOLL

A great deal has been said lately about the state of the air transportation industry, and these four walls have heard far more than their fair share.

Why all this talk? Why all the comments, the suggestions, the filings to the Civil Aeronautics Board and the appeals and petitions to Congress and the courts?

And with it all, why do we seem to make so little progress toward solving the problems that confront us: problems such as pricing; capacity; excessive, even destructive, competition; illegal charters; widespread illegal discounting on scheduled service; and the rest.

Part of the answer, I think, is that the air transport industry is living in the past. It is still living in that golden age when air travel was such a novelty that people would pay any price for it. And it refuses to face the fact that today's consumer is too sophisticated to accept just any deal that is offered him. He wants real value for his dollar.

The scheduled industry's attitude is typified by the recent statements that what the industry needs is "more stability and less change."

I could agree with more stability, but not less change. It is my firm conviction that most of the industry's problems stem directly from the fact that it has not satisfied the consumer demand for low-cost air transportation, and that it has not lived up to the mandate laid down for it by the Congress of the United States.

However, there can be no stability within our industry unless and until we make some very basic changes in the way the air transportation business is conducted. We are only deluding ourselves if we pretend otherwise.

The demand for change exists. It is not going to go away.

As I was preparing this speech—sifting through the verbiage and counter-verbiage that the scheduled versus charter battle has produced over the years, I noted the appearance of some possible areas of agreement between the scheduled and supplemental segments of the air transportation industry. Nothing has been done, however, to focus on these and use them to solve our mutual problems.

It is as though we are all in a gigantic holding pattern, circling endlessly and bickering among ourselves and with the control tower about who should land first. Our fuel reserves are dwindling and in a little while none of it will matter, but still we fight on.

And in the meantime, our passengers are almost forgotten.

Lip service is paid to the "rights of the consumer" and the "need of the traveling public," but no real effort is made by the industry to protect those rights or meet those needs.

Oh yes, there are promotional fares, and discounting practices, and illegal charters with fares that threaten our very existence.

But we haven't really tried to provide the public with low-cost transportation on a simple, straightforward basis that meets its needs on an economic level that insures the well-being of the industry and the continued availability of its services to the public.

Quite frankly, the air transportation industry seems to have lost sight of its reason for being. What the industry sees as a fight for survival may, in fact, be a rather elaborate form of suicide.

The scheduled-versus-supplemental argument has produced many myths; among them, the following:

1. The scheduled carriers and the supplemental carriers are two separate industries.

2. The U.S. International Air Transportation Policy does not exist, or it is an empty policy pronouncement dreamed up by some bureaucratic regime without support of fact or law.

3. Only those carriers who engage in individually ticketed services serve the public need. Those engaged in bulk transportation do not serve a public need because they are under no obligation to serve the public on particular routes.

Let's examine these myths in the light of day.

MYTH NO. 1

All carriers presently certificated by the CAB are authorized to engage in charter air transportation. This is the type of service designed to provide low-cost air transportation by taking advantage of the economies of planeload traffic. Part of the industry, however, is also authorized to engage in individually-ticketed, scheduled transportation. Thus, although there are two types of authority, there is only one industry—and it's about time we accepted that fact and started working together to develop charter transportation to the fullest rather than trying to destroy it.

MYTH NO. 2

The International Air Transportation Policy has been described by one scheduled industry spokesman as a policy that does not exist. Others call it a scheme designed to destroy the scheduled industry.

Is that really so? Let's look at the declaration of policy contained in Section 102C of the Federal Aviation Act of 1938, which calls for:

"The promotion of adequate, economic, and efficient service by air carriers at reasonable charges, without unjust discrimination, undue preference or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices."

In essence, ladies and gentlemen, the International Air Transportation Policy of the United States is hinged to that basic declaration: a charge to the regulators to insure that proper attention is focused on meeting those objectives.

You will note that it doesn't say scheduled carriers, or supplemental carriers—it simply says air carriers.

MYTH NO. 3

There is no requirement under the Federal Aviation Act that any level of charter service be maintained on any specific route by either segment of the industry. But then, there is no requirement that any specific level of individually-ticketed service be maintained on any particular route, either. It just says "adequate" service—and relies on competition and public demand to decide what that level is. I think history will show that the scheduled segment of air transportation industry has more than met the public need in this area.

However, had the scheduled industry adequately served the charter market, the Congress of the United States would not have found it necessary to create charter specialists to stimulate the development of this type of service to meet the public need.

These and other myths have kept the scheduled-versus-supplemental battle going for more than ten years now, and it's about time we realized that this isn't very productive. What we should be talking about is the relationship of individually-ticketed and bulk transportation. What we should be doing is finding ways to balance them in the best interests of the public.

Your speaker last month referred to "the fallacy of bulk transportation"—and then proceeded to say that it made up more than half of the scheduled airlines' traffic.

Bulk transportation is no myth, but neither is it a monster that threatens to devour the scheduled airlines. It is, quite simply, a term coined to describe transportation that relies on volume sales for its profitability—and it *does* include promotional group traffic as well as pure charter traffic.

Bulk transportation is becoming increasingly important to the scheduled carriers—as witness their increasing charter activity—and it promises to become even more important to the future of the air transportation industry as a whole.

In commenting on Travel Group Charters, last week's Airline Reports points out, "traffic that shifts or is 'diverted' to charter . . . may be lost to scheduled service but not to scheduled airlines. Their authority will be no more limited than that of supplemental airlines and, in fact, their capacity to serve a growing charter market may be far beyond that of the supplementals."

I might add that we do not expect significant diversion, but rather an expanded base of traffic.

The challenge facing us, therefore, as an industry, is to find ways to meet the growing public demand for bulk transportation and at the same time, protect essential levels of scheduled traffic on all routes.

The Civil Aeronautics Board's new Travel Group Charter rules are a step in the right direction, as are the British Government's new Advance Booking regulations covering charter flights.

It is gratifying to see that others are beginning to recognize the need for change: for example, Pan American's call to IATA for a quote "innovative and profit-oriented approach to pricing," unquote, in the North Atlantic market.

Pan Am's own economic analysis, it seems, has demonstrated something that we have been saying for some time; namely, that the quote "continued proliferation of promotional fares," and "liberalization of their condition," unquote, are self-diversionary and are major factors in the yield erosion in the North Atlantic market.

The Air Transport Association also recognizes the desirability—in part at least—of a new look at rate levels.

Significant though they are, however, these expressions of willingness to change with the times still represent what I would call a piecemeal approach to the problem. We need a total system approach to regulation that will put our industry in tune with the times.

This "total system" approach to air transport regulation is, I believe, essential to the development of a viable, balanced air transportation system—which brings me back to the Federal Aviation Act's Declaration of Policy, and the questions and the challenges that it presents us with.

What is adequate, economic, and efficient service?

What are reasonable charges?

How do we, as an industry, provide service without unjust discrimination, undue preference or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices?

Let's take them one at a time.

WHAT IS ADEQUATE, ECONOMIC, AND EFFICIENT SERVICE?

As I see it, this is service which, to the maximum extent feasible, satisfies the public demand, whether it is for individually-ticketed, scheduled service, or for low-cost vacation travel—bulk service.

In other words, the levels of both individually-ticketed and bulk services must be tied to the demand for each.

Excessive capacity dilutes the airlines' yield per passenger mile just as surely as commingling too many promotional fares creates self-diversion and which, in turn, also dilutes the yield. We need to determine, on the basis of demand, what *are* adequate levels of service on individual routes and then devise ways of protecting those levels against impairment.

In our proposals to the Civil Aeronautics Board, for example, we proposed a method of protecting essential scheduled services against impairment by one-stop Inclusive Tour Charters—should they be approved. We suggested that in markets in which more than fifty ITC's per year are conducted, the CAB should establish what are "essential levels" of scheduled service and then conduct an annual review to determine the effect of the ITC's.

The Board would then be able to impose conditions in those specific markets where ITC operations could be seen to have impaired traffic.

WHAT ARE REASONABLE CHARGES?

In my view, fares, whether scheduled or charter, *must* be tied to the cost of providing the service. Destructive competition that drives fares below cost is self-defeating and is detrimental to the airlines and, in the long run, to the public.

What is desperately needed at this point in time is a structured fare system, from first class to charter, in which the value to the consumer is balanced by the cost of providing the service.

We have proposed a fare structure that would place the economy fare at 100 per cent, the first class fare at 120–125 per cent, promotional fares at 70–80 per cent, and part charters on regularly scheduled flights at 65–70 per cent.

Planeload charters, whether on scheduled or supplemental carriers, would be 45–50 per cent.

Such a structure, we believe, would give the consumer a clear choice and show him exactly what his travel dollar can buy. He can then decide whether he wants to fly plain or fancy.

If he wants fancy service with all the trimmings and can afford first class—let him have it.

If he wants individually-ticketed service with all the attendant amenities—let him have it.

But, if he wants plain, low-cost bulk transportation—let's make that available to him too, at levels that are economically sound for him and for us.

After all—and as we are all painfully aware—a sound air transportation system cannot exist unless it is conducted on a profitable basis.

In our brief, we asked the CAB to return to basic rate-making principles to guard against the kind of loss-leader promotional fares that have been playing havoc with per passenger yields in recent years. The air transportation industry must recognize that promotional fares are supposed to generate new traffic—not shift it from one class of service to another or from one part of the plane to another.

How do we, as an industry, provide service without unjust discrimination, undue preference or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices?

The answer to this question is not as simple as it would appear, but there is an answer. It is:

a. Self-discipline by the industry—elimination of marginal or below-cost fares.

b. Policy direction by the Civil Aeronautics Board in international fares much the same as we have domestically.

c. Scrutiny by the Civil Aeronautics Board of all fares and rejection of below-cost or marginal fares proposed by IATA and policing of tariffs to insure that below-cost scheduled or charter fares or rates do not become effective.

d. Management of the marketing by air carriers (both supplemental and scheduled) of the air transportation product they produce. This, of course, would be through or in conjunction with reputable travel agents and tour operators.

Let me reiterate that the U.S. air transportation industry I am talking about is one INDUSTRY.

Only when we accept this as fact can we tackle the challenges that face us—domestically and internationally.

Only when we accept this as fact can we work together to implement systems that will broaden the base of air transportation and provide more Americans opportunities for low-cost vacation travel by air—on both scheduled and supplemental airlines.

Only when we accept this as fact can we deal realistically with other governments and negotiate international aviation agreements on an economic rather than a political basis. After all, aviation rights are no different from any other form of trade.

It is time, now, to look to the future: take a long, hard, realistic look at our present system. We need to define the proper and related roles of scheduled and charter services with the kind of "adequate, economic, and efficient" air transport system that the authors of the Federal Aviation Act had in mind 34 years ago, and which was reiterated in President Nixon's International Air Transport Policy statement in June, 1970.

We, as an industry, have a duty to live up to that Congressional mandate, just as the Civil Aeronautics Board has an obligation to see that we do.

BUT HOW DO WE DO THIS?

The industry has solved other major problems through cooperative efforts while still maintaining competition to the maximum extent feasible.

It may be that as bulk transportation becomes even more of a dominant part of our

air transport system that a conference of charter operators or some similar type organization will be needed. Of course, any such system would have to operate within our legal and regulatory framework and, above all, would necessarily refrain from rate-making or setting practices: the latter being the province of the CAB.

We have had suggestions that our industry must maintain the "status quo." It seems totally illogical and inconsistent in today's world to even think of maintaining the "status quo." The structure of our society is changing, our culture is changing, our personal ambitions are expanding and our technology continues to progress at a rapid pace.

Our communities throughout the world are demanding the right to participate in the tourism movement. If we in the United States do not recognize the changes all about us, then other nations of the world will move into the leadership of air transportation, as they are beginning to do now, and we will become reactive to the actions of these nations rather than maintaining our role as the originators and innovators for the benefit of our own citizens and our own industry.

Now, if the industry is unable, or unwilling, to measure up to this task, then it may be that the Government will have to step in and we may end up with more regulation rather than less regulation—only this time, I am certain, the regulations will be designed to insure that low-cost air transportation is available to the public on a continuing basis.

I believe that unless positive actions are taken by the industry within the next few months to eliminate destructive competition, the U.S. Government should call for a conference of world governments with a view to taking the necessary action to protect what the CAB has described as quote "the irresistible and understandable public demand for low-cost air transportation."

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD H. POFF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, in the closing hours of the 92d Congress I wish to pay tribute to one whose presence is already missed, RICHARD H. POFF. For no man in this Chamber had a keener legal mind. Whenever he stood in the well to address the House, the Chamber hushed and his colleagues listened. With impenetrable logic he would cut through layers of complexities to reach his starkly clear conclusion. In legislative clashes, where he positioned his standard was critical, for his followers were legion. In a body composed mostly of lawyers, he was the lawyer that the lawyers admired, respected, and—when they disagreed—feared.

DICK POFF left his stamp on the law. But his influence has not diminished. It continues to be felt more and more as the bills he moved through the Congress find their life through implementation. And it will grow as his ideas and insights incorporated in a draft of a revision of the entire Federal criminal code, flourish in future Congresses.

He has left the Federal legislature for the State judiciary. It was evident to all of us that DICK POFF loved the law. No man who did not could know it so well. And so I have complete confidence that Mr. Justice Poff will be a bright star in his State's historic galaxy of jurists. I am sure that this lawyers' lawyer will become a judges' judge.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE MINORITIES PROGRAM

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, last month the Congressional Black Caucus, under the leadership of my friend, the distinguished Representatives of the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY), conducted a series of hearings on discrimination against Government employees in the Washington, D.C., area.

One agency given serious study is the General Accounting Office. I have just read a fine study of GAO practices and policies, and, for the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to have the general comments from that hearing printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE MINORITIES PROGRAM

General Comments: Note that we continually have recommended that the EEO Advisory Council of GAO have a stronger voice in developing and implementing GAO's EEO Action Programs. Of equal importance is the inclusion in the 1973 Plan of a program to provide assurance that the EEO Advisory Council will indeed represent minority and female employees.

The EEO Advisory Council was created in 1971 to assist the newly formed "Personnel Relations Planning Committee" and to provide assurance that the "voice of the rank and file employee" would be heard in setting EEO policy. However, the "rank and file" voice of the employees, as heard through the EEO Advisory Council has been muted in various ways:

"Elections" are held by employees in each GAO Division to choose their representatives on the Advisory Council (15 members, 8 black, 7 white) but *then* agency management officials decide which of those so elected can actually serve on the Council!! Moreover, employees do not participate in tallying the votes cast and have no way of knowing for certain whether individuals receiving the greatest number of votes have been "elected" to serve on the Council. To say that these are true elections then is a mis-statement of fact.

The Steering Committee of the Personnel Relations Planning Committee has no representative sitting on it from "rank and file" employees—all of the members of the Steering group are top agency officials. The Steering Committee meets every two weeks.

Three of the 15 members of the Advisory Council, the "rank and file" group, are permitted to come into the Steering Committee meetings for half an hour to present their views. They are then excused, and the Steering Committee continues its deliberations without them!

The Citizens Advocate Center recommends the following procedures be presented in the 1973 Plan to provide assurance that the EEO Advisory Council meets its objective of providing "a channel for meaningful participation between employees and management in EEO matters:"

That the EEO Advisory Council continue to have one representative elected from each of the 3 employee organizations (NFFE, AFGE and the Black Caucus). Representation of the remaining Council members by division should be proportionate to the combined number of minority and female employees within each division. For example The Transportation Division (which has a sizable number of minorities and women) probably would have 2 or 3 representatives on the Council while a division having few minorities or women would be required to share a representative with another division.

That representatives of the 3 employee organizations be permitted to observe the election procedure and count the ballots.

That all persons elected to the Council serve on the Council.

That provisions be included in the Plan for representation of members of the Advisory Council on the Steering Committee.

The 1972 EEO Plan does not begin to cover all of the areas which should be included in a comprehensive EEO program. It is particularly alarming that the 1972 Plan *drops entirely* a most worthwhile goal outlined in the 1970 Report: Participation in Community Efforts to Improve Conditions which Affect Employability. *This should be in particular importance to the GAO as a government employer in the District of Columbia community.* Omitted from the 1972 Plan are the following important goals:

"1. To promote and lend support, where appropriate, to those equal housing programs at the community level in those locales where segments of our agency are situated.

"2. To provide information on available housing to job applicants in respective recruitment areas as a regular part of recruiting services and provide full assistance to applicants in obtaining fair housing rights where known barriers may exist.

"3. To encourage women and minority group students at the college and university level to pursue professional careers with the General Accounting Office through our 'Student Meeting' and 'Faculty Meeting' programs sponsored by our regional offices and by headquarters staff here in Washington. This medium of promoting the discipline and providing prerecruitment advertising for the General Accounting Office has proven productive...

"4. To encourage staff participation in community affairs and membership in civic organizations and societies as a viable extension and positive affirmation of our support for equal opportunity programs."

We fail to see how the relaxation of standards in the area of fair housing, whether in the Washington area or in the regional offices, can affirm equal employment opportunity. Federal agencies should play a positive role as advocates in helping government employees combat the problems of discrimination in their respective communities. The GAO could actively participate in such an effort by assigning members of the General Counsel's Office to work in this area.

Finally, the 1972 Plan makes no mention of the employee grievance procedure, which should be restructured and streamlined if it is to be effective. The existing system is complex and discourages employees from seeking relief from discriminatory practices. Few employees, counselors or EEO officers understand the entire process.

Those employees who follow the established procedures wind up in a complicated and lengthy maze which carries them from their EEO Counselor to their EEO Officer before their case is even brought to the attention of the EEO Director. In some cases, an unfortunate employee may find that the counselor or EEO officer assigned to his or her division is his or her own supervisor against whom the complaint is being brought! Whether or not this situation exists, it is often difficult for an employee to discuss

a complaint with an individual from the employee's own division.

The GAO should provide an alternative for those employees who seek corrective and prompt action on a complaint and who are reluctant to request assistance from counselors and officers within their divisions. One suggested method would be to name attorneys in the General Counsels Office as EEO Officers and to permit any employee having a complaint to go directly to one of these officers and by-pass the established procedure in his or her division. The EEO Officer would have the authority to request a meeting with both the aggrieved employee and the supervisor. If no satisfactory resolution of the problem were found, the employee could then proceed to file a written complaint with the EEO Officer. At present, the EEO complaint system does not effectively provide a forum outside of the personnel administration hierarchy until a late stage in the formal complaint procedure. For this reason, the employee is effectively denied due process and fairness in presenting his or her grievance at the initial *and* critical first step to gain Equal Employment Opportunity. The GAO should be required to notify each employee within the agency of both established and alternative procedures in filing grievances and complaints. Flow charts outlining the procedures should be distributed to all employees, EEO Counselors and EEO Officers.

We have outlined in this letter only the most obvious problems in GAO's EEO program. We strongly recommend that the Civil Service Commission and the Congress seek the opinions of the EEO Advisory Council and the GAO employee organizations before conducting its review of the 1973 GAO Plan. They have first-hand experience of the problems of discrimination within the GAO and should be able to offer valuable suggestions for improvement.

We trust that the information presented herein will prompt the Civil Service Commission to conduct a thorough investigation of the General Accounting Office along the lines we have recommended.

MINORITY AND FEMALE EMPLOYMENT IN THE GAO REGIONAL OFFICES

Discrimination against minorities and women is even more blatant in GAO Regional Offices than in GAO Headquarters Divisions.

Statistical data on minority employment in each GAO Regional Office was released by the agency on May 31, 1972. A summary of the data is presented in Attachment A of this Appendix. Here are some of the most shocking facts:

Three of the 15 Regional Offices have *no minority employees*:

Atlanta (125 employees).

Boston (104 employees).

Norfolk (73 employees).

An additional 2 Regional Offices have *no Black employees*:

Dallas (156 employees).

Kansas City (130 employees).

In addition, the Seattle Regional Office has *no minority professional employees*.

The remaining 9 Regional Offices have only token minority representation on their staffs. Consider the following:

The Philadelphia Regional Office has only 1 minority employee.

The New York Regional Office has only 1 minority *professional employee*. It has *no Spanish surnamed employees*.

There are no American Indians on *any* of the GAO Regional Office staffs.

The Washington, D.C. Regional Office (which is located in Virginia, but which covers only a small portion of Northern Virginia, portions of Maryland, and all of the District of Columbia) has only 4 Black professional employees.

There are no Black employees above the GS–12 category in *any* Regional Office, although there are 513 positions above GS–12 in the Field Operations Division!

The statistics presented above are even more significant when considering the fact that the GAO regularly monitors programs which directly effect minority groups. For example, 23 states (and portions of 5 additional states) are covered by GAO Regional Officials which have *no Black professional staff members*—this includes all of the states in the deep South. States having large Indian populations—Oklahoma, Arizona, New Mexico, California and Alaska—are covered by Regional Offices which have *no American Indian employees*. New York City, which has a large Spanish-speaking population, is covered by a Regional Office having *no Spanish surnamed employees*.

The status of women in GAO Regional Offices is, in many ways, as bad as it is for minorities. Attachment B to this Appendix gives GAO's own statistical break down in the Regional Offices. Unfortunately, the figures released by GAO on September 29, 1972, reflect female employment in the Regions *as of June 30, 1970!* This leads us to believe that GAO either does not have enough interest in female employment to update its figures or GAO is hesitant to release new data which might reveal backsliding on female employment within the regions.

The 1970 data reveals that GAO is making little or no effort to get women into all grade levels (particularly professional categories) in significant numbers:

The entire Field Operations Division (excluding military branches) had a total of only 193 women in June 1970! If compared with the present number of 1,808 Field Operation Staff members (excluding military branches), and assuming this number has not changed significantly in the past 2 years, we can conclude that the percentage of women in Regional Offices is only slightly higher than 10%!

Only *one* of the 15 Regional Offices has *any* women above the GS–9 level. (The Washington, D.C. regional office has 2 women who are GS–12's), according to the 1970 statistics.

SENATOR KARL E. MUNDT

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, a long and distinguished career in public service will come to an end with the retirement of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) at the close of the 92d Congress.

After he had four terms in the U.S. House of Representatives, South Dakota demonstrated their confidence in KARL by electing him to the Senate in 1948. When he retires, he will have completed 24 years of Senate service.

Few men who have served in this body have had such a wide range of interests. As one who had operated a farm himself, he gave close attention to agriculture problems which were of concern to his State. At the same time he maintained a lively interest in world affairs and served most efficiently for several years as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

An eloquent speaker as befitting one who had taught college speech, KARL, as we all remember, was most forceful and persuasive in Senate debate. Until struck by illness, he was tireless in carrying out his responsibilities to his State and the Nation.

I wish to join with all his friends in wishing for him and his devoted wife, Mary, many happy retirement years.

THE GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW CANCER EDITORIAL CONTEST

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that there are many Americans today who are not aware of the country's No. 1 public enemy: cancer.

About 53 million Americans now living will eventually have cancer; one in four persons according to present rates. Cancer will strike approximately two out of three families.

These are chilling facts. They are the reason I was one of the prime sponsors of the Conquest of Cancer Act, and have worked to secure full funding of the Federal effort to combat cancer.

However, there are 1½ million Americans alive today who have been cured of cancer. Moreover, more could have been saved through early diagnosis and treatment.

That is where the American Cancer Society fills a major role. It is the aim of the society to educate the public to cancer's warning signals so that they will seek the aid of a physician immediately. The American Cancer Society also wants to impress upon the public the absolute necessity of an annual check up whether or not there is any indication of cancer.

The New Jersey Division of the American Cancer Society is one of 58 divisions in the country which have developed successful public education programs. For many years, the New Jersey Division has been in the forefront in the fight against cancer. It is an ongoing and continuous endeavor.

An essential phase of the New Jersey Division's education program is the annual George E. Stringfellow Editorial Contest, named after the division's first president. Through this contest, which has been in existence since 1947, the press of all New Jersey daily and weekly newspapers, and of all secondary high schools, are invited to submit an original editorial on the subject of cancer control.

The New Jersey Division is most grateful to the press for its continued support of the contest and proudly announces the winners of the 1972 George E. Stringfellow Editorial Contest.

In the daily category, the winner is "Cancer Control Month: Hope," written by Z. Kamin of the Daily Register, Red Bank, N.J.

In the weekly category, the winner is "Around the Bend," written by Guy Frederick of the News Leader, Netcong, N.J.

In the high school category, the winner is Marianne Castranova of the Dia-

dem Newspaper, Holy Rosary Academy, Union City, N.J.

I am pleased to insert these editorials into the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

[From the Red Bank (N.J.) Daily Register, Apr. 18, 1972]

CANCER CONTROL MONTH: HOPE

(George E. Stringfellow Editorial Contest Winner—Daily Category)

Both by presidential proclamation and congressional resolution, April is Cancer Control Month. Here in Monmouth County, Cancer Crusader volunteers are busy spreading the word of their national chairman, Joan Crawford, who confidently says: "The cancer dragon's days are numbered . . . So let's help cut down the number with a check-up and a check to the American Cancer Society."

Because we dread the disease and because we know that the American Cancer Society, through our donations, has been able to provide the research that has made vast inroads against this killer, Cancer Crusade fund drives normally are successful in the county.

We certainly hope that this year is no exception, because just as inflation has hit the household budget, so has it hurt the many charitable organizations that depend upon public support.

It takes more dollars to perform this year what they d do a year ago, and it would be a terrible blow to each of us if what appears to be a victorious battle against cancer should be stalled.

One of the positive aspects of the Cancer Crusade is that, besides soliciting contributions, it wages an educational campaign directed to young and old, and those in between.

Show business and sports personalities have endorsed the Crusade, and they lend their voice in appeals to the young not to take up cigarette smoking, and to the middle-aged to have check-ups because the earlier cancer is located, the better are the chances for cure.

The emphasis this year is on convincing all American adult women to take a simple, quick and painless cancer test. It's called the Pap test, which was developed by an immigrant Greek scientist, Dr. Papanicolaou. It can detect uterine cancer in an early stage, at a time when it can be cured. It is, as the Cancer Society says, "an unacceptable tragedy that about 13,000 American women died from uterine cancer last year."

The society estimates that the death rate from that form of cancer has been cut by more than half in the last 30 years, and it predicts that uterine cancer deaths can be wiped out if every woman takes the test in the next four years.

Not too many years ago, the toll of cancer deaths was frightening and often a cause for despair. That such need not be the case today is shown in the fact that there are 1,500,000 people in the United States who have been cured of cancer.

Statistics are still grim, however, in that it is expected that 52,000,000 Americans will develop cancer. Unless the victims have those life-saving checkups, and unless science can make some more important breakthroughs, 34,000,000 of them will die.

Cancer Control Month is a time for hope, and a time to follow Miss Crawford's advice: Get that check-up, and send that check to the American Cancer Society.

[From the Netcong (N.J.) News Leader, Apr. 13, 1972]

AROUND THE BEND

(George E. Stringfellow Editorial Contest Winner—Weekly Category)

There was an accident around the bend from my house. It happened suddenly. Coming down the hill, the brakes of the car failed. The driver and passenger were fortunate, only shook up.

The two were lucky. The driver chose to crash before coming to the bad curve at the foot of the hill.

A neighbor and I waved a red flashlight frantically. Others were coming down the hill at a high rate of speed. Only at the last minute would anyone slow down.

While directing traffic, I asked him about his family. I had not seen them for some time.

"My wife has cancer," he said. "I have not told her. She does not know, but I cannot understand," he added. "She neither drinks or smokes. Can you tell me what causes cancer?"

Does it just crash into us as we go down hill in life? Is our body perfect one minute to be diseased the next? Is it something in the air we breathe, the water we drink, the food we eat?

Are we coming closer to a cure? We are told there are 7 signs to look for as potential danger signals in a set of human brakes.

Bleeding, a lump, a sore, a cough, indigestion, change in a wart or mole, change in discharge, any one of these indicates the brakes will fail.

Doctors and leaders in the medical world are standing in the dark, frantically waving the red light. "Slow down," the light says. "There is a wreck around the bend."

I'm in too much of a hurry, the oncoming human cries out. I'm in too much of a hurry.

The Cancer Society predicts that 100,000 of these will crash beyond the curve.

So the fast course of human travelers is strewn with human wrecks.

When the crash comes we use special diets, we operate, we use cobalt, but as yet the percentage of cures is small. A cure is considered survival for five years without the return of cancer.

Five years in the beautiful valley of time. But we must get safely to the bottom of the hill. We must slow up for the red light waving in the dark. We must give so always there will be someone to wave the light. Save for a pile of stones by the side of the road, one hour later no one knew of the wreck that had just happened.

The neighbor went back to the wreck in his own home. Two weeks later his wife was taken to the hospital. Six months later my neighbor looked into the face of his wife, but she could not speak. She had died of Cancer.

[From the Union City (N.J.) Diadem Newspaper, Holy Rosary Academy, June 14, 1972]

THE LIFE YOU SAVE

(George E. Stringfellow Editorial Contest Winner—High School Category)

Somewhere a businessman is harshly coughing over his lunch while, 3,000 miles away, a young girl casually ignores the sore on her arm.

What do these people have in common? Nothing, except that they could be two of the thousands in the United States who will needlessly die of cancer this year.

"Needlessly die of cancer?" you might ask. "How can anyone needlessly die of cancer?" The truth is that many forms of cancer are remediable, but only if treated in time. In fact, it is estimated that 90,000 cancer mortalities could be prevented each year by early detection.

Therefore, since time is an important factor in the control of this disease, awareness of the following danger signals is pertinent: unusual bleeding or discharge; a lump or thickening in the breast or elsewhere; a sore that does not heal; a change in bowel or bladder habits; hoarseness or cough; indigestion or difficulty in swallowing; and a change in a wart or mole.

If you find that you are subject to one of these signals for more than two weeks, go to your doctor immediately, for cancer is indeed a formidable enemy to be reckoned with since it is one of the most common causes of death in this country, second only to heart diseases! And if you've got the ridiculous notion that you're too young to get cancer, don't feel so smug, for although the risk of developing this dreaded disease increases with age, cancer is often found in young people, and in the U.S. kills more children from ages of 1 to 15 than any other disease.

So remember—early detection is the best conceivable weapon against this horrible disease which has plagued man since the dawn of time. And with this weapon, the life you save—may be your own.

ST. ANTHONY CHURCH CENTENNIAL

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, St. Anthony Church in my home district of Milwaukee, Wis., celebrated its 100th anniversary in special ceremonies on Sunday, October 8. Participating in the services which marked the anniversary were the Very Rev. William E. Cousins, Archbishop of Milwaukee, Fr. Gerard J. Clark, pastor, and Fr. Frederick Schmidt, a former pastor.

A century of dedicated service is certainly an occasion for jubilation. However, it also offers an appropriate opportunity to recall—and appreciate—what churches like St. Anthony represent in terms of our country's moral strength.

I am therefore pleased to share with my colleagues an article which appeared in the Catholic Herald which outlines the history of important contributions St. Anthony Church has made to its parishioners and the Nation down through the years.

To the priests, sisters, and all the people of St. Anthony Church go my heartiest congratulations and best wishes.

The article follows:

ARCHBISHOP WILL PRESIDE AND PREACH AT MASS NOTING ST. ANTHONY'S CENTENNIAL

MILWAUKEE.—St. Anthony parish will observe its centennial Sunday with a solemn high Mass beginning at noon.

Fr. Gerard J. Clark, pastor, will be celebrant. He will be assisted by Fr. Frederick Schmidt, a former pastor, and Fr. Earl Dionne, part time assistant, as deacons. Archbishop William E. Cousins will preside and preach.

A dinner will follow in the parish hall.

The founding of St. Anthony's is traced to 1872, a time when there was much immigration from Europe, especially Germans, Poles and Irish. They were people rich in the inheritance of their faith which they were determined to keep in the New World.

At that time old Holy Trinity parish was a large German congregation in the area but Bishop John Martin Henni realized the need for a second German parish on the south side. He chose Fr. A. J. Decker to establish St. Anthony.

Ordained in December, 1871, Father Decker served as assistant at Holy Trinity. His new assignment presented many difficulties.

Initially he was strongly opposed on the site which he chose for the new church,

then Mitchell street and 4th avenue. The opposition resulted in meager response to appeals for funds to make the foundation.

Nevertheless, Father Decker's abilities and endeavors were reflected in the fact that after only a few months, on November 3, 1872, Bishop Henni dedicated a combination church-school building. It was a two-story structure, with four classrooms on the first floor. The second floor served as the parish church for the first 10 years.

The school was opened two weeks later by the School Sisters of Notre Dame, with 160 pupils enrolled.

Plans for the present church, now at S. 9th and W. Mitchell sts., were developed in 1875; and one of the highlights of the parish was the laying of the cornerstone on June 26, 1881. Work was completed and the building was dedicated November 19, 1882, by Archbishop Michael Heiss.

Later, gas lights were added, a new pulpit was installed, the present organ was erected and chimes were placed in the tower. In 1910, a large bronze bell, weighing 4,200 pounds, was installed in the tower.

Old St. Anthony school was situated on Mitchell st., between what are now 9th and 10th sts. The number of students grew rapidly and soon the school was enlarged. The first rectory was built in 1897.

Father Decker remained as pastor for 38 years. One of the highlights during his tenure occurred in 1886 when he was given an assistant because at that time the parish numbered 550 families. He died September 5, 1910, after a lingering illness.

Father Decker was succeeded by Fr. Michael J. Graettinger who served the parish during what was considered its golden years. A new school, which cost $95,000 was dedicated November 7, 1920.

The parish numbered 830 families, including 3,110 individuals. The school boasted an enrollment of 500 and there were 12 active societies. One of the greatest sources of pride for St. Anthony's was the many priestly and religious vocations that came from its ranks.

Father Graettinger remained as pastor until his unexpected death in 1926. His successor was Fr. Charles F. Keyser, who held the pastorate for the next 42 years.

During that time the ethnic complex of St. Anthony's changed considerably. Many Polish people moved into the area and became active members of the congregation.

Father Keyser was an administrator of exceptional ability. He established scholarships which still aid many many graduates of the parish school. The St. Elizabeth maternity guild financially assists mothers at the birth of their children. Also, a seminary fund continues to help young men studying for the priesthood.

In 1939 Father Keyser instituted the novena of Our Lady of Sorrows, which during its early years attracted a minimum of 2,000 to the devotions each Friday. While the number of participants has declined, a good many from all parts of the city still attend regularly.

Father Keyser was rewarded for his efforts on July 6, 1954, when Pope Pius XII named him a domestic prelate with the title of "Right Reverend Monsignor." But his career came to an untimely end 4 years later. Msgr. Keyser died July 6, 1968, of burns which he suffered from an accidental fire in the church.

Fr. Frederick Schmidt, now pastor of St. Patrick, Beaver Dam, was the fourth priest to head St. Anthony's. During his tenure the church, school, rectory and parish hall were renovated and repaired.

Father Clark was named pastor in August, 1971. He serves in an era that reflects great change. The school which once boasted 700 pupils now has 185. Many of the old families have left the area. Others retain their ties and cherish an inspiring history.

In its 100 years, St. Anthony's has seen 3,567 couples exchange marriage vows, and 13,006 infants and adults received the sacrament of baptism.

SLOVENIAN FESTIVAL DAY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on the weekend of October 28–29 an event will take place that makes me proud to be a native of Chicago and a Representative in Congress from that great city.

October 28 has been proclaimed Slovenian Day by Hon. Richard Daley, mayor of Chicago, and Hon. Richard B. Ogilvie, Governor of Illinois; and the 54th anniversary of Slovenian Independence Day will be celebrated October 29 by the Slovenian community.

These celebrations are examples of the cultural richness of our city made possible by the creative pride and community spirit of the various ethnic groups which came to America seeking a peaceful life in freedom. Our city and Nation are immeasurably richer in spirit because of the contributions of those immigrants and their descendants.

The Slovenian Festival weekend will begin on Saturday evening, October 28, with a special program at St. Stephen's Hall, 1837 West 22d Place, Chicago. The Hencek Ensemble of Slovenia will entertain with polkas and folksongs of their homeland. Their style is typical of Slovenian village music. They play on traditional instruments including the button box accordion.

Costumed in their native garb, guests of Slovenian origin will be coming to the festival from Milwaukee, Wis., and Montreal, Canada. Dancing will follow the concert program and home-style sausage—Slovenian klobase—with Slovenian nutbread—"potica"—will be served.

Part of the festival program, emceed by Lud and Corinne Leskovar, directors of the Slovenian radio program, will be the annual Slovenian Award, given to a distinguished person of Slovenian heritage, who has excelled in service to his community.

"Gospodichna" Mary Kreslin, 3240 North Osceola, Chicago, has been selected Miss Slovenian Day. Miss Kreslin, an 18-year-old senior at Steinmetz High School, will read the Slovenian Day Proclamation in Slovenian language and will appear as the Slovenian Princess at the International Folk Fair of the city of Chicago, November 4–5.

Slovenian Day in Chicago is being celebrated this year in conjunction with the 22d anniversary of the Slovenian radio program of Chicago. The president of the Slovenian American Radio Club, Dr. Ludwig A. Leskovar, has been producing the outstanding weekly Slovenian radio program, heard on WEDC in Chicago, for 22 consecutive years.

Dr. Leskovar, a highly respected leader in the Chicago Slovenian community, is also active in many civic, educational, religious, and social endeavors in the Chicago area, and was named Man-of-the-Year by the Heart of Chicago Community Council. I congratulate him for his energetic and creative leadership over the years and wish him many more anniversaries full of accomplishment.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I would like to include the names of all of the able officers of the Slovenian American Radio Club. The names of the officers follow:

OFFICERS OF THE SLOVENIAN AMERICAN RADIO CLUB

Executive Officers: Dr. Ludwig A. Leskovar, President; Frank Mikec, Vice-President; Mary Foys Lauretig, Secretary; Alma Helder, Treasurer; Stephanie Osterman, Recording Secretary; Roman Possedi, Sr., Sergeant at Arms.

Auditors: Otmar Tasner, Michael Fleischhacker, Minka Grasich.

Cultural Narrator: Frank A. Schonta.

Director of Special Events: Corrine Leskovar.

Directors: John Blatnick, Joseph Osterman, Fred Orehek, Anna Tasner, Frank Karner, Frances Maxwell, Anton Skamperle, Ludvik Jelenc, Jerome Soukal, Ursula Krzisnik, John Oblak, Frank Dolenc, Mike Kores, Peter Gorenc.

Slovenian program staff: Ludwig A. Leskovar, Director; Corinne Leskovar, Announcer; Tony Gaber, Assistant Announcer.

October 29, the 54th anniversary of Slovenian independence from Hapsburg domination, is to be commemorated this year with a talk by Dr. Bogdan Novak, professor of history at Toledo University.

Slovenia, now one of the six republics of Yugoslavia, has a long and distinguished history. Through the centuries, its people have fought with distinction and valor for the preservation of their national identity and cultural traditions. Though surrounded by powerful neighbors, the Slovenian people have, by virtue of their courage and fortitude, been successful in maintaining their proud identity. This has proven to be the case regardless of where Slovenians have found themselves, and today, it is our American Nation which has benefited by their strength of character and the honorable values of their homeland.

More than 400,000 Americans of Slovenian descent reside in the United States, many of whom have won recognition because of dedicated service to their country. They have contributed with distinction to the cultural, political, and social enrichment of our country. Among these distinguished Slovenian-Americans are the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, Congressman from the Eighth District of Minnesota, who is the chairman of the powerful Public Works Committee; the Honorable Ludwig J. Andolsek, able Commissioner of the U.S. Civil Service Commission; the Honorable PHILIP E. RUPPE of the 11th District of Michigan, who serves on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee; the Honorable JOE SKUBITZ of the Fifth District of Kansas, who serves on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; and the Honorable Frank J. Lausche, former U.S. Senator from Ohio and five-term Governor of the State.

On this gala 22d anniversary of the Slovenian Radio Program of Chicago and the 54th anniversary of Slovenian independence, the Honorable Vito Marzullo, alderman and committeeman of the 25th ward and annual sponsor of the city of Chicago Solvenian Day Proclamation, joins me in extending warmest congratulations and best wishes to the Slovenian community in Chicago. May the Slovenian-Americans continue the wonderful traditions which have made them a valuable part of our great Nation.

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I take this time to express my thoughts about the Honorable WILLIAM M. COLMER, Democrat of Pascagoula, Miss., chairman of the powerful House Rules Committee who has decided not to return to the U.S. Congress. BILL COLMER as he is affectionately known by his colleagues is one of the most gracious gentlemen I have ever had the pleasure of knowing. A dedicated public official he gave unstintingly of his time during his service in the U.S. Congress for those ideals he believed in.

An articulate spokesman for views he could disagree without being disagreeable. BILL COLMER will be missed in the Halls of Congress. I can say without equivocation that his home State and congressional district was fortunate in having his services these many years. Yes, I stand here today saluting BILL COLMER and wishing him the very best in the years to come. As he embarks on another stream of life I know he will continue to have an active career in the years ahead. BILL COLMER always appeared ageless to me, young in mind, young at heart but wise beyond his years.

ABSENTEE BALLOTS

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues the following official opinion issued by the attorney general of Indiana, Theodore L. Sendak. I wish to commend Attorney General Sendak for this excellent opinion regarding the matter of whether or not to supply absentee ballots to military deserters and other fugitives from justice outside the jurisdiction of the United States.

The attorney general's response is as follows:

It is, therefore, my Official Opinion that a person is *not* entitled to obtain an absentee voters ballot in Indiana when he has voluntarily removed himself from the jurisdiction of this state and nation to Canada, or some other country outside the United States, for an indefinite period of time in order to avoid service under the Selective Service Act, or in order to avoid prosecution as a deserter from the Armed Forces of the United States, or in order to avoid prosecution under any criminal law of the State of Indiana or of the United States.

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, few men in Congress exercise greater influence over the proceedings of this body than the chairman of the Rules Committee, and few men who have chaired that committee have exerted a greater influence for the good than the Honorable WILLIAM M. COLMER.

When the 93d Congress convenes in January, BILL COLMER will no longer be here to guide us on the vital issues we shall face, and the House will be the poorer for his absence. A stanch conservative and a man of strong principle, BILL is nevertheless a master of the art of reasonable compromise, and many times succeeded in reconciling opposing factions on a measure where a less tactful and experienced legislator might have failed.

We have all learned from BILL COLMER'S judgment, and we shall all miss him personally. It is my hope that his successor will enjoy an equally productive and effective term as chairman of the Rules Committee.

FOREIGN POLICY ISSUES AND THE LAW OF THE SEA CONFERENCE

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I include following my own remarks an address by the Honorable John R. Stevenson, the legal adviser to our Department of State. This address was delivered on October 11, 1972, at a meeting at the University of Washington in Seattle on the local aspects and interest in United Nations' Meetings on the International Law of the Sea. Mr. Stevenson was chairman of our U.S. delegation which last met in Geneva, Switzerland, this past summer.

Mr. Speaker, the general outline of issues and difficulties of establishing agreement on new and up-to-date international conventions is objectively presented in Mr. Stevenson's remarks and I am sure will be of interest to others as it was to those attending the Seattle conference.

Following is the text of Mr. Stevenson's speech:

FOREIGN POLICY ISSUES AND THE LAW OF THE SEA CONFERENCE

(Address by the Honorable John R. Stevenson)

It is a great pleasure to be here today to speak to you about the coming Law of the Sea Conference, and what it may mean to us as Americans.

There has been a growing awareness in the public about the importance of the oceans to our lives. But I think many here would agree that this awareness does not yet match the level of importance.

Here in the Pacific Northwest we have a major port, and a major segment of our fishing industry. Concern about marine pollution is strong. Government and private industry conduct important activities related to our national security. Both Senators from Washington are Chairmen of Committees that are deeply concerned with Federal laws and policies regarding the oceans and their resources. Congressman Pelly has a long record of interest in the oceans, and we were pleased to have him present in Geneva this summer during meetings of the U.N. Seabed Committee. The University of Washington has been a leader in contributing to the study and knowledge of the oceans, and the related scientific, economic, technological, and legal disciplines. Thus, Seattle is an especially appropriate city for a meeting of this sort, and the University of Washington a particularly suitable site.

Before addressing ocean problems specifically, let us stop for a minute and think what life would be like in this country, or this city, or even this room if people did not agree on how they should behave. What if there were no common understanding of one man's rights and another man's duties? Some of us might adhere—perhaps ardently—to one code of behavior, while others would have different inconsistent codes. Sooner or later there would be conflict. The conflict would increasingly involve matters, however important, that really could not justify the cost of the conflict in material or human terms. Whether by agreement—social contract if you will—or by force, common rules of behavior would ultimately have to be imposed on everyone in the common interest.

In this situation we have two fundamental choices—agreement or conflict. Before considering the merits of any specific proposals for the oceans, it is essential to bear in mind President Nixon's firm warning in May 1970: "if the law of the sea is not modernized multilaterally, unilateral action and international conflict are inevitable."

Let us remember that most nations border on and use the oceans, and that all nations have a vital interest in their use and preservation. Neither history, nor logic, nor law would permit us to conclude that one country, or one group, could itself decide its rights and duties in the sea with respect to the others.

Apologists for unilateralism frequently cite the success of the 1945 Truman Proclamation on the continental shelf to make their case. They omit to say that other States whose interests might have been affected did not object. They also omit to consider the wave of unilateral claims to the seas as well as the seabeds that followed, and the disputes that have resulted. They also forget that in 1945 the world was not as well equipped with institutions that could provide a multilateral alternative as it is today.

On the other hand, the principle that no nation or group can make the decisions itself is not limited to classic forms of unilateral action. We are all aware that representation in the United Nations General Assembly, and at a Law of the Sea Conference, is equal—each State has one vote. Majority or even two-thirds votes do not necessarily reflect any real accommodation of the relevant interest involved.

In short, if artificial voting majorities are resorted to, a multilateral conference becomes more than the vehicle chosen by one group of states to impose its will on another. The result will be nothing but a variant of unilateral action, no more legiti-

mate, and no more successful; except, unhappily, that one more blow will have been struck at the idea of seeking international solutions. Those whose national interests are protected by their voting strength in international forums would do well to consider whether the perceived advantages of abusing that strength are worth the price of degrading, if not destroying, the role and influence of all such forums on matters that affect their interests.

I think it is fair to conclude that the large majority of the nations of the world, developed and developing, believe that multilateral agreement on a large regime for the oceans is desirable. This was manifest in the decision of the UN General Assembly to convene a law of the Sea Conference. It was even more manifest in the seriousness of purpose that marked this summer's meeting of the U.N. Seabed Committee, which is charged with preparing for the Conference.

However, this does not mean agreement has already been reached on the outcome. Nor does it mean that all agree the Conference should be held soon. Strong and divergent interests are involved. The real test is not whether a Conference is called: it is whether the Conference will be timely and successful. The relationship between time and success is a critical one: on the one hand, adequate preparation is needed; on the other hand, events and technology will not stand still, and may make agreement far more difficult in the future. It is, for example, much easier to make a unilateral claim than to alter it.

There seems to be a good chance that the United Nations General Assembly this fall will establish a precise schedule for further preparatory work and for the Law of the Sea Conference. The question therefore is: what are the elements of success?

It is common to answer this question with exhortations for a spirit of good will and mutual accommodation. Indeed, I suspect that the Law of the Sea Conference will need more than an ample measure of such a spirit. But, if it is to write rules that provide the answers to real problems, the Conference must be prepared to deal with those problems honestly. It is not at all reprehensible for nations to identify their interests clearly and seek solutions that accommodate them. My own view, after three years of negotiation of this subject, is that the national interests involved are not as difficult to reconcile as formal positions might indicate.

Because of the divergence of view regarding what is permitted under current international law, I think there is too great a tendency to overlook the gradual convergence of ideas on what the effect of the Law of the Sea Conference should be. In this connection, it must be emphasized that States can take a far more flexible approach to changes in the Law of the Sea effected by a widely agreed treaty than they could to unilateral changes; the danger of setting adverse precedents is minimized by the fact that the treaty itself specifies what can and cannot be done.

In some cases, there is wide agreement on a specific result. This, for example, is the case with respect to the breadth of the territorial sea. The overwhelming majority of States from all regions are supporting agreement on a 12-mile territorial sea. Of course, this support is frequently contingent on reaching agreement on an overall Law of the Sea settlement that satisfactorally resolves other issues. For example, we have made clear that, because extension of the territorial sea from three to twelve miles would affect many vital international straits that are narrower than 24 miles, there must also be agreement on free transit of straits used for international navigation.

In other cases, the broad practical objectives appear to command widespread support.

Let us take the case of resources beyond the territorial sea. Whenever the divergences in various proposals made, it is clear that all of them contemplate increased coastal State regulatory authority and preferential rights over fisheries beyond the territorial sea. No such common element existed at the 1958 and 1960 Law of the Sea Conferences. Similarly, broad coastal State management jurisdiction over seabed resources is widely contemplated. In both cases, of course, there are critical questions regarding international limitations on coastal State rights. These questions are of course the key to a successful resolution of the problem of coastal State economic jurisdiction.

However, the very broad support for a 12-mile territorial sea itself indicates that at least one of these limitations is also widely supported, namely the protection of freedom of navigation and overflight in areas beyond twelve miles where the coastal State exercises resource rights.

It is also clear that there is very widespread support for the establishment of an international regime for the seabeds in the area beyond coastal State economic jurisdiction. Once again, there are however critical questions regarding the nature of the regime, and the structure and functions of the international seabed authority to be established.

There is also a widespread belief that the Law of the Sea Conference should make an important contribution to international efforts to protect the marine environment. The Declaration of Principles regarding the seabeds beyond national jurisdiction makes clear that the international regime for this area should include such provision. The United States has proposed international standards to ensure such protection in coastal seabed areas as well. Where ships are concerned, the problem is one of reconciling the interest in free navigation on the high seas and free transit of international straits with that of assuring adequate protection of the marine environment. This can be done by seeking adequate measures of an international character, such as making IMCO traffic separation schemes mandatory, strengthening IMCO itself, and establishing certain general legal principles.

What then are the major problems to be resolved? I could give an exhaustive list, but let me discuss some of them.

First, the problem of free transit of straits used for international navigation. In the broadest sense, the United States as well as many other nations simply cannot agree that the extension of the territorial sea can subject the transit of straits used for international navigation to the discretion of the states bordering those straits. Since for geographic reasons the use of such straits is necessary for access to and from high seas areas, the right to transit straits must be regarded as an inseparable adjunct of the right to use the high seas. In more refined legal terms, this means that while we are not insisting on complete freedom of navigation and overflight in straits used for international navigation, we oppose the substitution of innocent passage for three reasons:

(1) While we are not of this view, it is apparent that certain important coastal States believe they can unilaterally determine the innocence of passage subjectively, and unilaterally determine limitations on such passage, whether for safety or pollution reasons, or for other reasons.

(2) Under the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, to be in innocent passage, submarines must navigate on the surface.

(3) The Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone does not apply the right of innocent passage to aircraft.

There are obvious reasons of national security for this position, for maritime powers and their allies, and for countries that rely on a stable balance of power to ensure their own security. However, these are not the only reasons. The movement of merchant shipping, including tankers, will be critical to international trade for the forseeable future. For many nations, exporters as well as importers, the importance of such movement is so vital as to reach the level of primary security as well as economic concern. Those who would leave interests of such magnitude to the vicissitudes of international and domestic politics around the world are inevitably inviting very serious problems.

This is not to say that the only interests involved are international. States bordering straits obviously have legitimate interests in being assured that vessels and aircraft do no more than transit their territorial sea in straits, and that their concerns with safety of navigation and pollution are met. The proposals we have made regarding international regulation of these problems, coupled with coastal State enforcement rights and strict liability, indicate that we are prepared to deal with these legitimate problems of straits States. The Soviet Union has made other proposals that I think indicate that it is prepared to do so as well.

A second set of problems concerns the nature of coastal State rights over resources beyond the territorial sea.

Under traditional approaches to the Law of the Sea, this was basically regarded as a question of limits. On one side of a line the coastal State had unlimited exclusive rights over resources; on the other side its high seas rights were essentially no different from those of all other States. The major flaw in this approach is that the coastal State is not the only State with interests on the landward side, and that the coastal state has special problems regarding resources beyond the line that may not be shared by other States.

The fundamental innovation in President Nixon's Oceans Policy Statement of May 23, 1970 is that it proposes a pragmatic balancing of coastal and international interests in the same area, as opposed to the older "all or nothing" approach. While the Continental Shelf Convention was a first step in this direction, separating resources rights from the territorial sea, it still represented an "all or nothing" approach regarding the resources. What we now propose is a harmonization of coastal and international interests in the context of coastal State resource management authority. If these interests can be harmonized, the limits question becomes far less contentious.

The interests of our Pacific Coast fishing industry provide a good example of the advantages of this approach.

The development of large, mobile and highly sophisticated foreign fishing fleets has significantly altered the practical effects of freedom of fishing on the high seas. Serious depletion of stocks can occur rapidly. Local coastal fishermen economically dependent on coastal or resident stock are not in an equal competitive position: they can be pre-empted by the distant water fleets rapidly without enjoying the same ability to move on to other areas. Understandably, these fishermen would like the United States to regulate these fisheries. For this regulation to be fully effective, it should apply to the coastal stocks wherever they may be off the coast.

The United States has important commercial and sports fisheries for Pacific salmon. The viability of these fisheries depends upon significant positive measures and restraints in the rivers and streams where they spawn. However, the salmon migrate far out to sea. If regulation is to be effective, the coastal State of origin should regulate them throughout their migratory range on the high seas.

We also have an important tuna fishing industry based on the West Coast. Tuna are highly migratory species that must be regulated throughout their migratory range. Unlike salmon, spawning is not localized. Thus, adequate conservation of tuna requires international action; no coastal state could assure this on its own. Moreover, fishing boats obviously must follow the fish. In the case of tuna, this means operations over a wide area of the sea off the coasts of many countries. Thus, by and large an economically adequate tuna fishery of substantial size requires access to fish off several coasts; virtually no coastal State could develop such a fishery off its own coast alone.

Finally, although important interests in this fishery are located in other parts of the country, we should bear in mind that our shrimp industry engages in significant fishing not only off our own coast but off foreign coasts. Its problems are analogous to those of foreign fishermen who have an interest in fishing for coastal species off our coast Moreover, we should consider the conservation and economic effects on our local shrimp fisheries if all these boats were forced to return.

What all this means is that a simplistic solution cannot resolve all the relevant problems, for us or for others. In important measure, the diversity of our own interests is a fairly accurate reflection of the diversity of interests that exists in the international community in general.

How then can international limitations be coupled with coastal State authority to provide an adequate accommodation? We believe a two step analysis is needed.

First, what fisheries should be subject to coastal State authority beyond the territorial sea? For reasons I have outlined, we believe the coastal State can regulate all coastal stocks wherever they may be located off the coast, and all anadromous stocks throughout their migratory range on the high seas. This covers over three quarters of all the world's fisheries. However, because of their biological characteristics, we believe highly migratory oceanic species like tuna should be subject to international regulation.

Second, with respect to coastal and anadromous species, what should be the rights of the coastal State and what should be the obligations of the coastal State to protect the interests of other States and the international community in general? Obviously, the coastal State should be responsible for assuring conservation. Beyond this, the coastal State should have an economic preference based on its capacity to harvest these stocks. However, since fish are a renewable resource, the coastal State has no need to prevent fishing consistent with sound conservation measures for stocks it cannot itself fully utilize for the time being, and should be required to provide access to others for what it cannot itself fully utilize. Some accommodation with states that have traditionally fished in an area, and with other states in a region, is also desirable.

Finally, if States are to have the necessary confidence in the viability of such an approach, a procedure for compulsory settlement of disputes is required. This goes to the heart of the matter, because the essential ingredient is a balancing of interests, and States must be assured that the agreed balance will be subject to disinterested review.

We envisage a similar process of analysis with respect to seabed resources in coastal areas. However, the problems are different, and therefore the solutions would be different. Nevertheless, the basic premise of coastal State resource management jurisdiction subject to international treaty standards and compulsory dispute settlement remains the same.

For reasons of time, I will not develop the analysis here at great length; I have done so in other places and I am sure that many of you are aware of the considerations involved. The petroleum and gas potential of the continental margins around the world is enormous, and the need for sources of energy is growing rapidly. For important environmental, economic, and other reasons, we and other coastal nations must examine this problem for a global, as well as coastal, point of view. The international standards we contemplate with respect to seabed resources in coastal areas are indicated in the President's Oceans Policy Statement of May 23, 1970. In general, they would provide for:

Prevention of unreasonable interference with other uses of the oceans;

Protection of the ocean from pollution;

Protection of the integrity of investment;

Sharing of revenues with the international community; and

Peaceful and compulsory settlement of disputes.

While the reasons for most of these standards can be readily understood, I would like to dwell for a moment on one that can give rise to misunderstanding. It is obvious that anyone making an investment is interested in protecting its integrity. However, as energy becomes more important, the question takes on much broader international significance.

Moreover, we are witnessing a situation in which stability of investment conditions is increasing as a factor influencing not only the assessment of the risk and rate of return, but the very decision to invest in the first place. At a time when most of the world is interested in stimulating the flow of investment capital to developing countries, at the very least we should try to minimize the effect of political factors that are encouraging precisely the opposite. The investments required for offshore oil exploitation can be very substantial.

Treaty standards protecting the integrity of investment would be of great benefit to developing coastal countries that desire to attract offshore investment and maximize the potential benefit from such arrangements. It would strengthen their ability to exercise the right to decide whether, by whom, and under what conditions such investment can be made. The entire international community would benefit from the elimination of a serious potential source of conflict, and indeed would hopefully share in some of the revenues generated.

Another problem area concerns the international regime for the seabeds beyond the limits of coastal State economic jurisdiction. The basic problem here is that of reconciling the interests of States with the indigenous capacity to exploit the deep seabeds with the interests of other States in participation in the regulation and benefits of such exploitation. These are not inconsistent objectives. But they can be made to appear so if too much emphasis is placed on theoretical or ideological considerations.

There is no dispute, at least in principle, about such matters regarding the seabeds regime as the need to assure protection of the marine environment or to provide for equitable sharing of benefits. The heart of the problem resolves around three inter-related questions. What will be the system for exploring and exploiting the resources? What will be the functions and powers of the international authority? How will the interests of State be reflected in the decision-making process of the international authority?

The desire of our citizens and others for reasonable and secure investment conditions is involved in all these questions. In the first place, the opportunity for such investment must exist. An international exploitation monopoly clearly would be inconsistent with this. Second the international organization must have regulatory authority to assure that conditions remain reasonable in the light of changing conditions, but at the same time there must be a definite element of predictability for large investments to be made. Arbitrary action by the international organization clearly would be inconsistent with necessary predictability; in this connection, compulsory dispute settlement, including judicial review of administrative action, is an integral element of a solution. Finally, to the extent that the international authority has discretionary regulatory authority, the States with interests most likely to be affected must be assured of reasonable protection in the decision-making process.

A subsidiary problem relates to the concerns of those few States that produce metals on land that are likely to be found on the deep seabeds. While our own and other economic studies do not indicate that deep seabed production is likely to lead to a reduction of world prices or have other serious adverse effects, some land producers remain concerned. This is true despite the fact that some of the most interested land producers are not developing countries. One effect has been to sharpen significantly the concern over the functions and powers of the international organization. Investors and consumers are opposed to the idea of production and price controls. Moreover, the fact that some developing countries that are consumers, and that would share in the benefits of deep seabed exploitation, have made few attempts to assure a more balanced approach to this question has intensified the inherent difficulties in urging confidence in an organization that is not yet in operation.

Scientific research, particularly in areas of coastal State resource jurisdiction, presents still another problem. The United States and others have stated their strong belief that there should be maximum freedom of scientific research in the oceans because such research, is and should be, open and of benefit to all. On the other hand, certain coastal countries have questioned this conclusion, on the grounds of their ability to participate meaningfully in such research and in its benefits, to protect their interests in resources in the area, and to prevent environmental damage. A new and more vigorous approach to the problems of training, participation, and technology sharing may provide the basis for an accommodation that protects freedom of scientific research and assures that it is of maximum benefit to all, including developing countries. The draft seabed treaty we presented, and various statements we made, elaborate in detail on some of these ideas.

There are of course other problems as well. Some of them will not be easy to overcome. But I also do not think that success is impossible or even improbable. What is required is a translation of the general foreign policy considerations favoring agreement, that most countries share, into specific harmonization of interests with respect to each problem. I think the recent session of the U.N. Seabed Committee this summer gives us increased hope to believe this can be done: not only—or even primarily—because of its concrete accomplishments, but because of the seriousness of purpose and business-like approach that characterized the meeting.

Some of you doubtlessly have questions about that meeting and about other aspects of the Law of the Sea Conference. Accordingly, I will end my formal remarks here, and thank you once again for your kind invitation.

TRIBUTE TO CLINTON P. ANDERSON

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, through the passing decades many men

have entered the doors of these Chambers as U.S. Senators. For some, their stay here has been brief; for others, more than a score of years have passed. For some, their impact on history is but a shadow—seen while they are here, forgotten when they are gone. For others, their records will be indelibly inscribed in the memories and annals of Congress and the country.

The words spoken here today and the history books yet to be written will bear eloquent testimony to CLINTON P. ANDERSON'S role in writing a new chapter in American life through legislative action. Were his mark to be made solely on his 24 memorable years in the Senate, he would have few peers as he walks out these doors today into retirement. But in recognizing Senator ANDERSON'S accomplishments, we cannot start, or can we end with this Chamber.

For four decades CLINTON P. ANDERSON has devoted his enormous energies and talents to the well-being and betterment of his State and the Nation at large. I personally find it most difficult to utter words adequate to describe his services and our loss upon his well deserved retirement.

His vision has resulted in large part in the creation and expansion of the Nation's atomic development program. Our defense depends upon it; our hopes for tomorrow count on it. Children yet unborn will reap a bountiful harvest of blessings because CLINTON P. ANDERSON fought for the establishment of this structure which so many Americans take for granted. Those of us who have worked with him and have seen close-up what it means, know full well that it is in truth his finest legacy to the Nation.

However, it is across New Mexico that his presence in the Senate will be most keenly missed. His door has never been closed to any of our people. His efforts have never been made in behalf of any but the best causes. His courage is legendary; his ability to produce, unrivaled.

No State, particularly a small one, produces many like him. Here in this Chamber he has been a leader among leaders, sought out by many on a variety of national and international problems. In each case he has risen to the challenge with wisdom, vision, and decisiveness.

The affection and respect we have for him transcend party lines. He has truly earned the high respect of his nation and his constituency. As he walks out these doors, it is difficult not to envy him and his record here. Rather, I know you will join me in trying to emulate him; for such is greatness made.

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER of California, an outstanding and dedicated Member of Congress, will soon end 28 years of distinguished service in this body and return to his native California. Congressman MILLER'S departure comes as a great loss to the American people and to those of us who have had the privilege to serve with him.

GEORGE MILLER, as chairman of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, demonstrated time and time again his unique insight into the needs of America's future. His essential strengths that make him a superb human being have also made him a very effective public servant.

In GEORGE MILLER, Californians have sent to the Congress a man of immense wisdom and great integrity. His guidance and courage have enabled the people of this Nation to survive hard times as well as enjoy the benefits of a better life. I served with Chairman MILLER from the very inception of the Science and Astronautics Committee. Our great accomplishments in space are attributed to a large extent to his tireless effort and leadership.

I join with all of my colleagues in wishing great happiness and a fulfilling retirement to GEORGE and his loved ones.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have had the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives with a most distinguished gentleman from Colorado, the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL. WAYNE has been a most respected Member of the House for 24 years. WAYNE'S accomplishments, spirit, and convictions will remain in the Halls of Congress for many years to come. His good judgment and high integrity was a credit to this country. He was the kind of leader who had the fortitude to stand up for his beliefs and the interests of his constituents. He served as chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during a grave and critical time. After consideration in an open and objective manner of legislative matters before him, Chairman ASPINALL was willing to vote his conscience. I respect a man of his stature and feel his membership will be missed by the House.

I had the honor of serving with WAYNE on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. All these qualities I have mentioned were displayed with great dignity and prestige on this committee.

I will miss Congressman ASPINALL. He is a good friend and a neighbor in the Rayburn House Office Building. The State of Colorado has lost a senior Member of Congress who did them well. As he returns to Colorado, I want him to know his service was appreciated and respected. I wish him every success in the future.

TRIBUTE TO HON. JACKSON BETTS

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of personal satisfaction to join with the rest of the House in paying tribute to my very close friend and fellow colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, JACK BETTS.

I have come to know JACK BETTS well during my 11 years in the House, although JACK had been serving here 11 years before I came. JACK has remained the grand gentleman throughout his 22 years here—dedicated to his work and the people of Ohio whom he loved so much and represented so well. He is an outstanding American patriot who has always placed his love of country above all else.

The Nation and we here in the House will sorely miss JACK BETTS' wisdom, leadership, and legislative abilities. My warmest personal regards to you, JACK, for the future.

FRANK FISHKIN, A DISTINGUISHED CITIZEN

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 18, 1973, a testimonial dinner is being given for a leading San Fernando Valley citizen. We will pay tribute to a man who for over 30 years has proven himself to be a citizen of the first degree, who has used all his energies in improving the lives of those around him.

Frank Fishkin is this man. He has lived in the Los Angeles area since the age of 17, when he had his first job. Attending school at night he secured a college and legal degree. With these in hand he set out not just to be a success for himself and his family but to give of himself to his friends and neighbors just as much.

Frank has been a member of the San Fernando Valley Bar Association and in this capacity served on the original committee that worked in the creation of legal aid and lawyer reference service for San Fernando Valley. He has worked with the Valley Bar Association and the Los Angeles County Bar Association and been their delegate to the State bar association meetings on numerous occasions. In the community Frank has served as president of the Sun Valley Chamber of Commerce and president of the Valley Jewish Community Center and Temple, which has the largest congregation in the valley.

As a personal friend of Frank Fishkin's for over 20 years and his colleague in the San Fernando Valley Bar Association, I can easily testify to his consistent

high integrity and willingness to use all the time required for the betterment of his community. I am sure that Frank Fishkin will continue this service, and we in the San Fernando Valley are grateful to him.

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, what could be more depressing than to contemplate the next Congress without the wonderful Mississippi seafood luncheons hosted by the very distinguished and beloved chairman of the Rules Committee, the Honorable WILLIAM M. COLMER. But, alas, BILL COLMER has determined to retire and I suppose that after 40 years of devoted service he is entitled to do so.

I have never known a better example of the true meaning of the words "southern gentleman" than BILL COLMER. His friendship has been one of the greatest rewards of my own service here. His devotion to the House of Representatives and to the welfare of the United States may be equaled by some but is surpassed by none.

It is simply impossible for me to say in words what a void he will leave in our ranks, or to recite his many courtesies and kindnesses to me personally. I can only wish him many years of health and happiness as we say farewell and Godspeed.

JOHN L. McMILLAN

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to make brief but very sincere comments on behalf of my good friend and colleague of many years, the Honorable JOHN L. MCMILLAN of South Carolina.

Everyone who has ever known JOHN recognizes him to be honest, conscientious, and one of the hardest working Members of the House.

My close association with JOHN comes from our service on the Agriculture Committee together, where JOHN is the vice chairman. Of course, he also has had one of the hardest jobs in the Congress by serving as chairman of the House District Committee. He has received some criticism from the papers here in Washington but those who know JOHN realize that he always has placed his country above politics. JOHN MCMILLAN's leadership will be missed when the 93d Congress begins, but I know that JOHN will never stop serving his country regardless of the capacity he is in.

In short, JOHN MCMILLAN is a statesman and the epitome of what is referred to as a southern gentleman.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON

HON. HENRY BELLMON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, among those Members who are leaving the Senate to return to private life is a man from my neighboring State of New Mexico, whose career of public service has spanned four decades.

During this long and distinguished career, CLINTON P. ANDERSON has served as a State and Federal official in New Mexico, as a Member of Congress, as Secretary of Agriculture, and finally as a Member of the Senate since his election in 1948.

As one of the leaders of this lawmaking body, he has earned the admiration of his colleagues through his steadfast devotion to his duties.

Having served with him as a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I am fully aware of the singular role he has played in shaping important legislation.

I extend my best wishes to him in his retirement.

TRIBUTE TO HON. WAYNE ASPINALL

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, many words of tribute have been paid to WAYNE ASPINALL and I would like to analyze why these remarks are so accurate and so true. What sets aside WAYNE ASPINALL from other legislators? I think that two or three things can be picked out that make him unique.

Let me list a few qualities that characterize this very unusual and very remarkable man. One is the total mastery of the subject. We hear Congress knocked a lot, and we hear committee chairmen criticized a lot, but here is a man who knew more about Interior Committee jurisdiction than anybody in the United States—congressional staff, colleagues, people in the other body or anybody on the outside.

Second, I would list just pure hard work. If I can work half as hard as he has when I am 10 years younger, I will be very lucky. He was in his office before any of us, and worked longer and harder and put in more time, I believe, than any Member of this Congress.

The third thing I would list would be total integrity. A lobbyist approached me once and expressed his concern about Chairman ASPINALL's position on some pending matter. I said I was reminded of the old story that someone once described a particular girl by saying that every woman has her price, but in her case, you have to pay the $2 to the minister. I told the lobbyist that you do not get to WAYNE ASPINALL with anything but logic and reason. He was sometimes accused of taking positions that favored this interest or that interest, but I can tell you that every position he ever took in this body was because he was convinced on the evidence that it was the right position for his district, for Colorado, and for the country.

The final tribute I would like to leave to him is this: You know, any damned fool can be a good winner, but it takes a real man to lose with class. I am sure this defeat he sustained must have cut and hurt pretty deeply, and some men would have run off and hidden; some men would have cursed the fates and denounced those who were responsible. WAYNE ASPINALL has come back here with good grace, rolled up his sleeves, and gone to work cranking out legislation, going through all of the hard work he has always put in here. We have seen how WAYNE ASPINALL has accepted a big disappointment, and I think that is a pretty good test of a man.

PAGE BELCHER

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, PAGE BELCHER has rendered distinguished legislative service to our State and our Nation. I will miss his counsel and advice and deeply regret he has not chosen to continue his service in the House of Representatives.

After a close 22-year working and social relationship, I can say that my impression of PAGE is that he is a great down-to-earth guy who speaks a langauge that everyone can understand. He talks horsesense and has been well received by and very influential in the Congress. For years, he was the only Republican in our delegation and was a strong conduit to the White House during the Eisenhower years. He has been a fine representative for Oklahoma and has made a real contribution to the national legislative process.

It is with fondness that I remember PAGE as master of ceremonies at a dinner here in Washington in honor of HENRY BELLMON who had just been elected Governor of Oklahoma. PAGE introduced each Member of our congressional delegation to speak to the audience and when he got to me mentioned that he and I had come to Congress together, had officed close together in the Cannon Building, had played golf together and were very good friends. Mr. Speaker, when you were introduced, you reiterated what PAGE had said about me and added:

> What PAGE could have said is that he and JOHN JARMAN not only came to Congress together but have been voting together ever since they have been here.

I will miss serving in the Congress with PAGE but certainly wish him the very best in his well-earned retirement.

FRANK T. BOW

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, to everyone in either House of Congress, our long-time colleague FRANK Bow has been known and respected as a champion of responsible fiscal policy. He introduced legislation to limit waste in the Federal budget as far back as April of 1966, and did much to bring about House approval of the $250 billion budget ceiling asked by President Nixon this year. As ranking Republican on the House Appropriations Committee, he maneuvered many a money bill down the prickly path toward passage, avoiding floor fights with the quiet diplomatic skill of a veteran foreign service officer. FRANK Bow learned diplomacy in Congress. He will serve his country well in his new post as Ambassador to Panama. All of us will miss him in the House.

IN HONOR OF HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, after 30 years of service to the people of the First Congressional District of Mississippi, Congressman TOM ABERNETHY is retiring from the U.S. House of Representatives.

His long record of achievement and dedication to his constituents includes both local and national office. As mayor, district attorney, and U.S. Congressman, he has proved his commitment to the service of the people of Mississippi and his unselfish pursuit of their welfare.

I have served with Congressman ABERNETHY on the District of Columbia Committee for many years. He is one of the most popular Members of Congress, respected by both friends and adversaries.

I am sure that, in his retirement from the House of Representatives, Congressman ABERNETHY will continue to use his talents and experience to aid the people of Mississippi.

THREE FROM MISSISSIPPI ARE RETIRING

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Mississippi delegation in the House is losing three distinguished and dedicated Representatives who have served well their districts and their Nation.

The close of the 92d Congress will see the retirement of our colleagues, WILLIAM M. COLMER, THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, and CHARLES H. GRIFFIN.

I appreciate this opportunity to join my colleagues in paying tribute to these three stalwarts who decided not to seek reelection this year.

WILLIAM M. COLMER is completing 40 years in the House, 20 consecutive terms, most of which time has been spent on the important Committee on Rules. For the past 6 years he has been committee chairman.

I have had numerous occasions to appear before his committee—both before he became chairman and since—and if there is one single reference I could make to the role of WILLIAM COLMER, I would cite his "dignity." Always in my relations with him and with his committee I found this to be his hallmark.

A quiet man with a great sense of humor, WILLIAM COLMER has shown outstanding leadership and understanding on matters of national concern, while at the same time carefully attending to the needs and interests of his district. His record of achievement will be hard to match.

THOMAS G. ABERNETHY is completing 30 years in the House, 15 consecutive terms, and has risen to the position of third ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture and second ranking member of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

During his service in the House, THOMAS ABERNETHY has served well his district and his State. His public service began earlier when he was district attorney of the Third Judicial District of Mississippi and he also served as president of the Lower Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association. I count THOMAS ABERNETHY as a good friend and regret his decision to terminate his membership in the House.

CHARLES H. GRIFFIN is completing his third term in the House and is serving on the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

During his relatively short service in the House, CHARLES GRIFFIN has made many friends and has made a fine mark on behalf of his constituency, his State, and his Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my best wishes to these three fine men from Mississippi who have decided to close out their congressional careers and return to their native State.

TRIBUTES TO RETIRING STATESMEN

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege and pleasure over the past 14 years to serve on the Appropriations Committee with the Honorable FRANK Bow, now our ranking minority Member. I have never ceased to be impressed with his ability, knowledge, and determination to keep the spending of the Government within the most reasonable limits possible. He is indeed a friend to the taxpayers, as he is to his colleagues on the committee and in the House. FRANK Bow has been a Member of Congress who has met his responsibilities and fulfilled his duties with dedication and generosity. He has never failed those who put their faith in him, and he has always gone the extra mile to meet their needs. The citizens of the 16th District of Ohio have been very fortunate to have FRANK as their Representative—and he has been equally devoted to the welfare of all our people. The House will miss FRANK's leadership, and his colleagues will miss his warmth and friendliness.

My heartiest congratulations and every good wish go with FRANK Bow as he takes up his new position as Ambassador to Panama. May he have the success and happiness which he deserves.

The Honorable WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH leaves the House of Representatives at the end of the 92d Congress after 26 years of outstanding service to all citizens of the United States. He has represented his district—the Fourth of Ohio—during these years with loyalty and ability, and leaves a record of service which will be difficult for anyone to follow. Nationally, BILL MCCULLOCH is recognized for his effective espousal of the cause of civil rights, which was a major factor in enacting the legislation in that field which became the law of our land in the 1960's.

The wisdom and judgment which he has shown in helping to solve the various problems which faced the House over the years will be greatly missed by his colleagues. BILL is a great legislator—but more than that, he is a fine man and a good friend. I sincerely regret his retirement, but I wish for him only happiness and health in the years ahead.

I am pleased to join my fellow colleagues in this well deserved tribute to an outstanding legislator of 22 years in the House of Representatives, the Honorable JACKSON E. BETTS.

We all know JACKSON BETTS to be a very soft-spoken gentleman, but one who possessed a nobleness of purpose and an iron will when it came to his loyalty and dedication to his country. His tenure has been distinguished by his innate qualities of fairmindedness, his ever present willingness to help others, and his natural love for people from all walks of life. These qualities are reflected in the scores of legislative bills he introduced or helped to enact for the betterment of his fellow Americans and all mankind.

The people of his State and our Nation are truly grateful to this outstanding Representative from Ohio, and I am truly grateful to JACKSON BETTS for the friendship we have shared throughout our years together in the House. Betty and I look forward to continuing this close personal friendship with Martha and JACKSON BETTS, and they have our warm best wishes for every fulfillment and happiness in the years to come.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM. J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

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

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

How long?

TRIBUTE TO DURWARD HALL

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to depict what Congress is going to be like without the presence of our friend, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, DURWARD HALL. We have had our differences in the House, but agreement, not difference, has usually prevailed between us.

DURWARD HALL has been a tremendous force for good in the House of Representatives, and I want to pay tribute to him and his work as he departs the Washington scene.

DURWARD HALL has been attentive to the work of the House, giving legislative matters a high priority in the budgeting of his time. Recognizing that we need to take greater precautions to make sure that we are following the right course, he has probed into the implications of proposed programs as well as the operations of on-going programs. DURWARD HALL has made a very meaningful contribution toward more thorough consideration of legislative matters and has performed an oustanding service for the House and for the country.

DURWARD, I salute you and wish you and your loved ones a great abundance of happiness.

TO RUSSIA WITH LOVE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American people are now expected to thrill at the announced settlement of the Russians' $11.1 billion war debt for $722 million.

It may be another first all right—the first time the Communist leaders of Russia ever paid a dollar on their debts—but what a deal this is.

The interest on $11.1 billion at 5½ percent for 1 year is $6.10 million. To write off an $11.1 billion debt that has been carried 27 years for $722 million barely covers the interest for 1 year.

This $722 million figures out to a recovery of 6½ cents on the dollar loan with nothing for interest—and even then the Soviets want until the year 2001, or 30 years, to make the token settlement.

Consider the kind of money we are talking about—$11.1 billion. A billion dollars is one million thousand-dollar bills. A billion dollars is a thousand million dollars. Then our national leaders put on an act as though they have accomplished something great in an offer to settle the $11.1 billion debt for only $722 million.

The Soviet's offer was ridiculous to the point of being an insult—but our leaders took the bait.

If we are to use the Soviet lend-lease collection deal as a precedent, little wonder our country is in such poor financial straits. Can we not assume that our many other debtor nations will not seek to repay their foreign aid and export-import loans at a couple cents to the dollar.

This past week in Congress, the national debt ceiling was increased by $15 billion to authorize the President to borrow additional money at from 5 to 7 percent interest to run our country. Little wonder the need to continue mortgaging our country when we cancel debts like $11.1 billion for $722 million—6½ cents on the dollar.

The Russian debt was twice the annual amount involved in the revenue sharing bill.

In short, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has offered to settle our foreign aid revenue sharing loan with 1 year's interest on the principal, provided we give them 30 years to make the payment and reassure continued credit trade with them in the meantime.

What a charade. Who talks of fiscal responsibility and efforts to stave off tax increases?

To Russia with love; what a deal.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1972

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, for the past half century our distinguished colleague, EMANUEL CELLER, has been a dedicated and distinguished Member of the House of Representatives. Only one other Member in our Nation's history has served longer, and that was only by a matter of 2 months.

EMANUEL CELLER has carried well his great responsibility as longtime chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. Many matters of vital importance to our country have come before his committee and he has handled them consistently with complete fairness, giving sympathetic consideration to all sides of each question.

Indicative of the important era in which he has served is the fact that he has had a legislative role in the enactment of more constitutional amendments than anyone since the original Congress adopted the Bill of Rights.

His knowledge and understanding of the law and the judicial process is beyond question. This is quickly evident to anyone who has observed him handling legislation either in committee or on the House floor. His perception is swift and pointed.

He has been the dean of the House for a number of years and for a longer period has been dean of the New York State delegation.

He has chaired the New York delegation's steering committee, of which I am also a member, and has provided outstanding leadership in protecting and promoting matters of interest and concern to our State.

All of us are going to miss the day-to-day wise counsel of EMANUEL CELLER in the House. Although the pressures on him have been great, he always has been most helpful and considerate when individual Members have sought his guidance.

I join with all my colleagues in wishing EMANUEL CELLER continued good health as he puts aside his legislative chores. I am not the least surprised at his decision to carry on in the private practice of law and to expand this work to include a Washington office so that he will continue to have a window on the Nation's Capital to which he has devoted so much of his life.

TRIBUTE TO HON. WAYNE ASPINALL

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to the Congress in 1955, I had the pleasure of serving on the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee with Congressman WAYNE N. ASPINALL, of Colorado. During the 4 years we served together on this committee, I became aware of Congressman ASPINALL's expansive knowledge about reclamation, irrigation, Indian affairs, and problems pertaining to U.S. territorial possessions. Being associated with him during this period helped enrich my own experience in a manner I shall always remember.

I trust that his dedication to public service will continue to make such views available.

THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. MILLER

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, as we draw to a close this 92d Congress I would be remiss if I failed to express a fond farewell and sincere best wishes to a re-

spected colleague and good friend, the Honorable GEORGE P. MILLER of California.

With the sine die adjournment today GEORGE concludes a distinguished career in Congress that began in 1944. Prior to that he had already won respect as a military officer and as a member of the California State Assembly.

His work as chairman of the House Science and Astronautics Committee was instrumental in achieving U.S. leadership in space. As a matter of fact, those efforts merited for him the Robert H. Goddard Memorial Trophy in 1967, which, in the words of the award, was presented for "his sustained leadership in the formulation and execution of national policy contributing immeasurably to the remarkable accomplishments of the U.S. space effort."

As he now approaches a new stage in a busy and productive life my wife Blanche and I wish him and his lovely wife continued good health, happiness, and every possible fulfillment. Undoubtedly he will return to his beloved California for a well-earned rest but not retirement. We look forward to his future visits to our Nation's Capital. In the interim his wisdom and advice will be sorely missed.

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to rise in honor of my good friend and colleague, the Honorable EDWARD A. GARMATZ, to pay tribute to his distinguished quarter of a century in the U.S. House of Representatives.

The people of Maryland's Third District have lost a great representative. The people of this country have lost a great leader in Congress. The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has produced many laws in the past 6 years under Chairman GARMATZ which are providing benefits to the entire world. Eddie never backed away from an issue and met every challenge head on. The work and results of his committee show evidence of this attribute. He was very dedicated in his work and I know I will personally miss his presence in Congress. I wish him a very fulfilling retirement.

TRIBUTE TO RETIREES

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I join our colleagues in paying tribute to the three distinguished gentlemen from Ohio, JACKSON E. BETTS, FRANK T. BOW, and WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, who are retiring at the close of the 92d Congress.

One of the rewarding aspects of my service in the U.S. Congress has been the privilege of association and friendship with these three gentlemen. As colleagues, they have earned my highest esteem and respect, so it is only natural that their presence will be missed in the 93d Congress.

However, it does not seem appropriate for us to dwell on our regret at their departure, for each has compiled an exemplary record which he can look back upon with satisfaction and pride. Each has served his district, the State of Ohio, and America well and has always reflected credit on the highest traditions of public service.

JACKSON, in his work on the Ways and Means Committee, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, FRANK, in his work on the Appropriations Committee, and BILL, in his work on the Judiciary Committee, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the National Advisory Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, have performed every task with excellence. Their service to the Congress has always been marked with the dignity and dedication which is characteristic of them.

Mrs. Flynt and I join with the people of Ohio in wishing all three gentlemen every good wish for many rewarding and pleasant years ahead as they return to their homes.

TRIBUTE TO RETIREES

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the State of Ohio, from the early years of the last century, has been noted for the number and quality of its statesmen, having produced five Presidents and a host of other distinguished leaders such as the late Senator Robert Taft. The three Ohioans whom we honor today are completing their congressional careers in that great tradition.

Two of these men, FRANK BOW and JACKSON BETTS, came to Congress the same year I did. We have fought many legislative battles together over the past 22 years. As ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, FRANK BOW worked unceasingly, though often to no avail, I regret to say, for the principle of fiscal sanity. He has been a "Rock of Gibraltar" in the way of excessive expenditures that burden the economy and cause inflation. If we had had more like FRANK BOW around, inflation never would have reached the proportions it did in the late 1960's.

Similarly, on the Ways and Means Committee, JACK BETTS has been most diligent over the years in his efforts to keep America's financial house in order. As one of the early supporters of revenue sharing, he had a major role in shaping the bill we have just sent to the President.

To BILL MCCULLOCH, ranking minority member of our Committee on the Judiciary, must go considerable of the credit for much of the far-reaching legislation reported out of that committee in recent years, particularly in the field of civil rights. He is retiring after a quarter century of service in this body and certainly will be missed next year.

I am sure all my colleagues join me in wishing FRANK BOW, JACK BETTS and BILL MCCULLOCH many years of good health and happiness.

JOHN L. MCMILLAN

HON. JOHN W. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my many dear friends and colleagues who have risen today to express their regret at the passing of one of our most esteemed public servants from this chamber.

JOHN MCMILLAN has served my neighboring State of South Carolina with devotion and zeal for nearly 35 years. During that time, he established himself as a knowledgeable and articulate friend of American agriculture. As chairman of the House District Committee, he distinguished himself by consistently standing up for his beliefs in the face of strong opposition.

Those of us who have been privileged to call him both colleague and friend know that JOHN MCMILLAN's true contributions to his State and country will be remembered long after philosophical disputes are forgotten. I wish for him the very best in the ensuing years, and hope that he will continue to lend us his valuable experience in the days to come.

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ) and President Nixon first came to the House in the 80th Congress, one from the Atlantic seaboard State of Maryland, one from the Pacific coast of California.

I came along 2 years later when these two were very senior second termers, and got to know both of them as friends and colleagues.

But who would have guessed in those days that some 20 years later we would be working in close cooperation to save the American merchant marine—indeed the whole vital American maritime industry—from a slow and painful death.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1970 was

proposed by President Nixon and introduced by all the members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Democrats and Republicans. The committee under EDDIE GARMATZ' chairmanship moved expeditiously but carefully and 1 year after his original message to Congress, the President signed this landmark legislation into law.

At this particular season of this particular year I am certainly not the one who is going to take any credit away from President Nixon or my party for the new American maritime revival which has been launched. But I want to say with all sincerity that it never could have happened without EDDIE GARMATZ and that the historic Merchant Marine Act of 1970 is a monument to nonpartisanship for national security and a monument to the distinguished gentleman from Baltimore.

I know I speak for all of us on the Republican side of the aisle when I wish him every happiness and success that the future can bring.

HON. WILLIAM COLMER

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, few committee chairmen and Members of the House of Representatives will ever match up to the Honorable WILLIAM COLMER. BILL COLMER has chosen to retire from the House as a most distinguished leader after 40 years of service to his district and Nation. As another committee chairman, I have appeared before his Rules Committee in accordance with the rules of the House and have always found him fair and equitable in judgment.

When BILL and his wife, Ruth, return to Mississippi, I know they will be welcomed with open arms. BILL served in Congress longer than any other Member in the history of Mississippi. He ranked third in seniority among the entire membership of the Senate and House of Representatives. The electorate in his district of Mississippi have truly shown their respect and love for this able gentleman.

BILL has shown insight into the lawmaking process which few men can match. He has been a most effective public servant, and I know his service as demonstrated has been ingrained in the Halls of Congress for time immeasurable. I commend BILL COLMER's record. I wish him every happiness and a fulfilling retirement.

B. EVERETT JORDAN

HON. HENRY BELLMON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, I am pleased to join other Members of the Senate in extending best wishes to our distinguished colleague from North Carolina, B. EVERETT JORDAN, upon the completion of 15 years in the Senate.

As chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, he has won the respect of his fellow members for his continuing efforts to be fair and cooperative in recognizing individual members' needs.

It has been a pleasure to serve with him on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Senate Office Building Commission. It has been my good fortune to sit across the table from Senator JORDAN through the consideration of many difficult and important issues. I have come to admire his judgment and to appreciate the wisdom he has gained through his varied and colorful career. It was once my pleasure to join with him in an inspection of meat processing facilities in Poland. Based upon that experience and others, I can testify that EVERETT JORDAN is an effective advocate and ambassador for our country and its principles.

The contributions he has made as a Member of this body will be long remembered. I congratulate him upon his accomplishments and wish he and his charming wife a rich and rewarding future.

JAMES MENGER AND KURT BORCHARDT, STAFF MEMBERS, INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, as every Member knows only too well, the smooth functioning of a committee depends on the technical competency, the skill, and its devote to its job of the committee staff. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is immeasurably proud of the quantity and the quality of the legislation it has produced during the 92d Congress. Acceptance of most of this legislation on the floor of the House is evidence of its thorough preparation. For this we have our capable staff to thank, and I want to express my great appreciation of the fine work each member of the staff has done.

It is with the greatest regret that I find we shall not be able to avail ourselves of the services of two important members of this capable staff in the next Congress, Mr. James Menger and Mr. Kurt Borchardt. Mr. Menger's field has been largely health and railroad legislation. Mr. Borchardt has been responsible for much of the power and the consumer legislation that has come out of our committee. Both have been extremely useful to me and to all the members of the committee. They are men of character, thoroughly grounded in the legal and economic aspects of the subject matter they have handled. Because they knew what they were doing, we were able to offer their work to the Congress with complete confidence that it was right. Considering the fact that the legislation they helped to prepare affected practically every citizen of the Nation, it is fair to say that they have been shaping the destiny of the future. We shall find them hard to replace in the committee.

While we want to express our appreciation of their past performance, we want to add our sincere hope that whatever role they choose to assume in the future will bring them equal success and satisfaction. It is men such as these who assure progress in the Nation's affairs and convince us that our society is producing talent and integrity equal to the challenge of the future.

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, each Congress witnesses the retirement of Members whose contributions to national policy have been noteworthy. Few men who depart the Hill leave behind as tremendous an impact on the direction and course of American life as WILLIAM MCCULLOCH.

Since I was elected to Congress and joined BILL MCCULLOCH on the Judiciary Committee, his dogged and courageous leadership in the area of civil rights has never ceased to impress me. His persistence in the realization of the rights of all Americans has been the conscience of the Republican Party in the true tradition of the party's inception.

The unmistakable imprint of WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH is on the landmark Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Open Housing Act of 1968. His efforts in the reform of administrative court procedures and the selection of Federal juries have gone a long way toward helping resolve some of the serious defects in our judicial process. The penetrating incisive investigation into the root causes of many of our social problems by both the Kerner and Eisenhower Commissions was in no small part a result of BILL'S participation on these panels.

The record of accomplishment he has realized is one worthy of emulation and one of which he can justly be proud. I know I am speaking for more than myself when I say his presence and guidance will be sorely missed. As he sets upon the retirement he has so deservedly earned. I wish him the very best.

DURWARD G. HALL

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, DURWARD HALL has been better known around Congress as "Doc," even though he gave up the practice of medicine when he entered the House in 1961. He never gave up his convictions as a conservative. He was not one of those who put on a different

face for every audience. His conservatism was a point of pride. He had another conviction. He believed his job as a Member of Congress obliged him to know everything he could learn about Congress. He was on the floor of the House from opening to closing bell, starting from his first day as a freshman. He knew floor procedure. He made himself a deep student of the House, an expert on parliamentary rules. The long sessions on the floor meant, of course, long hours into the night catching up on office work. But work never frightened "Doc" HALL. We need more like him. I particularly will miss his wise counsel on the Committee on Armed Services where we both served for so long. I know all of us wish him many golden years of retirement.

NIXON ADMINISTRATION'S CENSORSHIP PLANNING—LINKS TO THE BUGGING OF DEMOCRATIC HEADQUARTERS IN THE WATERGATE

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, bits and pieces of information about the Republican-financed bugging of the Democratic National Committee offices are being put together by many courses, inside and outside the Federal Government, and one of the apparently minor items interested me greatly. A month before the bugging caper, the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of which I am chairman held hearings on the Office of Emergency Preparedness planning for censorship in the event of a national emergency. OEP witnesses insisted that none of their censorship plans would be put into effect in any emergency short of a war, and they implied that all of their plans were pointed toward a censorship system for use only in the event of a nuclear attack upon the United States.

When the buggers were caught in the Democratic National Committee offices, I was surprised to learn that one of the men arrested also was involved in the OEP's censorship planning, so I had further discussions with OEP officials to find out just what they—and he—were doing to plan censorship, or collect intelligence information, or carry out other duties assigned by a Presidential Executive order. I found some disturbing facts which did not come out at the subcommittee hearings and which the Members of Congress and the public should know.

James W. McCord, one of those arrested at the Democratic National Committee offices, is a former Federal Bureau of Investigation agent. Apparently, he was a Central Intelligence Agency operative in the Bay of Pigs invasion. He also was the top-ranking security specialist hired by the Republican's campaign committee and, until a few months before the bugging, was reserve lieutenant colonel assigned by the U.S. Air Force to the OEP group which is coordinating information to be collected as part of a censorship program.

The OEP group—called the Special Analysis Division—SAD—meets every month in the Executive Office Building Annex to prepare for the collection and dissemination of information gathered as part of a censorship program which will be put into effect in a national emergency. The OEP contends that the SAD system does not apply to the information media—to censorship of the newspapers, radio and television stations. The Special Analysis Division, OEP says, will help collect intelligence information from censored mail, from travellers coming into the United States and from telecommunications.

The SAD operators also are preparing what they call the National Watchlist—a list of information the censors will look for as thy open letters, monitor broadcasts and question travellers. I fear that this National Watchlist may also include the names of "questionable" individuals, such as those collected during Army surveillance activities, and also collect similar types of information about American citizens. When men like James McCord are involved in political espionage and also are responsible for the official collection of information through a censorship system, I have no doubt that the official National Watchlist will pinpoint individuals slated for political reprisal.

But the National Watchlist is not the worst part of the standby censorship program which permits a bunch of military intelligence agents to operate under the cloak of civilian censorship.

This sort of a program for censorship and citizen-watching is questionable enough if it will be used only in the event of a nuclear holocaust. Some bending and twisting of the democratic system can be excused by the fear of nuclear attack on the United States. But none of these violations of the democratic ideals are justifiable in the limited "brush fire" types of wars or in military conflicts which do not involve nuclear attacks upon the United States—wars like that in Vietnam, for instance.

Yet that is just the type of conflict the SAD system of censorship is pointed toward. As I looked behind the sworn testimony of OEP witnesses who implied that their censorship and information-collection plan would be put into effect only if there were a nuclear attack on the United States, I found they are ready to impose censorship in the United States when we become involved in a foreign conflict just like the Vietnam war. As a result of my inquiry into James McCord's involvement in the Democratic National Committee bugging, I uncovered the OEP's national censorship plan.

Section 1 of chapter 4 of the national censorship plan explains the contingencies under which the censorship system will be activated:

> The contingencies to be considered in any emergency planning within the Federal Government are many and varied. In planning for National Censorship it is necessary to consider only those contingencies, or situations, wherein the National Security may require imposition of such censorship. Generally stated these are: (a) General War; (b) Limited war, or conflicts of the "brush fire" type, in which United States forces are involved elsewhere in the world on land, sea, or in the air."

The Government's official plan permits censorship not only in a general, nuclear war but also in a limited conflict the President might involve us in anywhere in the world. And some of the details of this censorship plan were apparently worked out by a political security operative who was caught spying for the Republican Party on the inner workings of the Democratic Party.

This whole smelly mess raises many questions:

Why are military intelligence types given responsibility for censorship planning?

Why are they planning censorship for "brush fire" wars which do not involve attacks on the United States?

What sort of information, and whose names, will be put on the national watchlist?

What other facts about the censorship system have been hidden from the Congress and the public?

Since 1963 the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee has occasionally investigated the Government's censorship planning. The time has come for a full-scale study of both the plans and the practices and, as subcommittee chairman, I will initiate such a study immediately, asking formal questions of the censorship planners in preparation for full-scale hearings in the next Congress.

HON. KARL M. LECOMPTE

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to join Mr. KYL in paying tribute to the late Hon. Karl M. LeCompte.

Congressman LeCompte served our Nation, and the great State of Iowa, as a State senator, a soldier, and as a U.S. Representative for 20 years. He led his constituents through troubled times, times of peace, and times of war. Yes, Mr. Speaker, Iowa has lost a great leader, and we have lost a former colleague, but his mark upon the State will serve as an inspiration to the young people, the people he loved and helped.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Dorn joins with me in expressing our condolences to Mrs. LeCompte and his wonderful family.

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, long before women's lib became a household word the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey, the Honorable FLOR-

ENCE P. DWYER, was not only working to secure equal rights for women but demonstrating that they are eminently capable as public servants.

Before coming to Congress 16 years ago, FLO served as an officer of the New Jersey Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs and for 6 years as a member of the New Jersey State Legislature. Her career was capped in 1965 by becoming ranking Republican member of the Committee on Government Operations and since I have been minority leader she has been a valued counselor and loyal friend.

We shall all miss FLO DWYER'S great contributions and we wish her all the best as she leaves us at the close of this Congress.

HCA PRODUCES LANDMARK REDUCTION IN HOSPITAL COSTS

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is not news that we face a massive health care crisis in this country. As the recent DSG study pointed out, one of the sources of this crisis is the high cost of medical care, especially hospital care.

Despite the general inability of existing health institutions to deal with this problem, there have been a few noteworthy exceptions. One such exception is the Miami North Shore Hospital, managed by the Hospital Corp. of America.

This hospital recently announced major reductions in room rates that will save patients a half-million dollars annually. The reductions would cut some room rates $11 per day and would reduce total room and board costs to patients by approximately 10 percent.

The method employed by HCA at North Shore in the reduction of costs was simply efficiency. Major cost savings were achieved at North Shore through improvements in food service operations, business office operation, and housekeeping, developing better cost and billing controls in several departments, and in general management of the facility which resulted in major reductions in personnel costs.

These cost savings, moreover, were employed in a manner that directly relieved the hospital patient. As Dr. Fred Gunion, president of the North Shore Board of Trustees, explained. He stated that:

> Patient room rates are the part of the hospital bill which most patients pay out of their own pockets. Most other hospital charges are fully covered by some form of insurance or other reimbursement program, so we selected room rates as the area for reduction most beneficial to the average patient.

This kind of policy is almost completely unheard of in a day when most other hospitals are seeking approval for increases rather than considering reductions in charges. The cost of health care in this country can be cut, and the North Shore Hospital stands as proof of that fact. The example set in Miami can be duplicated in other hospitals if they can succeed in running an operation as efficient as HCA's.

The Hospital Corp. of America owns and operates 47 hospitals, including Broadway Hospital in my district. It is the largest firm in its field, with more than 6,000 beds in operation in 12 States. HCA certainly disproves the often-held belief that bigness necessarily implies waste. Here is a case of a private enterprise managing hospitals effectively, reducing the rate of operating expenses, while still producing a reasonable profit margin. HCA's success in Miami should certainly be closely scrutinized by all members of the health industry.

LEGACY OF PARKS

HON. LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that President Nixon recently transferred the 200th piece of Federal property to the people of America through the legacy of parks program. I congratulate the President on reaching this landmark, and I congratulate him for the success it represents for the legacy of parks program and the Property Review Board, both of which he wisely created.

In 1969, when a total of 760 million acres of our lands were owned by the Federal Government, the President discovered that many of these lands were not being used according to priority needs. Their use was determined by which agency first obtained rights to the land. Therefore, on February 10, 1970, the President issued an Executive order establishing a Property Review Board, to implement newly outlined land management initiatives.

The legacy of parks program was inaugurated on March 1, 1971, in Nassau County, N.Y., when the Federal Government turned over 128 acres of beachfront property valued at $1.6 million. To date, a total of 25,718 acres spread over 200 properties provide American citizens with an opportunity to enjoy open air. State and local governments now control an additional $111,392,926 in market valued land within their boundaries.

Once again I commend the President on innovative steps to bring America's natural beauty to her people, and I ask unanimous consent that the recent statement by the President and the news release that accompanied it be included in the RECORD, along with a brief explanation of both programs.

There being no objection, the President's statement, the news release, and the review of the two programs were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I am pleased to announce the transfer of the 200th Federal property to the people of this Nation through the Legacy of Parks program. Under this program, 43 State and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico have received underutilized Federal lands for park use in the last 19 months.

As a result, 180 communities in this country can now provide their citizens with parks and recreation areas they could not enjoy four years ago.

My appreciation goes to the officials of States, cities, and other municipalities who have worked with our Federal officials to develop these parks for local use.

The goal of this Administration is to make available an increasing number of parks and recreation areas to provide for both the physical and spiritual enrichment of all Americans. Through this program we are also insuring that the most sensible use is made of our natural resources.

The establishment of 200 new parks is an accomplishment of which we can be proud. But we will not stop here. The Property Review Board will continue to work closely with Federal agencies as we carry forward our efforts to identify Federal property which can be converted to recreational uses. This Administration is determined that more Americans should be able to share more fully in the natural wealth of our Nation.

THE WHITE HOUSE

The President today announced the transfer of an additional 33 parcels of land to State and local governments for park and recreation use under the Legacy of Parks program. This program was inaugurated March 1, 1971, with the first cost-free transfer of $1.1 million worth of Federal Property to the County of Nassau, New York.

The 33 properties, located in 24 states, total 3,441 acres and have an estimated market value of $3,521,331. Today's announcement brings to 200, the number of properties turned over to local governments in 43 states and Puerto Rico under the program since its inception in 1971. These 200 properties total 25,718 acres and have an estimated market value of $111,392,926.

Included in the 33 properties are three in New Mexico and one in West Virginia, marking the first such transfers in these states under the Legacy of Parks program. Other properties are located in California (two properties), Colorado, Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Jersey (two properties), New York (three properties), Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas (two properties), Virginia (two properties), Washington, and Wisconsin (two properties).

LEGACY OF PARKS PROGRAM AND THE PROPERTY REVIEW BOARD

Early in 1969 while walking along the shores of the Pacific beachlands which border the Western White House, President Nixon noticed the public bathing facilities nearby becoming more congested while neighboring beachlands belonging to the Camp Pendleton Marine Complex remained practically empty. President Nixon instructed his staff to look into this situation.

The Camp Pendleton beachlands in which President Nixon expressed an interest were 2,395 acres of a total of 760 million acres owned by the Federal Government. This acreage represents approximately one-third of the entire land mass of our Nation, with an estimated value of one trillion dollars. These lands are the Federal Government's largest asset.

The President's staff found that the uses to which Federally-owned properties had been put were often determined not by priority need, but by which government agency first obtained rights to the lands. These vast Federal holdings had been accumulated almost at random over many decades and Federal agencies and departments had developed a tendency to hold on to land even when it was no longer needed. Many thousands of

acres of Federal real estate throughout the country were not being put to optimum use while other vast areas were unnecessarily fenced off, their enjoyment denied to the American people.

After reviewing his staff's report on utilization of Federal property, the President wrote to Congress on February 10, 1970, and emphasized that "countless properties with enormous potential as recreation areas linger on in the hands of agencies that could just-as-well-or-better locate elsewhere."

A new philosophy for the use of Federal lands was proposed by President Nixon. He asked that these properties be treated as a precious resource belonging to all the people, and that their use serve the highest possible public good. In his words, "we must do everything we can so that people will love this country and love it deeply . . . to preserve those great areas of natural beauty and environment in which our children will want to live."

On the same day, the President issued Executive Order 11508 directing all Federal agencies to initiate a review of Federally-owned properties and to identify those which are underutilized. The principal issue was to determine which method of utilization best served the public interest.

The Executive Order provided for the establishment of a Property Review Board composed of close Presidential advisers. The current members of the Board are Donald Rumsfeld, Chairman, Counsellor to the President, James Dwight, Associate Director, Office of Management and Budget; John Ehrlichman, Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs; Herbert Stein, Chairman, Council of Ecnomic Advisers; William Timmons, Assistant to the President for Congressional Relations; Russell Train, Chairman, Council on Environmental Quality; Arthur Sampson, Acting Administrator of General Services. Darrell M. Trent, Deputy Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, is Executive Director of the Property Review Board. The President instructed the Board to implement his newly outlined land management initiatives. The Board effected a systematic process of identifying underutilized Federal properties.

As promising Federal tracts were identified, the Property Review Board initiated discussions with the holding agency. The General Services Administration, and the Department of Defense, executed field surveys of the properties. Through negotiations with the holding agency a determination was sought on whether the land should be retained by that agency, turned over to some other Federal agency, or declared excess.

The Board considered the merits of each case carefully and submitted its recommendations to the President. In disputed cases, the President determined whether the property was to be retained or declared excess.

State and local governments were encouraged to file applications for the excessed parcels with understanding that these tracts would be utilized as park lands and recreational areas. A special effort was made by the Property Review Board to locate land within urban areas. State and local governments have been eager and cooperative in this rapidly growing Presidential program.

The Property Review Board also recognized the need to update the policies, the organizational framework, and the administrative procedures for managing Federal properties.

The Board has initiated actions to modernize and centralize the Federal property inventory and standardize a system of control. These actions have contributed to the Administration's effort to secure much needed legislation on a wide range of general property management issues:

National Land Use Policy.

Relocation of Federal Installations.

Land and Water Conservation Fund Growth.

Park and Cultural Sites.

Gateway National Recreation Area (New York-New Jersey).

Golden Gate National Recreation Area (San Francisco Bay).

Rental Charges on Federal Office Space.

The modernization of the Federal property management system will continue for some time to come, with the Property Review Board serving as the principle advisory body to the President.

By the end of the year it is planned that all fifty states and Puerto Rico will have received benefits from the President's Legacy of Parks program. To date State and local governments have an additional 200 properties to develop into much needed park and recreation land. A total of 25,718 acres spread over these 200 properties provide American citizens with an opportunity to enjoy the open air. These state and local recipients now control an additional $111,392,926 in market valued land within their boundaries. This massive undertaking has been accomplished in little more than a year and one half since the Legacy of Parks program was inaugurated on March 1, 1971, in Sands Point when the County of Nassau, New York received 128 acres of beachfront property valued at $1.6 million.

The review program is continuing and will include all 20,650 Federal installations. From these reviews, it is expected that not only a realistic assessment of all Federal holdings will be achieved, but hundreds of thousands of acres of Federal property will be returned to the people who really own them, for their use and enjoyment.

Each day brings forecasts of ecological problems. Unless innovative steps are taken America's legacy of natural beauty could be lost to future generations. President Nixon is anxious to see the natural wonders of this Nation preserved for this and future generations. To insure this outcome, the President has seen to the establishment of this Nation's first Federal property review system.

TRIBUTES TO HON. BILL HULL AND HON. DOC. HALL

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, it is with real regret that I see the Honorable W. R. HULL, Jr. leave the House of Representatives at the close of this session. BILL HULL has been an outstanding Member of Congress who has served his constituency, State, and Nation with devotion, ability, and loyalty. I value his friendship and will miss the pleasant relationship we have had over the years. My very best wishes go with BILL for health and happiness in the days ahead.

It is a pleasure to join in the tribute being paid to the Honorable DURWARD G. HALL. He is one of our most admired and respected colleagues, and his able and dedicated service will be missed by all the Members of the House. "Doc" HALL has provided strong and responsible leadership to his committees and colleagues, and loyal and devoted representation to his district.

In addition, Doc HALL, together with our mutual friend from Iowa, Hon. H. R. GROSS, has been the watch-dog of the House, and its conscience. I am sure it is not possible to estimate the money that the hard work and constant attention to duty of Doc HALL and H. R. GROSS has saved the taxpayers, but it is certainly a sizable sum.

In addition, Doc HALL's knowledge of the rules of the House caused him to be a most effective guardian of the rights of the minority. For this, as well as for his general excellence of performance, we will miss him.

It is with real regret that I see "Doc" leave the Congress—he takes with him the affection and admiration of those who have served with him, as well as good wishes for only the best in years ahead.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE WILLIAM McCULLOCH, THE HONORABLE FRANK BOW, AND THE HONORABLE JACKSON BETTS

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the close of this Congress marks the departure, through voluntary retirement, of three of our colleagues whom we have all come to regard as virtually indispensible to Capitol Hill: BILL MCCULLOCH, FRANK BOW, and JACKSON BETTS.

It is very difficult to imagine the just cause of civil rights without one of its most distinguished champions, BILL MCCULLOCH, sitting on the great Committee on the Judiciary; nor the House Committee on Appropriations without FRANK BOW piloting the ship of state away from the reefs of bankruptcy, and without JACK BETTS on the Ways and Means Committee, trying to bring some sense and equity into our tax laws.

I served in the Ohio Legislature with BILL MCCULLOCH and JACK BETTS, more years ago than any of us care to recall. It was Speaker MCCULLOCH in those days in Columbus, and as young, freshmen legislators JACK and I warmly respected BILL as a wise leader and a firm friend. That friendship and mutual respect has held strong through our years together in Washington.

FRANK BOW, who is one of the best friends I have ever had, has made his name synonymous with economy in government. His wisdom and wit will be sorely missed.

While I regret that FRANK is leaving, I am extremely pleased and proud that the President has selected him for the important and sensitive assignment of Ambassador to Panama. No more capable or knowledgeable person could fill that post than FRANK BOW. He will continue to serve his country with brilliance.

With the departure of our three friends and colleagues, we will lose also their lovely wives, Mabel McCulloch, Caroline Bow, and Martha Betts, whose friendships have meant so much to Franny and me.

It is always hard to say good-bye, but especially so in this case. This is a loss not only to the Nation, but to all of us who have admired and worked with these three distinguished Ohioans. By their long records of selfless service, of

excellence in all their undertakings, and of integrity and honor, they have assured that the names of WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, FRANK T. BOW and JACKSON E. BETTS will be on the honor roll of great 20th century congressional statesmen.

To these three friends, I say: Goodby, good luck, God bless you.

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this is the last session for one our most beloved and distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. ABERNETHY), who is retiring at the close of the 92d Congress after a career that goes back to the early days of World War II. I want to join with others in saluting TOM ABERNETHY from both sides of the aisle for his enormous contributions to his district and State and to our country, as well as for his fine friendship.

My wife Betty and I wish TOM and Alice many years of health and happiness as they return to their beloved Mississippi. We shall miss them.

LETTER TO SENATOR McGOVERN

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Volodymyr Y. Mayewsky, vice chairman of the Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc., recently provided me with a copy of a letter he addressed on July 11, 1972, to the Democratic nominee for President of the United States in which he decried the lack of consideration given by political parties and the news media to ethnic minorities.

As I believe this letter may be of interest to all who read this RECORD, I insert it in full.

The letter reads as follows:

ORGANIZATION FOR THE
DEFENSE OF FOUR FREEDOMS
FOR UKRAINE, INC.,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1972.

Hon. GEORGE MCGOVERN,
U.S. Senate, Democratic National Convention, Miami Beach, Fla.

DEAR SIR: In connection with the Democratic National Convention now in session at Miami Beach, I would like to make a few vital observations concerning its delegate representation and platform.

As in many other aspects of the political, economic, social and cultural life in our country, Ethnics (the forgotten minorities) are being continuously and persistently silenced, ignored, discriminated against, and treated as secondary citizens by the government, the political parties, the presidential candidates, and especially by our established news media, from "left" to "right" and from "white" to "black". The ethnic minorities, always exploited by the establishment, have been forced through a continuous and unjust pressure by the power structure to occupy the lowest political and economic level in America.

Those forgotten Ethnics are quite numerous. In accordance with the statistics of Dr. Richard J. Krickus, a consultant to the Institute for Resources Management on a project funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity, there are 40 million Ethnics in the U.S.A. (See "Our 40 Million Ethnics" in the Washington Post on August 31, 1969).

The hard-working ethnic minorities have labored with devotion and toiled for generations for America and greatly contributed toward the building of this great country. They dutifully paid their taxes and neither asked nor ever received much in return. They served with distinction in their country's armed forces during WWI, WWII, Korean and Vietnam wars and in proportionately larger numbers died for America. They have always strongly upheld and supported constitutional democracy in the United States of America. The "fault" of the ethnic minorities is that they have failed to unite and create a power block to demand and to push for their share of America's bounty.

The discriminatory policy toward the ethnic minorities is especially evident by the content of the party platform and the composition of the body of delegates to the Democratic National Convention at Miami Beach. No candidate for the presidency, the Credentials Committee, or political or editorial voice has ever indicated concern for the shameful under-representation of the ethnic minorities within the delegation to the convention. Some ethnic minorities are totally unrepresented at the convention. For example over two million Americans of Ukrainian descent have no effective delegate strength at the Democratic National Convention. Similarly, ethnic minorities are not represented in party committees and are ignored by the Platform Committee. Why is there such an obvious omission of justice?

There is plenty of loose talk about "other minorities" but really and truly nobody cares or gives a damn about the ethnic minorities, their needs and problems. The established politicians care only about their own power groups and not about all American people. Some politicians cry for more power for the youth but, somehow, the young generation of the ethnic minorities are equally discriminated against as the older people. Similar situation is with the ethnic women. The irony of the situation is that the Arrangements Committee of the Democratic National Convention gave full consideration to the demands of the group "The Poor People's Campaign" but nothing at all for the really not-so-well-to-do 40 million ethnic minorities.

It is high time for the political parties, their committees and the presidential candidates to give some attention and consideration to the most discriminated against and under-represented 20 per cent of our population.

We shall overcome!

Sincerely yours,

VOLODYMYR Y. MAYEWSKY,
Vice Chairman.

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Congressman JOHN L. MCMILLAN is not returning to Congress this January. America and the Sixth District of South Carolina will miss this distinguished statesman. I served with Chairman MCMILLAN for some 10 years on the House District Committee. Being chairman of this committee is an extremely demanding position. There is no doubt that JOHN has always taken his duties seriously and acted in good conscience to afford the District of Columbia equitable and fair prosperity during very complex times.

I really do not have to discuss the accomplishments of Mr. MCMILLAN in such areas as his PeeDee District in South Carolina or on the House Agriculture Committee. These document themselves. I commend JOHN for his long record of public service which was carried out with a true sense of responsibility.

I know we all will miss this able and respected Congressman. I am sure he will return to Florence, S.C., knowing his service and loyalty has been appreciated by everyone. I wish him every happiness.

NEVER LOST A BILL

HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, WAYNE ASPINALL's committee never lost a bill on the Union Calendar. He permitted his committee to work its own will and never skipped a parliamentary step. No one ever questioned his knowledge of any subject under his jurisdiction.

He has been a great chairman.

No Member of Congress ever contributed more to his home State.

Most important to me, he is my friend and I treasure that friendship.

HERBERT C. WILSON, PUBLIC SERVANT

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, in the near future the State of Texas will lose the services of one of its most wise and able public servants, Mr. Herbert C. Wilson.

Mr. Wilson, currently deputy commissioner of the State Welfare Department, has announced he will retire soon after 39 years of public service.

All of those 39 years have been spent in pursuit of a single profession—helping the down and out, the needy, and our less fortunate children.

Seldom has one person amassed the wealth of respect and love which is extended toward Herb Wilson for the work he has done over his 40-year career in four different State agencies. We all shall miss him greatly.

A recent article in the Austin American-Statesman tells of Mr. Wilson's career and why it has been such an important one for Texas. I would like at this

time to reprint that article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HERBERT WILSON RETIRING FROM STATE WELFARE POST

Herbert C. Wilson, who worked for four state agencies in pursuit of a single profession, announced Saturday that he will retire after 39 years of public service with the State of Texas.

His profession is public welfare administration, and Wilson capped his career as deputy commissioner of the State Department of Public Welfare, the position from which he is retiring.

When Wilson first joined the Welfare Departmnet, it was a small agency with only a few hundred employees. It had one assistance program, Old Age Assistance, but was about to implement two new ones—Aid to the Needy Blind and Aid to Dependent Children.

Wilson helped chart the development of the department into one of the major agencies of Texas state government. He has served with four commissioners—John S. Murchison, John H. Winters, Burton G. Hackney, and the present commissioner, Raymond W. Vowell.

"Herb Wilson is respected and loved by all of the people he has worked with throughout the years. He has a great wealth of knowledge about the department and its programs, and his skills and talents will be missed," Vowell said.

Wilson started out as a caseworker in the early 1930s, after working his way through Baylor University as a shoe salesman, and a year of graduate work at Tulane University. His first caseworker jobs were with the Social Service Bureau and the Depelchin Faith Home in Houston.

He began his state welfare career in 1934 as an employee of the State Board of Control, doing administrative child care work at the Waco and Corsicana State Homes.

Two years later he became state supervisor of social services to crippled children, for the Vocational Rehabilitation and Crippled Children's Division of the old State Department of Education.

He received his master's degree from the School of Social Service Administration at the University of Chicago in 1941, doing his field work in medical social work.

This was followed by his first job with the State Department of Public Welfare, as a medical welfare consultant. He was the first person to be employed in that capacity by the department and his original assignment was to assist with the organization of the Aid to the Blind and Aid to Dependent Children programs in Texas.

In 1944 Wilson moved up as assistant executive director of the State Welfare Department. For the next decade, his duties with the Welfare Department were in an administrative capacity. He took on responsibilities as budget officer and legislative liaison representative of the department with the Legislature, along with other administrative tasks dealing with the department's programs.

At that time the welfare department operated a children's institution, Waco State Home, and it was there that Wilson moved next. He has said that in all his years in state government, he never held a job he applied for. ("Of course, I applied for some I didn't get," he said.) This time, he was "convinced" to go to Waco State Home as its superintendent by the late John H. Winters, then state welfare executive director.

He stayed there eight years—from 1955 to 1963—and now looks back on that job as one of the most challenging and rewarding of his experience. Advances were made during Wilson's years at Waco State Home, an institution for dependent and neglected boys and girls. The children started attending Waco public schools, new cottage dormitories were built, a foster family care program was developed.

Wilson had his own recipe for child care: "Give them God and a job." This, he said, would provide the child with a way of life and a way to make a living.

His Waco assignment also moved him into employment with the fourth state agency he worked for. That was when the Texas Youth Council was created and took over the Waco State Home. "I was the first state welfare employees to be legislated out of the department," Wilson said.

In 1963, Wilson was called back to Austin and the Welfare Department by Commissioner Winters. He returned as director of program administration, and shortly thereafter was made assistant commissioner. He assumed his present post as deputy commissioner in 1967.

Wilson is a member of the board of trustees of Buckner Baptist Benevolences. He is a past president of the Texas Public Employees Association and was a member of the first professional advisory committee for the University of Texas School of Social Work at Austin.

He had held part-time teaching positions with University of Texas Graduate School of Social Work at Austin and the Worden Graduate School of Social Work at San Antonio.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a personal announcement regarding my absence from the remainder of today's session of the House of Representatives.

Unfortunately, a very close personal friend of mine, Hon. Harold Tessler, a justice of the New York State Supreme Court, died yesterday, and I am attending the funeral which is being held this afternoon in New York.

Harold Tessler and I had a very warm and longstanding association that goes back over the years, and I am much grieved to learn of his passing.

He was a courageous and compassionate man, an outstanding jurist, but, above all, a valued friend who will be sorely missed by his legions of friends and associates.

He was truly dedicated to public service, and lived up to the full measure of his responsibilities. He leaves a rich legacy to all of us in public office.

My deepest sympathies go out to his devoted wife, and his family.

WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, all of us who have served these many years with BILL MCCULLOCH know him as an early and consistent fighter for civil rights which he preferred to call "human rights." He was responsible for the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and was behind many of its subsequent improvements. As the ranking Republican on the House Judiciary Committee, and an astute attorney, he became a top constitutional authority widely consulted by other Members. BILL MCCULLOCH also contributed importantly to anticrime legislation. His retirement is a distinct loss to the Hcuse, and I am pleased to join in this special tribute to him.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN WAYNE ASPINALL

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is with, indeed, great pleasure that I am able to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Interior Committee, my good friend, WAYNE ASPINALL, who will after 24 years of service to his district and Nation be retiring from the House at the end of this Congress.

In the 11 years that I have been in the House with WAYNE, I have had the occasion to work with and know him pretty well; and there is no man who has worked harder for the people of his district and his State than WAYNE ASPINALL has for his. Nor has anyone worked any harder to insure the preservation of those values of American life which we all hold so dear.

Naturally, I will personally miss WAYNE's expert knowledge of the legislative process and his unexcelled leadership, but even more than that I will miss our association and close friendship which I will always cherish.

HON. JACK H. McDONALD

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to say goodby to so many good friends among the Members who are retiring this year, and I am particularly sad to lose one of my distinguished colleagues in the Michigan delegation, JACK MCDONALD.

JACK has served his constituents well since he came to the House in the 90th Congress, which was an extremely able group of new Members on our side of the aisle. He has been a diligent member of the Comimttee on Public Works and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. He has been a staunch supporter of President Nixon.

I am sure that JACK's fine contributions to his country will continue and my wife,

Betty, and I wish for him and Marion all success and happiness in the future.

HOME LOAN BANK BOARD POSTPONEMENT OF VARIABLE RATE MORTGAGE PROPOSAL

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board recently issued a draft of proposed regulations authorizing insured savings and loans to offer variable interest rate mortgages. Under this concept, the home buyer, instead of signing a contract for a fixed rate of interest for the life of the mortgage, would obligate himself to pay a higher rate, or would be entitled to a lower rate, according to subsequent developments in the finance market.

Anyone entering into that kind of mortgage transaction prior to 1969 would have had his mortgage of 6 percent or less raised to 9 percent or more. If he could not afford the higher payments, the alternative would be to stretch out the maturity of the debt so that he would pay the same monthly amount as before but have less of his payment applied to principal. Of course, when and if interest rates came down, he would benefit by being granted a lower rate.

The idea has some appealing aspects, but not to the home buyer when interest rates are going up. There are so many unanswered questions about this proposal, however, that seven senior members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency who serve on the Housing Subcommittee recently asked the Board to postpone the promulgation of any such regulations until the committee or the subcommittee can hold hearings on this issue and thoroughly explore the pros and cons. Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN also wrote to the Board in a similar vein.

The Board has now agreed to postpone final adoption of its proposed regulations on variable rate mortgages "for a reasonable period of time" in order for the committee to schedule hearings.

Mr. Speaker, I submit as part of my remarks the letter which I sent to Chairman Preston Martin of the Home Loan Bank Board on October 4, with the concurrence of Representatives HENRY S. RUESS, WILLIAM A. BARRETT, chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, HENRY B. GONZALEZ, JOSEPH G. MINISH, WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, and FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN. Following that letter is the reply which arrived over the weekend from Acting Chairman Carl O. Kamp, Jr., of the Home Loan Bank Board.

The correspondence referred to is as follows:

WASHINGTON, *D.C., October 4, 1972.*

Hon. PRESTON MARTIN,
Chairman,
Federal Home Loan Bank Board,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MARTIN: We understand the Federal Home Loan Bank Board is ready to authorize the use of variable interest rate mortgage loans by member savings and loan associations some time this fall following the end of the period for comment, October 15.

We view the use of variable interest rates as an extremely serious change in the structure of the Nation's housing market. The question of whether such a change will benefit or hinder the homebuyers and the housing industry of the Nation has not been answered to our satisfaction or to the satisfaction of other members of the Banking and Currency Committee, especially in view of the fact that in an overall sense residential mortgage interest rates have risen sharply in the past several years.

As you know, the housing crisis of 1969–1970 produced mortgage interest rates which frequently exceeded 9 percent. Even now, despite the abundance of mortgage funds in savings and loan associations, the prevailing rate exceeds 7.5 percent and is expected to rise in the months ahead as overall credit demands increase due to an expanding economy.

Under a variable interest rate loan, many families will be forced beyond the point at which they can afford to meet mortgage payments as well as other payments essential to maintain an adequate standard of living during periods of rising credit demand. By the same token, the alternative of lengthening the term of the mortgage rather than increasing the interest rate will serve to significantly reduce the opportunity of many families to acquire equity in their homes. Under these circumstances, such families will find themselves in the position of being tenants rather than homeowners.

These are but a few of the points that concern us and other members of the Banking and Currency Committe. As senior majority members of the full Banking and Currency Committee and as members of the Housing Subcommittee, and because this proposal will have such far-reaching effects on the Nation's housing industry and achievement of the Nation's housing goals, we are asking you and the other Members of the Board to delay authorization of the use of variable interest rates until members of the Committee have had the opportunity to hear you and others on this subject during Committee hearings that will be held to thoroughly explore the issue.

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
HENRY S. REUSS,
WILLIAM A. BARRETT,
HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
JOSEPH M. MINISH,
WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD,
FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD,
Washington, D.C., October 13, 1972.

Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SULLIVAN: The Federal Home Loan Bank Board appreciates the interest and concern in our variable interest rate proposal as expressed by you and several of your colleagues on the House Banking and Currency Committee. Research undertaken by our economists and several independent academic groups lend support to the concept of variable rate mortgages along the lines of our proposed regulations. Consequently, we would welcome the opportunity to further develop this subject in Committee hearings at an appropriate time.

As you know, the comment period for these proposed regulations ends October 16. In recognition of your concern, we are willing to postpone the final adoption of regulations for a reasonable period of time in order for your Committee to schedule the hearings requested.

The Board would be pleased if your Committee can give these hearings an early priority on your calendar. We look forward to your cooperation in the final resolution of this subject.

Sincerely,

CARL O. KAMP, Jr.,
Acting Chairman.

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to extend my sincere best wishes to a fellow colleague who has given 24 dedicated years of his life to his country and the State of Virginia. Hon. WATKINS M. ABBITT is retiring from his 13 terms in the House of Representatives with a distinguished record of dedicated service to the House Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. I have had the privilege of working with WATT on the Standards Committee and can attest to his commendable and respected service. I will miss this good friend and wish him well in the years to come.

FLORIDA OCEAN SCIENCES INSTITUTE

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, for more than 3 years Florida Ocean Sciences Institute—FOSI—in Deerfield Beach has been running a rehabilitation program for youths who have been in trouble with the law. Mr. Robert A. Rosof, president and inspiration behind the creation of this marine science oriented center, has fought long and tenaciously to maintain a foothold and build the institute into a valuable and productive training center for these young men.

And the results have been impressive. During the past 3 years the program has had a total of 237 participants. More than 90 percent of this group had a legal record prior to entering the program. The overall known recidivism rate for all individuals who have been involved in the program is only 12.7 percent. This in itself is a remarkable accomplishment in light of the national rate as reported by the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of 74 to 85 percent.

Further proof of the success of this rehabilitation venture was demonstrated on a very human level earlier this month when two FOSI students, Bill Wade and Jeff Hurt, saved a man's life after his plane had crashed into a bridge embankment in a residential area of Deerfield Beach.

Jeff, now a graduate of the program, was teaching a seamanship class at a

marina when the two spotted the plane going down. Jumping into the institute's 19 foot outboard, they took off full throttle reaching the downed plane within 45 seconds. Although the plane and the victim were engulfed in flames, the youths grabbed a fire extinguisher, doused the man's clothes and managed to pull him clear of the wreckage. A spokesman for the local fire department said there was no doubt that the youths' quick action made the difference between life and death for the crash victim.

Shortly before this incident, Bob Rosof was notified by the Department of Labor that his $80,000 manpower training grant was not going to be renewed because his program lacked priority in the scheme of things. This attitude on the part of the Department of Labor is unfortunate. A crucial aspect of the war on crime should be training and rehabilitation programs particularly for youths to enable them to learn the skills that will promote useful and productive citizens.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1972

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that I was fulfilling a longstanding commitment in my home district on October 12 when special tributes were paid to the retiring dean of the House of Representatives, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER of New York. Had I been present, I could not have equalled the eloquence that historic occasion demanded, because only rarely do we have occasion to honor a legislative career of such length and magnitude.

When I came to the House nearly a quarter century ago, "MANNIE" CELLER had already served longer than I have now; he has been chairman of one of the most important committees of this body longer than most of us have been Members. Yet no Member present today is keener in debate or sharper in wit, none more formidable a foe or more amiable a friend, than the gentleman from New York. He is a living legend and proof positive that you cannot measure any man by the calendar alone.

As everyone knows, MANNIE and I have often disagreed, but we have always done so in good temper and mutual respect. To say that our beloved dean is a man of his word is to be redundant, since who could have weathered the political storms of the past half century without this essential virtue.

Mr. Speaker, I will not here repeat the details of MANNIE CELLER'S remarkable career or his many learned contributions to the law and to the Constitution itself. I do want to thank him for his many courtesies to me and for his profound love of this body, in which he leaves an enduring monument of admiration and affection.

JACKSON E. BETTS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this special tribute to one of our retiring Members from Ohio. During his years in the House, JACKSON BETTS was not the kind of man who did a lot of shouting. His Ways and Means Committee colleagues rather knew him as a quiet, but highly effective, legislator who knew what he wanted and usually got it. He was a deep student of the complex and all-important issues which come before that committee. JACKSON BETTS is known to all of us as a very kind, human person with many, many friends. He will leave a gap we shall not easily fill.

NEW TECHNIQUES IN WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, now that the clean water bill is a legislative reality, we can look forward to a period of innovation and progress in the field of water pollution control. New ideas will be given the encouragement and financial support that lead to the development of more effective technologies. It is conceivable that the next two decades will mark the beginning of a golden age in environmental science.

As an example of what we may expect, I would like to submit the following report for the information of my colleagues on the fine work of a Montgomery County, Md., firm in perfecting a technique for the removal of phosphates in sewage.

The report follows:

BIOSPHERICS PROCESS MEETS GREAT LAKES STANDARDS FOR PHOSPHATE REMOVAL

A new biological process developed by a Rockville, Maryland firm has successfully removed phosphorus from sewage in recently completed pilot tests in Chicago.

Biospherics Incorporated reports that its PhoStrip method reduced sewage effluent phosphorus levels to meet regulations imposed by the State of Illinois this year on the Great Lakes and the Fox River areas. Similar regulations have been adopted by Canada and the United States to curb pollution in the Great Lakes. Eight states are affected.

Tests conducted at the Northside Sewage Treatment Plant of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago showed that the total phosphorus content of the pilot plant effluent averaged 0.23 mg/l (milligrams per liter) and at no time exceeded 0.50 mg/l. The regulatory limit is 1.0 mg/l of total phosphorus.

The Chicago tests, which lasted 22 days, represent the third sewage treatment plant where the Biospherics PhoStrip process was pilot tested. The others were the Washington, D.C. Water Pollution Control Plant, and the Piscataway Plant in southwestern Prince George's County, Maryland. In all three cases, 90 percent or more of the total phosphorous was removed from the sewage effluent.

The phosphorus removed from the sewage effluent was concentrated into a waste flow of approximately five percent of the total plant flow resulting in proportionately lower treatment costs. The phosphorus could be chemically removed from this relatively small volume by currently available standard methods, according to Biospherics.

The tests were conducted as a joint effort by Biospherics and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. Biospherics supplied the pilot plant, engineering guidance and daily operating staff. The District collected and analyzed the sewage samples to measure the effectiveness of the process.

Complete details of the process will be published in the October issue of the *Journal of the Water Pollution Control Federation.*

TRIBUTE TO W. R. HULL, JR.

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor to the Committee on Appropriations when BILL HULL joined our ranks in 1964. He has been a stalwart Member through the years. He has had both feet on the ground. He has served the public interest with skill and distinction. He has wrought well for his people in Missouri, and he has stood steadfast in support of the traditions and values which have made this Nation great.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues will forgive me for being partial to the members of the Committee on Appropriations with whom I serve. We work closely together on mutual problems, and it is but natural that an attachment develops among the members of this great committee.

BILL, I do not have to tell you that you have been one of my favorite friends on the committee for a long time. I regret seeing you depart the legislative scene, but I know you will be busy serving your fellow man in the future years. My congratulations for a job well done and my very best wishes for continued health and happiness.

THE HONORABLE JAMES A. BYRNE

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I join with his many colleagues, friends, and admirers in extending farewell to Pennsylvania's distinguished son, Congressman JAMES A. BYRNE.

Since his election to the 83d Congress in 1952, Congressman BYRNE has served his fellow Philadelphians of Pennsylvania's Third District with distinction and honor. His work as a member of the House Armed Services and Merchant Ma-

rine and Fisheries Committees has resulted in legislation of benefit to our Nation's security.

As he now concludes 20 years of service in the House my wife, Blanche, joins me in wishing him every possible happiness and success in the years ahead.

THE NATION DEMANDS CLEAN WATER

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the time for deliberation and debate has passed. It is time for this body to act.

In President Nixon's own words, we cannot procrastinate if we are to end the polluting of our rivers and lakes and restore the waters on which our whole future depends.

The Congress has deliberated long and carefully on this issue; we have produced a landmark, bipartisan bill that can save our waters from the total disaster that threatens them.

Mr. Speaker, this undertaking is going to be costly, but the cost of inaction would be far greater, because ultimately we are going to have to do the job and the longer we delay, the worse the problem will become and the more expensive it will be.

The people of this country have told us they are ready to pay the price of action, provided they get results. And in this legislation we have created a program that will produce those results.

This legislation will not add one iota to the inflationary pressures that concern all of us. The spending will not have appreciable impact on the President's budget until at least 1975, by which time we all hope the Vietnam conflict will have long been over and we can shift our resources over to such vital peacetime purposes as the protection of our environment.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country have given us, their elected representatives in the Congress, a mandate for prompt and effective action against the continuing pollution of our waters.

In overturning the presidential veto today, we must make it unmistakably clear that we have given the President the program and the spending authority he needs to carry out that mandate and that we expect him to do so.

This landmark legislation is a national commitment to halt and reverse the pollution of our rivers and lakes and coastal waters, and to get on with the job starting right now. We, in the Congress, have faced up to our responsibility; we have fixed deadlines for our industries and our communities to stop discharging pollutants into our waters and to make them fit to swim in by 1983. We have set as a national goal the complete elimination of all water pollution by 1985.

We are not going to back down on that commitment. The American people have let us know in unmistakable language that they are not going to back down on that commitment, that they are ready to pay the price of clean water.

But in the light of President Nixon's veto message, we cannot help but wonder whether he now intends to implement this law with all the power and all the funds at his command, or to withhold the necessary Federal spending and let this national commitment molder in the back rooms of the Office of Management and Budget.

Sixteen years ago, when the present White House occupant was Vice President of the United States, another Republican President vetoed a similar, but far more modest effort of mine to attack the water pollution problem on a national front. That President justified his veto on the grounds that water pollution was only a local problem.

What excuse does Mr. Nixon now give us? Certainly, he no longer believes it is a local problem, even if he may have agreed with his former chief back in 1956. He has told us again and again that protection of our environment is one of his top national priorities, that if we are ever going to have our waters it is now or never.

I urge the President now, with all the force at my command, to put aside partisan motivations and cooperate with the Congress so that the hopes of all our people for the restoration of their environment may be fulfilled.

The highly respected Christian Science Monitor in an editorial published on October 6, describes this legislation as:

> Realistically funded and equipped with teeth sharp enough to scare water polluters into corrective action.

The editorial goes on to say:

> The end result will be a country whose abundant assets of rivers, streams, and lakes will have been in great part cleaned up and restored to their original beauty and usability by 1985. For that result, the price tag is none too large.

And the Washington Post, on October 9, added its editorial endorsement to this legislation as a "solid, bipartisan" commitment to clean water. The Post editorial says:

> Cleansing our waterways will, of course, have a long-term budget impact of some magnitude, but this cost must be measured against the price of non-action—the tremendous national loss in filthy rivers, dying lakes, and poisoned estuaries. For instance, without this bill and the investment it contemplates, the Potomac will remain a dirty disgrace for years. Given this chance, we think the public is prepared to bear the cost of cleaning up, and will have little stomach for procrastination or false economy.

To that, I say "Amen."

Mr. Speaker, the question before the House today is of more than national concern. The peoples of the world are watching for our decision.

Ours is the richest nation on earth. We enjoy the highest standard of living on earth. We have the most advanced technology on earth. And, as the most industrialized, urbanized society on earth, we are the greatest polluters of the earth's waters.

If we who are most responsible for the earth's pollution and best equipped to deal with it cannot afford to save the environment, who on earth can?

We must decide for the environment here and now, Mr. Speaker, or confess to the peoples of the world that our planet cannot be saved.

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the time has come to bid farewell to many colleagues who are retiring at the end of this Congress, and we do so with a heavy heart. This is especially so in the case of our friend from New York, the Honorable SEYMOUR HALPERN, whose good humor and talent for friendship have cheered all of us during the 14 years he has so ably served in the House of Representatives. I have been grateful on many occasions for his cooperation and counsel and for his diligence as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SY's public service goes all the way back to the days when he was an aide to Mayor LaGuardia of New York City in 1937 and his achievements are legion; he has earned a rest, but we shall greatly miss him.

My wife Betty and I wish for SY and Barbara many more years of health and happiness in the future.

IN TRIBUTE TO HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, in his 34 years as a Member of Congress, JOHN McMILLAN has impacted the lives of countless people from Florence, S.C., to Washington, D.C., and beyond. He has had the unique experience of spanning such diverse interests as tobacco farmers in his rural district and the urban affairs of the Nation's Capital.

The period of his service, from 1938 through 1972, has made him a participant in some of the most grave decisions of our times. As he reflects upon this long tenure with deserved satisfaction, I trust that he will not only be sustained by the memories but also continue to make his experience available.

WORK ON WILCOX MANSION GETS HIGH PRAISE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the 89th Congress approved legislation which I introduced to establish the Wilcox Man-

sion in my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site.

It was in the Wilcox Mansion on Delaware Avenue that Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office as President in 1901 after the assassination of William McKinley.

Integral in this project was the requirement that the community provide a large share of the support, financial and otherwise.

Some were dubious that the renovation of the Wilcox Mansion would ever be achieved notwithstanding the obvious enthusiasm of many organizations and individuals in the Buffalo area.

A few days ago a representative of the Department of the Interior visited the Wilcox Mansion. His last previous visit was before any renovation work had been done.

He is Ellsworth R. Swift of the Interpretive Design Center of the National Park Service at Harpers Ferry, W. Va.

His observations in an interview with the press were most heart-warming to me because they reflect the views of an outsider on the tremendous progress that has been made in renovating the building as a national historic site. In the interview, he is quoted as saying:

My last visit and look at the mansion left me with the feeling that the restoration was an impossible dream. The plaster was falling from the ceilings and the house interior was in great need of repair.

It is wonderful to see the job that has been done and a good deal of credit must go to Dr. Walter S. Dunn, director of the Buffalo and Erie County Historical Society, for his accurate research work in recreating the library as it was in 1901.

To another reporter he is quoted as saying:

Compared to what I first saw, this was a real delight.

Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments of many individuals in connection with the Wilcox Mansion are worthy of wide applause and show clearly what can be done when people take a real interest in preserving our heritage.

As part of my remarks, I include the text of a news story on Mr. Swift's visit:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier-Express, Oct. 7, 1972]

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE AIDE HONORED AT WILCOX MANSION

Ellsworth R. Swift, a representative of the Interpretive Design Center of the National Park Service at Harpers Ferry, W. Va., attended Friday a luncheon in his honor at the Wilcox Mansion on Delaware Ave.

Frank D. Leavers, president of the area's Theodore Roosevelt Inaugural Site (TRIS) Foundation, was host at the luncheon held in the morning room of the Wilcox Mansion. Mr. Swift is in Buffalo to review the restoration work of the library at the Theodore Roosevelt Inaugural National Historic Site.

VERY PLEASED

Mr. Swift said at an interview before the luncheon that he was very pleased to see the completed work at the mansion. "My last visit and look at the mansion left me with the feeling that the restoration was an impossible dream. The plaster was falling from the ceilings and the house interior was in great need of repair. It is wonderful to see the job that has been done and a good deal of credit must go to Dr. Walter S. Dunn, director of the Buffalo and Erie County Historical Society, for his accurate research work in recreating the library as it was in 1901," he said.

Mr. Swift was in Buffalo also to discuss the recent work and research the Historical Society and Site Foundation board members are doing on the dinning room of the Wilcox Mansion.

NEED CLEARER PICTURE

Dr. Dunn remarked, "We at present have a faint and fuzzy photograph taken in the 1930s, but we are still looking for a clearer picture of the dining area to use as a guideline. Perhaps some local resident might find such a picture in an old magazine or book that will help us."

Mrs. Roger W. Brandt, a member of the foundation and chairman of the restoration and the docents at the mansion as a representative of the Junior League of Buffalo, will be closely involved with the research development of this forthcoming project.

MAIN DUTIES

Speaking about the main duties of the Interpretive Design at Harpers Ferry, Mr. Smith said, "We are interested in the audio-visual exhibits and special publications for national parks and historic sites."

He said that the Wilcox Mansion is operated on a rather unusual basis, since the foundation and the Historical Society operate this site while the National Park Service serves only as consultants.

"The token fees of 25 cents for children and 50 cents for adults visiting the Wilcox Mansion go directly to the TRIS Foundation, since it is their responsibility to operate the site," said Dr. Dunn. "This is a city, county, state and federal operation, differing from the set-up of most national historic sites where the fees go directly to the United States Treasury and are controlled by Congress."

Mr. Swift left Buffalo Friday afternoon to pay a short visit to his brother, Arby R. Swift and his wife and family before returning to Harpers Ferry. His brother lives outside Cuba, N.Y.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as we conclude our business today, one of our finest accomplishments, in my opinion, is passage of legislation to establish a Consumer Product Commission which will be able to coordinate all of our previously fragmented, and too often ineffective, Federal efforts at providing some measure of guarantee to the American consumer that products he finds in the marketplace are safe for use in his home and his place of employment.

One organization, the Arlington Safety Council, Inc., located in Arlington, Va., in my congressional district, has been a leader for many years in an effort to provide for a centrally directed consumer protection effort. One of the safety council's board members, Col. G. B. Kidwell of Arlington, has worked since 1954, first as a private citizen and later as a member of the safety council, for enactment of legislation which would provide for greater protection for children from entrapment in household refrigerators and freezers, as well as entanglement in thin plastic sheets, such as those often used for protecting dry-cleaned clothing and too often misused a second time for covering crib mattresses with disasterous results.

On September 30, when it appeared that the legislation we have sent to the President might be lost in the last minute legislative rush, Colonel Kidwell wrote a letter to the editors of several Washington area papers expressing the Arlington Safety Council's strong support for a Consumer Product Safety Commission and documenting the council's difficulties in attempting to obtain remedies for some of the hazards it had discovered because of fragmented responsibility and lack of direction of the several Federal agencies involved to a greater or lesser degree in product safety. As I believe his letter will be of interest to all who read this RECORD, I insert it in full.

The letter reads as follows:

ARLINGTON SAFETY COUNCIL, INC.,
Arlington, Va., September 30, 1972.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR:

As a member of a civic group which has long deplored the ineffectiveness of our regulatory agencies in the field of product safety, I have been intrigued with the frequent editorials in the press forecasting limited chances for the enactment of meaningful consumer product protection legislation during the present session of Congress.

However, it now seems that the long and conscientious investigation and probing by the Congress to design a strong "consumer product protection" law is headed for fruition.

One bill under consideration would provide for a three-member agency to act as a sort of super-lawyer for consumers in court and in rule-making proceedings and other regulatory agencies. This concept might lead to unreasonable harassment of rule-making bodies during their deliberations. A thought on this type of concept might be that citizens and industry aleady have means of impact upon rule-making deliberations in the persons of their elected representatives in the Congress.

Basic to all investigation and probes has been the conviction that existing regulatory agencies have been generally ineffective. This has been forcibly expressed by Senator Percy as quoted in a recent editorial, "Too often in the past agencies established as watchdogs for public interests have become lapdogs for private interests".

In our testimony before the Senate committee in July 1971, supporting a "Commission on Product Safety Act of 1971," we suggested the ineffectiveness of regulatory agencies as possibly due to the fragmented allocation of product safety authority and responsibility within the governmental structure, and cited instances of gross neglect associated with efforts to improve child protection from entrapment and suffocation in idle household refrigerators and freezers over the past decade. The record unfolded in this testimony suggests an attitude on the part of the industry of extreme disinterest toward these efforts to reduce the needless sacrifice of young children—some of which were enthusiastically supported by such knowledgeable groups as the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and the American Academy of Pediatrics.

The thrust of our recommendation was to realign the present fragmented and ineffective government-industry product safety system to provide for centralized management, to include provision for product research and development, testing, and statistical information on which to base safety programming

and legislative advice to the Congress—and overall clearinghouse capabilities.

Another bill now awaiting resolution in a joint committee provides for a five-member "Consumer Product Commission" with broad powers of rule-making and enforcement. That this commission's management should rest in a bi-partisan five-man membership instead of in a single director seems vital to the future public protection from outside pressures.

It is hoped that this carefully prepared and strongly sponsored legislation will emerge with a consumer protection quality that will discourage continued industry domination of product safety criteria, heretofore accomplished through "liaison" by a variety of councils, institutes, societies, and trade organizations largely concerned with preventing unattractive safety demands being made upon their membership of manufacturers.

GAYLORD B. KIDWELL,
Colonel, U.S. Army (retired),
Vice President.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT PRYS LOOSE REVEALING IRS STATISTICS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, last month I called attention to the Federal court decision in the freedom of information suit by Mr. and Mrs. Philip H. Long, who sued the Internal Revenue Service under the act for certain types of IRS manuals and other information. They won their case and IRS was forced by court order to make the requested data available. See RECORD, September 6, 1972, page 29625.

Information contained in such manuals dealing with regional variances of appellate settlement of individual's income tax deficiencies, corporate appellate settlement variances, and other fascinating types of statistical data heretofore kept from the public eye by the IRS has now been published in a series of articles by the courageous tax columnist, Mr. E. Edward Stephens. He states that the Longs had made available to him statistical data contained in the material which the court forced the IRS to reveal.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all taxpayers will be extremely interested in the data provided by Mr. Stephens in his articles in the Washington Star and News and the New York Daily News. The three articles are included at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Sunday Star and Daily News, Sept. 17, 1972]

CAT NOW OUT OF IRS BAG

(By E. Edward Stephens)

Dear Counsel: A revenue agent examined my income tax return and came up with a deficiency. I disagreed. A conferee in the Philadelphia district director's office has indicated that he'll settle for about 50 cents on the dollar. Now I must decide whether to accept or try my luck in the IRS appellate division. It would be very helpful, in making this decision, to know what the average settlement has been in the Philadelphia appellate division. Will the Internal Revenue Service give me this information?

No—but I will. In fiscal 1971, Philadelphia appellate conferees settled individual income tax deficiencies at an average of 32 cents on the dollar. So, if the strength of your case is average or better, chances are it will pay to go on to the appellate division.

IRS keeps such statistics under heavy guard. But Susan and Philip H. Long, of Bellevue, Wash., have pried the fiscal 1971 figures out of the IRS disclosure staff; and they've passed the tables along to me.

So the cat's out of the bag. For the first time, these figures can be published. In the hands of taxpayers, they reduce the tremendously unfair advantage that IRS conferees have enjoyed in settlement negotiations.

Today, I'm giving you only figures on individual income tax settlements in the IRS appellate divsion. (I'll report soon on corporations.) Don't confuse these statistics with district conferee settlement figures published previously in this column.

Here we go! Appellate conferees settled individual income tax controversies in fiscal 1971 at a nationwide average of 34 percent of deficiencies cooked up by revenue agents.

There were wide variations in settlements made at different locations. This shatters the claim that IRS administers the tax laws uniformly throughout the entire country.

In the North-Atlantic and Mid-Atlantic regions, for instance, average agreements ranged from 24 percent in Washington, to 50 percent in Newark. Here's the list:

City	Percent
Washington	24
Buffalo	25
New York City	31
Philadelphia	32
Pittsburgh	32
Boston	34
Baltimore	35
New Haven	45
Richmond	46
Newark	50

The Longs fought hard, at considerable expense, to get these figures. Then they immediately made them available to you through this column. In extending heartfelt thanks to Phil and Sue, I'm sure I express your sentiments

Rep. William S. Moorhead, D-Pa., chairman of the House foreign operations and government information subcommittee, told Congress Sept. 6 what he thinks of the Longs. He said: "I commend these outstanding Americans for their courage and perseverance."

They're fighting the battle of many millions of our fellow citizens against the "secrecy-minded bureaucrats" of the IRS and other executive agencies, Moorhead added.

There's room on the ring for all freedom-loving Americans. Your rights are worth fighting for—even against overwhelming odds.

[From the New York Daily News, Sept. 22, 1972]

COMPANIES FARED WELL IN TAX FIGHTS

(By E. Edward Stephens)

Q. You reported last week that, in fiscal 1971, individual taxpayers settled their income tax deficiencies in the IRS appellate division at a national average of 34 cents on the dollar. How did corporations fare?

A. They did even better. On a nation-wide average, corporations wriggled off the deficiency hook for 27 on the dollar.

This is revealed by IRS statistics obtained at great effort and expense by Philip H. and Susan Long, of Bellevue, Wash. For the first time, the figures now are available to U.S. taxpayers through this column.

The IRS disclosure staff, headed by Donald O. Virdin, have used every ploy, every ruse, to keep these figures secret—to bypass the 1967 Freedom of Information Act, which says bureaucrats must produce such information on request. But the Longs pursued them doggedly, and painfully extracted the tables, as dentists pull teeth.

The figures are startling. Like those published last week on individual-taxpayer settlement agreements, they prove that IRS failed to administer the tax laws uniformly throughout the country. There were wide fluctuations in the agreements that corporations were able to make at IRS appellate division offices.

In the North-Atlantic and Mid-Atlantic regions, for example, average corporation income tax settlements in 10 cities ranged from 19 to 62% of deficiencies concocted by revenue agents and tax auditors.

LINEUP BY CITIES

Here's the lineup. So that you can compare, I'm including average agreements made by individual taxpayers—the figures published here last week.

City	Individual percentage	Corporation percentage
New Haven	45	19
Boston	34	23
Richmond	46	30
Washington	24	34
New York City	31	37
Pittsburgh	32	39
Buffalo	25	42
Philadelphia	32	44
Baltimore	35	46
Newark	50	62
U.S. average	34	27

Of these 10 cities, Newark was the worst place to settle cases for both individuals and corporations. Washington conferees were most favorable to individuals, while New Haven IRS negotiators were kindest to corporations.

Nation-wide, IRS appellate conferees were easier on corporations than individuals. But this was the pattern in only three of the 10 offices of the North-Atlantic and Mid-Atlantic regions. IRS negotiators in the other seven cities favored individuals over corporations.

PENCHANT FOR SECRECY

In a Sept. 18 article discussing the activities of Phil and Sue Long, Time magazine refers to the IRS "penchant for secrecy." In defense, a Service spokesman said "detailed knowledge of our procedures would make it easier for people to get around or evade the regulations."

This is an insult to Congress and all U.S. taxpayers. It's up to our elected representatives, not IRS, to decide what information Americans can be trusted with.

Congress has told IRS and other bureaucrats to give the public this type of information. IRS officials have disobeyed. Congress, the courts, and citizens like the Longs will bring them to heel.

[From the Star and News, Oct. 1, 1972]

SCORING ON IRS APPEALS

(By Edward Stephens)

Dear Counsel: I'm the executor of my uncle's estate. I filed a federal estate tax return. IRS Form 706. An examiner at the Internal Revenue Service has figured up a deficiency which I think is wrong. I'd like to try for settlement in the IRS appellate division. How have other taxpayers done in such negotiations?

A. Exceptionally well. In fiscal 1971, taxpayers who went to the IRS appellate division were able to wash out estate tax deficiencies at a nationwide average of 34 cents on the dollar.

If your case is at least average in strength, your chances are good. But a great deal depends on which IRS appellate office you're dealing with.

For example, 1971 estate tax average settlements, made in 10 cities of the North Atlantic and Mid Atlantic regions, varied from

25 to 79 percent of deficiencies brewed by IRS estate tax examiners.

DATA KEPT SECRET

Such statistics never have been published anywhere before. Although they're compiled at public expense, IRS officials have kept them hidden from taxpayers who foot the bills. This strategy has given IRS conferees a shameful advantage over their opponents in settlement negotiations.

By refusing to release these figures, IRS disclosure staffers flagrantly violated the Freedom of Information Act. They got away with it for five years—until the whistle was blown by indignant taxpayers Susan and Philip H. Long, of Bellevue, Wash.

It was a hard, expensive fight. But Phil and Sue finally clamped a freedom-of-information hold on IRS, and squeezed the figures right out of the disclosure staff. Then, to help other frustrated taxpayers, the Longs asked me to report results in this column.

Gladly! And to further enlighten you, I'm listing comparable gift tax settlements for the same year, 1971. Each figure is the average percentage for which IRS appellate conferees settled deficiencies served up by estate and gift tax examiners.

IRS office	Estate tax percentage	Gift tax percentage
Philadelphia	25	79
Buffalo	28	29
New Haven	39	76
Pittsburgh	40	30
New York	41	35
Richmond	42	37
Boston	44	36
Newark	53	7
Baltimore	57	52
Washington	79	65
U.S. average	34	24

WASHINGTON WORST

Of the 10 offices listed, Philadelphia was the best place to settle an estate tax deficiency beef in 1971. The worst place was Washington.

North Atlantic and Mid Atlantic conferees generally were tough horse traders. In all cities listed here, except Philadelphia and Buffalo, they made taxpayers shell out more than the 34-percent average U.S. settlement.

These figures—plus the income tax settlement percentages previously published in this column—prove the IRS fails to administer the tax laws uniformly throughout the country. And they show that IRS tries to collect as much as possible from each taxpayer, although service bigwigs claim they want only the right tax, "no more, no less."

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn I would like to pay tribute to my good friend from Massachusetts, the Honorable HASTINGS KEITH, who is voluntarily retiring at the close of this Congress.

In the 14 years we have served here together I have always found him a fine friend and a diligent Representative of his district. He has served with distinction on the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Above all, I have found him a staunch and courageous ally in many tough legislative battles on behalf of President Nixon's program.

I wish for HASTINGS all the best in the future, as do all of us in the House.

LATEST RESULTS OF OPINION POLL

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, each year it has been my custom to solicit the opinions of the people of the 10th Congressional District on the vital issues which affect our district and the Nation. It is deeply gratifying to report that by the tens of thousands the people of my constituency take time to answer the difficult questions put to them in this opinion poll. I need not say that it is of invaluable assistance to me in my efforts to represent them here in Washington.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of this House are very much interested in those opinions and I hereby include the latest results of my opinion poll for the guidance of my colleagues:

RESULTS OF McDADE'S 10TH ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

[In percentage]

1. Do you favor the President's actions in trying to establish more normal relations with China? Yes 95, no 5.

2. Would you favor a similar effort aimed at more normal relations with Cuba? Yes 55, no 45.

3. Do you favor additional efforts in such areas as arms limitation and mutual space ventures between the United States and the Soviet Union? Yes 90, no 10.

4. In the matter of Vietnam, would you favor:

a. Immediate withdrawal of all U.S. forces, negotiating for the release of the POW's afterwards? Yes 12.

b. Withdrawal of our forces only on the condition of the simultaneous release of all POW's? Yes 24.

c. Withdrawal after a cease fire is negotiated and the release of the POW's is firmly agreed upon? Yes 64.

5. In the case of young men who have left this country to evade military service, or who left while in military service, would you favor:

a. Unconditional amnesty and pardon? Yes 16.

b. No amnesty or pardon? Yes 33.

c. Amnesty or pardon if they agree to an alternative type of service for a specific period of time? Yes 51.

6. If a member of the Armed Services is killed during combat, would you favor making G.I. Bill benefits available to another member of his family? Yes 63, no 37.

7. Do you favor the present program of higher military salaries and benefits in the hope of creating an all-volunteer armed services? Yes 77, no 23.

8. Would you favor strict Federal regulation of strip-mining and surface restoration for the mining of all minerals in the United States? Yes 96, no 4.

9. Would you favor the Federal Government's sharing its tax revenues with local communities, with the communities deciding the priorities in spending within federal guidelines? Yes 75, no 25.

10. Do you support legislation to prohibit the use of busing to achieve a racial balance in school systems? Yes 73, no 27.

11. Would you favor a new form of Federal tax as a substitute for property taxes to fund elementary and secondary school education? Yes 75, no 25.

12. In the area of health insurance, would you prefer:

a. An expansion of Federal health care to cover working poor or unemployed? Yes 6.

b. Tax credits to purchase private insurance protection? Yes 19.

c. A Federal program to help pay catastrophic medical costs? Yes 24.

d. Government financed health care for everybody? Yes 33.

e. No new Federal legislation in this area? Yes 18.

13. Do you believe it should be a stated national policy to preserve the small family farm in America? Yes 72, no 28.

14. When a parity level is selected for the pricing of farm products, do you favor moving that level with the movement of the cost of living index? Yes 68, no 32.

15. Should Congressmen or Senators be removed from office for excessive unauthorized absences? Yes 92, no 8.

16. In primary elections for the Presidential nomination, would you favor:

a. The present system of many primaries on many dates? Yes 4.

b. A national presidential primary held on the same day in all states? Yes 91.

c. Many presidential primaries, but on a restricted number of dates? Yes 5.

17. Number in order the priorities each of the following should receive:

a. Education, 89%.
b. Rural problems, 20%.
c. Urban problems, 41%.
d. Space exploration, 55%.
e. Defense, 46%.
f. Environmental improvement, 72%.
g. Anti-crime measures, 79%.
h. Health, 77%.
i. Housing, 60%.

NO REVENUE TO SHARE

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the last months of the 92d Congress were filled with debate on the issues of deficit spending, raising the ceiling on the national debt, setting a spending ceiling and, of course, revenue sharing. I have always opposed the concept of massive deficit spending and the unending increases in the ceiling for the national debt. I also supported placing a ceiling on Federal expenditures, but supporting a measure which would immediately add $5.3 billion to our already ballooning national debt seems somehow inconsistent with the philosophy of economy in government.

This proposal that the Federal Government raise the national debt in order to share revenue is rather difficult to justify especially in light of the fact that overall, State and local governments will show a budget surplus estimated as high as $4 billion during fiscal year 1973. During this same period the Federal Government is faced with a deficit estimated at $33 billion. It is obvious to me that we can no longer substitute rhetoric for action on this matter at a time when we are spending over $20 billion a year in interest on the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, I recently read an editorial from the October 12, 1972 edition of the Palm Beach Times, titled "No Revenue To Share." This editorial makes a number of important points and I would like to insert it in the RECORD at this point for the benefit of my colleagues:

[From the Palm Beach Times, Oct. 12, 1972]

NO REVENUE TO SHARE

Looking at the balance sheet, it is very hard to understand the clamor for revenue sharing that is being raised by supposedly hard-pressed state and local governments.

According to Andresen & Co., a New York investment house, the federal budget for fiscal 1973 will have a whopping $33 billion deficit. In plain language, that means the federal government is going to spend $33 billion more than it takes in.

State and local governments, however, will finish fiscal 1973 with an aggregate budget surplus of $4 billion. Obviously there will be some state and local governments in the red and some in the black; but on the whole, they'll take in $4 billion more than they spend.

Why? Because state and local governments already get a great deal of federal aid. Between 1963 and 1972, federal grants in aid to state and local governments grew from $8 billion to $41 billion. In addition, state and local tax receipts have decreased sharply in the past decade.

In spite of the fact that the federal government has no revenue to share, a joint Senate-House committee has worked out differences in the revenue sharing bill and congressional approval is virtually assured this year.

Where will the money come from? More deficit spending by the federal government. More borrowing to further increase the staggering national debt. More paper money to create more inflation.

If any individual taxpayer or business firm operated in this fashion, it would mean bankruptcy court in a very short time. But the federal government aided and abetted by a spendthrift Congress keeps shoveling out money it doesn't have as if there were no tomorrow.

And who pays for it all? You do.

HONORABLE EDGAR A. BROWN, PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SENATE

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Senator Edgar A. Brown is retiring at the end of this year after an unsurpassed public career of more than 50 years.

Senator Brown is South Carolina's most accomplished and distinguished statesmen of this era. Since World War I, he has played a leading role in the government of our State. I believe Mr. Brown to be the greatest statesman South Carolina has produced since the days of Charles C. Pinckney, Edward Rutledge and John C. Calhoun. A thoughtful student of South Carolina history would agree that Senator Brown accomplished more to uplift South Carolina than any other leader in the State's illustrious history. Edgar Brown was elected to the State house of representatives in 1921, and became Speaker of the House in 1925. In 1929 he was elected to the South Carolina Senate and has served in that great body continuously. Mr. Speaker, for 30 years Edgar Brown has served as president pro tempore of the senate and chairman of the powerful senate finance committee.

Senator Edgar Brown led the fight for the $65 million State bond issue to build highways. When the Nation was in the grip of the worst depression in history, Edgar Brown provided jobs for thousands of the unemployed in building highways. He put idle contractors and rusting machinery to work. He provided the means in those depression years at low cost for the foundation of our present State highway system—the best in the entire World, studied by contractors and engineers the world over. It would cost more than a billion dollars today to build that foundation, and under present economic conditions it would not be possible. Through bitterly opposed, Senator Brown's leadership prevailed, and South Carolina's splendid highway system is evidence of this leadership. As a member of the roads subcommittee of the public works committee in the house, I can testify, Mr. Speaker, to the reality of Senator Brown's fantastic accomplishment.

Senator Brown guided South Carolina's fiscal affairs through depression, inflation and war, and today we are No. 1 in the Nation in financial solvency. We rank No. 1 on the bond market in New York, above any of the other States. Our AAA credit rating saves South Carolina taxpayers untold millions of dollars each year in interest charges. Just this week, South Carolina sold $48.8 million in general obligation bonds at the phenomically low interest rate of 4.25 percent, indeed a great savings to our people.

Senator Brown's constant admonition as chairman of the powerful Finance Committee was "pay as you go," a fiscal responsibility to future generations of South Carolinians. His foresight and courage in fiscal affairs could be emulated to great advantage in our National Government.

Today, South Carolinians can point with pride to the amazing progress our State has made during Senator Brown's public life. Fiscally soundness, quality education, and good highways are splendid achievements and fitting monuments to Senator Brown, all of which form the basis for the fantastic economic progress we have witnessed in our State since World War II.

With the influx of diversified industry, including the most advanced and sophisticated atomic science installations, jobs and opportunity are plentiful. We can call to mind that not too long ago South Carolina was a State of extreme poverty, windswept hillsides and burning forests. But today it is an environmental showplace, with thousands of farm ponds, and hundreds of thousands of acres of forests filtering the rain where it falls.

Mr. Speaker, South Carolina is No. 1 in the Nation in technical education, adult and vocational education. We are No. 1 in educational television. Many foreign planners and educators are studying these magnificent accomplishments. This superb progress is due in no small measure to Edgar Brown's foresight, persistence, prestige, and dedication. Senator Brown himself, born in the impoverished South in the "tragic era" following the War Between the States, did not have the opportunity of higher formal education. He nevertheless became one of the best educated and informed men I have ever known. He studied long hours on shorthand and court reporting. He mastered this art while studying law at night, becoming one of the great lawyers of our time. As an attorney he was known and respected throughout the Nation. In one well known case, he entered into the defense of a young man from my home town whose case had already twice gone up to the Supreme Court of a neighboring State. Through Senator Brown's incomparable courtroom skill and erudition, justice prevailed and the young man was acquitted of the extremely serious charge.

Senator Brown's devotion to education allowed him to lead South Carolina into a new era of educational advancement. The public school system has shown marked improvement and our institutions of higher learning are now second to none. Senator Brown is a life member and the president of the Clemson University board of trustees. He recently announced the Brown endowment fund at Clemson and made available to the university library his important papers and documents. The Senator has been honored with honorary degrees by Clemson University and by the Medical University at Charleston.

A member of the South Carolina Democratic Committee since 1914 Senator Brown was elected delegate at large from South Carolina to the Democratic National Convention of 1924. He sat with William Jennings Bryan, a renowned Democrat who was three times the Presidential nominee and standard bearer of the Democratic Party. It was at this time that Bryan commended Edgar Brown and predicted for him a great political future. Senator Brown attended every Democratic National Convention from that time until 1964 and only missed the 1968 convention because of ill health. He became a confidant and friend of not only Bryan, but Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and John F. Kennedy. He formed a very warm and personal friendship with Jim Farley and every national Democratic leader of his time. For more than 60 years he has actively associated himself with the Democratic Party. Senator Brown never left the Democratic Party on account of someone's race, creed, or color. He never left the party because a nominee was selected who did not exactly share his political philosophy. He stayed in the party and fought within for a better platform and better national candidates. Throughout his illustrious career Senator Brown was, and remains, a Thomas Jefferson Democrat. He believes that the Democratic Party cannot perform its vital role of protecting the welfare of the Nation

should it run into the ditch on the left-hand side of the road or into the ditch on the right-hand side of the road. He believes the party should include representatives of conservative and liberal positions and should move forward with equal justice and rights for all our people.

Edgar Brown kissed his mother and lovely wife good night in 1926 in the belief that he was elected U.S. Senator. He was awakened the next morning only to learn that he had lost by a narrow margin. He was defeated by one of the greatest politicians of our times. But, Mr. Speaker, I have wondered a thousand times what America and the Free World would be like today had Edgar Brown guided the U.S. Senate during the last half century.

Mr. Speaker, Edgar Brown was born on July 11, 1888, in Aiken County, S.C., a county whose people it is my great honor to represent in the Congress of the United States. He attended the common schools of Aiken County and Graniteville Academy in the famous Horse Creek Valley. Senator Brown began his long public career as a court stenographer for South Carolina's second judicial circuit. His many positions of public trust and Party leadership are far too numerous to be mentioned here, but his splendid career can be found outlined in the South Carolina legislative manual, the archives of Clemson University, and biographical reference works. In 1913 Edgar Brown married Annie Love Sitgreaves of Laurens, S.C., and since that time she has shared Senator Brown's hopes and aspirations in the true tradition of a southern lady. She has been a gracious and lovely helpmate, encouraging her distinguished husband throughout his long career of service to God and country. Senator and Mrs. Brown have a lovely, charming and vivacious daughter, Emily McBurney, who is married to Hon. R. M. Jefferies, Jr. of Barnwell. Mr. Jefferies is a son of the late Governor Dick Jefferies and is an outstanding attorney and highly respected leader in his community. The Senator is rightly and tremendously proud of his lovely grandchildren. Shortly before Senator Brown celebrated his 84th birthday, this past July 7, he announced his retirement from the South Carolina Senate to a grateful people who learned of his decision with much regret.

The South Carolina Senate will never quite be the same again, for the Halls of that great body will indeed miss the presence of the "Bishop of Barnwell." South Carolina's colorful politics, with its stump meetings and enthusiastic crowds whooping it up for their favorite candidate, also will never be the same again.

One of the most talked about, discussed, and admired political leaders has retired. An entire era has passed, but South Carolina is a greater State, and this is a better Nation, because Edgar Brown came our way. A man of tremendous dedication, unsurpassed persuasiveness, a born leader, and a great Patriot—he devoted his life to the service of others.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Millie and my family join the citizens of South Carolina in wishing for Senator Brown every continued success and much happiness always.

GESTAPO TACTICS IN POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I have been utterly shocked, amazed, and saddened over the reports of unbelievable corruption in the national campaign. At first I could not believe that anyone through political sabotage and unethical practices would invade, bug, eavesdrop, and disrupt the campaign headquarters of any fellow candidate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced much of these reports are true. While I cannot believe the President is personally involved and I recognize the necessity of maintaining the dignity and respect for this office, the time has come when the President should repudiate this political sabotage and Gestapo tactics. The very existence of our political system depends upon a standard of ethics and adherence to certain ideals and principles, or else our entire system will be destroyed. Tactics as charged of shadowing candidates and their families, using bogus literature, fake phone calls, forged letters, agents provocateurs must be renounced and repudiated. These tactics, if not repudiated and the guilty individuals promptly prosecuted, will deter honest Americans from offering for any office, much less the highest and most exhalted office of President of the United States.

A richly financed Gestapo shadowing and bugging campaign is a tactic borrowed from totalitarian governments and must not be permitted to flourish unchecked. These tactics are deplored by every decent American of all political parties.

Already the prestige of this Congress and those in political life have suffered from smear and misunderstandings. We should all pledge to conduct the cleanest campaign possible, for ethical practices in a political campaign should be no different from the ethics of everyday life. If the Gestapo tactics become the order of the day in political campaigns, it will shake the very foundations of our Republic.

CARNEGIE HERO FUND NAMES FIVE PITTSBURGHERS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission annually recognizes men and women who selflessly take extraordinary risks to save the lives of other human beings.

This year five of the awardees are being given their award posthumously. These five men all were involved in a gas leak incident in Pittsburgh on November 17, 1971.

They all died while attempting to save their fellow employees.

I think the valor and courage demonstrated by these men, and by other winners of the Carnegie hero awards, is the kind of behavior that is inspiring.

My heart goes out to the families and friends of the five men and I wish to thank the Carnegie commission for their recognition of the deeds of these five Pittsburghers.

I enclose in the RECORD at this time short case summaries of the men and the actions they took, which led to their awards.

CARNEGIE HERO FUND COMMISSION CASE SUMMARIES

SUFFOCATION—FILE NO. 52874

Case of Donald R. De Vine, deceased.

Bronze Medal awarded to Donald R. De Vine, who died after helping to save John J. Ladasky, Jr. from suffocation, Pittsburgh, Pa., November 17, 1971. Ladasky, aged 30, maintenance man, who was working in a gas-line manhole with De Vine, aged 56, head regulator man, and a laborer, was affected by escaping gas and collapsed. De Vine and his fellow worker dragged Ladasky to a ladder and thrust him upward toward the ground-level opening. Other workmen lifted Ladasky out. De Vine and the laborer then also collapsed. Others entered the manhole to give aid but were themselves affected by the gas. When De Vine and the others were removed by firemen, none could be revived. Ladasky recovered after treatment at a hospital.

SUFFOCATION—FILE NO. 52875

Case of Monroe J. Coleman, deceased.

Bronze Medal awarded to Monroe J. Coleman, who died after helping to save John J. Ladasky, Jr. from suffocation, Pittsburgh, Pa., November 17, 1971. Ladasky, aged 30 maintenance man, who was working in a gas-line manhole with Coleman, aged 35, laborer, and the head regulator man, was affected by escaping gas and collapsed. Coleman and his fellow worker dragged Ladasky to a ladder and thrust him upward toward the ground level opening. Other workmen lifted Ladasky out. Coleman and the head regulator man then also collapsed. Others entered the manhole to give aid but were themselves affected by the gas. When Coleman and the others were removed by firemen, none could be revived. Ladasky recovered after treatment at a hospital.

SUFFOCATION—FILE NO. 52275

Case of Raymond J. Grundler, deceased.

Bronze Medal awarded to Raymond J. Grundler, who helped to save John J. Ladasky, Jr. and died attempting to save others from suffocation, Pittsburgh, Pa., November 17, 1971, Ladasky, aged 30, maintenance man, who was working in a gas-line manhole with two other men, was affected by escaping gas and collapsed. His fellow workers dragged Ladasky to a ladder and thrust him upward toward the ground-level opening. Grundler, aged 32, gas service man, entered the manhole and pushed Ladasky up the ladder to others, who lifted him out. When Ladasky's two fellow workers also collapsed, other workmen entered to try to remove them but were themselves affected by the gas. Grundler reentered the manhole to give aid and almost immediately was overcome. When Grundler and the others were removed by firemen, none could be revived.

Ladasky recovered after treatment at a hospital.

SUFFOCATION—FILE NO. 52273

Case of William Henry Letzkus, deceased.

Bronze Medal awarded to William Henry Letzkus, who died assisting in an attempt to save Donald R. De Vine and Monroe J. Coleman from suffocation, Pittsburgh, Pa., November 17, 1971. De Vine, aged 56, head regulator man, and Coleman, aged 35, laborer, were in a gas-line manhole when they collapsed from the effects of escaping gas. Letzkus, aged 38, regulator helper, and other workmen entered the manhole to try to remove DeVile and Coleman but were themselves affected by the gas. When Letzkus and the others were removed by firemen, none could be revived.

SUFFOCATION—FILE NO. 52274

Case of Albert R. Zeleny, deceased.

Bronze Medal awarded to Albert R. Zeleny, who died assisting in an attempt to save Donald R. De Vine and Monroe J. Coleman from suffocation, Pittsburgh, Pa., November 17, 1971. De Vine, aged 56, head regulator man, and Coleman, aged 35, laborer, were in a gas-line manhole when they collapsed from the effects of escaping gas. Zeleny, aged 52, truckdriver, and other workmen entered the manhole to try to remove De Vine and Coleman but were themselves affected by the gas. When Zeleny and the others were removed by firemen, none could be revived.

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is with real sadness that we say farewell to Members who are retiring at the close of this Congress. After 14 years of working together I shall certainly miss the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable J. IRVING WHALLEY, whose friendship and support I have greatly appreciated.

IRV WHALLEY has served with distinction as a senior member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He has been diligent in serving his Pennsylvania constituents, and those of us who have known him over the years join in wishing him every good fortune in the future.

IN HONOR OF HON. WAYNE ASPINALL

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a man who has served the Congress and the country with distinction for several years, the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, U.S. Representative from the State of Colorado.

WAYNE has displayed his industry and dedication continually as a hard-working member of several congressional committees, each requiring distinct and specialized talents and wide ranging knowledge. We have enjoyed the benefit of his service on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Most important, of course, has been his loyal leadership on the busy Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which he was the distinguished chairman Through his able guidance, many legislative measures of crucial importance to the well-being of our environment have made their way into public law.

WAYNE ASPINALL has carried out in the U.S. Congress the same kind of outstanding performance which he offered throughout an equally commendable career in State government and politics back in Colorado. No doubt he will devote himself with the same kind of dedication to all his future endeavors. I would like to extend my best wishes to WAYNE for a happy and successful retirement, and I offer him my sincere congratulations on a truly outstanding career in the House of Representatives.

CONGRESSMEN BOW, BETTS, AND McCULLOCH

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in a special way in this tribute to my three retiring colleagues—Congressmen BOW, BETTS, and MCCULLOCH. What makes this special is that fact that, when my Democratic voting record is contrasted with theirs, a reasonable person might wonder why I should have any words of commendation in the first place. But reasonable as such persons might be, they are not familiar with Congress. If they were, they would realize that a Democratic freshman such as myself seeks sound advice where he can find it—and if he trusts the gentlemen on the Republican side of the aisle, he will not hesitate to search for counsel even there. The point of all this is to declare, as strongly as I can, my complete trust not only in the wisdom of Messrs. BOW, BETTS, and MCCULLOCH, who are my seniors, but also in their character. In my many discussions with them, they have never been less than truthful, and never have they failed to be helpful. I have relied on them a great deal during my first term because I know them to be men of their word—even though they are as firm in their convictions as I am mine. This clash of opinion between us, and others like us, is what has made the U.S. Congress the greatest lawmaking body in the world. When opinions clash, but when mutual trust is achieved in spite of it, those who witness this phenomenon get a glimpse of America—of democracy in action. I will sorely miss Congressmen BOW, BETTS, and MCCULLOCH, but perhaps the greatest compliment that I can extend to them at this time is to assure them that, should I become fortunate enough and worthy enough to get reelected as many times as they have, I pledge that I will be as helpful to any Republican freshman entering Congress as they have been to me. I wish them the best of luck in their retirement, Mr. Speaker.

"THE RING" IS BROKEN

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, with the end of an era comes the beginning of a legend, and so it is with the history of politics in South Carolina. After the public announcement by Senator Edgar Brown that he would not seek reelection to the South Carolina State Senate, many splendid editorials were written paying tribute to this great leader and his illustrious career. Among the hundreds of articles appearing throughout the South concerning Senator Brown's retirement was one I would like to commend to the attention of my fellow colleagues, a fine column by Charles Wickenberg, public affairs editor for The State newspaper. The article follows:

"THE RING" IS BROKEN

(By Charles Wickenberg)

"The Barnwell Ring" will be no more. An era is at an end.

It ended with Sen. Edgar A. Brown of Barnwell announcing his health would not permit a race for the re-election to the State Senate, the legislative hall which he dominated for close to five generations.

Few friends or political observers were surprised at the physician's advice or the senator's decision. Infirmity of age at 83 has made it well-near impossible to meet the demands on the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, or public life for that matter. It has been difficult the last few years and the rigors of a political campaign too much to take.

The legendary Barnwell Ring has been more myth than fact through the years. But it was one of those catchy ideas on which young and ambitious politicians could build an attack for the home folks' consumption.

"Elect me and I'll go down there in Columbia and break up that Barnwell Ring," was the way it went for years.

AS FAR BACK AS 1937

The idea of a Barnwell Ring went as far back as 1937 when Solomon Blatt of Barnwell decided to run for speaker of the house and then-Gov. Olin D. Johnston was running his own candidate.

Blatt was getting support from many quarters, including the S.C. Highway Department with which Johnston had been doing battle. And he was also supported by Lt. Gov. Emile Harley who presided over the State Senate, by Rep. Winchester Smith who was second vice chairman of the influential House Ways and Means Committee, and by Sen. Howard who'd been in the senate since 1929. He'd served before in the House, and as its speaker. All three of those prominent legislators were from Barnwell County and it was natural that Gov. Johnston lumped them into a term like the Barnwell Ring.

It wasn't generally accepted as legend or

fact until Strom Thurmond ran for governor in 1946 when he used the Barnwell Ring as the main point of his political attack.

And the idea has remained, largely because Blatt has been speaker of the house for more than 30 years and Brown has been both president pro tempore and the chairman of the finance committee in the Senate. Between the two, they have been in position to wield unusual influence on legislation, especially the state's budget bills.

SEVERE DISAGREEMENTS

But it is an error to assume that Blatt and Brown—and Winchester Smith—were all of one mind and purposes at all times. Indeed the breaks and disagreements among them have been severe and in recent years it has had the aspects of "peaceful coexistence."

But now, with the Barnwell senator's retirement from the active political life of the senate, the legend can no longer carry any substance at all. It is a pity. In the hectic and often monotonous public affairs of the state, the idea of a Barnwell Ring has furnished color and conversation.

And Sen. Brown has enjoyed just about every minute of it.

There isn't much that he hasn't really enjoyed about public life, and that's probably the greatest sacrifice that the Barnwell senator will make with his voluntary retirement. While he has not been as active within the operations of the senate in recent years, his attendance has been good. He has privately confessed to friends that it is the association with the State House people, lawmakers, lobbyists, newsmen, attaches, visitors, old friends and cronies of years ago who come calling that has given him the real pleasure of the legislative day.

It isn't easy to put all of that aside after a lifetime of service and a mind full of memories enough to publish a dozen books.

"BISHOP" WILL REMAIN

The Barnwell Ring may be no more, but the "Bishop from Barnwell," an affectionate title which he cherishes, will remain as long as there is Edgar A. Brown.

That nickname was put on him by Gov. John G. Richards in 1928. W. D. Workman Jr. in his book, "The Bishop From Barnwell" tells it this way:

"(It) . . . grew out of his frequent conferences with Governor Richards who was a deeply religious man. As the two men would discuss fiscal and other problems, Senator Brown usually would wind up discussion of any given problem with the observation, 'We'll give it prayerful consideration.' By the time that expression had become a by-word between the two, the Governor was equally regular in his references to the Barnwell Senator as 'Bishop' Brown. The name stuck."

Edgar Brown has been called a lot of things in his career. V. O. Keys referred to him in his book on Southern Politics as a "prime minister." The party regulars called the longtime, National Democratic Committeeman "Mr. Democrat."

But he's proudest of the tag, "Mr. Good Government"—a handle that was put on him by Howard Carlisle during an introduction at a textile industry meeting a few years ago at Sea Island, Ga.

"It was flattery, of course, but anyhow the thing I'm most satisfied about is the whole package of sound government—the end results—in the midst of so much taxation and extravagance elsewhere in the nation. We seem to have put the right emphasis for and against good and bad government at the right times," Sen. Brown once said.

South Carolina will miss the Barnwell Ring and it will miss Edgar A. Brown. It has needed them both. There is nothing that can now fill that void.

And that's a shame because that kind of leadership is sorely needed for the future.

SENATOR KARL MUNDT

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in the truest sense of history, an era has come to an end in this body with the retirement of KARL MUNDT.

Although his unfortunate illness has deprived us of his experience and wise counsel in recent years, he will long be remembered for his most outstanding contributions to our legislative work and to the Nation and the State of South Dakota, both of which he loved so well.

It is a great tribute to Senator MUNDT's skill and dedication that the fiercely independent people of my neighboring State chose him to represent them for more than a third of a century—for five terms in the House and four terms in the Senate.

We in this body will cherish his memory as a skilled legislator whose philosophy and actions were guided by a strong sense of history, a man who excelled in committee, a friend who never failed to exhibit patience and good humor in his dealings with others, an honorable statesman in every sense of the word.

His constituents in South Dakota will remember him as a loyal and dedicated advocate of that great State, assiduously determined to protect its welfare and role in the Federal family, exhibiting always a legislative skill and deep knowledge of the State which insured that their interests were secure in his hands.

All of us will remember him as a great patriot who dearly loved his country and who spoke so forcefully and eloquently in its behalf. There is no question it would have pained KARL MUNDT in recent years to hear its many detractors, but we may be assured that if he had enjoyed good health, he would have done battle enthusiastically with all who downgrade it.

His leaving is most regrettable, especially so under the unhappy conditions of his health. I join with all his colleagues in the hope and prayer that he will once again regain his health so that he can enjoy the retirement which he so richly deserves.

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1972

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest things about this great legislative body is that the center aisle does not divide friendship; indeed vigorous debate very often strengthens the bonds of mutual respect and affection. So it is with genuine regret that I bid farewell to one of Virginia's distinguished sons, the Honorable WATKINS M. ABBITT, who is retiring at the end of this Congress.

It is hard to believe that future rollcalls will sound off with another name, but we will all remember WATT's great contributions over nearly a quarter century.

My wife Betty and I wish for WATT and Corinne many years of health and happiness in the future.

BLUEPRINTS FOR ACTION

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon in his state of the Union message at the beginning of the first session offered one of the boldest blueprints for action and reform in the history of our country. He set six great goals for the Nation and the Congress; namely, welfare reform; a stable, prosperous economy; substantial new environmental efforts; major health care improvements; revenue sharing; and a comprehensive restructuring and consolidation of the Federal bureaucracy.

Admittedly these are not easy goals. To an uncommon degree the President's proposals go to the heart of the problems they seek to solve.

However, despite this great challenge and opportunity, the response of the 92d Congress has been exceedingly slow and sporadic, at best. In most cases, completed action has come only in the closing hours under the obvious pressure of adjournment and the coming election.

CONTROL OF CONGRESS

When the 92d Congress convened on January 21, 1971, the composition of the House was 254 Democrats and 179 Republicans, with two vacancies. The Senate lineup was 55 Democrats and 45 Republicans. This meant, of course, that just as in the preceding 16 years, the Democratic Party had full organizational power over the Congress with a heavy majority to choose the leadership, name the chairmen of all committees, and to control at every stage the flow of all legislation.

Of the President's six main legislative goals, only one, revenue sharing, received complete consideration, with only partial action on two others, environmental protection and federal spending control. The remaining three were left almost totally without definitive progress.

Certainly the 92d Congress has not been without activity. The first session ended only late in December of last year, and over the two sessions there have been 648 rollcall votes. The problem has been that for all this exercise, the majority leadership has not exerted sufficient effort to achieve completed actions. In my view, it has, then, simply failed to lead.

VOTING RECORD

At the outset, I want to point out, concerning my own participation, that my cumulative voting record over the years stands at 94 percent with my position made known on all issues of record.

ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION

The fate of the President's ecology proposals has been typical of the handling of so much of his legislative program by the majority leadership of the Congress. In three special messages in 1970, 1971, and 1972, 31 different environmental quality proposals were requested by the administration. However, until the final week of the session, only six of these had been enacted.

In order to urge action, early in the first session I joined in cosponsoring the President's requests, particularly as contained in 11 separate bills: Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act, H.R. 6576; Toxic Substances Control Act, H.R. 6577; National Land Use Policy Act, H.R. 6578; Mined Area Protection Act, H.R. 6580; Land and Water Conservation Fund Act Amendments, H.R. 6581. Marine Protection Act, H.R. 6582; Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments, H.R. 6583–5; Environmental Financing Authority Act, H.R. 6586.

Of those measures finally cleared, undoubtedly the single most significant was S. 2770, the Federal Water Pollution Control Amendments of 1972. Initially passed by the Senate last November, the House approved its version on March 29, 1972. Five months later, after 34 meetings, a House-Senate conference committee finally succeeded in resolving the differences between the two bills.

As approved, with my support, the legislation sets 1985 as a goal for eliminating pollution discharges and authorizes $24.6 billion overall. Some $18 billion is allocated over the next 3 years to provide 75 percent Federal funding for the construction of waste treatment plants. At the same time, strong new enforcement authority is provided with specific deadlines: By July 1, 1977 all industries discharging into U.S. waters are required to apply the "best practical" treatment technology; by July 1983 the "best available technology" must be used. Among its other provisions the bill calls for a commission to analyze costs of meeting these deadlines as well as funds for restoring small, inland lakes such as Lake Lansing for which $300 million is authorized over the next 3 years.

CLEAN WATER GRANT

In addition, after working literally years with Michigan State University officials I was greatly encouraged last July by the approval of $1.2 million in Federal support by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for the university's water quality management project. The plan, made in connection with a $7,696,920 EPA grant to the city of East Lansing to upgrade sewage treatment, calls for waste water treated at the East Lansing treatment plant to be piped to a series of four lakes where the waste nutrients will be removed and used to grow aquatic and terrestrial plants for beneficial purposes, such as feeding livestock. A recreational park-like area around the 40 acres of lakes will also be developed on university property.

I am proud to have had a part in getting the Federal bureaucratic wheels to begin to turn on this most promising plan, which I personally discussed with EPA Administrator, William D. Ruckelshaus.

CEREAL LEAF BEETLE

In another environmental area, during debate on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, I again urged support for funds to carry on research on the control of the cereal leaf beetle and particularly to draw attention to the scientific program underway at MSU to find means to control the pest without the use of hard chemicals, thereby avoiding damage to the environment, people, and animals. For the past few years MSU has taken the leadership in this research.

Among other legislation in the environmental field which had my support were:

H.R. 9727, Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act;

H.R. 6482, to regulate strip coal mining;

H.R. 10729, Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act;

S. 3507, National Coastal Zone Management;

S. 1478, Toxic Substances Control Act;

H.R. 11021, Noise Control Act;

S. 365, Mineral Resources Research Act;

H.R. 56, to establish a National Environmental Data System;

H.R. 5060, providing criminal penalties for shooting wildlife from aircraft;

H.R. 2587, to create a National Advisory Committee on the Oceans and Atmosphere;

H.R. 3146, to improve law enforcement in national forests;

H.R. 9093, a 5-year expansion of the Water Desalting program;

H.R. 12186, Bald Eagle Protection Act;

H.R. 13089, Reforestation of National Forests;

H.R. 14106, to extend the Water Resources Planning Act; and

H.R. 13152, the Federal Animal Damage Control Act.

INFLATION CONTROL

The future success of the President's New Economic Policy which, since it went into effect on August 15, 1971, has met its target of cutting inflation in half, continues to be jeopardized by strong pressures within the Congress to increase spending. Because I share the President's concern, I supported his request to impose an overall spending ceiling of $250 billion for fiscal 1973. Although this effort was successful in the House it touched off a tug of war with the Senate over the specific authority to be granted the President to cut spending by $7 billion necessary to meet this limit. As Congress faded away—for the lack of a quorum—one of its final failures was the rejection of any spending ceiling at all.

The President, of course, cannot spend a dollar that the Congress does not appropriate. If the majority leadership in the House and Senate were really concerned over maintaining congressional control over spending, the best way to do it would have been to act responsibly throughout this session on each of the individual spending bills so that there would not be the $7 billion problem we have today.

As for my own stand on economy in Government, I am proud to report that I have again received the Watchdog of the Treasury Award for my voting record over the past 2 years.

COMMITTEE WORK

During this Congress over 17,000 bills have been introduced and referred to the 20 standing committees of the House. More than 3,000 of these were assigned to the Committee on Ways and Means, on which I serve. This high proportion is not surprising considering the importance and scope of its jurisdiction which, in addition to originating all tax legislation, includes social security, unemployment compensation, trade, Federal debt, welfare, health care, pension reform, and revenue sharing.

REVENUE SHARING

The 92d Congress will probably be most remembered in history for inaugurating a program of sharing revenues with State and local governments. The State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972 authorizes a 5-year $30 billion program retroactive to January 1, 1972. For calendar 1972, $5.3 billion will be distributed, with the States receiving one-third of the funds and the remaining $3.5 billion going to local units. In subsequent years $150 million will be added annually so that by 1976 the total annual amount will have reached $6.6 billion. This means Michigan this year will receive $74 million for the State government and nearly $148 million for cities, counties, and townships.

Local funds may be only used for maintenance and operating expenses, for public safety, environmental protection, public transportation, health, recreation, libraries, social services for the poor or aged, and financial administration, and for capital expenditures authorized by law.

Recognizing the very real financial problems confronting all levels of local government, I have since 1967 joined in sponsoring revenue-sharing proposals. While I am satisfied this new approach holds great promise, and I supported the bill, I also realize that this concept does depart from the time-proven view that those who spend the money should also bear the responsibility for levying the taxes that provide the funds. For this reason, I believe the actual performance of this new program should be carefully watched by the Congress to insure the most efficient use of these Federal dollars.

Overall, this legislation represents a pioneering effort in Federal-State relations which, it is hoped, will tend to check the longstanding trend toward greater centralization of power in Washington.

Under the distribution formula for 1972 finally adopted, Lansing, for example, would, according to Department of Treasury estimates, receive $1,967,556; Jackson, $652,863; East Lansing, $327,274; Mason, $51,227; Williamston, $19,547; Howell, $52,702; Chelsea, $27,192; and Owosso, $216,207. Overall totals for each type of governmental unit within each county are as follows:

1972 REVENUE SHARING—6TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT AREA

[Totals to all local units]

	Cities	County	Townships	Total
COUNTIES				
Clinton	99,712	202,838	69,320	371,870
Ingham	2,411,717	1,221,081	109,683	3,750,482
Jackson	728,536	868,291	129,237	1,726,063
Livingston	106,735	231,259	52,238	390,231
Washtenaw	1,208,072	920,310	172,832	2,301,214
Shiawassee	359,426	381,249	38,026	778,700

AUTO EXCISE REPEAL

From a personal point of view certainly the repeal of the discriminatory automobile excise tax, as part of the Revenue Act of 1971, ranks high on the list of accomplishments of this Congress. This has meant the realization of my very first legislative goal which I pledged to work for when first a candidate for Congress. It has taken much too long—and at times it has been discouraging, for over the years we have had few supporters. But when our economy really needed a boost, President Nixon recognized what I have been contending for years—that the automotive industry is the bellwether of the economy—and that this unfair tax imposed only on automobiles had to go. With his urging, and the help of Senator ROBERT GRIFFIN in the other body, it has now gone.

WELFARE REFORM

Ironically, one of the last acts of the 92d Congress was passage of a highly modified version of its first bill, H.R. 1, originally approved by the House on June 22, 1971, and stalled in the Senate ever since. Regrettably, unlike the House bill which included the President's "workfare" proposal, the measure as finally cleared contains no basic change in a welfare system that is urgently in need of reform.

SOCIAL SECURITY

What remains in H.R. 1, however, are over 125 improvements in social security and medicare benefits, including boosting widows' benefits from 82.5 to 100 percent of the deceased husband's entitlement; permit social security retirees to earn up to $2,100 a year without loss of benefits; give medicare benefits to 1.7 million under-65 persons who are retired on social security disability insurance; and federalize the welfare system for the aged, blind, and disabled, starting in 1974, with a $195 a month guarantee for an elderly couple without other income.

These steps are long overdue. Coupled with two previous actions raising benefits a total of some 30 percent in less than 2 years, they represent substantial progress for those who depend so much on social security. Also adopted this year is the proposal I have long urged that sets up an automatic mechanism for providing periodic cost-of-living increases in the future so that our senior citizens will not be penalized by any failure of the Congress to act promptly.

To finance these new changes, social security taxes would be raised beginning next year in two steps from the present 5.2 percent rate on the first $9,000 in earnings to 5.85 percent on a $12,000 wage base in 1974.

TAX REFORM

Items on the committee agenda for next session include national health care plans and pension reform, on which hearings were held this year; tuition tax credits to parents of nonpublic elementary and secondary school children, which the committee tentatively approved on October 3; and general tax reform.

While I helped shape the Tax Reform Act of 1969, which reduced individual income taxes by $19 billion at the same time increasing corporate taxes by $5 billion, I am convinced that still more must be done. For example, I believe there is an urgent need to provide property tax relief, and I am certain that this will be considered early next year.

FOREIGN POLICY

The very uneven performance of the legislative branch over the past 2 years stands in sharp contrast to the decisive executive action taken in the field of foreign affairs. President Nixon's historic missions to Peking and Moscow have opened a new era in East-West relations which have brought the world its best hope for peace in decades.

The resulting bilateral understandings and agreements, such as the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty, although necessarily modest first steps, underscore the hard reality that progress towards lasting peace has come from firm, patient but persistent bargaining.

VIETNAM

The steady withdrawal of over one-half million American troops from Vietnam since President Nixon took office is another demonstration of his determination to work for solutions that hold long-term promise.

The goal is to end the war, not only U.S. participation in it, and to seek to avoid any precipitous unilateral action resulting in the creation of a dangerous power vacuum in Southeast Asia. By December 1, U.S. troop strength will have been cut 95 percent, from 543,000 to 27,000, with no American combat units or draftees any longer involved.

The success of the President's policy is further dramatically indicated by the progress made toward implementing an all volunteer army. The growing prospects that the draft will be completely ended by next July are indeed encouraging.

EDUCATION

The Education Amendments of 1972, in addition to extending virtually all existing higher education programs through fiscal 1975, breaks ground on several new forms of student assistance. As passed by the House last June with my support, a program of basic educational opportunity grants is created enabling needy students to receive up to $1,400 per year. The present educational opportunity grant program would be continued as a supplement, as well.

Other changes include increasing the amount a student may borrow each year from $1,500 to $2,400; establishing a student loan marketing association to help insure adequate funds for guaranteed student loans' and offering matching Federal grants of up to 50 percent to States that increase their appropriations for college student grant programs based on need.

Along with expanded aid to students, a $1 billion program of direct institutional assistance is authorized for the first time. New programs of support for community colleges and post secondary adult occupational education are also created.

While it will take time to implement and fund this greatly expanded effort, Public Law 318 represents a further important contribution toward enlarging the Federal commitment to greater educational opportunities, which, since President Nixon took office, has seen the U.S. education budget increase some 74 percent to well over $6 billion annually.

I fully agree that education must be given high priority, for I am convinced it offers the best hope for providing long term solutions to many of our social and economic problems.

BUSING

In August the House passed, with my support, legislation setting stringent limits on Federal court powers to order the busing of schoolchildren to achieve racial balance. Unfortunately, the bill died when repeated attempts to end a Senate filibuster were unsuccessful. This constitutes another major failure of this Congress. However, I feel that this setback should not be allowed to stand and, that another effort should be made for action early in the next Congress.

MEAT INSPECTION

Recently, three large meat packing companies took the State of Michigan to court charging that its high standards for ground meats, such as hot dogs and sausages, should be lowered to conform with Federal levels. Because I shared the concern of Michigan officials and consumers, I strongly urged, in the House Agriculture Committee and on the floor during consideration of S. 1316, the Federal Meat Inspection Act Amendments of 1972, action to preserve Michigan's better quality standards which prohibit the use of stomachs, spleens, pig snouts, pig ears, and similar animal parts. Even though this effort was successful, unfortunately the bill as a whole was defeated for other reasons, and a new effort will have to be made in the 93d Congress if the court's ruling, now being appealed, is not favorably resolved.

MAJOR ACTIONS

Other significant bills which also had my support were:

House Joint Resolution 223, amending the Constitution to lower voting to 18 years, ratified as 26th amendment;

The Federal Campaign Spending Reform Act, Public Law 92–225;

S. 2097, creating a National Drug Abuse Office to coordinate Federal programs, Public Law 92–255;

House Joint Resolution 208, amending Constitution with respect to equal rights for men and women, so far ratified by 17 of necessary 36 States;

The Equal Employment Opportunity Act Amendments, Public Law 92–261;

The Strategic Arms Limitation Agreement, Public Law 92–448;

S. 3419, Consumer Product Safety Act;
H.R. 15657, Comprehensive Older Americans Act;
The Nutrition Program for the Elderly Act, Public Law 92–258;
The National Sickle Cell Anemia Act, Public Law 92–294;
The Rural Development Act, Public Law 92–419;
The Black Lung Benefits Act, Public Law 92–303;
The Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act, Public Law 92–381;
H.R. 12828, Vietnam Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act;
H.R. 15927, providing a temporary 20-percent railroad retirement benefit increase; and
House Congressional Resolution 471, expressing concern for rights of Soviet Jews.

CHAMBERLAIN BILLS

In order to prompt action in many areas, I have introduced a number of bills, including the following:
House Joint Resolution 983, to amend the Constitution relating to the assignment and transportation of public school children;
H.R. 4515, to exempt persons working after 65 from payment of social security tax;
H.R. 3489, to provide tax incentives for small business development;
House Resolution 35, to require the retirement of congressional committee chairmen at age 65;
H.R. 114, to prohibit farm subsidy payments in excess of $10,000 to any one producer;
H.R. 116, to provide a deduction of up to $100 for political contributions. Similar provision enacted as Public Law 92–178;
H.R. 118, to permit a liberalized child-care deduction as a trade or business expense;
H.R. 2272, to institute a revised, coordinated national boating safety program. Similar bill enacted as Public Law 92–75;
H.R. 4711, to extend head of household benefits to single persons at age 35;
H.R. 8728, to promote an accelerated effort to conquer cancer. Similar bill enacted as Public Law 92–218;
H.R. 12848, to provide more effective means to protect public interest in national emergency disputes involving railroad and airline industries;
House Joint Resolution 1180, to amend the Constitution to provide for a National Presidential Primary; and
H.R. 4921, to establish a National Cemetery at Fort Custer.

INCOMPLETE ACTIONS

The following were among the unfinished business left by the 92d Congress:
Electoral College Reform, no action;
Consumer Protection Agency Act, S. 3970, only passed House;
Housing and Urban Development Act, H.R. 16074, never scheduled for House debate;
Hand Gun Control Act, S. 2507, only passed Senate;
War Powers Act, S. 2956, died in House-Senate Conference;
National No-Fault Motor Vehicle Insurance Act, S. 945, recommitted to Senate Judiciary Committee;
National Agricultural Bargaining Act, H.R. 8874, defeated in House Committee;
Comprehensive Headstart, Child Development and Family Services Act, S. 3617, only passed Senate;
Transportation Special Revenue Sharing, H.R. 13021, no floor action;
Education Special Revenue Sharing Act, H.R. 7796, no floor action;
Federal Aid Highway and Mass Transportation Act, H.R. 16656, died in conference;
Rural Community Development Revenue Sharing Act, H.R. 7993, no floor action;
Manpower Revenue Sharing Act, H.R. 8141, no floor action;
Law Enforcement Revenue Sharing Act, H.R. 6770, no floor action;
Urban Community Development Revenue Sharing Act, H.R. 8853, no floor action;
Health Maintenance Organizations Assistance Act, H.R. 7764, no floor action;
National Health Insurance Partnership Act, H.R. 7741, no floor action;
Federal Reorganization, H.R. 1430, H.R. 1431, H.R. 1432, H.R. 1433, no floor action;
Pension Reform, H.R. 12272, no floor action; and
National Emergency Strike Reform Act, H.R. 4116, defeated in House Committee.

HON. FRANK BOW

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, FRANK BOW has been a voice for fiscal responsibility and responsible legislation during his long and distinguished career in the House of Representatives. I have long been fortunate to be able to count him as a friend in Washington, in this House, and on the Appropriations Committee of which he has been an outstanding minority leader. I have enjoyed that friendship and have benefited on numerous occasions from FRANK's advice and counsel, as well as from his reasoned oratory on the floor of this House.

It is with special regret, therefore, that I acknowledge the departure of this able leader from the House, and with special admiration that I salute his many legislative accomplishments over the years.

I know, however, that, while this son of Canton, Ohio, will be leaving the House of Representatives, his strong record of public service will not end. The particular distinction awaiting FRANK—that of U.S. Ambassador to Panama—will be a great honor, indeed. I know that FRANK will fill such a position with the same qualities he has displayed so often to his colleagues in the House—that of a gentleman, a diplomat in the best sense of that phrase, and an eminently reasonable man.

So few from the ranks of this House are able to attain the stature and effectiveness of a FRANK BOW that their leaving inevitably leaves a large gap, one which will only be filled by a man with great distinction and a strong sense of responsibility. Mr. Speaker, I salute FRANK T. BOW of the 16th District of Ohio, a man who has served his constituents, his colleagues, and the Nation, and whose service will be remembered in this forum as he begins work on another distinguished assignment.

HON. FRANK BOW TO RETIRE

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, as the 92d Congress draws to a close, I want to express my respect and admiration for one of the truly great Americans serving in the U.S. House of Representatives, the Honorable FRANK BOW who is retiring after 21 years of public service. I have known FRANK BOW since he came to the Congress in 1951. Particularly, I have known him through his service on the Appropriations Committee where we have worked together very closely. I suppose there is no tougher assignment, subject to more pressures, and at the same time more sought after than membership on the Committee on Appropriations. His committee work has been applauded by both Democrats and Republicans and his diligence in trying to hold back on runaway spending has been a great source of strength to this Nation. In the 83d Congress he was chairman of a subcommittee that won recognition for recommending savings of $11 million as the result of an overseas investigation of State Department activities.

Congressman BOW represents the 16th District of Ohio and there is abundant record that he has represented it ably and well and with complete dedication to not only his State, but the Nation as well. He has been a foremost patriot. He has been faithful to friends, a hard-hitting but fair partisan, a dynamic and effective leader. He has been an inspiration to us all, and he will be sorely missed by this body of legislators, which he has served so well. Although I am sorry to see him leaving the Congress, I join with his many friends in wishing him success and happiness in all his future endeavors.

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in offering my congratulations and best wishes upon the retirement of the Honorable W. R. HULL, Jr.

BILL HULL has served in the Congress for 18 years and has proven himself a loyal and dedicated Congressman to his constituents of the Sixth Congressional District of Missouri. BILL has served diligently as a member of the House Appropriations Committee serving on its important Subcommittees on Agriculture, Environmental, and Consumer Protection and, Labor, and HEW which consistently enacts monumental legislation.

My wish for BILL is good health and the happiness he is seeking and deserves.

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN: A GREAT SOUTHERN GENTLEMAN

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was 34 years ago that JOHN MCMILLAN was first elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. He was then, as he is today, a distinguished man of noble bearing, great dignity, and solid integrity—admirable traits that reflect the rich character and proud traditions of the historic State from which he comes. After more than a third of a century of service by his side here in the House, I know that in the case of the Honorable JOHN MCMILLAN, the "Honorable" before his name is much more than a title automatically conferred upon Members of Congress—it is, when applied to JOHN MCMILLAN, a meaningful description of this strong and dedicated southern gentleman who has represented his constituents in the highest tradition of the great and legendary statesmen from the historic Palmetto State.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to express in these brief words the full measure of the gratitude our Nation owes to JOHN MCMILLAN for his long and faithful labors in the public interest. In his remarkable 24 years as chairman of the House District of Columbia Committee and as a leading members of the House Agriculture Committee, JOHN has demonstrated an inspiring commitment to hard work and conscientious service. In all of his endeavors, he has been a tremendous source of strength to his colleagues during the trying times that have confronted the country over the past three decades. His courage and steadfastness have earned him wide respect, and all who have observed his career recognize JOHN MCMILLAN as a patriot of the highest order.

It has been a great privilege to have served with such a great and staunch American and to be able to call him my friend. JOHN will be sorely missed in this Chamber, and it is my sincere hope that he and his family will have the best of everything life can offer in the years ahead. Here is a man who did all that his country asked, and then volunteered the equivalent of an additional lifetime of splendid service.

CULVER PRAISES RECORD OF ACTION FOR THE ELDERLY

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the 92d Congress has written a record of improving the lives of our Nation's senior citizens of which we can be proud. This Congress—together with the 74th Congress, which passed social security under Franklin Roosevelt, and the 89th Congress, which passed medicare and Older Americans Act under Lyndon Johnson—stands as one of the three great Congresses in legislation for the elderly.

However, the 92d Congress differs from the 74th and 89th Congresses in a significant way. While the landmark legislation of its two predecessors received strong White House backing, this Congress has stood alone in providing leadership for legislation to improve the lives of America's older citizens. Indeed, in writing this remarkable record of achievement, the Congress had to overcome substantial opposition from an administration apparently willing to ignore the needs of our older Americans.

The difficulty, quite simply, for our elderly, is an income level that does not keep up with expenses. Living costs increase, but incomes do not keep pace. Many Americans are forced to retire and experience an immediate and permanent loss of a major portion of their income. Meanwhile, our Nation's standard mandatory retirement age is coming down, pushing more and more older people into economic difficulties that they could not have forseen.

It is estimated that all the men and woman in human history who have lived past the age of 65, 25 percent of them are still alive today. Twenty million of those men and women live in the United States today—one of every 10 Americans. It is even more startling though, to realize that one-quarter of our senior citizens, prior to legislation passed by this Congress, lived their lives below the poverty line.

This is a particularly urgent problem in a State such as Iowa, which has the largest percentage of population over 65 of any State in the Union, other than Florida. Over 12 percent of Iowa's population is 65 and older and 14,000 people are currently receiving both social security and old-age assistance payments.

But this Democratic Congress has made a commitment to the principle that our older citizens should be able to live their lives in dignity and with peace of mind. That commitment to the elderly has been measured in real terms by the laws this Congress has passed to upgrade the lives of many older Americans. Major legislation has been enacted to provide increased income, medical care, employment and training opportunities, social services and facilities, and access to better housing at reasonable rates.

THE 92D CONGRESSIONAL ACTION FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the progressive legislative actions taken by the 92d Congress to help older Americans:

Social security benefits—Social security payments were raised by 32 percent in just 2 years, and 50 percent in the last 4 years. This represents the largest increases ever voted by a single Congress, or Congresses.

Medicare, medicaid, and welfare—Legislation was passed designed to insure participation in medicare, medicaid, and welfare by the elderly, after they receive new social security increases. Up to $20 of the new increases may be kept before loss of any payments or benefits under welfare, aid to the disabled and the blind. Those disabled under 65, who are receiving social security payments, will now be eligible for medicare. This legislation, while not providing the complete pass-through of benefits contained in legislation I introduced, should remove most of the threat many older citizens felt, because of cuts in other programs caused by social security benefit increases.

Older Americans Act of 1972—This legislation, which also incorporates provisions from several Culver bills, provides increased funds for the elderly in the areas of transportation, nutrition, home delivery of meals for the disabled elderly, recreation, housing, and pre-retirement training. In addition, the bill increases sharply the attention given by the Federal Government to problems of the elderly. Instead of remaining submerged within the bureaucracy of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the administration on aging will be attached directly to the Office of the Secretary.

The Congress, through this Older Americans Act, has coordinated and upgraded the planning, implementation, and funding for programs to assist older Americans. Next to creation of social security and the recent historic increases and improvements in that program, this $2.1 billion legislation is the most significant and far-reaching law that Congress has ever passed in behalf of older Americans. I am very pleased that I had a part to play in fashioning and passing this renewal of the Original Older Americans Act.

National Institute of Aging—A new National Institute of Aging, to be part of the National Institutes of Health, will conduct research on the aging process and on special health and social problems associated with growing old. Concentrated scientific efforts focused on these problems may someday result in a slowing of the aging process and will certainly result in improved understanding and adjustment to this process.

Mr. Speaker, this listing of legislation needed to provide our older Americans with the lives of financial independence, and dignity that is theirs by right does have a price tag. However, predictions by the administration that social security increases and other program increases will cause budget deficits and pour more fuel on the fires of inflation are refuted by leading economists. These experts believe these new benefits will help stimulate our economy and increase demand for the goods and services that American workers provide.

The extra money the elderly will be

spending will help the economy directly. It will help by putting idle machines and unemployed men and women back to work. Everybody will benefit: The businessman, the farmer, the worker, and the elderly. That type of direct economic benefit to all Americans is not inflationary. It is simply good, sound economics.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the months ahead will prove the wisdom, justice, and compassion represented by this record of legislative achievement for the older American. The historian, Arnold Toynbee, concluded that the quality and durability of a society were best measured by "the respect and care given its elderly citizens."

That respect and care are the inspiration of the legislation which the 92d Congress has passed on behalf of older Americans. And this record of legislation will serve as a stronger foundation on which to help build more secure and dignified lives for our older Americans.

MOOD DRUG ADVERTISING

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I am very much concerned with the current trends in the advertising of mood-altering drugs. During the course of a day you cannot help but hear a pitch for a readily available pill for nearly any problem. I have been working for years to try to bring about better regulation of this type of advertising and to prevent what amounts to a disservice to the American public. Recently I heard a television editorial by Mr. Bill Gordon of station WPTV, channel 5, in Palm Beach, Fla. This editorial is a clear, concise look at the whole area of mood drug advertising and I include the text of the editorial in the RECORD at this point for the benefit of my colleagues:

MOOD DRUG ADVERTISING

We caught a radio commercial in the car the other day; one of those sixty seconds dramatizations in which a couple is preparing to attend a social event. But, she's feeling tense and he's recommending a couple of aspirin.

The final pitch is for something like, only supposedly better than aspirin.

You've likely heard the same commercial, or one like it.

The air and the ads are filled with suggestions of what to take for pain, tension, sleepless nights or in order to be alert during the day. We are urged to replace coffee breaks with aspirin breaks and there are such diverse characters as police chiefs and movie stars telling us why, when we do, their sponsoring product will do the job best.

We're aware there are all kinds of pros and cons on the subject, but we tend to buy the proposition that, while such promotions probably can't be blamed as a cause of the nation's hard drug problems, they certainly do nothing to discourage it.

A youngster who sees his elders popping pills for a great many reasons other than to relieve real pain or to stimulate necessary functions; who is constantly being more on the casual than careful use of various medications can hardly be as discerning as we'd like him to be when it comes to drawing the line between those medications . . . are aren't they all really drugs . . . which can be of help and those which can cause serious harm.

We're not opposed to those kinds of pain killers, sleep aides and eye-openers that are readily available. We just take the position that we ought to put a stop to encouraging their promiscuous use and the seeming effort to find more reasons to justify their use.

We could care less who sells the most of what when it comes to these kinds of products.

We recognize that, by these comments, considering the business we're in, we might well be biting one of the hands that feeds us.

But, be that as it may, its time some effort be made to at least discourage the advertised proposition that there's a freely available pill to cope with almost every problem.

GENE HACKMAN, AL PACINO COME TO HAMTRAMCK

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Hamtramck, Mich., is small in size, only 27,500, but its name is known in the far reaches of the world. This is largely due to its Polish flavor.

Hamtramck has had its share of difficulties in recent years. But its people are good people, and when a little glamor comes to the city, we are happy to notice it and take pride in it.

A few days ago a Hollywood troupe, led by the distinguished actors Gene Hackman and Al Pacino, visited Hamtramck for some filming. The local newspaper, The Citizen, in an article written by its editor, Leslie Ziemba, reported the event on October 19, in the following terms:

HAMTRAMCK DRAWS HOLLYWOOD TROUPE

(By Leslie Ziemba)

Way back then maybe Shakespeare would have said "Oh, star-struck Hamtramck . . ." but today he would have to say "The stars struck Hamtramck . . ."

In other words, Hamtramck donned its dark glasses, grabbed a megaphone and went Hollywood when Warner Bros. selected the two-square mile City to shoot a scene for an upcoming movie called "Scarecrow" starring Gene Hackman, academy award winner, and Al Pacino, who palyed Michael Corleone in "The Godfather."

The crew of 40 was in Hamtramck last Wednesday at the home of Julius Penzin, 11411 St. Aubin, to film what production manager Tom Shaw calls "the climaxing scene."

It's here where Pacino (Francis) finds his former wife who he has been looking for across the country. He had left her five years earlier when she was eight months pregnant. His wife, played by Penny Allen, has since married "Joey the banana king" and the baby is now five years old.

Miss Allen, wanting to retaliate because Francis had left her, told him that the baby died. With religious strains running through the picture, the audience will see Francis becoming extremely despondent because the baby wasn't baptized and he thinks is now in limbo.

Following scenes, filmed at Belle Isle and Harper Hospital, show how he is affected by the baby's presumed death.

Following the scene at the St. Aubin house, the crew also filmed a telephone conversation scene at the corner of Caniff and Lumpkin. Gene Hackman comes into the picture in Hamtramck at that point.

"Scarecrow," according to the producer, will cost a little under $2 million and is expected to be released some time in March.

Now you might be asking yourself why was Hamtramck selected? Well, trying to adopt as much realism into the picture as possible, Shaw wanted a Polish-American community since some of the persons in "Scarecrow" are of Polish descent.

"What better place is there than Hamtramck?" he asked.

The whole thing started about two months ago when Shaw and two of his associates came into The Citizen office saying that they were having a difficult time locating a two-story frame home with an exposed back porch for a film that they would be shooting here sometime in October.

Shaw said that most of the people who they approached were hesitant to let them into their home thinking that something like this couldn't be happening in Hamtramck.

So the editor, (after a call to Warner Bros. office in Detroit) was summoned to help them find "the perfect house."

Most of the people contacted in the area were more than willing to rent the use of their house. But it was Julius Penzin who had an empty upper flat which the crew thought to be just right since they could furnish it any way they wanted.

Penzin intimated that he and his family were excited that their house was selected. "We sure brought some life into Hamtramck that day," Penzin commented. "I think we had a good part of the City out at one time or another that day.

"It's a plug for the City."

THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in honoring Honorable THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, who is retiring from Congress this year. For 30 years TOM has been one of the most able, dedicated and affable legislators in this body. As a senior member of the Committee on Agriculture, he has guided every piece of legislation affecting rural America. This year he was significantly instrumental in shaping the most important bill ever devised on behalf of our rural citizens—the Rural Development Act of 1972. The implementation of the provisions of this measure will be of incalculable benefit toward successful social and economic development in rural America.

Not only has TOM been in the vanguard of rural development but he has played a major role in the enactment of legislation affecting our Nation's Capitol. Since his election to the U.S. House of Representatives, he has received numerous awards, including the National Commander's Award of the Disabled American Veterans for "his long years of dedicated service in behalf of America's war disabled veterans," the Mis-

sissippi Farm Bureau Federation award for outstanding and meritorious service to agriculture and the National Civic Affairs Associates award for his record as an advocate of economic and free enterprise.

TOM will be missed by all of us who have been privileged to serve with him. Millie joins me in wishing TOM and his family continued success and a long and happy retirement.

HON. DURWARD "DOC" G. HALL

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join my colleagues who have expressed such fitting accolades to my colleague and friend, the Honorable DURWARD "Doc" G. HALL upon his retirement from the U.S. Congress.

"Doc" HALL, who serves on the important Committee on Armed Services and five of its major subcommittees is not only well versed on his committee's bills but is well respected for his vast knowledge of all legislation during debate on the House floor. His constituents of the Seventh Congressional District of Missouri should be proud of this Congressman's record.

Although we have never had the opportunity to serve on a committee together, I have always considered "Doc" a good friend because of his interest in boating and fishing which we both share.

Doc deserves the retirement he is seeking and I wish for him that his future years will be as bright as the happiest days of his past.

LEN B. JORDAN

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the passing of this 92d Congress has a very deep implication for many of us since it also means the retirement of one of our ablest Members, the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN).

Senator JORDAN is most deserving of retirement. He has enjoyed a long and most distinguished career of service to the Nation, and to the people of his own great State. But, his absence will leave a void in our midst because there are many of us who leaned heavily upon this capable and dedicated statesman for support, sustenance, and leadership in trying times.

For me, Senator JORDAN'S retirement means the loss of a most rewarding relationship with a man who has become one of my close personal friends through the 10 years we have worked together.

There are many reasons why Senator JORDAN has excelled among us. One of the primary reasons is found in the remarkable diversity of experience which he brought with him to the Senate.

He was rancher and a businessman, and successful at both pursuits. He took his experience in those basic fields to the Idaho legislature and then to the office of Governor of his State before joining this body.

He has made many contributions to our work and our progress through his tenure here. But the one which I cherish more than any of the others is the strong sense of State sovereignty which he has always brought to our deliberations.

This philosophy well befits a man who comes from the rugged individualistic background which the Senator enjoyed. His views were refined by his experience at the State level in both the legislature and the Governor's chair.

I am sorry to see him go for many reasons, not the least of which is the loss of a most fulfilling friendship. But I am primarily sorry to see him go because his departure means the loss of his strong advocacy of State sovereignty. There are not enough of his kind left.

Every Member of this body will miss Senator JORDAN and his lovely wife Grace. I join with my colleagues in wishing for them many long and happy years of retirement.

TRIBUTE TO HON. FRANK T. BOW

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in this tribute to FRANK T. BOW, who is retiring from public life this Congress. FRANK Bow is a fine Ohioan, and a legislator of the highest caliber. I count him as a friend. While I am glad for him and wish him well in his retirement, I am saddened to see him leave.

FRANK has ably represented his constituency in the State of Ohio for over two decades. He has supported legislation consistent with his belief that the strengthening of America is a first priority to the strengthening of other countries.

FRANK'S committee assignments in this Congress afforded him an opportunity to put his personal fiscal philosophy to good use. He served as the ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee and as the ranking Republican House member on the Joint Commission on Reduction of Federal Expenditures. That personal philosophy tempered and honed by his experience as Ohio's Assistant Attorney General during the late 1920's, as general counsel to the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Expenditures in the late 1940's, service to the Select Committee To Investigate the Federal Communications Commission in 1948, and experience in Congress has earned him the respect of his colleagues and the reputation as firm believer in Americans getting their money's worth. FRANK was truly a pillar of fiscal integrity—a watchdog of our economy.

Through the years, FRANK proved himself to be a humanitarian as well. His service on the House Appropriations Committee was notable and included his championing a bill denominated H.R. 21, legislation providing Federal tax incentives and assistance to provide medical care insurance for the retired in order that the twilight years of those that have served might be more secure.

I have enjoyed my association with this distinguished Member both on and off the floor of the House of Representatives. In the press of legislative business, FRANK has proven to be both a formidable opponent and a valuable ally. I think I can say without fear of contradiction that there are bureaucrats in this Government of ours that wished him more an ally than an opponent, for FRANK never forgot his personal credo.

I publicly wish FRANK Bow and his lovely wife, Carolyn, the best of luck and happiness.

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

WATER POLLUTION

I was one of 247 Members of the House of Representatives who voted overwhelmingly to override President Nixon's veto of a massive water pollution control bill. New Yorkers and Staten Islanders specifically, have been plagued with chronic sewer overflows and lack of waste treatment plants. They have been depending on the successful passage of the "Federal Water Pollution Control Act." It was up to the Congress to provide money for these vitally needed services to the City and State of New York as well as the rest of the Nation, and the Congress responded. The President has repeatedly cited his commitment to clean up our nation's waterways, and I find it inconceivable that he went so far as to override this important bill. The needs and the wishes of the citizens of every district in the country were reflected by the four overwhelming votes it took the Congress to pass this legislation. In all of these votes, two in the Senate and two in the House, there was a total of only 49 votes objecting to its passage.

Now that this bill has been passed into law, New York State can apply to the Federal Environmental Protection Agency for grants up to 75% of the cost for water pollution control projects, such as the one at Oakwood Beach. It is up to the State and local municipalities to work out the funding of the remaining 25%. Grants for construction of treatment works would require the application of the best practicable waste treatment techniques. After July, 1973, no grants will be approved unless the applicant demonstrates that each sewer collection system discharging into a treatment facility is not subject to excessive infiltration. This program provides a total of $18 billion for the nation.

The "Federal Water Pollution Control Act" applies not only to municipal waste treatment, but establishes for industry a two-phase cleanup program. This program will have increasingly tightening restrictions on industrial pollution backed up by penalties

of fines and imprisonment for violators. Another important provision of the law provides that citizens who have a direct interest in pollution control can institute suits against the government or a private interest for violation or failure to carry out mandatory provisions of the law.

At last New Yorkers, and especially Staten Islanders, will be provided with all of the water and sewer facilities needed, and we will no longer be victimized by terrible flooding and drainage difficulties every time it rains. And we will be able to solve the problems many of us face every day in our homes and businesses due to the lack of a proper sewer and water treatment system. The ultimate effect of this legislation will be clean waters which we can enjoy permanently for recreation without danger to our health.

Hand in hand with this Federal legislation goes the Environmental Quality Bond Act of 1972 which will be on the ballot on November 7th as Proposition Number One. With the passage of this bond issue, New York City would receive almost $260 million out of $650 million. This money would go toward the completion of the City's $2 billion water pollution control program with the goal of providing better than 80% removal of organic pollutants from the City's sewage. Projects included at this point include the Oakwood Treatment Plant in Staten Island. Other monies provided by the bond would go for air pollution and solid waste disposal.

COUNTRIES PRACTICING DISCRIMINATORY EMIGRATION

On October 17, 1972, I introduced legislation providing that "no non-market economy country shall be eligible to receive most-favored nation treatment or to participate in any program of the Government of the United States which extends credits or credit guarantees or investment guarantees" during any period in which it is determined that that country is:

1) denying its citizens the right or opportunity to emigrate;

2) imposes more than a minimal tax on emigration and the procedures involved in emigrating.

Of course this bill specifically demonstrates that the United States will not accept expanded trade with the Soviet Union so long as that Nation continues its present policies of exit visa taxes and harassment—a policy of ransom and barter in human lives aimed against minority groups within the Soviet Union.

NEW SUBWAY CARS

Also on October 17, 1972, I was able to announce a Department of Transportation grant of $40 million to the New York City Transit Authority to help purchase an additional 202 new subway cars, bringing the number of new rail transit cars recently approved for New York to 522.

The grant was made by the Department's Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA), under the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act of 1970, which is now providing about $1 billion a year in Federal funds to help cities all across the Nation save and upgrade their public transit systems.

Today's New York City grant is in addition to a similar UMTA grant for $63,422,507 made in June to assist the Transit Authority purchase 320 new air-conditioned subway cars. The $63 million grant was the largest single urban mass transportation grant ever made by UMTA.

I have been informed by the Secretary of Transportation that the combined Federal grants will now provide $103,422,507 of the $155,133,761 needed to buy the 522 new subway cars. Local one-third funding will cover the remaining $52 million purchase costs. The Transit Authority wants to buy a total of 750 new rail transit cars, all of them in the new R–46 class designation.

These new subway cars will make travel in New York City more convenient. They will replace outdated rail cars which were purchased between 1932 and 1940.

The new subway cars will be 75 feet long and will provide attractive interior and exterior design. Dependability of service will be enhanced by the addition of the 522 new R–46 subway cars. The older R–1 through R–9 rail cars are subject to frequent breakdowns and provide an inadequate level of performance, which results in a poor level of service on lines served by those cars. The new R–46 cars will be substantially quieter, both within the car and standing in the station. They combine the latest in technical and safety features, passenger comfort and pleasant interior design.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. MURPHY,
Member of Congress.

SHARING BORROWED REVENUE

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, much of the rhetoric of the last weeks of the 92d Congress has centered around revenue sharing and limiting Federal expenditures. The President has now signed into law the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972, which will add over $5 billion to the national debt this year and over $30 billion in the next 5 years. While I supported the proposal to put a ceiling on Federal spending, I question the wisdom of increasing the national debt to share revenue we do not have especially in light of the massive Federal deficit predicted for next year.

The final burden of this policy will fall on the shoulders of the already overburdened American taxpayer. He will be asked to spend his tax dollars to pay interest on this shared revenue in addition to the $20 billion-plus he is already spending in interest on the present national debt. I am not willing to ask American taxpayers to pay this additional cost.

Mr. Speaker, I recently read an editorial by Jack W. Gore in the October 15, 1972, edition of the Fort Lauderdale Sun-Sentinel. This editorial takes an interesting look at revenue sharing, and I am including it in the RECORD at this point for the benefit of my colleagues.

FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING MEANS BORROWING FUNDS FOR STATES, CITIES

Can anybody imagine anything more stupid than seeing a fellow who is already head over heels in debt rushing out to his bank to borrow another big wad of money to hand out to his debt free relatives?

Most people would say such a person ought to go running to a psychiatrist in order to find out what's wrong with his mental processes.

Yet, that is exactly the kind of stupid action the Congress took last week when it scorned all warnings of fiscal folly and overwhelmingly approved a revenue sharing bill which over the next five years will cost the federal government $30.1 billion.

The federal government is already in debt to the tune of some $437 billion, and by the end of next June it will wind up the current fiscal year in hock for at least another $25 billion.

But those figures had little impact on spend-happy House members who voted 265–110 last Thursday to begin a giant revenue sharing program which will result in all 50 states and some 28,700 towns, cities and counties being given a $5.3 billion handout from the federal Treasury during the next six months.

Since the Congress was almost certain to approve the revenue sharing bill before adjournment, the Treasury Department has already started preparing the flood of checks it plans to put in the mail just as soon as the bill clears the Congress and is signed into law by President Nixon.

Before it passed the bill last week, the House was told by Rep. John W. Byrnes, the senior Republican member of the House Ways and Means Committee, that "we ought to have our heads examined" for even considering such a bill in view of the massive size of the federal debt and the relative debt-free status of all the states and local governments which will benefit from the bill.

Byrnes warned that, in approving the bill Congress would find it had opened the government coffers to ever-growing demands by state and local governments which, collectively, now enjoy surpluses running into the billions.

If the federal government had $5.3 billion to hand out to state and local governments, neither we nor anybody else, could find any fault with this revenue sharing bill.

But the federal government doesn't have any excess revenue, and it will have to go out and borrow the $5.3 billion it will give the state and local governments. It will also have to pay interest on this money and guess whose taxes will be used to finance this added borrowing?

We'll grant the point that all 50 states and the 38,700 cities, towns and counties which will benefit from Uncle Sam's generosity can find ready use for the government checks they will soon receive. There are no restrictions on what the states can do with the money they will get, and the only restrictions on other beneficiaries are that the funds must be used within the framework of broad public service categories such as public safety, sewage disposal and similar projects.

Obviously, this money is going to generate a lot of needed public improvements in a lot of different places, which is all to the good. It might even work out that all this money will be put to better and more economical use than it would be in the hands of the federal government.

As we have said there is nothing wrong with the principle of the federal government sharing its revenue with state and local governments so long as the federal government has its own financial house in order and has some spare cash on hand.

But when our Federal Government is as broke as it is today, and with just about everybody admitting that another huge deficit this year will make a tax hike mandatory next year, it not only appears to be, but it is stupid for this same federal government to go out and borrow billions of dollars to hand out to state and local governments which aren't festooned in debt and many of which already possess surplus funds.

President Nixon, who has been one of the staunchest advocates of the federal government sharing some of its revenue with state and local governments is hopeful that revenue sharing will lead to the reduction of local property taxes.

In some instances this might happen, but if federal taxes have to be hiked to pay for revenue sharing and all the other spending excesses the federal government is belabored with these days, the whole business will add up to nothing more than taking money from one pocket to put in another with some being lost in the shuffling process.

It is also interesting to note that both the Congress and the President want this bonan-

za in the mails and in the hands of state and local government officials prior to election day next month. Of course there's no politics behind this, but we will wonder how this revenue sharing bill would have fared in the Congress if this just didn't happen to be an election year.

J. IRVING WHALLEY

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, with the close of the 92d Congress we will lose the talents of our colleague J. IRVING WHALLEY, who is retiring from this great body.

IRV WHALLEY, who was first elected to Congress in 1960, brought with him 30 years of business experience as a banker-businessman, 4 years as a State representative and 12 as a State senator. While in Congress he served on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and was the ranking Republican on the African Subcommittee. He was also appointed to serve on the Interparliamentary Conferences held in Canada and Mexico. Representative WHALLEY further distinguished himself as a Delegate to the United Nations General Assembly for the 1969 session.

I know all my colleagues will miss IRV WHALLEY and the example he set of hard-working dedication to his job, and wish him and Mrs. Whalley an active but perhaps less strenuous life in the years ahead.

TRIBUTE TO THREE MOST RESPECTED MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I join my colleagues in this special order to pay tribute to three of the most respected Members of Congress, JACKSON BETTS, FRANK BOW, and BILL MCCULLOCH. Representing a total of 69 years of service to our Nation, these men are three of the most hard-working and knowledgeable Members of the House of Representatives. Their experience and expertise will surely be missed by everyone. That they all come from Ohio is an amazing tribute to the extremely high caliber of the Republican delegation from the Buckeye State.

The example created by these three men in their many years of service has been an inspiration not only to me but also to all the younger members of our party, and the Congress. How many times during the past years has a fellow Republican Member sought the advice and counsel of JACK BETTS on a tax issue or some other important subject before the Ways and Means Committee? Or, how often has FRANK BOW been approached on an important appropriations matter? And what Member has not recognized the important role that BILL MCCULLOCH has played in guarding the constitutional liberties of our citizens?

The Congress will not soon recover from the loss of these three great men. Their retirement will have a dramatic effect on the State of Ohio, as well. Becoming experts on national issues was easy for these men because they had served so long and so well the interests of their constituents back home in Ohio. Their dedication led them to understand completely the problems of their State, and they have worked tirelessly to bring about effective solutions. Two of them—JACKSON BETTS and BILL MCCULLOCH—served in their State legislatures, and in fact, both served as Speaker of the Ohio House of Representatives. Few State delegations can boast of such distinguished service from their Members.

To all three retiring men, I extend my heartiest good wishes for the coming years. I have considered it a deep honor to have served in Congress with them, and their leadership will long be remembered, both in Ohio and throughout the Nation.

JAMES T. McFATE, HOST OF HANOVER INN, RETIRES

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article appearing in the October issue of the Dartmouth Alumni magazine, entitled "Hanover's 'Host With the Most'." The reference is to nationally known hotelman, James T. McFate, who retires this month as manager of a college and community landmark, the Hanover Inn.

There are thousands who know Jim McFate with respect, affection, and friendship. I am proud to be counted among that number. Businessman and civic leader, thoughtful and concerned citizen, genial host and raconteur, large in frame and spirit, Jim personifies the best there is in full and productive life.

Jim McFate may be leaving the inn for the enjoyments of a well-earned retirement, but his presence there can never be forgotten.

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

HANOVER'S "HOST WITH THE MOST"

James Thomas McFate for 19 years has prowled the lounges and lobbies, the corridors and kitchens of the Hanover Inn as its resident boniface, moving his six-foot-six frame as unobtrusively as a six-foot-six frame can be moved. His head is always slightly a-tilt (perhaps from too frequent contact with lintels?) and the eyes are always alert for any rough burr in the smooth operation of a hostelry that stands for more than mere room and board.

On November 1 the last prowl will have been made. On that date Jim McFate will step down as manager of the Hanover Inn ("the front door to Dartmouth" he calls it) and retire to his home on Lake Shore Drive at the head of Mascoma Lake in nearby Enfield, N.H.

His 19-year marriage with the Hanover Inn has been, as all honest marriages are, a mixture of querulousness and affection, with the latter far outweighing the former. One recent day, reminiscing in his nicely appointed, ground-floor office, he said this about runnning an inn in a college town that is not exactly on the beaten-path:

"It's peak and valley, a roller-coaster business. Look, bringing the Yale and Princeton football games to Hanover was the worst thing that ever happened to the Inn. There are about 35,000 Dartmouth alumni, right? Say they have 30,000 wives—that's 65,000 people. If only one per cent of them want to come to Hanover they would more than fill all the rooms in the area."

On non-football weekends Jim McFate thinks that the interstate highway system has not helped to fill up the valleys. "It's easier to get home . . . and it's easier to get beyond us."

But, he admits readily, gesturing to the awards and mementos that festoon his office walls, "I'm proud of these . . . and I'm proud that I survived 19 years with only two heart attacks."

The awards include Hotelman of the Year and the Distinguished Service Award for his stint as president of the American Hotel Association; the mementos include a picture autographed by "Dick Nixon" and a cartoon and an appreciation by Dr. Seuss (Ted Geisel '25).

"You know," he said referring to the cartoon, "I'm even in one of Dr. Seuss' poems. He needed something to rhyme with 'not too late' and he came up with 'Buck-Buck McFate.'"

Jim McFate will grouse about the unending nature of his business ("You work 168 hours a week—Christmas Eve is just another Tuesday"), but then will switch off to "it's a fun business. Dartmouth attracts a wide range of people. One minute you're meeting a well-known entertainer, then a learned scholar, and finally an inconspicuous guy from the Class of Oughty-Ought who thinks Dartmouth was heaven and always will be."

As with any hotel-keeper, Jim McFate has had his share of untoward experiences (people stuck in elevators, guests who lock themselves in their rooms for three days) and eccentric guests. He ranks as champion in the latter category an elderly lady who came, unbeknownst to the Inn management, equipped with all her own light bulbs. Big light bulbs; six or eight of the 150- to 200-watt variety. These she promptly placed in all the sockets in her rooms and just as promptly turned on. Fuses started to go off like popcorn and it was quite some time before Inn personnel solved this electrical enigma.

He rates the top incident of his years at the Inn as the time a couple of enterprising fraternity men liberated a piano from the Inn.

"They slipped it out of the Tavern," he recalls, "and started pushing it up Main Street toward Webster Avenue. It was slow work, for there were only two of them. About midway in their voyage, a campus cop stopped and asked what they were doing. The kids told him they were taking this piano to their house for a dance, and darned if he didn't help them push."

The greatest weekend of his Hanover career was the visit of President Eisenhower at Commencement 1953 to receive an honorary degree. Next to it he places the Bicentennial Commencement of 1969 when Lord and Lady Dartmouth ("my wife baby-sat her jewels") received degrees.

The white cowboy hat he owns is a memento of another special hotel experience, but not related to Hanover. Jim McFate is

often taken for actor John Wayne; he has the same features and build and even sounds like him. When Jim was managing the Wolverine Hotel in Detroit, John Wayne stopped there. Word got around and autograph-seekers began waylaying Jim all over the hotel. John Wayne and McFate both had fun with this case of lookalikes, and later the movie star sent Jim a white cowboy hat which he can be persuaded to wear on a rare occasion.

Managing the Wolverine was one of five hotel assignments Jim filled before coming to Hanover in 1953. In DeLand, Florida (the location of his alma mater, Stetson University) he managed the College Arms Hotel and Golf Club, as a resort hotel and later as a U.S. Navy Rest Center, during World War II. He was associated also with the Bismarck in Chicago and the Hotel Northamption in Northampton, Mass. For 15 years before taking over the Hanover Inn he owned and managed the Wayne Hotel in Wayne, Pa. His wife Beth came from nearby Lock Haven, home town of John Sloan Dickey '29, with whom Jim has developed a close and mutually disrespectful friendship.

McFate had oversight of one of the major building changes of President Dickey's administration when the Hanover Inn's main wing, dating from 1902, was rebuilt from the ground up. Opened in early 1968, the main wing increased its rooms from 28 to 50; added a new lounge, conference rooms, and underground garage; and rehabilitated its coffee shop and bar. So Jim McFate's final years as manager have been spent in rather splendid surroundings.

Hanover itself has worked its spell on him. "When I told a friend I was coming up here to work, he said 'You'll never get old.' It's true, you know. There's so much offered here."

Jim McFate has taken the offerings and remained young. He has also done more than a little of the giving himself.

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of WILLIAM MCCULLOCH leaves this House and this Nation greatly diminished. To chronicle his personal achievements in the area of civil rights and crime prevention and control cannot fully illustrate his dedication to the cause of justice and equality for all Americans.

As the ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee, BILL has worked in close harmony with Chairman CELLER in the areas of judicial and constitutional reform. But it is in the field of civil rights legislation where his initiative and resourcefulness, his personal courage and conviction, his dedication and diligence have earned him the epithet, "Mr. Civil Rights."

Time and time again BILL MCCULLOCH has broken with members of his own party to stand by his personal conviction that all men are created equal and deserve equal opportunities and treatment under the law. BILL won high adulation from both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson for the role he played in sponsoring in subcommittee, in guiding through full committee and in managing on the floor of the House, the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

In the forefront again in 1965, BILL was vigorously leading the fight for the Voting Rights Act. In 1970, against the wishes and judgment of his own party's administration, BILL succeeded in gaining a 5-year extension of the Voting Rights Act.

BILL MCCULLOCH has brought to this Chamber one of the most active and brilliant legal minds of the century. His personal success and presidential accolades do not stop with civil rights legislation. As principal author of most of the crime legislation which came out of the 91st Congress. BILL singularly was responsible for the adoption of the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970. In recognition of his efforts in combating crime, he has had the distinct honor to be chosen as a member of several Presidential advisory commissions on crime and violence.

Serving first as Speaker of the Ohio House of Representatives, and since the 80th Congress, a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, BILL MCCULLOCH has conscientiously and diligently performed his duties as the Representative of Ohio's fourth District. Whether it was answering a rollcall on the floor of this Chamber or responding to the needs of Chairman CELLER, BILL has worked for reforms in the best interest of all citizens of this Nation. He proudly merits one of the finest attendance records in this Chamber.

BILL MCCULLOCH will return to his private law practice in Ohio. Mrs. O'Neill joins me in wishing him well in his retirement, and in his future endeavors.

CAPTAIN KANGAROO'S 5000TH BROADCAST

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the television program "Captain Kangaroo," which first was broadcast on October 3, 1955, will celebrate its 5,000th broadcast Friday, October 27, on the CBS Television network.

Over the years, the series and its creator and star, Mr. Bob Keeshan, have been honored with many awards. Its young audience, parents, educators, and the press have joined in acclaiming it as one of the most outstanding children's programs on network television.

As a one-time participant on the program—during one of the Captain's visits to Capitol Hill—I am delighted to share with my colleagues some background materials in connection with Captain Kangaroo's 5,000th broadcast.

I urge all of my colleagues to review this information and join with me in saluting the program and network for this accomplishment:

BOB KEESHAN LOOKS BACK ON 5,000 BROADCASTS

(By Bob Keeshan)

When "Captain Kangaroo" arrived in American homes for the first time in 1955, I felt that television had the potential to be the greatest educational medium ever devised. On Friday, October 27 the Captain will have opened the doors to his Place 5,000 times in the past 17 years, and my intimate experience over those years has convinced me that I was right.

With the exception of the home, school and church, no other institution has such an impact on the mind of the child. Surveys made of children's viewing habits often disagree, but, significantly, they usually agree on one point: Children spend a great deal of time in front of the glass screen—more than twenty hours a week, slightly less than the average child spends in school. Is the child influenced positively, negatively or not at all?

The mind of a child is "open." By nature he desires to know; he is curious, tremendously aware of those things which most adults take for granted. Since the child's mind is open and since he gives so much time to TV, there is no question that television can help to mold that mind, cultivate attitudes and develop good taste.

Knowing this, the people who write, produce and perform for children must realize a special responsibility. The program must first be entertaining. We can't educate and inform if we are not entertaining. Our audience would leave us.

Careful attention to detail is most important if we are to avoid any suggestion of a negative or malicious influence. We must remember that the child is a human being, intelligent and cloaked in dignity.

We have tried not to forget this in 5,000 hours of programming over the last 17 years. It has not always been easy. But in this complex world of business and production, we believe that the daily extra effort has been worth it. We are proud of our work.

In looking back over the years I can't detect any appreciable change from our original "Captain Kangaroo" format. The principles and the philosophy remain the same. It's true the production has become more complex, more sophisticated in technical terms, but the effect on the viewer at home is still the uncomplicated, simple approach first seen on October 3, 1955.

Our basic purpose is to entertain. That is the beginning point. How we entertain comes next. Our entertaining subject can be anything in this wide world. If we are creative people, we can inform and educate in an entertaining manner. We can have our cake and eat it too. If we trigger the imagination of a child, if we interest him in a new subject for thought, if we develop his taste, if we impress him with healthy social attitudes, if we help him to grow just one mental inch, we feel rewarded.

I often hear actors, particularly those with a background in legitimate theatre, talk of the coldness of the television medium. Nothing feeds an actor better than the reaction of real live people. Applause, laughter, gasps and screams are the natural diet of the Thespian soul. This need is much more than egocentric. Audience reaction is an integral element in the actor's environment if he is to realize his full potential in any role. The "give and take," the communication with an audience expressed in this reaction, sharpens and heightens a performance. What, then, do I do to fill this need?

Perhaps one of the best avenues of communication with an audience for a television actor is mail. If anyone tells you actors do not read their mail, don't believe it. But, despite my efforts and the efforts of "Sesame Street," my pre-school audience is not noted for literary skills. Most letters are from adult women—mothers—who express their feelings about our program. Sometimes, but only sometimes, the household pre-schooler's feelings filter through.

Often I get a better insight from older brother and sister who do write. Sometimes this mail is the most fun to read. I received a one-line letter last week:

"Dear Captain: Do you know you are talking to puppets? Your friend, Erik."

Or: "Dear Captain: I'm sick today and I'm staying home. I've never seen your show since kindergarten. I really liked it. I hope to be sick tomorrow. Your friend, Laura."

Captain Kangaroo has been around for 17 years, and there are some real fringe benefits from such longevity, the obvious ones aside. Recently there has been an increase in mail from older young people who were once our audience. One young man studying classical music at Syracuse University fondly recalled a series of shows on the symphony orchestra and pointed to this series as originally interesting him in good music.

A young lady entering Williams writes a letter of appreciation and says: "I believe that you have played a much larger role in our lives than you could imagine."

Albeit unscientific, this sort of follow-up research indicates that we have been fulfilling one of our most important programming goals, the reinforcement of incentives. I don't expect every preschooler to remember or even understand the programs on Michelangelo or space exploration or opera or American history or Wordsworth and Shakespeare. If we can weave a fabric of culture for the child so that, even years later, his attitude toward art, music, history or science is manifested in a positive way, we have performed some small service.

Specific skills are important, but how those skills are utilized is of far greater significance. As a medium, television can play an enormous role, along with the home and school, in helping a child to appreciate his world and his culture. It is most important that we in television help to develop our young people as complete human beings.

The communication we have with our audience through the U.S. Postal Service has been a significant factor in helping us fulfill our responsibility.

One last letter from a friend:

"Dear Captain: I know your show is supposed to be for kids, but I want you to know that one of your greatest fans is my cat, who watches and scratches the screen."

Meow!

MANY DISTINGUISHED AWARDS FOR "CAPTAIN KANGAROO"

"Captain Kangaroo" had been on the air little more than a year when it received the Sylvania Award, then regarded as one of the broadcasting industry's most distinguished honors. The award bore the words: "For outstanding contributions to creative TV technique."

A little more than a year later, the prestigious George Foster Peabody Award came to the program, hailing it as one "which instructs children in safety, in ethics, in health, without interrupting the serious business of entertaining them at the same time."

"Captain Kangaroo," which had its premiere October 3, 1955 on the CBS Television Network, reaches its 5,000th broadcast Friday, October 27 (8:00–9:00 AM, EDT), and still the awards come. Most recent was the 1972 Leland Powers School of Radio, Television & Theatre Award to Bob Keeshan, creator and star of the series, for "outstanding service in broadcasting, television and the theatre," with special mention of Keeshan for his "outstanding service to the youth of the world."

Following is a partial list of the awards given to "Captain Kangaroo" over the years:

Sylvania Award, December 1956, outstanding network children's program.

George Foster Peabody Award, April 1958, outstanding television youth and children's program.

National Association for Better Radio and Television: March 1959, award for children's television program; May 1960, award for children's television program; April 1961, award for outstanding pre-school and primary children's program on television for 1960; April 1962, award for children's television program for 1961.

California Federation of Women's Clubs—Junior Membership: 1959, "best children's program"; 1960, "most outstanding children's program"; 1961, "most outstanding children's show"; 1962, "Robert Keeshan—for his untiring efforts in consistently presenting an educational and entertaining production for children."

General Federation of Women's Clubs, June 1960, award for children's series.

Maryland State Society, Children of the American Revolution, February 1961, citation of merit for outstanding children's television program of 1960.

Freedoms Foundation, May 1962, "for outstanding achievement in bringing about a better understanding of the American Way of life."

United States Coast Guard, 1962, "for notable service rendered on behalf of the Coast Guard in promoting greater knowledge of the service and its activities."

Page One, March 1965, citation to Bob Keeshan "for his unfailing devotion to the minds and hearts of our children."

National Association of Television Program Executives, Inc., May 1967, Man of the Year award to Bob Keeshan.

Center for Early Education, June 1970, "for distinguished service for children and consistently high standards."

American Educational Theatre Association, Inc., 1970–1971, Children's Theatre Conference Seal of Merit "for past and continuing excellence in the television and film industry."

Leland Powers School of Radio, Television & Theatre Award, April 1972, to Bob Keeshan for "outstanding service in broadcasting, television and the theatre . . . outstanding service to the youth of the world."

OUR GOVERNMENT AND ITS LEADERS

It is never too early for a child to begin to develop an interest in our government, its leaders and our nation's heritage and culture, in the opinion of Bob Keeshan. Accordingly, program features conveying interesting information on those subjects are frequently presented on the "Captain Kangaroo" series.

"Captain Kangaroo" reaches its 5,000th broadcast Friday, October 27 (8:00–9:00 AM, EDT) on the CBS Television Network. One of its most popular and valuable projects, judging by viewer response, was a week-long series of segments filmed in Washington, D.C. So great was the reaction that these programs have been repeated twice since their original presentation.

Mrs. Bennetta B. Washington, wife of the city's mayor, led the Captain on a tour of the Washington Monument in the first of these broadcasts. Later, the Captain visited the Supreme Court Building, explaining the Court's function. The struggle that lay behind the Declaration of Independence was described by the Captain, who also told how the Constitution and Bill of Rights were created.

During a ride on the Senate subway, Senator Marlow W. Cook of Kentucky told the Captain and his audience of the duties and responsibilities of the Senate. Representative Patsy T. Mink of Hawaii similarly explained the functions of the House of Representatives.

Visits to the Capitol and its rotunda, the Lincoln Memorial and the White House grounds provided background for information about those buildings.

Why we have elections and how our voting system works was described by CBS News Correspondent Walter Cronkite in Election Day visits in national election years since 1966. He and the Captain contrasted the earliest form of voting, by depositing a marked ballot in a ballot box, with the most modern technique, in use in some states. On a tablet-like board, the voter uses a needle-like punch to make holes beside the names of his chosen candidates. The card is placed in a ballot box and tallied by computer.

On the morning after the funeral of President John F. Kennedy, Keeshan spoke briefly and sorrowfully of the tragedy, concluding: "We have all seen the grief, the sadness, brought to a nation by a single act of hate. Let us then begin today to fill our lives with acts of love. Whatever you do, wherever you go—go in kindness, go in peace, go in love."

On happier occasions, Keeshan as the Captain has described the backgrounds and achievements of various Presidents. Often, he uses a President's birthday as an occasion for such a salute. Holidays, too, are occasions to review the historical and social significance not only of our own holidays but of those of other nations—Canada's Dominion Day, France's Bastille Day, for examples; United Nations Day to review efforts at greater cooperation among nations.

The work of The U.S. Postal Service in delivering the mail from Pony Express days to the present, is but one of many similar explorations of the functions and traditions of the various branches and services of government.

State governments, too, have been discussed, as have the cultural, industrial, agricultural and other contributions of each state to the economy and general welfare of the nation.

The American heritage and the roots of its greatness are a continuing story, entertainingly told by "Captain Kangaroo."

TRIBUTE TO EMANUEL CELLER

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in paying tribute to the gentleman from New York, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary and the Dean of the House, EMANUEL CELLER. Others have spoken and much more will be said and written about his legislative achievements. I would rather note here my own personal admiration and regard for this man, who has been one of the most respected and articulate Members of the House in my time here.

Able and dedicated, EMANUEL CELLER has added quality and dignity to the proceedings of this House. Perhaps his most distinguishing quality is his obvious compassion for and stalwart activity in behalf of his fellow man. For 50 years his influence has been felt in the Government councils of this Capital City. We all shall miss him.

In dealing with legislation directly affecting the District which I have the honor to represent, the gentleman from New York has been especially kind and helpful and I shall never cease to be grateful to him.

His illustrious career has grown out of devoted work in behalf of the people of his District and the Nation. I know that he will continue to be active in service to fellow man and I join with his other friends in wishing him a great abundance of happiness in his future undertakings. EMANUEL CELLER, I salute you.

THE PROPOSED UNITED NATIONS UNIVERSITY

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 years, the question of establishing a United Nations University has been under consideration by the United Nations and UNESCO. The issue may reach a point of decision at the U.N. General Assembly now in progress in New York this fall.

I support the concept of a United Nations world university along the lines of this proposal and hope it will be approved and implemented. Basically it would involve a series of institutes for advanced research and training, which will focus on major world problems such as conflict resolution and relations, protection of the environment, and the interaction of science, technology, and society which will be linked by a programing and coordination center.

This concept is quite modest in its goals, and some of the limitations are described by Mr. Harold Taylor, former president of Sarah Lawrence College, in an article in "Change." Mr. Taylor has long been active in the world university movement, and I am reprinting his article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because of the importance of this proposal.

I am indebted to Dr. Ward Morehouse, director of the center for international programs and comparative studies, of the University of the State of New York, for bringing the article to my attention in his newsletter.

While the U.S. Government's position is said to be not to oppose in principle the creation of a United Nations University, the State Department has expressed a number of reservations about the plan and U.S. delegates to the United Nations and its specialized agencies have voted against the proposal, both at the 89th meeting of the UNESCO Executive Board last June in Paris and at the Economic and Social Council meetings in New York on September 14. I certainly hope that the Government will change its position and support this proposal.

The article follows:

THE WORLD AS AN OPEN UNIVERSITY

(By Harold Taylor)

When U Thant said in 1969 that the time had come to give thought to organizing a United Nations University "truly international and devoted to the Charter objectives of peace and progress," he was perfectly right. The time *had* come.

Thant was in a special position to know that the United Nations as a system of power did not have enough of it to do what the Charter called for. What power it had lay in a capacity for educating the world in the true nature of its problems, in bringing its representatives together to work out what solutions were possible, pushing those solutions as far as the political realities would allow.

To recognize that the United Nations is primarily an educational institution is to look for stronger and more complete ways of using it as an educational instrument. What better recognition could there be than to create a world university with a faculty, student body and curriculum drawn from the entire world, at work for the benefit of the whole of mankind? "Working and living together in an international atmosphere . . . students from various parts of the world would be better able to understand one another," said Thant. "Even in their formative years they would be able to break down the barriers among nations and cultures. . . ."

Two and one half years later, Thant's idea has now gone through the machinery of the international establishment, through three sessions of the General Assembly, two feasibility studies, consultations with dozens of international organizations and individuals, a UNESCO working party, the UNESCO Executive Board and a UN panel of experts, with more work to be done before next fall's General Assembly when the proposal will be voted on.

What has emerged after the two and a half years is a plan for an interrelated set of research centers around the world where scholars and scientists, recruited on a world scale can work on world problems—among them war prevention, social and economic development and the preservation of the environment. The students in U Thant's original proposal have disappeared, as has his idea of a central teaching campus in a neutral country. It was said that the latter would cost too much and would duplicate present facilities, and in the case of undergraduate students, that "this kind of teaching would duplicate the work already done in the existing institutions and, moreover, to organize such teaching would raise innumerable technical, political and financial problems."

The proposal is for a modestly staffed Secretariat in a neutral country to coordinate the work of setting up the regional research centers, starting with a center in the originating country, adding more around the world in subsequent stages, making affiliations with existing universities and institutes and encouraging regional groups to develop their own teaching programs through the stimulus of the work going on in the research centers themselves.

At first sight this seems to be very little more than more of the same, except that it is to be organized by a combination of UN and UNESCO bureaucracies, at a time when what the world needs is not more research but the application of the infinite variety of what is already known to the solution of human problems. There is so much that already exists in the global library, on the desks and in the journals of the scholarly elites, so many reports sitting on the world's shelves and in its filing systems, so little of it being shared with and used by the world's people or being taught to the new generations.

But on closer examination, we are faced with the fact that at this point what is proposed by the UN is about all we can get. With the exception of Japan, Austria and a very few others, the countries with the power and the money to build an imaginative new world university system are not much interested in doing it. It is against the spirit of nationalism to democratize and denationalize the world's higher learning, to make an open university of the world with free access to everything that is known, to let people, young or old, know the reality of global truths, to use communications satellites to bring the work of the world's intellectuals and other citizens to all those who wish to know.

The countries which need and want a new international university system the most do not have the power or the money to get it. They can barely keep their own universities going. At a time when all universities are under the most severe pressure, from political repression, student dissatisfaction, financial undernourishment, archaic structures and the crucial necessities of reform, there is no organized constituency around the world in support of the international university. At a time when the United Nations is fighting for its financial life, the thought of diverting funds from existing programs or of adding any new obligations has a dampening effect on any discussion of the larger possibilities for world development.

There is also the problem of how an idea of this size and breadth of educational vision can move through the UN system from its conception to its reality. The United Nations structure is the only one we have through which full educational action on a world scale can take place, aside from the work of individuals and groups inside the world's educational community. But the UN structure was not planned as a source of fresh educational thinking. As an organization it is a reflection of the past and of the hegemony of the West and its educational and cultural system.

That system was built on a series of cultural elites which have always interlocked with the instruments of political and social control. When education is considered by the universities, it leaves the realm of egalitarian thought and enters the field of cultural hierarchies. It is assumed that universities exist for those who can do university work, and university work is done by university people. If you have not been trained to that kind of work, you have no business being in a university.

In this sense, the United Nations itself is an organization of university people, most of whom have been trained in universities whose central model is 19th-century European. When plans are made for a new international system, it is assumed that the models of the past are the basis on which new systems should be built, and the idea of inventing new models designed to serve the needs of a mass clientele on a world scale is a concept foreign to the academic mind. Yet it is this basic assumption of the elites that is put in question by the world-wide student revolt, along with the assumption that the university should act as the central agency of intellectual authority and official culture of the contemporary nation-state.

Other deterrents to fresh educational thinking come from elsewhere. Even with the best will in the world, the members of the UN Secretariat, the UNESCO planners, the UN panel of experts, the members of the delegations, the Second Committee and everyone else connected with the proposal could not keep in touch with educators and intellectuals outside the UN system, let alone incite them to active thought about new possibilities. They have had enough trouble simply keeping up with each other and trying to keep track of all the documents produced as the idea has moved through the apparatus of possible consent.

This has meant that very little is known by the public at large or in the world educational community about the proposal itself. When it is described, as it must be, as a network of research centers for dealing with global problems, it takes no firm grip on the public imagination. Since it has no students or teaching program, except for the possibility that younger scholars of established repute could be attached to the senior members, it has no constituency among students or even among the members of the world's teaching community. It presents itself as a set of additional think tanks, this time inhabited by a global elite, and the big nation-states are not burning with desire to have their thinking done for them by strangers whose ideas for changing the world might turn out to be dangerous. There might be too many cats let out of too many bags.

The more critical commentators among the UN delegations and governments ask, Why add more research agencies and budgets to the ones already operating inside the UN system? Why call the proposed network

an international university at all? Why create a new international institution instead of concentrating on internationalizing the preset ones? If it is to cost $1.7 million for the first research and coordinating center, with a preliminary $700,000 annual budget, rising to a $12.5-million capital investment for a world communications and documentation center and an annual budget of $6.5 million, where is the money to come from?

There are very good answers to all these questions, but there are not as yet enough enthusiasts to make them. The amount of money is slight, except in relation to the poverty of the UN budget as a whole. A single country could easily invest in the capital cost for the first center; international financing in the public and private sector could deal with the annual expenses, as has been the case with the United Nations Institute for Training and Research; international airlines and the international communications industry could handle most of the transportation and equipment costs.

What we can have, if the world puts its mind to it, is something of very great importance. We could have an over-all structure for world higher education, supported by the UN, within which the scholars, students, teachers, poets, artists, writers, scientists and citizens of the world can pool their resources and concentrate on building new international environments for learning from each other. Once the structure is in place it can be used in countless ways.

A great deal is already happening even without the structure. In a sense, the July UN Stockholm Conference on the Environment is a functional, short-term university research center, except that the research is being done before and after the conference. The Pugwash conferences are another example. They have been going on for twenty-one years, and during the whole of this time they have brought together bodies of ideas and powerful multinational groups of scientists who care to use their talents to help advance the cause of world peace. Their work originally began outside governments and existing international structures, yet over the years it has penetrated to major government policymakers and into the entire international scientific community.

Suppose the UN research centers were in fact established, and that a coordinating center for the world's knowledge linked them all together. The most important effect would not lie in the amount of international research turned out, but in the number of new educational developments that would then become possible, even to the point of redefining the role of the universities themselves. It would mean that for the first time in world history, the scholars and universities of the world would be formally linked on a world scale, that the instruments of global collaboration would be put in their hands, including many of the instruments of communication.

In the early days of UNESCO, that is what some of us thought should be done with that organization—rather than building a centralized bureaucracy in Europe, give it a small coordinating staff in a neutral country with regional centers around the world for fully international student bodies, faculties most of the world's scientific and intellectual and curricula. We were already hoarding most of the world's scientific and intellectual manpower and equipment in the Western countries, and it seemed absurd not to spend the available international money on sharing the intellectual wealth on a world scale.

Now there can be a new beginning. It is obvious that the international communications systems—films, radio, television, transportation and mass printing—are going to continue to expand their outreach. It is equally obvious that the universities and schools will be making more and more use of all the new media in the daily tasks of teaching and learning about world society in its present and future forms. We manage to handle such problems globally when it is a matter of the Olympic games, a world's fair, or an American visit to China. It is only when we come to education that we pull in our horns.

Why is it not possible to seize this moment when the big questions of world education are up for debate and decision in the central bodies of world politics and culture, and concentrate a major share of educational energy on helping to answer the questions? In historical terms, we are just at the beginning stages of enquiry and action in the creation of global educational systems, and it would be foolish and irresponsible to leave the planning of the future entirely in the hands of appointed officials inside the international cultural establishment. Those who are now in charge of the planning have very little chance to hear from the rest of us unless we invent our own forms of communication and take the initiative in using them.

We who are Americans could start by doing something about our own government, whose attitude toward the United Nations in general and the international university in particular is just this side of scandalous. The U.S. National Commission for UNESCO could make the development of new international learning environments a major project for this year: it could call upon the American student movement to join them in creating new relations with the world student community. We are all at least honorary members of an imaginary open university of the world in which persons unknown to us are already enrolled. The least we can do is to seek them out, wherever they are, and to see what can be done to bring us all together.

THE FAMILY ASSISTANCE PLAN—HOW MUCH DOES IT COST?

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, during consideration by the Senate of H.R. 1, the social security and welfare bill, Senator RIBICOFF, in a colloquy with me, raised the question of how much had been spent by the administration to develop and promote its welfare program—the so-called family assistance plan.

As a result of this colloquy, I addressed letters on October 2 to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor, requesting the following information:

First. The amount of expenditures by the Federal Government in fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972 in support of and in anticipation of the passage of the family assistance program and the opportunities for families program;

Second. The number of employees in each of these years whose duties, in whole or in part, are in support of and in anticipation of the passage of the family assistance program and the opportunities for families program;

Third. The number of employees at this date whose duties, in whole or in part, are in support of and in anticipation of the passage of the family assistance program and the opportunities for families program, and the payroll costs of these employees on a monthly basis.

I have now received responses from both departments. The figures furnished by Labor and HEW show that these two departments spent a combined total of almost $10 million during the fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972 in planning for the family assistance program.

As of mid-October, 315 employees of the two departments were engaged in work on the administration welfare plan at a total payroll cost of $492,886 per month.

The number of employees involved in this work rose from 10 in fiscal 1970 to 289 in fiscal 1972. Costs of this effort were $127,000 in 1970 and climbed to more than $7.5 million in 1972.

The Senate now has rejected the administration welfare program. I think this was a correct decision by the Senate.

I opposed the administration plan for these reasons:

First. It lacks adequate work incentives.

Second. I doubt the wisdom of writing into law the principle of a guaranteed annual income.

Third. The annual cost of the program would be at least $5 billion greater than the present program.

Fourth. The number of welfare recipients would be increased from 13 million to 26 million.

Fifth. The Federal Government would need to hire an unprecedented 80,000 new employees to administer the program.

So I believe the Senate was right in rejecting the administration proposal.

I think it is most regrettable that so much in tax funds was spent by the administration in support of this welfare program, which the Senate has so justifiably turned down.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letters which I received from Secretary of Labor Hodgson and Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Veneman be included in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., October 13, 1972.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: This is in response to your request of October 2, 1972, inquiring as to the level of the Department's Welfare Reform planning effort.

In order to properly prepare the Department of Labor to assume the major responsibilities to be placed upon it by H.R. 1, a modest planning effort has been underway since April 1971.

The information you requested is provided below:

1. The total amount of expenditures including payroll plus non-personnel expenses such as equipment, travel, supplies, printing, etc., by the Welfare Reform Planning Staff for planning for the OFP program by fiscal year is as follows:

Fiscal year 1970—None.
Fiscal year 1971—$105,000.
Fiscal year 1972—$2,100,908.

2. The number of professional and clerical employees involved in planning for the OFP program by fiscal year is as follows:

Fiscal year 1970—None.
Fiscal year 1971—31.
Fiscal year 1972—71.

3. There are presently 85 professional and clerical employees involved in planning for the OFP program. The monthly payroll cost for these employees is $129,986.

Sincerely,

J. D. HODGSON,
Secretary of Labor.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., October 16, 1972.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: As you requested in your letter of October 2, the following information has been prepared relative to Family Assistance Program planning.

1. The total amounts of personnel expenses and other obligations incurred by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in support of this operation were $127,000 during fiscal year 1970, $2,144,000 in fiscal year 1971, and $5,469,000 in fiscal year 1972.

2. The number of employees in each of these years whose duties were substantially in support of this program were 10 in 1970, 120 during 1971, and 218 in 1972.

3. There are presently 230 employees working in the Family Assistance Program planning operation with monthly payroll costs of $363,000.

The Department of Labor which manages the Opportunities for Families Program will send you similar information about that program in response to your recent letter to the Secretary of Labor.

Sincerely,

JOHN VENEMAN, *Secretary.*

BILL McCULLOCH—A TRIBUTE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in tribute to WILLIAM MCCULLOCH upon his retirement from the Congress. Congressman MCCULLOCH has been in Congress since 1947, and in his 25 years of service to the people of Ohio and the Nation, he has consistently challenged this Nation to live up to the ideals it professes in the Constitution.

Mr. MCCULLOCH, a member of the House Judiciary Committee since 1949, has worked alongside the committee's chairman EMANUEL CELLER as ranking Republican member to produce the great civil rights legislation of the past 15 years. His commitment to civil and human rights has been unflinching, and on these issues he has had the courage to stand fast in the face of opposition from his party leadership and, sometimes, from his own constituency.

Mr. MCCULLOCH has a long and distinguished career. In addition to his service in the Congress he has been a member of the President's Commissions on Civil Disorders and on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. He has received the American Political Science Association's Congressional Distinguished Service Award, the Ohio State University Centennial Achievement Award, and other awards too numerous to mention. I am pleased to honor him today for these achievements, but I am especially pleased to honor him as a man who has exhibited courage, perseverance, wisdom, and above all, a deep understanding of the needs of his fellow human beings during his years of public service. I wish him as he returns to his native Ohio, many happy years of retirement which, I am sure, will include continued public service in new roles.

WILLIAM S. CONOVER II

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, it is particularly sad when Congress loses one of its new, young, and talented Members. Such is the case of WILLIAM S. CONOVER II who will not be returning for the 93d Congress.

BILL CONOVER's short term here was marked by a vigorous and inquiring approach to problems, qualities which are in relatively short supply in Congress, and his presence will be missed, I am sure, not only by his colleagues in general, but by the Pennsylvania delegation in particular.

I know all of us will join with me in wishing BILL CONOVER well and encouraging him to return to these Halls as soon as possible so that once again we may be the beneficiaries of his many talents.

HON. PAGE BELCHER

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join in saying a few words of thanks for many years of effective service to one of Oklahoma's truly outstanding public servants, Congressman PAGE BELCHER.

We have worked here together for 22 years since he was first elected in 1950, only 2 years after I came to the House. One of the true rewards of my time in public life has been my association during this long period with PAGE BELCHER. He is a man of his word, quiet and unassuming but rocklike in his integrity and in his devotion to Oklahoma and its people.

Whenever the interests of our State are involved, PAGE BELCHER has always been there to do his best. He has never placed partisan political matters above the well-being of his district or of our State.

We all respect his decision to leave the House at the end of the 92d Congress. He deserves a relative respite from the hard work he has always put in. But Oklahoma and the House of Representatives will be the poorer for his departure.

The fine working relationship among our Oklahoma House Members, five of whom have served together for 20 years, has always found PAGE BELCHER in a key role. It proves that party division need not prevent people from cooperating on many issues with constructive results.

PAGE BELCHER has served in the House longer than any other Republican in the history of our State. We all know his expertise in the field of farm legislation, where he has for years been the senior member of his party on the House Agriculture Committee.

Ever since he first came to public notice as a member of the University of Oklahoma football team long ago, he has been a man on whom one can rely.

Mrs. Steed joins me in expressing all good wishes for the future to our friends PAGE and Gladys Belcher.

TRIBUTE TO ELLIOTT HAGAN

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay a sincere tribute to my colleague, ELLIOTT HAGAN, who is retiring after 12 years of dedicated service in the Congress and to the Nation.

ELLIOTT HAGAN's integrity and devotion are reflected in his outstanding record of service in the House and the positions of trust and responsibility he holds.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, he has participated in shaping the continuing strength of our country's defenses. A champion of national security, he has been significantly instrumental in insuring the safety and protection of the American people.

ELLIOTT HAGAN's entire career is characterized by his faithful public service to his district, State, and Nation. He not only has been an able Representative, but he has found the time to participate in a number of eleemosynary organizations.

It has been my privilege to serve with ELLIOTT HAGAN and I wish him and his family the best of luck, health, and happiness in their richly deserved retirement as they return to their home and friends.

WANTED: AN HONORABLE, HUMANE, AND LASTING SOLUTION IN VIETNAM

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on October 15, one of the Nation's leading and most distinguished journalists and observers of the affairs of our Republic, editorialized in his newspapers on the national telecast expressing the views of the Democratic presidential candidate on termination of America's role in the Vietnam conflict.

This editorial appeared in the Hearst newspapers nationwide.

Thoughtful reading of the editorial

discloses that Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief, gave every fair intendment to the Democratic nominee's speech of October 10. Mr. Hearst described it as "exceedingly well written," and as one which "expressed better than any previous speech or statement" the candidate's belief as to how peace may be secured.

Mr. Hearst is a student of world affairs of long standing. And of soundness of views proven by events transpiring after the event of his editorializing. This Senator has long regarded him as a true patriot struggling constantly to plumb the range and the depths of current events to ascertain their true meaning, and persistently trying to influence in his own way their direction to the country's better advantage. The patriot's motivation is ever present in his words and in his acts.

So that when Mr. Hearst refers to the Democratic candidate's answers as "too pat and simplistic," it is well to note. Equally notable is the editor's low-keyed observation that a majority of our citizens do not "want the U.S.A. to become a discredited second-rate power nor act in a cowardly manner."

Further, in an almost too restrained low-key fashion, Mr. Hearst's editorial almost painfully called attention to the fact that Mr. Nixon's opponent failed to criticize the other side and its blatant, massive aggression across the demilitarized zone last spring; and that this opponent "practically told the Communists that if he is elected—which is highly doubtful—he will settle the war on their terms."

The editorial then goes on to say:

Yet McGovern who can weep and mourn over the North Vietnamese who have been killed by American bombs aimed at military targets, has little compassion for the South Vietnamese.

In the concluding paragraphs of his writing, Mr. Hearst says:

Every American wants peace. But peace-at-any-price in the McGovern manner could undermine our influence throughout Asia and much of the rest of the world. It also could spark the flames of much bigger war in the future, as did England's appeasement of Hitler more than 30 years ago.

Mr. President, that my colleagues in the Senate and others may have the benefit of the full text of this well-reasoned paper, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "A Viet Solution Without Honor," by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., and appearing in the October 15 issue of the Hearst newspapers, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

A VIET SOLUTION WITHOUT HONOR

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

Even those of us who disagree vehemently with George McGovern's view on Vietnam must concede that his Tuesday night television speech probably had a lot of appeal for a lot of people.

In rereading that speech, I found it exceedingly well written. It expressed better than any previous speech or statement McGovern's belief that peace can be secured by halting the bombing of North Vietnam, cutting off all military aid to South Vietnam, withdrawing all American forces from Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, and retrieving all salvageable equipment.

To a great many Americans who have become frustrated with this war far from our shores, the McGovern prescription must sound like the sensible way to end our torture.

Therein lies the danger. McGovern's answers are too pat and too simplistic. They do not take into account our role as leader and protector of the free world nor do they explain how we, in good conscience, could live with the bloodbath that would ensue in South Vietnam once we evacuated all of our forces and all of the materials of war that might be used by Saigon to defend itself.

I don't believe that a majority of our citizens want the United States of America to become a discredited second-rate power nor act in a cowardly manner. Our relationship to many smaller nations in Asia, Europe and Latin America is similar to that of parent to child. They look to us for protection in a world where the only other super-power is Communist Russia.

George McGovern would be far more credible in offering his solutions for Vietnam if he were to acknowledge the intransigence of Hanoi at the negotiating table and the fact that the bombing and the mining of Haiphong harbor were launched by President Nixon in retaliation for North Vietnam's blatant massive aggression across the Demilitarized Zone last spring.

But McGovern does not criticize the other side. He does not even mention the treachery of the North that led President Kennedy to commit thousands of military advisers and then led President Johnson to send in our ground and air forces.

At a time when we are involved in very serious negotiations with Hanoi in Paris, McGovern practically told the Communists that if he is elected—which is highly doubtful—he will settle the war on their terms.

This is not the American way. In previous wars we have had our dissenters and protesters, but we have seen those wars through to an honorable conclusion.

I found it interesting to note that James Reston, in his syndicated column, wrote that McGovern "went so far in meeting Hanoi's war aims that he may actually have lost more support by his TV speech than he gained."

Scotty Reston is a very sound and honest journalist in my estimation, despite the fact that I occasionally disagree with some of his views. He, too, is a sharp critic of the war.

He made eminently good sense when, in discussing McGovern's proposal to withdraw all salvageable military equipment, he added:

"This is far more than a promise to withdraw all Americans from Indochina within 90 days. It is a threat to withdraw future military aid to Saigon while leaving the Soviet Union and China free to continue sending military arms to Hanoi and the Viet Cong.

"Moreover, Senator McGovern asserts that he would 'immediately' stop the bombing and all acts of force upon taking office, but he merely assumes that this would end the hostilities and 'expects' Hanoi will then turn over the prisoners and account for the missing . . ."

This is a vital point in the whole McGovern charade. Just because President Nixon sat down with Chou En-lai in Peking and with Brezhnev in Moscow does not mean that the Communists have suddenly changed their spots.

They may be willing to seek certain accommodations with us that are to their benefit. But they have not retreated from their determination to subvert non-Communist governments or to extend the tenacles of Communist aggression.

Were we to withdraw from South Vietnam all guns, tanks, planes and other materiel that might be used for self defense, the North, equipped with Chinese and Soviet arms could overwhelm the South.

The New York Daily News described this prospect quite pungently in an editorial, when it said: "It would be disgrace enough for the U.S. to abandon an ally."

But to denude South Vietnam of every means of self-defense, delivering 17 million people into the hands of a merciless enemy, would make the U.S. an accessory to the certain butchery that would follow."

Yet George McGovern, who can weep and mourn over the North Vietnamese who have been killed by American bombs aimed at military targets, has little compassion for the South Vietnamese.

This is a major flaw in his reasoning. But there are others, too.

I simply cannot accept his theory that a vote for McGovern is a vote for four years of peace while a vote for Nixon is a vote for four more years of war.

President Nixon has made every conceivable effort to end the war without selling South Vietnam down the river. He could achieve peace tomorrow if he would end the bombing, establish a pro-Communist coalition government in Saigon, pull all our forces out of Indochina and let the North Vietnamese run rampant through the South.

But even such a surrender would not guarantee that Hanoi and her allies would not soon devour Laos and Cambodia and then move on Thailand, with which we have a sound defense treaty commitment.

There is no way that McGovern can promise that the Communists will react in a certain way if the United States makes a unilateral withdrawal from Southeast Asia—and he knows it as well as I know it and you know it.

Every American wants peace. But peace-at-any-price in the McGovern manner could undermine our influence throughout Asia and much of the rest of the world. It also could spark the flames of much bigger war in the future, as did England's appeasement of Hitler more than 30 years ago.

If enough Americans are willing to sacrifice our honor and scrap our commitments, then I suppose McGovern will be elected.

But I have enough faith in the American people to believe that they will stick with President Nixon and his efforts to find an honorable solution in Vietnam.

GEORGE MILLER

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of GEORGE MILLER will leave the 93d Congress greatly diminished. The House of Representatives and the Nation are indebted to Congressman GEORGE MILLER, whose continued leadership, encouragement, and unswerving support of our national program to explore space has brought incalculable benefits to all American citizens.

As chairman of the Science and Astronautics Committee, GEORGE MILLER has been a pioneer in fostering the advancement of science and the progressive development of technology in the field of aeronautics. No committee chairman has fulfilled his responsibilities with more

diligence, dedication, or resourcefulness than GEORGE MILLER. Whether it was fighting for another Apollo flight to the moon, or advocating a space shuttle program, Chairman GEORGE MILLER has illustrated the kind of unparalleled leadership and competence which have earned him the respect and admiration of all those members who have had the good fortune to serve on his committee.

No other Member in this House possesses more knowledge or greater understanding of America's space program than GEORGE MILLER. In recognition of his personal efforts and outstanding achievements in advancing space flight programs, GEORGE MILLER was the recipient of the 1967 Goddard Award for his contribution to U.S. leadership. In 1967, GEORGE MILLER was appointed to represent the House of Representatives as special congressional adviser to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations for the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. And again in 1971, Congressman MILLER was elected to honorary membership in the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics. There have been only six previous honorary memberships given by this organization, which dates back to the beginning of the space program.

Since the 79th Congress, GEORGE MILLER has been a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. Serving first in the California State Assembly and for 27 years in Congress, GEORGE has conscientiously and energetically represented the Eighth District of California.

Now, after more than a quarter of a century of public service, GEORGE MILLER will retire. Mrs. O'Neill joins me in wishing GEORGE well in all his future endeavors as he returns to life as a private citizen.

EMANUEL CELLER: A GIANT IN THE HOUSE

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1972

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to imagine this House without the distinguished presence of our beloved and highly respected dean from the great State of New York, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER. What can we say of this great man that will truly portray the tremendous stature and strength of such a giant among legislators? He is a lawyer's lawyer, a statesman's statesman, a scholar's scholar, and an orator's orator. Who among us can ever forget the eloquence, erudition, and good commonsense of his addresses on the House floor?

From Proverbs we are told: "Happy is the man that findeth wisdom, and the man that getteth understanding," and MANNY CELLER must be as close to that estate as it is possible for a human being to get. He has a mind that is encyclopedic in its range, with the speed and dexterity of a multicomputer, graced with an understanding and love of all God's creatures. So it is no wonder that his colleagues have long looked to him for advice and counsel on a host of complex and critical issues.

Mr. Speaker, I have been especially fortunate to have served alongside MANNY CELLER for 44 years—in fact, he is the only remaining Member who was serving in the Congress when I arrived in Washington on a wintry day in 1929. During these many eventful years, I have been privileged to witness firsthand the manifestations of MANNY'S keenness, his judgment—as sound as the solid rock that provides the basic strength and support the huge and towering buildings of his home city—his unshakable courage, fierce tenacity, omnipresent compassion, unimpeachable integrity, and total commitment to the public interest. For a full half century. EMANUEL CELLER has been widely recognized as a great advocate of and for the people, and he has been one of the most productive legislators in American history, framing hundreds of bills and four constitutional amendments. A valued ally and a fearsome adversary, EMANUEL CELLER has fought for the ultimate good of all the world's people with unfaltering efficiency and patriotic rectitude. He has earned the undying respect and gratitude of our Nation. History can now record the myriad accomplishments and contributions of Chairman CELLER, and the story of his career in the Congress will be an inspiration to Americans for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, how do we honor such a noble figure, but to carry forward in the great tradition which he in fact created by his Herculean labors in the Congress. In so doing, we best proclaim our admiration and acknowledge our debt, that he has been our mentor in excellence. As MANNY CELLER returns to private life, our thoughts and best wishes go with him as do our prayers that he will continue to be blessed in all that he may do.

MUCH NEEDED ADDITION TO THE OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL AND STREETS ACT OF 1968

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the House Committee on the Judiciary has approved H.R. 16932, which would provide a gratuity of $50,000 to any police or fireman killed in the line of duty.

This is a much needed addition to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. I sincerely regret that the retroactivity feature was taken out of the bill. I strongly believe that the bill should be retroactive to January 1, 1967. It was in that year that a large increase in political assassination of police officers occurred. I will vote for the bill today and actively seek its amendment in the next Congress to make it retroactive to January 1, 1967.

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, several times each year I send a printed report to all registered voters in my congressional district in the Bronx, N.Y., and once a year I send a questionnaire dealing with a number of widely discussed public issues. These reports and the questionnaire are prepared at my expense as a service to the community in order that the public may be more fully informed of developments in the Congress affecting every citizen. The texts of my most recent Report from Washington and my 1972 questionnaire follow:

CONGRESSMAN BINGHAM REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

MASS TRANSIT REFORM FINALLY CATCHING ON

Dear Friends and Neighbors, one of my first acts when I came to Congress in 1965 was to seek a solution to the severe transportation crisis faced by New York City and all our urban areas. The solution I came up with and proposed then, and have been pushing for at every chance since, was reform of the mammoth Highway Trust Fund, and I've just recently introduced new legislation expanding on that proposal.

Rather than being tied to using Federal Highway Trust Fund money for roads, I suggested in 1965, state governments should be given authority to use those funds for either road or mass transit construction "in whatever proportions they find appropriate to meet their problems." With then-Senator Joseph Tydings of Maryland, I introduced legislation to that effect.

That was before the public became so aware of the need to preserve our environment, and before so many miles of super highways had dissected city neighborhoods and displaced so many people. The Bingham-Tydings proposal drew little support and many yawns.

Gradually that has changed. In 1971, the National Governor's Conference passed a resolution endorsing the idea of using Highway Trust Fund moneys for mass transit. This year's Democratic Platform calls for a broad Transportation Trust Fund. Transportation Secretary Volpe is sympathetic, and the Senate has approved the idea.

My new bill would recast the Highway Trust Fund into a broad Surface Transportation Trust Fund, and would set a minimum proportion of all funds that must be devoted to mass transit based on local population densities. It would also encourage States to open up their own Highway Trust Funds for mass transit uses.

The total effect of these provisions would be to prevent the powerful Highway Lobby from continuing to monopolize transportation resources at both Federal and local levels. Substantial investment in mass transit would no longer be a matter of choice, but of necessity. In the 1960's the Federal government spent $30 on highways for every $1 on mass transit. By 1971, mostly as a result of enactment by Congress of the Urban Mass Transit Act, that ratio had dropped to about $12 to $1. By converting the Highway Trust Fund to a National Surface Transportation Trust fund as I have proposed, we could soon be devoting as much to mass transit as to highways.

While resistance to this idea remains strong in the House, particularly in the Public Works Committee, the support that has developed elsewhere and assignment of my bill to the more sympathetic House Ways and Means

Committee gives me hope for progress on this kind of transportation revolution—and for a big gain for our environment and the quality of life in our cities.

VIEW FROM SPEAKER'S CHAIR

House Speaker Carl Albert recently asked me to Chair the full House during action on two bills. As any one who's visited the House chamber knows, the Speaker cannot preside personally at all times and it is an honor to be entrusted with the gavel and to preside over the House on his behalf.

SENIOR BENEFITS THREATENED

Many of our senior citizens could be disappointed rather than relieved next month when they receive Social Security checks containing the 20% increase recently approved by the Congress.

The source of that disappointment would be that senior citizens receiving public benefits in addition to Social Security may find those other benefits reduced by as much or more than the amount of their Social Security increase. So, contrary to what Congress intended, they could end up with less income rather than more.

To head off such a development, I've introduced the first bills in the House to require that the full 20% Social Security increase be passed on to all Social Security recipients by disregarding the increase for purposes of computing such other benefits as veterans' compensation, Medicaid, Old Age Assistance, aid to the blind and disabled, and aid to dependent children. And I've appealed to the appropriate Chairmen of House committees to take action to plug this "loophole" before any Senior Citizens are deprived by any portion of their already inadequate incomes.

CARE FOR MENTALLY DISABLED

Much more is needed in the way of Federal programs to provide care for the physically and mentally ill, and health legislation is one of my major concerns in Congress. I was honored to be the subject of a "profile" in the July-August issue of the Epilepsy Foundation of America's National Spokesman, describing my recent efforts to obtain additional funds for the mentally disabled under the Developmental Disabilities Services Act (DDSA) and other health programs. It is reprinted below with permission:

From time to time, Spokesman will focus on lawmakers who have demonstrated a special interest in improving the health of our nation.

Our first profile subject is Rep. Jonathan B. Bingham (Dem), of the 23rd Congressional District, New York.

Although his work in Congress is multifaceted, in his seven years as a Congressman Jonathan P. Bingham has actively worked to help those with epilepsy, through DDSA and other programs.

He led the House fight this past April to increase funding for DDSA—a fight that has now been continued in the Senate.

Bingham has also introduced bills to provide tax relief (through a new income tax exemption and a special transportation cost tax deduction) for families of the disabled, and to increase the federal government's share of health insurance costs for federal employees.

The Bronx legislator has also co-sponsored numerous health-oriented bills, including a bill to create a national health security system and another to establish an emergency medical services administration under HEW. Bingham has also co-sponsored bills to aid the mentally retarded.

Jonathan Bingham's interest in the field of health extends back to 1959, when he served on the New York State Mental Health Council. He was president of the Bronx County Society for Mental Health in 1960–62.

LOCALLY

After far too much delay, the Golden Age Center for senior citizens in St. James Park is finally underway. Official ground-breaking ceremonies will be at noon on Oct. 17. Hope to see some of you there!

Additional street-lighting is planned to be installed in the Weeks Avenue and 167th St. area as a result of my contact with the Department of Public Works on behalf of residents there and a survey which confirmed that the lighting is now inadequate.

With many others from our community, I appealed to the Board of Estimate for continuation of express bus services from the Pelham Parkway and Co-op City areas via Fifth Avenue. Manhattan residents had complained about the buses and had raised doubts the service would continue. However, the Board responded to our need for this service in the Bronx, and renewed it.

I learned of a proposal to close the Bronx Rent Control Office by merging it with one in Manhattan. I immediately got in touch with the Mayor and city housing officials, and was later informed the plan to close the Bronx facility had been "laid aside".

A city employee whose health insurance coverage provides discounts for prescription drugs was having difficulty getting the necessary card. I contacted the welfare fund of his union. An error in their records was discovered and the employee now has his card.

The Immigration Service responded to my plea for issuance of a special alien registration card to a woman on Clay Avenue who had not received her card and needed one quickly in order to be able to leave the country temporarily to visit her severely ill father-in-law in Hungary.

A long-established store on the Concourse was being "invaded" by drug addicts who were keeping customers away. I supported the owner's request to the Mayor for police help. Arrests were made and patrols increased, and the owner tells me the situation has improved.

Several major Federal grants have come through in recent weeks for projects that will benefit our area. Among them: $501,787 from the Office of Education for a Health and Drug Education Program in School District No. 10 and $1-million from the Department of Interior to build a new swimming pool and recreation complex in Bronx Harlem River State Park at the foot of West Tremont Street.

LETTER FROM FORT WORTH JAIL

The imprisonment of five Irish-Americans in Fort Worth, Texas, by Federal authorities has deeply disturbed me.

The five men—all from the New York City area—were jailed without bail for refusing to testify before a Federal Grand Jury looking into alleged gun-running from this country to Northern Ireland.

I deplore the bombing and killing that is going on in Ulster, and I support legitimate inquiry into the shipment of guns to Northern Ireland. But regardless of the guilt or innocence of these men, they should not be forced by the Justice Department to leave their jobs and families and be detained 1500 miles from home in a city where they have never before set foot.

When I learned of this situation on June 30, I immediately sent a telegram to Attorney General Kleindienst (signed by seven other New York Congressmen) urging that "these witnesses be returned to their homes and families."

Soon thereafter I met with the wives of the prisoners to get more of the story.

Such outrageous treatment has been made possible by a 1970 law (which I opposed) that permits the Federal government to offer immunity from prosecution to grand jury witnesses, and to jail them indefinitely without bail if, despite the offer of immunity, they refuse to testify. In this case, the immunity offer could not protect these men from possible prosecution, for example, by the British, so they understandably refused to accept and testify.

I strongly suspect the British government put the Administration up to this—another example of what I've frequently called our Government's "pussyfooting" when it comes to dealing with the British with respect to Northern Ireland. Britain's policy of internment in Northern Ireland should be ended, and so should this British-influenced internment of the five Irish-Americans by our government in Fort Worth.

With that in mind, I joined with other House Members in appealing to Chairman Emanuel Celler of the House Judiciary Committee to convene special hearings on how to modify the 1970 law to keep it from being misused by the Federal government to harass and silence political groups.

In response to my efforts on behalf of the civil rights of these men, I received a handwritten letter from them—signed by Kenneth Tierney, Thomas Laffey, Matthias Reilly, Paschal Morahan, and Daniel Crawford—of which I'm certainly proud.

TARRANT COUNTY JAIL,
Fort Worth, Tex., August 2, 1972.

Congressman BINGHAM.

DEAR SIR: We the five imprisoned Irish born men here at Fort Worth wish to thank you for all you are doing on our behalf.

We know you are aware of the un-American Police State tactics used to incarcerate us on behalf of the British Government. Your concern for our civil rights is deeply appreciated. We are in jail without charge or trial. The Grand Jury abused its powers through four U.S. Attorneys and a most biased Judge (Brewster). Our wives, our children, families, and friends thank you for your dedicated efforts on our behalf.

Sincerely,

MATTHIAS REILLY,
KENNETH TIERNEY,
THOMAS LAFFEY,
DANIEL CRAWFORD,
PASCHAL MORAHAN.

SOVIET JEWRY

$50-million of the $85-million in my bill for aid to Israel to help resettle Soviet Jewish refugees has now been appropriated by the House. It could be delayed by controversy in the Senate over other parts of the Foreign Aid program, but eventual approval is almost a certainty.

I regard this program as one of my major legislative successes, though as always, the support of many Members and outside groups was essential.

The cause of freedom for Soviet Jewry, of course, has been seriously set back by the imposition of immense individual price-tags on Jews wanting to emigrate. While no price is too much to pay for a person's freedom, we must not capitulate to these demands for outrageous ransoms. This is the view of the Israeli government and of most Jewish leaders. If the Soviets persist with this ransom policy, they must be made to realize that present and proposed programs of increasing trade and other contacts with the U.S. will be jeopardized.

The Soviets also continue to prosecute Soviet Jews who wish to emigrate to Israel, and at least 15 major cases are in process. To help keep up the pressure from the West to which Soviet leaders are sensitive, I helped organize 90 Members to sign a letter to Soviet Party Secretary Brezhnev naming Jews known to be on trial and calling upon him "to stop this harassment and allow these people and their families to leave the Soviet Union in peace . . ."

On the eve of the sentencing of Mark Nashpitz by a Soviet Court, I made an unscheduled visit to the Soviet Embassy in Washington to appeal for fair treatment in the case.

Nashpitz was best man at the celebrated

wedding of an American woman to a Soviet citizen, Gavirel Shapiro.

Shapiro was convicted by Soviet authorities for "failing to report for reserve military duty" when he sought permission to leave the Soviet Union with his American bride. Although Nashpitz was charged with the same offense, it was feared he would receive a more severe sentence because of less publicity about him and because his father escaped to the West 16 years ago.

With me at the Embassy were Representatives Alphonzo Bell of California and Earl Landgrebe of Indiana. Ambassador Dobrynin refused to see us. But we persisted, sending messages into the Embassy through an officer of the Executive Protection Service, and were finally admitted and received by Embassy First Secretary Vladimir Bykov. I stressed the Soviet Union's commitment to the U.N. Delegation of Human Rights, which provides for freedom of emigration for all peoples. We each urged Bykov to relay to Moscow our insistence that Nashpitz be fairly treated.

Next day, we received word that Nashpitz was sentenced to one year of "supervised work"—considered a relatively light sentence.

VOTER REGISTRATION

I want to urge you to go out and vote for the parties and candidates of your choice in the November 7 elections. But you will not be able to vote unless you are registered. The last chance to register will be October 5, 6, and 7 from 5:30 p.m. to 10:30 p.m. and October 10 from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. at all regular polling places. For the one nearest you—and for other election information—call the Bronx Office of the Board of Elections (299–9017).

You will have to register if—

You've never registered before, or

You've moved since you last voted or registered, or

You have not voted in one of the last two general elections and have not reinstated your registration by mail when reminded by the Board of Elections

To register, you must be—

18 years old on or before election day (Nov. 7); and

A resident of Bronx county for one month.

No literacy test is required.

Naturalized citizens must show proof of naturalization when registering for the first time.

Remember to state the party of your choice when you register. Otherwise, you'll not be able to vote in primary elections which are so important in our city.

In response to my demand for an accounting, the Board of Elections has assured me that the long waits, snafus, and inadequate voting facilities that frustrated so many voters in the June primary will not happen again in November. The Board blames most of the problems in June on the complicated ballot and last-minute changes in the law that made it necessary to reprint the ballots. But more adequate funds and trained personnel could have helped overcome such an emergency, and I have introduced legislation which would make Federal funds and personnel available to local election authorities to help assure smooth, fair, and convenient conduct of elections involving Federal offices. At present, State and local governments bear full responsibility, and enactment of my "Election Assistance and Voter Registration Act" would assure availability of stand-by Federal help when local election officials become overtaxed. It would also require simple absentee voting in primary elections, which is not now permitted in New York.

CONGRESSMAN BINGHAM WANTS TO KNOW YOUR OPINION

Dear Friends and Neighbors, Again this year, I'm asking you to share your views with me on a number of widely discussed public issues. This questionnaire, of course, can't cover all the important decisions we face, but I hope you will take a few minutes to pick the response to each of these questions that comes closest to your views, and then return this form to me soon.

You will notice that separate columns are provided to allow up to three members of your family to respond. As always, I'm most interested in the thinking of every generation and group in our community. The tabulated results of this questionnaire will give me a valuable guide for action in the Congress and help me rally support among other Congressmen. You can expect to see the results in the press and in my next newsletter.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM.

1972 BINGHAM POLL

(Mark the one box for each question that best reflects your views)

Crime control

As far as handguns are concerned—

(a) just cheap "Saturday night special" pistols should be banned.

(b) private possession of all handguns (except for police, the military, and organized sport clubs) should be banned.

(c) no government bans on handguns are in order.

(d) don't know, no opinion.

Abortion

Laws governing whether a woman receives an abortion—

(a) should leave that entirely up to the woman and her doctor.

(b) should allow abortions only under special circumstances (such as danger to the mother's life).

(c) should simply not permit them.

(d) don't know, no opinion.

Amnesty

Young men who left the United States to avoid being drafted to fight in Vietnam should be—

(a) welcomed back without any conditions.

(b) welcomed back on condition they'll perform military or equivalent public service.

(c) allowed back to stand trial.

(d) don't know, no opinion.

Day care

The Federal government should support a system of children's day-care services for—

(a) everyone, at fees ranging from nothing to full cost, depending on ability to pay.

(b) low income families only, free or at low cost.

(c) none of the above—the Federal government should stay out of day care.

(d) don't know, no opinion.

Women's rights

From what I know about the movement for "Women's Liberation", I find that I—

(a) agree with most everything being proposed for a totally new role for women in our society.

(b) agree with demands for equal pay for equal work for women, and greater equality for women under the laws, but that's about all.

(c) mostly disagree with such proposals.

(d) don't know, no opinion.

Economy

As far as I'm concerned, the Federal government's controls on prices have been—

(a) mostly effective.

(b) somewhat effective.

(c) somewhat ineffective.

(d) mostly ineffective.

(e) don't know, no opinion.

Environment

To enable us to begin saving the environment, and end all this pollution, I'd be willing to—

(a) live more simply and carefully (like using less electricity, driving less, and generally consuming less).

(b) pay whatever it costs in higher taxes to clean things up and keep them clean.

(c) both the above.

(d) neither of the above.

(e) don't know, no opinion.

HON. SPEEDY O. LONG

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is losing one of its most dedicated and congenial Members. Although the U.S. Congress has only had Mr. LONG for 8 years, he was no stranger to public service.

Like many of his colleagues from Louisiana, he received his training in the State legislature and after 8 years he offered his services to the National Legislature.

All of America is aware of the amount of political dedication that the Long family has unselfishly offered to this country. SPEEDY has managed to carry on this long, admirable tradition.

But SPEEDY is not now relaxing in the anonymity of retirement. He has successfully run for the office of attorney general of his parish in Louisiana; a position for which he is well suited since he has been a member of the Louisiana bar for many years.

Once again he will serve his beloved people of Louisiana. He will remain a true representative of his people. I along with the rest of the country, am sorry to lose his services.

SPECIAL REPORT FROM WASHINGTON: THE 92D CONGRESS—A RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SPECIAL REPORT FROM WASHINGTON: THE 92D CONGRESS—A RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT

The 92d Congress has compiled a record of outstanding accomplishment in the fields of education, health, crime control, programs for older Americans, veterans, environmental protection, and campaign finance reform. In addition, we passed several measures designed to cope with the continuing problems of high unemployment and inflation.

This report reviews the highlights of Congressional action during 1971 and 1972, and the special section below describes accomplishments of particular interest to the 17th Congressional District of New York.

Gateway National Park became a reality in the closing days of the session, and the final bill includes all Staten Island beaches as well as Miller Field. Thus we succeeded in obtaining the first urban national park for New York and won the three year battle

to save Miller Field from greedy developers. Twenty-six acres of the field are slated for a new New Dorp High School.

Also in the closing days, I succeeded in passing a bill authorizing the turnover to New York of a new high school training ship, the USNS *Twin Falls*. This will replace the aging *John Brown* and provide new educational opportunities for thousands of New York boys in the maritime trades.

Thousands of Islanders received emergency disaster assistance from the U.S. through Small Business Administration disaster loans. When tropical storm Dora hit in 1971, the city and state of New York ignored our plight until I convinced the White House that Staten Island needed assistance. To date, thousands of families have received more than $30 million in disaster aid.

The U.S. Puolic Health Service hospital was rescued from closing when I revealed that the government was planning to abandon this vital health resource and turn it over to private medical groups. Instead, a plan was developed whereby the U.S. will continue to operate the hospital, but expand its mission and facilities to meet a wider range of community health needs—including the need for medical training facilities.

Fort Wadsworth was saved from an uncertain future by its retention as a military facility with the proviso that when the Army decides it no longer needs the base, it will become part of Gateway National Park.

The U.S. Coast Guard base at St. George was similarly slated for closing but this ill-considered plan was likewise given up after I brought a special Congressional Subcommittee to Staten Island and Governor's Island to evaluate the plan. The visit proved that the facility was worth keeping as an important waterfront activity.

NEW PROGRAMS HELP STUDENTS FROM PRE-SCHOOL TO COLLEGE

Young people throughout the nation will benefit from these historic education measures:

Omnibus Education Act of 1972 is the most significant advance for higher education since Abraham Lincoln signed the Land Grant College Act over a century ago. This measure extends all existing aid to higher education programs and creates important new ones, including:

A new system of *Basic Educational Opportunity Grants*, entitling every college student to an annual grant of $1400, less the amount his parents can contribute;

A new program of direct institutional aid for colleges and universities;

Help for occupational and vocational education;

A *National Institute of Education* to develop better ways of teaching and learning at every level—preschool through graduate school.

Expanded Head Start Program to enable children of working families as well as the poor to participate in this voluntary day care program.

National School Lunch Act Amendments provide free and low price meals for needy children.

Vietnam Veterans Education Assistance means a major increase in aid for education and vocational rehabilitation for returning veterans.

32 PERCENT SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE LEADS LIST OF ELDERLY BENEFITS

For older Americans, this has been one of the great Congresses in history—and the 32% Social Security increases passed in 1971 and 1972 are but the tip of the iceberg.

Here are some of the many benefits our 20 million senior citizens will realize from Congressional initiatives:

Nutritional meals for those who need them—even shut-ins;

Low-cost transportation;

Job training and employment;

Community centers;

Pre-retirement training;

Health and education services;

Gerontological centers to study the variety of problems older Americans face;

A new National Institute of Aging to conduct research on the aging process and the special health problems of the elderly;

Congress also overrode a Presidential veto of a 20% increase in Railroad Retirement benefits.

Note: the major legislation passed for America's older citizens during 1971–72 originated not in the White House, but in Congress. This legislation represents a lasting commitment to every American over 65.

NEW ACT REFORMS CAMPAIGN SPENDING

At a time when the costs of campaigning have skyrocketed, the Congress passed the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

This historic act—

Limits the amount of advertising spending in campaigns;

Requires broadcasters, newspapers and magazines to sell advertising to candidates at the lowest commercial rate;

Requires campaign committees to report contributions and expenditures of $100 or more; and

Limits the amount a candidate or his family can contribute to his own campaign.

REVENUE SHARING AIDS STATE, LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

In response to pleas from hard-pressed states, counties and cities, Congress this year enacted a $30.1 billion revenue sharing bill.

State governments will receive one-third of the funds; local governments the other two-thirds. The money is expected to be spent on such high priority items as—

Public safety;

Environmental protection;

Public transportation;

Health;

Recreation;

Libraries; and

Social services for the poor and aged.

NEW CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS ON FOREIGN, MILITARY POLICY

Among the several actions of the 92nd Congress in foreign and military policy are:

SALT Agreements To Limit Strategic Weapons: Congress approved a five-year U.S.-Soviet accord limiting offensive nuclear weapons.

ABM Treaty With Soviet Union: The Senate approved a treaty with the Soviet Union limiting the number of ballistic missiles.

Military Draft: Congress amended the Selective Service Act to—

Extend the draft to June 1973.

Grant student deferments; and

Increase military pay in order to encourage voluntary enlistments.

INCREASED ASSISTANCE FOR VETERANS

The 92nd Congress increased the level of assistance available to veterans in many key areas, and this has been a particular concern of mine. I have introduced the Veterans Comprehensive Education Act of 1972, and worked for passage of the following important bills:

New GI Bill—This landmark measure increases educational allowances for Vietnam veterans by 25 percent. Fulltime students will now receive—

Single students: $220 a month;

Married students: $261 a month;

Married and one child: $298 a month; and

Each additional dependent: $18 a month.

National Cemetery Bill—This law—

Transfers to the VA responsibility for administering all national cemeteries.

Increases burial allowances for veterans who die from service-connected disabilities.

Provides an additional burial allowance for veterans who do not wish to be buried in national cemeteries.

VA Medical School Act—To help meet the nation's medical manpower shortage—and to improve VA medical care—this pilot program authorizes the establishment of eight new medical schools in veterans' hospitals across the nation.

Veterans Medical Care—This new act will vastly improve the entire VA medical care system. To ease crowded hospital conditions, veterans with non-service-connected medical problems can now be treated as outpatients. Some families of permanently-disabled veterans or their survivors can also now receive hospital care.

Disabled Veterans' Benefits—Provides a 10% boost in benefits for disabled veterans.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION GIVEN HIGH PRIORITY

Clean air and water, and the conservation of our resources and wildlife have been chief concerns of the 92nd Congress. This Congress has taken important action to protect the nation's environment.

Water Quality Standards Act provides $24.6 billion to clean up the nation's waters and control water pollution. The goal of this, the most far-reaching water pollution bill ever passed, is to end all discharges of pollutants into navigable waters by 1985. Unbelievably, the President vetoed the bill but the Congress wisely voted to override.

Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act will help protect man and our environment, while permitting farmers to use pesticides to grow food and fiber.

Wildlife Hunting from Aircraft is prohibited, protecting certain wild birds, fish and other animals.

Youth Conservation Corps—To extend and expand this pilot youth conservation program.

CONGRESS ACTS TO MEET HEALTH CARE CRISIS

Quality health care—at prices people can afford—is one of the major problems facing Americans today. As a nation, we have slipped from 13th to 22nd place in male life expectancy, from 6th to 21st in infant mortality. Doctor bills and hospital costs have skyrocketed, yet 36 million Americans under age 65 are not covered by private health insurance. Moreover, the nation is suffering from a critical shortage of doctors and other trained health personnel.

The 92d Congress has taken the initiative to meet the crisis with several important measures:

Medical Personnel—Two new laws provide nearly $4 billion to train more family doctors and nurses;

Conquest of Cancer Act—Sets aside $1.5 billion to find cures for cancer;

National Cooley's Anemia Control Act—A national effort to prevent and treat this blood disease which affects some 200,000 persons in the U.S., mostly children;

Multiple Sclerosis Research—Creates a National Advisory Commission to help find the cause of M.S. and develop cures;

Communicable Disease Control Act—Helps states and localities control the spread of communicable diseases;

National Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung and Blood Act;

Rehabilitation Act—An extension of the 50-year-old Vocational Rehabilitation Act, adding major new programs to aid the severely handicapped and other disabled persons; and

Black Lung Benefits—To make it easier for coal miners, stricken by black lung disease, to receive benefits.

CONGRESS FOCUSES ON CONSUMER PROTECTION

In recent years, Congress has passed a host of measures on behalf of the American consumer. Truth-in-lending . . . wholesome meat and poultry . . . truth-in-packaging . . .

auto, tire and toy safety . . . fair credit reporting . . . these are a few.

The 92d Congress has expanded this record:

Flammable Fabrics Amendments of 1971 require manufacturers to certify that their products meet stringent anti-fire requirements.

Consumer Product Safety Act of 1972 assigns the Federal government a major role in protecting the consumer from unreasonable risks of death, injury or illness caused by consumer products. A new Consumer Product Safety Agency will set mandatory standards and remove products from distribution when necessary.

The Automobile "Bumper Bill" directs the Secretary of Transportation to fix minimum standards for bumpers to halt or reduce auto damage in low-speed collisions. The bill also outlaws tampering with mileage gauges.

NEW BILLS TO FIGHT CRIME AND DRUGS

Every public opinion poll of recent years shows that crime and drug abuse are major concerns of the American people. The 92nd Congress continued to face up to mounting problems in these crucial areas:

Crime

Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act. This major law provides $150 million over two years for:

Education and counseling, health services and recreational facilities for potential juvenile delinquents.

Training personnel in the juvenile delinquency field.

Drug abuse

Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act. This new law provides over $6 billion to—

Establish a National Institute on Drug Abuse;

Increase funds for special drug projects under the Community Mental Health Centers Act;

Help states develop drug abuse programs; and

Require federally funded health facilities to offer needed treatment to drug addicts.

Foreign Shipments of Narcotics. Gives the President power to halt foreign aid to countries which allow shipments of narcotics into the U.S. or allow the continued flow of drugs to our servicemen overseas.

Addiction of Servicemen. Another new law requires the military to identify drug-dependent servicemen and to treat them.

Rehabilitation of Addicts. A third measure creates new programs to encourage the employment of rehabilitated addicts, with special preference for veterans.

CONGRESS AIDS RURAL AREAS

Too many rural Americans are denied the basic necessities of modern life. That's why many migrate to the large cities.

With passage of the Rural Development Act of 1972, Congress sought to improve the conditions of rural living, especially by increasing job opportunities on farms and in small towns.

The new law provides help for rural communities for housing, water quality management, pollution control and farm credit.

NEW AMENDMENTS BROADEN RIGHTS

The 26th and 27th Amendments to the Constitution were passed by this Congress to guarantee the vote to 18-year-olds and to end discrimination based on sex.

18-year-old vote—This Amendment, first proposed in World War II, extends the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older in *all* elections. It was quickly ratified by the states and signed in July 1971. Because of it, eleven million more voters are eligible to vote in the Presidential election this year.

Equal Rights for Women—Throughout history, our laws, attitudes, regulations and customs have often discriminated against women. Numerous distinctions based on sex still exist in law. For example:

Twenty-six states prohibit women from working in certain occupations;

Thirty-seven states have fair employment practice laws, but only fifteen prohibit discrimination in employment based on sex; and

Some communities still have dual pay schedules for men and women public school teachers.

To end discrimination, the Equal Rights Amendment says: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex."

Twenty-one states have already ratified the Amendment; thirty-eight are required.

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS TROUBLE CONGRESS

Since January 1969, unemployment in the U.S. has climbed to over 5½ percent. The 1969 dollar has lost 12½ cents in value. The number of Americans on welfare has doubled. Business is off, profits are down and government tax revenues have dropped sharply. The Federal budget continues to show record deficits.

So one of the top priorities of this Congress was to help put people back to work. We passed the *Accelerated Public Works Act of 1971,* authorizing $2 billion to create 170,000 jobs in the public sector. (President Nixon vetoed this bill.) We then passed the *Emergency Employment Act* authorizing $2¼ billion for transitional public service jobs and special state employment assistance programs. We also earmarked $275 million for additional *unemployment benefits and allowances.*

Congress also—

Extended the President's authority to establish controls on prices, rents, wages and salaries;

Increased the personal income tax exemption per taxpayer and dependents to $675; and

Came to the aid of small businesses by increasing the amounts of Federal loans and guarantees.

Finally, Congress acted to hold down record budget deficits by cutting the fat out of the Administration's budgets, while seeking to meet the nation's genuine needs. During the past three years, Congress has cut a total of $14½ billion from the Administration's appropriations requests—and the total appropriations this year will again be below the President's budget.

TRIBUTE TO JACK BETTS, FRANK BOW, AND BILL McCULLOCH

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Speaker, no congressional delegation is sustaining a greater loss this year than Ohio with the retirement of three of our most distinguished colleagues, JACK BETTS, FRANK BOW and BILL McCULLOCH. Their collective 70 years of service to their districts, State, and Nation will long serve as an inspirational example to public servants at all levels of government.

Each of these men has made his individual and very significant mark in the Congress. JACK BETTS, long recognized for his mastery of our complex tax law through his able service on the Ways and Means Committee, will be missed and remembered by so many of us for his wise counsel and warm friendship. It was so fitting that JACK sat on the Ethics Committee, for he personified moral integrity.

Surely the taxpayer had no greater ally than FRANK BOW who, as ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee, took so seriously and conscientiously the responsibility of judiciously spending the public's money. At an age when many would be considering retirement and an easier pace, FRANK very characteristically accepted the President's request that he become our Ambassador to Panama and has just begun an entirely new and challenging career in diplomacy. His great talents insure his continuing contribution in yet another arena.

Our Nation owes an enormous debt to BILL McCULLOCH. Motivated by principle and not politics. BILL has fought valiantly for civil rights laws guaranteeing equal opportunity for all Americans. Existing law in this field is the greatest testimonial to BILL McCULLOCH, for without his brilliant and courageous dedication, these laws might not have been enacted.

And so to three fine friends I reluctantly say farewell. As a relative newcomer, I have learned so much from each of you, lessons that will stand me in good stead for the rest of my life. Please know how proud and grateful I am to have served with you in the Congress. May the years ahead be all that you want them to be.

WATKINS M. ABBITT

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, Congress is diminished whenever a hard worker leaves. Thus, it will be greatly lessened when WATKINS ABBITT retires. His intensive work in the House Agricultural Committee and the House Administration Committee helped both committees carry on their high standards.

A veteran of the Congress, Mr. ABBITT has unselfishly supplied Virginians with 24 years of devoted service. He more than carried his share of the load and thus, was a pleasure to work with.

As a Democrat, he was a stanch bearer of the party standards, and frequently offered his services to benefit his fellow Democrats. He will be a hard man to replace.

Mr. Speaker, I am truly sorry that WATKINS ABBITT is leaving. He will be missed by his Virginian constituents, his fellow Members, and fellow Democrats. I salute Mr. ABBITT.

KENSINGTON HIGH HONORS RETIRING TEACHERS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, Anne McIlhenney Matthews never misses an opportunity to compliment those who have dedicated themselves to making this a

better world. In her column in the Buffalo Courier Express, she has consistently sought out those in our community who have contributed much to society, and has called their fine deeds to the attention of the public.

In recent columns of June 30, 1972, and September 15, 1972, she made special mention of the retiring teachers at Kensington High School in my district. It is certainly an honor and a privilege to insert these columns into the RECORD:

SCHOOL LOSING DEDICATED GROUP

(By Anne McIlhenney Matthews)

My old alma mater, Kensington High School, is losing some of the finest and most dedicated teachers to retirement this year. Of the 12 whose resignations were accepted by the Board of Education Wednesday, four were members of the original faculty that were assigned there when Kensington High School opened in September 1937.

The group represents 450 teaching years and 361 years at Kensington High School.

The four Kensington veterans who started the Suffolk St. school under the leadership of one of the most tremendous school principals ever to serve in the Buffalo public school system—the late Thomas J. (Tom) McDonnell—are: Miss Agnes J. Creahan, Miss Ruth C. Culliton, Miss Mildred T. Kennedy and Miss Catherine T. Valente.

Their teaching records are: Miss Creahan, 46 years teaching, 35 at Kensington; Miss Culliton, 39 years teaching, 35 at Kensington; Miss Kennedy, 39 years teaching, 35 at Kensington; Miss Valente, 39 years teaching, 35 at Kensington.

Miss Creahan taught mathematics and was senior boys study room teacher; Miss Culliton taught English; Miss Kennedy taught English, and Miss Valente taught French.

The eight other retiring teachers and their records are: Wilbur S. Bergstrom, physical education teacher for 37 years, 17 years at Kensington; Anne Connors, 32 years teaching, 29 at Kensington, instructor at mathematics; Pauline T. Corcoran, 39 years teaching, 19 at Kensington, guidance counselor; Irma M. Dickman, 34 years teaching, 34 at Kensington, social studies; Vincent P. Kelly, 36 years teaching, 21 at Kensington, science teacher; John F. Reilly, 34 years teaching, 34 at Kensington, accounting; Genevieve R. Steffan, 38 years teaching, 33 at Kensington, stenography and typing; and Mildred L. Stewart, 37 years teaching, 34 at Kensington, English.

It had been rumored weeks ago that there would be a rush of teachers to retirement because a State Teachers Retirement System rule held that retirement pension would be based on the highest salary paid in the last three years as contrasted with the old rule of five years.

The three-year rule was dated to expire June 30 and it was said that future retirement would result in a lower pension. However, it was stated by Associate Supt. James M. Connors this week that the three year rule has been extended for another year.

PARK SHOW OFFERS VARIETY

(By Anne McIlhenney Matthews)

Added to the 12 teachers from Kensington High School who announced their retirement on June 30, are four more members of the notable faculty that helped open the Suffolk Avenue school in 1938.

There are thousands of Buffalonians in important careers and positions in Buffalo who owe achievement in their skills to these 16 dedicated teachers and it is hoped that they will turn out in numbers to salute the group at a retirement party planned for Monday evening, Oct. 9 at Mr. Anthony's, Transit Rd., near Sheridan Dr., 6 p.m. cocktails, 7:30 p.m. dinner.

"Mr. Anthony" has a vested interest in the success of this night of testimonial. He is a Kensington graduate. Invitations have been sent out to many school teachers in Buffalo who have long been associated with the Kensington sixteen. All former pupils are especially urged to attend the affair which is nominally priced. It should be a fun thing as well as a great reunion with former graduates because speeches will be "taboo" . . . instead "surprise entertainment."

The four teachers in addition to those whose careers I noted on June 30 are as follows: Ralph Stephen Duquin, 43 years as a physical education teacher, 17 at Kensington; Margaret M. McGee, 43 years as a math teacher, 34 at Kensington; John T. Meegan, 36 years a business teacher, 34 at Kensington; Ann I. Maloney, 42 years an English teacher, 35 at Kensington.

These four are added to the previously announced retirees: Wilbur Bergstrom, Anne Connors, Pauline Corcoran, Agnes Creahan, Ruth Culliton, Irma Dickman, Mildred Kennedy, Vincent Kelly, John Reilly, Genevieve Steffan, Mildred Stewart, and Catherine Valente.

Richard Wilcox is chairman of the affair and can be reached for tickets at 856-7471.

PRIORITY BELONGS TO CONSUMER

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, recently, three large meatpacking companies took the State of Michigan to court charging that its high standards for ground meats, such as hotdogs and sausages, should be lowered to conform with Federal levels. Because I shared the concern of Michigan officials and consumers, I strongly urged, in the House Agriculture Committee and on the floor during consideration of S. 1316, the Federal Meat Inspection Act Amendments of 1972, action to preserve Michigan's better quality standards which prohibit the use of stomachs, spleens, pig snouts, pig ears and similar animal parts. Even though this effort was successful, unfortunately the bill as a whole was defeated for other reasons, and a new attempt may have to be made in the 93d Congress if the court's ruling, now being appealed, is not favorably resolved.

The State Journal of Lansing, Mich., devoted its lead editorial on Tuesday, October 17, 1972 to this most disturbing situation and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and the Nation.

PRIORITY BELONGS TO CONSUMER

Michigan suffered a setback last week when the U.S. Court of Appeals ruled that a strict state law covering ingredients in packaged meat products has been preempted by a more lenient federal uniform food law.

Gov. Milliken, Dale Ball, agriculture director, and the attorney general's office have vowed to fight on, going to the U.S. Supreme Court if necessary to save a law that has been a strong safeguard for state consumers since 1952.

The federal law dates from 1967 and was designed to bring uniform meat packaging standards throughout the country. The appeals court ruled that to exempt any state from the federal standards would defeat the purpose of the federal act.

That argument is not without merit, since the purpose of any uniform federal law is to prevent the various states from deviating and bowing to special interests at consumers' expense.

The appeals court, it appears, was forced to rule more on the question of federal authority versus state's right than on the question of what's best for the consumer.

In this case it is clear that the Michigan law is heavily in favor of the public in its prohibition of the use of certain waste materials in packaged meat. It is a law which has proven its merit.

Future court fights on the issue will likely hinge on the federal versus state's rights point, and it will be a tough one for Michigan officials to overcome. But we encourage the governor, Ball and the attorney general to continue the struggle.

The last resort may be a campaign to persuade Congress to upgrade the federal meat packaging standards. If there is going to be real uniformity, then let it be in favor of the consuming public.

THE PACIFIC BASIN ECONOMIC COUNCIL

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the Pacific Basin Economic Council, now going into its sixth year, is an informal organization of business executives from five member countries—Australia, Canada, Japan, New Zealand, and the United States—and is regarded as an excellent forum for the mutual exchange of thoughts and ideas by business leaders in the Pacific Ocean area.

Mr. Clif Terry, one of the representatives from Hawaii, is chairman of the International Standing Committee on Tourism and a vice chairman of the U.S. National Committee of the Pacific Basin Economic Council.

The September 1972, edition of Fortune magazine contained an article on the Council as well as a Pacific Basin Charter on International Investment promulgated by the Council. In order that my colleagues may be advised on these activities, I am pleased to insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

PACIFIC BASIN ECONOMIC COUNCIL

Theodore Roosevelt once predicted that the Pacific—"greatest of the seas"—would become first in importance. Today his prediction is rapidly being fulfilled. In the past decade, most of the non-Communist countries rimming the Pacific have enjoyed an unprecedented period of economic growth. The Pacific has become the world's most dynamic trading region and is, potentially, the greatest. An already enormous market is expanding while a wealth of natural and human resources still await development. As economic activity has intensified, the Pacific basin has awakened to a new sense of interdependence and a community of interests.

There is no more dramatic or significant manifestation of this community of interest than the Pacific Basin Economic Council (PBEC), which in May concluded its fifth and most successful general meeting at Wellington, New Zealand. Organized only six years ago, the council is an informal organization of senior business executives representing the major corporations in its five member countries—Australia, Canada, Japan, New Zealand and the United States.

In the past five years, PBEC has progressed from "an organization in search of a cause"—to quote its international deputy president,

Mr. Charles W. Robinson—"to one which is now prepared to play a positive role in developing the multilateral structure of economic cooperation in the Pacific." A significant first step was taken in Wellington where PBEC, after two years of intensive study and discussion, endorsed and promulgated A Pacific Basin Charter on International Investment (the full text of which appears in this special section). This farsighted and imaginative charter offers criteria aimed not only at enhancing the investment environment but also at reconciling it with the economic and social aspirations of the developing countries. In promulating the charter PBEC expressed the "hope that it will become the focus for a continuous exchange of views between business and governments" and enhance the climate for investment.

Significant too, and indicative of the widening influence of PBEC in promoting a fruitful exchange of views, were the presence and participation at the Wellington meeting, not only of more than 300 representatives from its member countries but also of observers from Korea, the Republic of China, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Fiji and, for the first time, a delegation from Latin America representing Peru. Also in attendance were representatives of the United Nations and the Private Investment Co. for Asia.

PBEC is a unique organization operating in the interests of private enterprise under a covenant pledging its membership to strengthen business and economic relationships among its member countries and to generate greater economic and social progress among the developing countries of the Pacific region. It is the only organization that now deals with the regional problems as an entity and from a multinational standpoint. It does so not as an exclusive businessman's club or an economic bloc, nor does it aspire to become an incipient Common Market. It seeks instead to promote multi-national cooperation in the broadest global context and its activities embrace the whole range of human concern as represented by the work of its five international standing committees: Economic Development, Natural Resources, Human Resources, Transport, Tourism and a new committee, just appointed, on the Environment. Of particular importance to the developing countries is the initiative taken by PBEC in addressing itself to the most urgent problem of the Third World: how to balance employment with economic growth.

In origin and membership PBEC is truly international. The founders were Mr. Shigeo Nagano, chairman, the Nippon Steel Corporation, and Mr. R. W. C. Anderson, director-general, the Australian Chamber of Manufacturers. The retiring President was Sir Edward Warren, Managing Director, the Wallarah Coal Co. Ltd. of Sydney, Australia. The international President is Mr. Kenneth Clarke, President, Canadian Marketing Division, International Nickel Co. of Canada Ltd., and the deputy President is Mr. Charles W. Robinson of the Marcona Corporation. The chairman of the U.S. National Committee is Richard P. Cooley, Wells Fargo Bank. All the members of the organization represent multinational corporations working in the public interest for economic and social progress.

The Pacific Basin Charter on International Investments

(A declaration of basic principles)

(Note.—The Pacific Basin Charter on International Investments is a declaration of basic principles adopted at the PBEC Fifth General Meeting in Wellington, New Zealand. This text will serve as a basis for discussion during 1972–73 with business, governments and international agencies in both developed and developing nations.)

Preamble

We, the Members of the Pacific Basin Economic Council (PBEC) and as members of the international business community from Australia, Canada, Japan, New Zealand and the United States, recognizing the vast demands for an increasing flow of private investment capital across national boundaries and the fundamental importance of improving the investment environment in all Pacific Nations, hereby endorse, and invite other organizations—public and private—to embrace a Pacific Basin Charter on International Investments.

We advance the principles of this Charter with high aspirations that they will be increasingly accepted and applied by governments and international business in the Pacific Basin and with a firm belief that these steps will foster more rapid and sound economic and social progress—as well as strengthen free enterprise—in the Pacific Community of Nations.

Our objective in this initiative is to fulfill a responsibility to governments and private enterprise by indicating the basis on which we believe sound and constructive investment can be attracted to the economic development process in nations subscribing to private enterprise concepts.

We believe that widening application of the principles in this Charter will, among other things, facilitate the flow of capital—both public and private—to developing nations in line with goals established by the United Nations.

Basic Principles

A. Responsibilities

1. International investors in the pursuit of their business objectives should proceed in ways that will contribute to established economic and social development programs particularly in host countries, and they should maintain a sensitivity to changing national goals and aspirations in all countries with which they are concerned.

2. Governments wishing to receive international investments should strive to develop an economic and business environment—including appropriate inter-governmental agreements—conducive to the flourishing of private enterprise in the interests of all parties involved and consistent with the achievement of national economic and social objectives.

3. Governments of countries from which private capital flows abroad should strive to develop agreements with other governments aimed at encouraging private investments and the growth of international business in the mutual interests of the countries concerned.

B. Policies

1. International investors should fully recognize the sovereign rights and responsibilities of governments and be willing to accept reasonable obligations that are placed upon business enterprises in the national interest.

2. Governments should insure that their policies are applied on a fair and nondiscriminatory basis and that they do not serve to abrogate on a unilateral basis investment agreements entered into in good faith.

3. Governments should publicly announce policies—together with appropriate details—concerning their economic priorities as well as on the encouragement and/or limitation of international investment, both incoming and outgoing.

4. Governments—especially those of nations in a creditor or favorable foreign exchange situation—should stimulate and encourage the flow of private investments abroad.

5. International investors should be accorded freedom of action and treatment by governments on a basis no less favorable than is applied to national investors except for those fields and circumstances in which restrictions or conditions on international investment have been publicly announced and duly established with reasonable notice.

6. In selecting projects and in operating their enterprises, international investors should give prime emphasis to activities that provide long-term net additions to the economies of host countries and that cannot be as effectively provided by national investors. They should also utilize and assist in the development of local resources, human and physical, as well as local industrial capabilities to the fullest extent possible.

7. Both international investors and governments should fully implement the terms and conditions of investment agreements to which they are partners. These agreements should be altered only by mutual acceptance of new terms and conditions as may be proposed by either party; they should not be altered by unilateral actions from governments or other parties.

8. International investors should maintain high standards of conduct in all their relationships with governments and other parties, thereby maintaining their enterprises as national and international corporate citizens of high standing and integrity.

9. Both international investors and governments in their mutual interests should give special emphasis in their planning and operations (including transfers of funds) to continuity, growth and sound long-range development of international investment projects. Governments wishing incoming international investments only for limited periods of time should announce their policies in this respect and thus recognize that this will restrict the inflow of sound constructive investment.

10. Governments and international investors should support the principle of multinational effort to create and maintain a feasible and mutually-acceptable international investment insurance or re-insurance program.

11. International investors and governments should jointly strive in their mutual interest to enhance the ecological environment associated with investment projects.

C. Operations

1. Ownership-Management-Employment

1.1 International investors should be permitted to own and manage their enterprises except as may otherwise be agreed with governments and/or with national investors. Ample opportunities should be available to national investors to participate through joint ventures or otherwise in ownership and management of international enterprises operating in their countries. Governments should look with favor on the development of joint ventures when they are proposed by national and international investors.

1.2 To the extent feasible for both national and international investors, investment agreements should provide opportunities for national investors to increase to agreed-upon levels their initial equity participation in joint ventures operating in their countries. Governments should not unilaterally impose requirements for local equity participation or for greater local ownership after an investment agreement for a given period has been approved on some other basis.

1.3 International investors should train and utilize local personnel in their foreign enterprises, and make every effort to include nationals in management positions. However, international investors should be permitted to employ persons from other countries as may be necessary for efficient operation of their enterprises, particularly duing the early stages of development, and they should be encouraged to engage in such employment when technological and other "know how" is an important consideration.

2. Taxation-Financing-Transfers

2.1 Governments should levy taxes on international investors and their employees from abroad on a basis no less favorable than those levied on national investors and their national employees. They should strive to maintain a stable tax system involving reasonable rates and through international agreements to avoid double taxation as between countries.

2.2 International investors and governments should seek to strengthen local capital markets and to cooperate in developing sound financial systems and regulations. The former should seek financing from national sources only after due consideration of available funds in relation to needs of national enterprises; the latter should not place undue restrictions on local financing by international investors except as may be mutually agreeable in particular cases.

2.3 Capital transmitted to a country through recognized banking channels, dividends or profits thereon, as well as license and royalty fees, should be freely transferable by international investors. Otherwise, to the extent exchange controls are maintained by governments, equal treatment in applying such controls should be given to national and international investors.

2.4 In international transfers of funds, both governments and international investors should proceed in a manner consistent with the articles of the International Monetary Fund and international banking practices, and as may be fair and reasonable to the parties concerned.

3. Life and Property

3.1 International investors should observe all policies and requirements of governments pertaining to the protection of life and property. Governments should ensure that adequate protection of this type is available to international investors.

3.2 Governments should not unilaterally take ownership or control of the property of international investors except as may be necessary under very special circumstances (e.g., serious violations of agreements, war, hostilities or public emergency) and then only with prompt and reasonable compensation.

4. Commercial Policies

4.1 International investors should conduct their business affairs in such a way as to create a fair return to their local enterprises and to host countries taking into account all international agreements between the governments concerned.

4.2 International enterprises in a given country should normally have access to regional and other markets available to national enterprises.

4.3 International investors should not apply policy restraints which would prevent or discourage their local enterprises from competing in other national and international markets except as such limitations may arise from application of patent rights.

4.4 In the process of operating in other countries, international investors should strive to avoid the development of positions in local markets of any industry or type of business beyond that recognized at the outset by all parties concerned as being appropriate or necessary.

5. International trade

5.1 Governments should facilitate the importation by international investors of equipment and raw materials unavailable in local markets at reasonable prices as may be necessary for efficient operation of their enterprises and in other ways should strive to reduce international trade barriers.

5.2 Requirements by governments on the use by international investors of available locally-produced equipment, materials and services should be fair and reasonable taking into account quality considerations.

5.3 International investors should import and export equipment, raw materials and other goods to and from their affiliated companies in line with open market conditions.

6. Legislation

6.1 International investors should fully comply with legislation, regulations and international agreements within and among the governments concerned.

6.2 Legislation affecting international investment should be fair and reasonable as well as nondiscriminatory among all types of investors.

6.3 Governments should not attempt to extend their laws and regulations in such a way as to influence business activities in other countries and should strive through diplomatic channels to resolve problems in cases where legal acts in a foreign jurisdiction have undesirable consequences in their own jurisdiction.

7. Technology

7.1 Governments should encourage and international investors should strive to stimulate the flow of technology—as well as sound managerial concepts and practices—across national boundaries, the main objective being to improve the technological capabilities of recipient nations.

7.2 Governments should recognize the rights of international investors to receive reasonable payment covering the use of their proprietary technology.

8. Consultations

8.1 Governments and international investors should give sympathetic consideration to and adequate opportunity for consultations on any policy or operating problems raised by one party with the other. In the event a mutually satisfactory solution to a given problem cannot be reached, the parties concerned should seek suggestions from a mutually acceptable third party such as the International Center for the Settlement of Investment Disputes.

PACIFIC BASIN ECONOMIC COUNCIL OFFICERS—1972–1973

President

Mr. K. H. J. Clarke, President, Canadian Marketing Division, The International Nickel Company of Canada, Ltd., Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Deputy President

Mr. C. W. Robinson, President, Marcona Corporation, San Francisco, California.

Vice Presidents

Sir James Vernon, C.B.E., Director and General Manager, The Colonial Sugar Refining Company Ltd., Sydney, Australia.

Mr. Shigeo Nagano, Representative Director and Chairman, Nippon Steel Corporation, Tokyo, Japan.

Mr. John Mowbray, General Manager, The National Bank of New Zealand Limited, Wellington, New Zealand.

Director-General

Mr. W. D. H. Frechette, Executive Vice President, The Canadian Manufacturers' Association, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

National Committee Chairmen

Sir James Vernon, C.B.E., Director and General Manager, The Colonial Sugar Refining Company Ltd., Sydney, Australia.

Mr. W. D. H. Gardiner, Vice President, The Royal Bank of Canada, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

Mr. Shigeo Nagano, Representative Director and Chairman, Nippon Steel Corporation, Tokyo, Japan.

Mr. John Mowbray, General Manager, The National Bank of New Zealand Ltd., Wellington, New Zealand.

Mr. Richard P. Cooley, President, Wells Fargo Bank, San Francisco, California.

International Standing Committees

Economic Development

Chairman: Mr. Yoshizane Iwasa, Chairman, The Fuji Bank Ltd., Tokyo, Japan.

Deputy Chairman: Mr. J. H. Stevens, President, Canada Wire and Cable Company Ltd., Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Natural Resources Development

Chairman: Mr. A. H. Parbo, Managing Director, Western Mining Corporation Ltd., Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.

Deputy Chairman: Mr. P. S. Plummer, Chairman, W. Richmond (Meat Exporters) Hastings, Waipawa, New Zealand.

Human Resources Development

Chairman: Mr. E. A. Crothall, Managing Director, Management Services Ltd., Christchurch, New Zealand.

Deputy Chairman: Mr. Gordon L. Ness, Board Chairman, President, Ness Industries Inc., Atherton, California.

Transportation

Chairman: Mr. A. H. Hart, Q.C., Sr. Vice-President, Canadian National Railways, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

Deputy Chairman: Mr. R. W. Bruce Reid, Managing Director, Oceangas Australia Pty. Ltd., Sydney, Australia.

Tourism

Chairman: Mr. Clifton D. Terry, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Bank of Hawaii, Honolulu.

Deputy Chairman: Dr. Shizuma Matsuo, Chairman, Japan Air Lines Company Ltd., Tokyo, Japan.

Environment

Chairman: Mr. Fumihiko Kono, Chairman, Mitsubishi Heavy Industries Ltd., Tokyo, Japan.

Deputy Chairman: Mr. R. Coulton, Chairman, Commonwealth Steel Co., Ltd., Newcastle, N.S.W., Australia.

Special International Committee on the Pacific Basin Charter

Chairman: Dr. Weldon B. Gibson, Executive Vice President, Stanford Research Institute, Menlo Park, California.

DAVID PRYOR

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished colleagues in the words of tribute they have paid to DAVID PRYOR of Arkansas. During his years in the House, DAVID has been a truly gifted legislator, and his spirit, dedication and courage have been an inspiration to us all.

Prior to joining us in Congress, DAVID served in the Arkansas General Assembly where he was known as one of a hearty band of "Young Turks," seeking reforms in Arkansas government. He is best remembered as the author of the County Purchase Act of 1965. Upon Congressman PRYOR's arrival in the U.S. House of Representatives, he was appointed to membership on the prestigious Appropriations Committee, where he has served with distinction. His fellow freshman Representatives in the 90th Congress selected DAVID as president of their organization, known as the 90th Club.

A great deal of DAVID's energies have been devoted to the problems of our eld-

erly and the expert knowledge and understanding he has acquired in this area are unparalleled in this body. The legislation and resulting programs for the elderly will reflect impressively and indicate his imprint in the field of geriatrics for generations to come.

We will all miss DAVID's wise counsel, rich experience, and helpful guidance. I know he has a distinguished future ahead of him in public life.

Mrs. O'Neill joins me in wishing him the very best of luck and success in the years to come.

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, IRV WHALLEY has served the State of Pennsylvania and the Nation with great distinction. We will miss him here in the Congress and wish for him continued success in his retirement. Mr. Speaker, IRV WHALLEY brought to this House a colorful and rich background as one of the oldtime barnstormers and aviators. He is a man devoted to the highest religious principles and ideals. A true Christian, he is man of utmost honesty and the highest integrity. It has been a great pleasure serving with IRV in the Congress of the United States, and we wish for him every happiness and the best always.

FRANK HECHT: IMMIGRANT OF 50 YEARS AGO

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I have known of many stories similar to that of Frank Hecht, the man whose story I shall ask shortly to be printed in the RECORD. I have known them because, as a boy and a young man, I lived in an area of many immigrants. In fact, my father was an immigrant who came to this country when he was 4 months old in 1876.

These are days of cynicism and far too great a flagrant and abrasive ridicule of many aspects of our past and the values attaching to it.

Hence, Frank Hecht's way of saying thank you is heartening and refreshing.

Frank Hecht came to America 50 years ago from a family in Germany. "We were starving," he said. Hence, he got to this country in search of a better place.

Fifty years later, he inserted an ad in the Council Bluffs, Iowa, Nonpareil. An October 5 article in the Omaha World-Herald gave the story behind that ad. I ask unanimous consent that the ad and the story be printed in the RECORD.

A prominent Omaha businessman called the ad and the story to my attenion, saying: "I think it is unique."

Thank you, Sam Segnar.

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

IMMIGRANT OF 50 YEARS AGO SAYS THANKS TO TWO "UNCLES"

COUNCIL BLUFFS.—The train was pulling out of the Bluffs Burlington station about 11 p.m. that October night in 1922.

Watching it leave was a short, frail 11-year-old boy in rumpled knickers who had just completed a lonely journey from his native Germany.

Moments later, florist Frank Hecht got a call from the station agent "who said he had a boy there with tags all over him with my name on them."

That event, and the years that were to follow were commemorated last week when that boy—now 61-year-old Frank J. Hecht of Mankato, Minn.—purchased a full page newspaper ad to publish a "thank you note" to "my Uncle Frank and my Uncle Sam."

In part the note said: "In Germany, I was the oldest child and we were starving, but receiving occasional food parcels from Uncle Frank in Council Bluffs, which motivated me to write and ask if he would let me come to the United States to live with him.

"These packages were all the evidence I needed that he lived in a better place than I did.

"He applied for an immigration permit to Uncle Sam which was granted and Uncle Frank sent me the ticket."

WORKING AT 85

Now 85, but still working daily in the family floral shop at 316 Fleming Street, the elder Hecht recalls the young boy who made his own decision to come to America.

"They lived in a two-room apartment in Stuttgart and they were poor."

"I remember he said he saved the oranges he got on the ship so he would have something to eat on the train, but they took them away from him when the boat docked in New York. I guess you couldn't bring fruit into the country. He never forgot that."

The elder Hecht came to America in 1910 and after World War I acted as sponsor for "about 25" young men from Germany, not as young as his nephew.

During a telephone interview from his office in Mankato, the younger Frank Hecht renewed his praise of his uncle and of the United States.

FAIRY TALE

He is now owner of the Valley News Co., a magazine distribution firm, owns a similar firm—Husker News—in Atlantic, Iowa as well as the Ace Beer Distributing Co. there.

He remembers the dismal years after World War I in Germany.

He said, "There's a German fairy tale that says if you eat through a mountain of rice you'll find the land of the golden apples—and I was sure my Uncle Frank had found this land."

"The packages he sent had wonderful things in them— food that we couldn't have bought even if we had had the money.

"Without my folks even knowing it, I wrote him asking if I could come and live with him.

"My folks? They didn't hesitate to let me go. They knew it would be one less child going hungry and that I'd have a better chance."

In the Bluffs, he had to begin school in the first grade because he could not speak English.

But within two years at Harrison School, which still stands, he was a year ahead of other students his age.

In his high school years, Frank Hecht left the Bluffs to live with other relatives in Stanton, Neb., and, in the stock market crash of 1929, "me and another fellow went to Chicago to see what the world had in store."

After a few false starts, he got a job with a magazine distributing company and took over the Mankato firm in 1940.

"This country has been good to me and I can't help but tell you how fortunate I am to be an American."

"My hope is that every American would appreciate his freedoms more."

WALLS BRINGS TEARS

"I stood at the Berlin Wall about six years ago and almost cried to think that I might have been subjected to something like that."

"If some of the people in this country could stand at that wall they wouldn't do any complaining about this country."

Hecht has visited his homeland often and still makes the trip semiannually to visit his mother, now 86.

He said the final paragraph in his full page "thank you," in the Council Bluffs Nonpareil sums up his feelings:

"So again, my deepest gratitude to my Uncle Frank and my Uncle Sam for letting me be an American. I shall cherish it to my dying breath and trust that my children and my children's children will do likewise."

ON MY 50TH ANNIVERSARY IN THE UNITED STATES A SINCERE "THANK YOU" NOTE TO MY UNCLE FRANK AND MY UNCLE SAM

Fifty years ago this month, October, 1922, at the age of 11, I—a hungry German immigrant—came to Council Bluffs to my Uncle Frank Hecht.

In Germany, I was the oldest child and we were starving, but receiving occasional food parcels from Uncle Frank in Council Bluffs, which motivated me to write and ask if he would let me come to the United States to live with him. These packages were all the evidence I needed that he lived in a better place than I did. He applied for an immigration permit to Uncle Sam which was granted and Uncle Frank sent me the ticket.

My first banana, which he bought for me at the Peoples Store the morning after I arrived, convinced me that I now lived in the right place. I could call this my Golden Anniversary, but it would not properly express my feelings. Every anniversary has been a Golden one—yes, all fifty of them.

I can't help but tell you how fortunate I am to be an American. Freedom of speech, freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom of religion, freedom of the press. Yes, freedom to swim across any river without being shot to death. Freedom to cross any American border and return. My only hope and wish is that every American would cherish these things more. If we only did that, then no thinking American would want to change any part of our system or our way of life.

So, again, my deepest gratitude to my Uncle Frank and my Uncle Sam for letting me be an American. I shall cherish it to my dying breath and trust that my children and my children's children will do likewise.

FRANK J. HECHT.

ACTION ON MAJOR BILLS IN 1972

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report to the residents of the Ninth Congressional District of Indiana on the 92d Congress action on major bills in 1972. The re-

port is to be distributed after the adjournment of the Congress:

ACTION ON MAJOR BILLS IN 1972

ENACTED

Campaign spending—limits advertising expenditures by presidential and other federal candidates and sets strict requirements for reporting contributions and expenditures.

Women's rights—clears for ratification by the states a constitutional amendment prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sex.

Revenue sharing—returns to state and local governments a portion of federal taxes to finance state, county and city services.

Busing—postpones court-ordered school busing and limits the use of federal funds for busing intended to overcome racial imbalance.

Strategic arms agreement—approves U.S.-U.S.R.R. agreement limiting offensive nuclear missile systems.

Wage Board employees—establishes a new system for adjusting and increasing pay rates for federal wage board employees.

Rural development—expands size and coverage of federal loan authority for individuals and businesses in rural areas; expands federal flood control efforts.

Pesticides—regulates the manufacture, distribution and use of pesticides.

Higher education—continues and expands existing programs of federal aid to colleges and students and vocational education programs. Creates National Institute of Education to promote educational reform.

Pollution control loans—provides $800 million in loans to small businesses to help them meet new pollution control standards.

Occupational health and safety—exempts firms with 3 or fewer employees from occupational health and safety standards.

Social security—raises benefits by 20 percent, effective September, 1972, and provides for an automatic cost of living increase in the future; raises widows' and widowers' benefits and income limitation; extends Medicare benefits to disability pensioners under 65.

Nutrition—creates a program of daily hot meals for needy older Americans.

Community services—improves scope and delivery of community services for older Americans.

OEO—extends anti-poverty and manpower training programs for three years.

Equal rights—strengthens the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to prevent discrimination in hiring.

School lunch—expands and strengthens child nutrition programs.

Marine mammals—improves the protection of marine mammals and prohibits the importation of endangered species.

Oceanic pollution—curtails and tightly regulates the dumping of pollutants into the oceans.

Veterans' compensation—increases by 10 percent the rates of compensation for disabled veterans.

Veterans' medical aid—extends VA hospital and medical benefits to wives, widows and children of veterans totally disabled because of service-connected causes, or who have died because of service-connected disability; provides outpatient hospital care for veterans.

Veterans' education—increases the monthly allowance under the GI bill by approximately 25 percent.

Drug control—coordinates the federal attack on the problem of drug abuse and traffic.

Product safety—creates an independent consumer product safety commission to protect consumers against product safety hazards.

HELD OVER FOR ACTION IN 1973

Auto insurance—provides "no fault" auto insurance.

Farm bargaining—gives the farmers more bargaining power.

Minimum wage—increases the minimum wage.

VETOED

Private pensions—provides protection for pension plans.

War powers—limits the President's authority to involve the country in hostilities without specific Congressional approval.

Housing—completely revises present federal housing programs.

Government reorganization—consolidates 7 executive departments into 4.

Health insurance—increases federal health coverage benefits.

Tax reform—redistributes tax burden and closes tax loopholes.

Veterans' drug treatment—expands veterans' drug treatment programs and provides that all servicemen and veterans, including those dishonorably discharged, are eligible for treatment.

Welfare reform—completely revises federal welfare programs and establishes an assistance "floor" for needy families.

Consumer aid—creates a Consumer Protection Agency to conduct research on consumer affairs and to represent consumers in certain court actions.

Water quality—increases federal funds for waste treatment facilities and sets as a goal the year 1968 to end all discharges of pollution into navigable waterways. Veto overridden.

Labor/HEW funds—funds the departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare. Veto sustained.

Railroad retirement—temporary 20 percent increase in benefits. Veto overriden.

LEGISLATIVE HIGHLIGHTS 92D CONGRESS—1971–72

Voting age lowered to 18.

Military draft authority extended to June 30, 1973.

Constitutional amendment to protect women's rights, now being ratified by the states.

Federal higher education programs revamped.

Two increases in social security benefits, totaling 32 percent.

SALT agreement approved.

Campaign spending laws tightened.

Revenue sharing to aid state and local governments.

Water pollution programs expanded.

THE NATION NEEDS YOUR VOTE

If you think the great majority of our citizens chooses the President, Vice-President, Senators and Congressmen, you're wrong. The great majority doesn't vote at all.

In 1968, 47 million Americans—an astonishing 40 percent of the eligible voters—failed to get to the polls in an election in which 31.8 million votes went to President Nixon, 31.3 million votes went to Hubert Humphrey, and 9.9 million votes went to George Wallace.

In the 1972 Indiana primary, only about 33 percent of the eligible voters cast their ballots.

This decline in the participation in the democratic process poses a threat to the American system—a system which has served us well. It is a living, changing process, and it needs your continuing support and participation.

Please vote on November 7.

PRAYER AMENDMENT

HON. J. KENNETH ROBINSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that a high level of interest in the prayer amendment is being maintained across the Nation, and that we may expect this support to be made evident again in the 93d Congress.

As one who signed the discharge petition for the prayer amendment resolution, and voted for it, I include, in the Extensions of Remarks, a column by William Willoughby which appeared in the Washington Star-News under date of September 30, 1972, as follows:

IS GOD BACKING THE PRAYER AMENDMENT?

Some Congressmen—in fact, an awful lot of them—don't stand a prayer of a chance of being reelected in November.

It's because their attitudes toward little school kids aren't right. With such attitudes they're making little sneaks out of kids who want to pray on company time, using company facilities.

And they're contributing, on the other hand, to the delinquency of other kids who seem to find enough latitude—on company time and with company facilities—to play all sorts of nasty little games such as Push the Pot, Mash the Maiden and Sass the Brass.

That's what, if I'm reading correctly between the lines and capturing the quintessence of the rhapsodic rhetoric, many supporters of a school prayer amendment are contending.

To a large degree, unfortunately—and I'm not particularly a supporter of a school prayer amendment—there's a lot more to what the prayer amendment supporters are saying than interlinear accusations and embellished language.

And for this reason Operation Prayer 72 is in full swing around this country. It's an operation, largely based here in Washington, that's politely telling candidates for office that if they don't support prayer amendment legislation they'd better go back to selling used cars.

And while the Operation Prayer 72 people say their effort is "non-sectarian" and "non-political," don't kid anyone. It might be non-sectarian in the loosest sense of the word—many Protestants and Catholics are involved.

But it isn't non-political. Unless, of course, one takes into consideration there are lots of Democrats, Independents and Republicans affiliated because of this one overriding interest.

The Operation Prayer '72 people are making no bones about the fact that they helped get a school prayer amendment plank into the GOP platform in August. Not since the days of Barry Goldwater had it been part of the official policy of the Republican party.

And they aren't exactly quiet about the fact that, as they put it, "the McGovern Democrats in Miami Beach shouted down such a plank."

I think I see pretty clearly which way the plank in the political teeter-totter is titled even if they do say it is non-political.

But that's not the point. They're saying that school kids don't really have the right to pray together in schools across America. They don't deny, naturally, that anyone can pray privately as he's walking along or when he should be concentrating on the question the teacher is asking him about the day's lesson.

But they do echo the words of the late Sen. Everett Dirksen who wrote in The Washington Daily News that America follows a "double standard" when it comes to prayer in public. Officials routinely allow it in such places as Congress, in the Armed Forces, or at the military academies, but forbid it publicly in the schools, Dirksen said.

Yet, as prayer amendment supporters point out, polls in various districts from which the politics come run as high as 91 percent of those polled favoring prayer amendment legislation.

The National Association of Evangelicals does not actively engage in political pushes

such as the Operation Prayer '72 people are engaged in, but one of the key figures in getting the GOP to adopt the prayer plank, along with Martha Rountree of Leadership Foundation, was Floyd Robertson, an NAE executive.

Robertson and NAE contend that, notwithstanding language in the Supreme Court rulings of a decade ago on prayer that there was no ban on public prayers, test cases since then prove pretty conclusively that no matter how one looks at it, prayer in a public sense at schools is verboten.

That's why the NAE supports prayer amendment legislation. Robertson, retiring chairman of Cherrydale Baptist Church, contends that rulings such as those against students at Netcong, N.J., and Leyden, Mass., and Fair Chance, Pa., are "legally consistent with the Supreme Court rulings."

Therefore, Robertson argues, "inasmuch as there is no other recourse to the courts the problem should be corrected by what we believe to be the proper means—legislation providing for a prayer amendment."

Spearheading the more political Operation Prayer '72 are such persons as the Rev. Robert C. Howes, a professor at Catholic University, and Mrs. Bennett Miller, a Washington housewife and national secretary of Citizens for Public Prayer.

Anyway, signs indicate that a lot of politicians might better take this prayer amendment seriously. It missed by only 28 votes last year. The Operation Prayer '72 people are looking for some good replacements, and it's doubtful they'll be satisfied to topple just 28 congressmen.

Besides, what if enough of those little kids get brave and sneak off in some corner and start praying up a storm while one of them keeps an eye out for the principal?

Those kids might even get some higher up support for such legislation.

Who knows? God, the Supreme Court notwithstanding, could possibly be interested in the prayer amendment Himself. Who's to say for sure?

HON. ALTON A. LENNON

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, AL LENNON has represented his district and the great State of North Carolina with highest distinction, in the U.S. Senate, in the U.S. House of Representatives, and also in the North Carolina Senate. The tremendous progress made by the Tarheel State during his years of service is due in no small part to AL LENNON's leadership. He leaves this body voluntarily and will be greatly missed by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, AL LENNON has served his North Carolina Seventh District and the entire State well through his dedicated membership on the great Armed Services Committee and on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. There is no installation in the Nation more crucial to our national security than is Fort Bragg. He has been a leader too, in preserving hundreds of thousands of textile jobs from cheap, low-wage imports.

Mr. Speaker, AL LENNON is one of this body's most distinguished attorneys and earlier in his career he served as a county judge. We predict for AL LENNON continued success and Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for him and his lovely family every happiness and the best always.

HON. ALTON LENNON

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1972

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I cannot see this Congress closing without expressing my personal appreciation and affection for the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable ALTON LENNON, who is retiring voluntarily. After 16 years of working together, sometimes differing in debate but always in friendly spirit, I want to assure him that he will be greatly missed.

Many Members have forgotten that he served briefly in the other body as an appointed Senator, but we are all happy that he found his true home in the people's House, where he has served his constituents and his country with great distinction. I wish him every good fortune for the future.

POLONIA TO TAKE PART IN BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the American people have begun serious planning for the 1976 American Revolution bicentennial celebration. In that year we will be celebrating 200 years of economic, political, and spiritual growth—a maturity which has been made possible by the contributions of all of America's ethnic and religious groups.

The bicentennial celebration will be a celebration of the success of a people—one people united in their dedication to American ideals and strengthened by their ethnic diversity. The bicentennial will be a reminder to all Americans that though we may have different opinions, backgrounds, or religions, we all must remain dedicated to the basic American principle of the right to be different—the right to develop one's potential in one's own way.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to report plans by the Polish American Congress, led by President Aloysius A. Mazewski, to take part in the 200th anniversary celebration of the founding of the United States.

These plans were presented at the Polish American Congress' ninth annual convention on October 6, 1972 by Dr. Edward C. Rozanski, chairman of the Polish American Congress' Committee on the bicentennial of the United States, as follows:

[From Zgoda, Oct. 15, 1972]

POLONIA'S PART IN U.S. BICENTENNIAL

Dr. Edward C. Rozanski, Chairman of the Committee on the Bicentennial of the United States, presented the following report and recommendation to the Ninth Convention of the Polish American Congress:

Bicentennial of the United States 1976 presents to Americans of Polish origin certain challenges which, we feel, must be met with vision, rectitude and determination.

Our participation in the history of this Republic has been significant and honorable.

It should and must be brought to proper light and perspective, if we are to assert our status in American life and give our younger generations the priceless awarements of their ethnic heritage.

In view of these imperatives and their relevancy to American Polonia, this Committee recommends:

1. Commissioning eminent American scholars of Polish origin to prepare papers on—

(a) Polonia's history in the United States and the scope and significance of our contributions to the founding and development of the Republic.

(b) Sociological make-up and its changes in evolution within Polonia from the very first Polish pioneers to the present status of Americans of Polish ancestry in the mainstream of American life;

(c) Polonia's contributions and participation in the field of education and culture evolving in our pluralist society;

(d) The progress of Polonia in the political and civic involvement in the United States;

(e) Polonia's struggles and attainments in the areas of profession, industry and banking.

(f) Unite the intellectuals, scholars and historians of Polish origin in the United States to serve with their talents in the Bicentennial Committee, and cooperate with all Institutions: The Kosciuszko Foundation, The Polish American Historical Association and any others wishing to join the Bicentennial activities.

We realize that all these subjects are interdependent and in certain areas overlapping. Their relevance, integration and interpretation should be detailed and appraised by scholars.

2. It is recommended that this Convention instruct the next PAC administration, and devise the means of financing the following projects in 1976:

(a) Presentation of Kosciuszko historic contribution to the Saratoga victory;

(b) Presentation of Pulaski's deeds at Brandywine, Valley Forge and Charleston;

(c) Presentation of the part General Krzyzanowski played at Gettysburg.

These presentations could be offered to the public in the form of pageants or special commemorated publications.

3. The Committee is not in a position to present a detailed plan or estimate their cost at the present time.

Therefore, it is recommended that the present Committee be given permanent status by this Convention to make feasability studies and cost estimates and submit to the next administration a list of eminent Americans of Polish origin from which a permanent Bicentennial Committee could be formed.

These recommendations were unanimously accepted by the Convention.

Members of the Committee are: Rt. Rev. Francis Rowinski, Bishop of the Polish National Catholic Church; writer-historian Arthur J. Waldo; Very Rev. Michael Zembrzuski; Zygmunt Sluszka; Stephen Obremski; Anthony Piwowarczyk; Dr. Z. W. Sobal; Dr. Stanley Sulkowski; Kazimierz Burawski; Mitchell Cwiek; Zofia Zyski-Kline; Dr. Joseph A. Wytrwal, author of several volumes on Polish American history; Rev. M. T. Madaj; Very Rev. Walter J. Ziemba of the Orchard Lake Schools; PNA Director Estelle Neider; Very Rev. Msgr. Zdzislaw Peszkowski; Dr. Eugene L. Sikorski; Stanley Sredzinski; Victoria P. Lewicki; Rose Corso; John M. Frysiak; Dr. W. Sikora and Stephanie Gondek.

President Mazewski expressed the sentiment of those assembled at the recent Polish-American Congress convention in Detroit by saying:

MAZEWSKI ISSUES PAC CONVENTION MESSAGE

Our next, the Tenth National Convention of the Polish American Congress will coincide with the 200th anniversary of the founding of the United States.

As Americans of Polish origin and tradition, we are heirs of a proud legacy. Pioneers, military leaders, educators, scientists, technicians, workers and farmers from Poland contributed significantly to the birth, growth, development and defense of our beloved Republic.

These deeds and accomplishments are only partially known to us and recognized by our American compatriots. The major portion of our history as an ethnic entity of considerable measure in the pluralist society of the United States, is still gathering dust in the archives and forgotten documents of America's past.

These will have to be brought to light to enhance Polonia's status in all walks of American life and end the derogatory, and, at times, vicious outbursts against Americans of Polish heritage in the communications media.

Toward this end I recommend that the Convention instruct and empower the Executive Board to be elected, to appoint a Bicentennial Committee of American historians and scholars of Polish origin to prepare an appropriate monograph and spell out details of our participation in the Bicentennial Observances.

Budgetary provisions for this project should be set by the Convention.

In considering this plan, we should be mindful of the premise that by planning our American past in proper perspective and spotlighting its relevancy to our times, we would be making a strong and eloquent appeal to our younger generations to get involved in Polonio's pursuits and objectives.

I want to commend and congratulate the Polish American Congress for moving forward in a positive and constructive manner to participate in America's bicentennial celebration by emphasizing the prominent role that Polonia has played in the growth and development of our great country.

SENATOR B. EVERETT JORDAN

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN has served in the Senate from my neighboring State of North Carolina since April 19, 1958, and we have often worked together in solving the common problems of our people. I have appreciated his dedication and desire to serve not only the people of North Carolina and our region, but all of the people of our Nation.

Mr. President, as a World War I veteran, EVERETT JORDAN learned compassion and service at an early age. He was the son of a minister, and he grew up in a Christian environment. In his later years, he has not forgotten his Christian heritage, and he has been active in his church as lay leader, Sunday school teacher, and servant on many church-related boards.

Further, he has not been satisfied to serve only in an elected capacity as a U.S. Senator. Public service has had a much broader meaning for EVERETT JORDAN. He has served as trustee for various institutions of higher learning, and he has been an active civic leader, Mason and Shriner.

In the Senate, Mr. President, Senator JORDAN has distinguished himself as chairman of the Rules Committee and as a very effective member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and Public Works. However, he has not been satisfied with his legislative duties alone; he has continued his interest in public activities beyond the realm of the Senate floor as a trustee of the Capitol Historical Society and a member of the Commission on Arts and Antiquities of the Senate.

When EVERETT JORDAN retires from this body at the end of this session, I wish him the best as he returns to his native North Carolina. He has earned the respect of those of us with whom he has served, and the gratitude of those he has served.

Mr. President, I wish Senator JORDAN many years of happiness with his family and friends, and may his retirement be an enjoyable one.

PENSION PROTECTION LEGISLATION—OUR NO. 1 PRIORITY

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed disappointing to see the 92d Congress adjourn without passing effective and comprehensive pension protection legislation.

It is especially disheartening to me, as a member of the General Labor Subcommittee which has jurisdiction over this matter in the House of Representatives. I have worked very closely with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) who chairs this subcommittee, and I am well aware of the problems involved in devising a bill which could overcome objections of the Nixon administration and others who have continually fought against any meaningful pension protection legislation.

But time is running out for the millions of American workers who have been or will be adversely affected due to the lack of effective laws regulating private pension plans, and I want to urge my colleagues here and now, to make pension protection legislation a top priority item when the 93d Congress convenes in January.

Mr. Speaker, the issue involved is very simple—it boils down to this: Will the retired American working men and women receive the pension benefits which they have earned and to which they are rightfully entitled or will they not?

The answer must be in the affirmative. The American worker must be assured that the pension benefits for which he or she has worked will be there when he or she retires. In order to provide this assurance it is necessary for Congress to pass appropriate legislation.

The legislation does not concern itself with any kind of Federal Government giveaway programs. It need only contain adequate safeguards for three very important pension rights—compulsory funding, required minimum vesting, and Federal insurance for terminated plans. It must also provide for stringent fiduciary standards.

Mr. Speaker, these are not unreasonable demands. They are merely necessary requirements—necessary to assure that workers in this country will actually receive the pension benefits for which they have labored nearly all their lives.

We are all familiar with the hundreds and thousands of tragic stories about workers who have lost their pension rights due to the lack of effective laws and regulations. We continue to hear new ones every month.

The workers of this country are no longer content to listen and watch as we in Congress discuss and study this subject. They have told us loudly and clearly that they want action—not just more talk—and they are entitled to action. They are just plain fed up with all the doubletalk, the backroom wheeling and dealing, and the tricky parliamentary maneuvers which have thus far been responsible for killing any truly effective legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this situation grows more serious each and every day. I would like to impress upon my colleagues—on both sides of the aisle—that we can no longer afford to play politics with this issue. We are aware of the problem. We know what is required to solve it. We need only put politics aside and get to work on it.

In the 93d Congress it is my sincere hope that we will be able to do so at a very early date. In the 93d Congress pension protection legislation must be our No. 1 priority.

H.R. 1, THE 1972 SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the first bill introduced in the 92d Congress, H.R. 1, the Social Security Act Amendments, has been passed here in the closing days of the 92d Congress. It is one of the last major pieces of legislation. While it is the best and most far-reaching improvement to the Social Security Act passed by the Congress since medicare, I still am not satisfied that it makes enough improvement in its terms.

One of the first priorities of the 93d Congress must be an effort to modernize many Federal programs in this area, such as retirement income, pensions, welfare, and health care, not with the-

ory but using the facts of reality which these the people must face every day.

As we all know, the improvements to the Social Security Act made by H.R. 1 directly and indirectly affect every home in the United States. The following is a summary of the major amendments:

H.R. 1, THE 1972 SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS

I. SOCIAL SECURITY CASH BENEFIT PROVISIONS

1. Special minimum cash benefits

The bill would provide a special minimum benefit of $8.50 multiplied by the number of years in covered employment up to 30 years, producing a benefit of at least $170 a month for a worker who has been employed for 30 years under social security coverage. This benefit would be paid as an alternative to the regular benefits in cases where a higher benefit would result.

Under this provision, the new higher minimum benefit would become payable to people with 20 or more years of employment; at that point, the specfal minimum benefit would be more than the regular minimum—$85 as compared to the regular minimum benefit of $84.50 payable under present law. A worker with 25 years of employment under social security would thus be guaranteed a benefit of at least $127.50; while one with 30 years would receive at least $170 a month. Minimum payments to a couple would be one and one-half times these amounts.

2. Increase in widow's and widower's insurance benefits

Under present law, when benefits begin at or after age 62 the benefit for a widow (or dependent widower) is equal to 82½ percent of the amount the deceased worker would have received if his benefit had started when he was age 65. A widow can get a benefit at age 60 reduced to take account of the additional 2 years in which she would be getting benefits.

The bill would provide benefits for a widow equal to the benefit the deceased husband would have received if he were still living. Under the bill, a widow whose benfits start at age 65 or after would receive either 100 percent of her deceased husband's primary insurance amount (the amount he would have been entitled to receive if he began his retirement at age 65) or, if his benefits began before age 65, an amount equal to the reduced benefit he would have been receiving if he were alive.

Under the bill, the benefit for a widow (or widower) who comes on the rolls between 60 and 65, would be reduced (in a way similar to the way in which widows' benefits are reduced under present law when they begin drawing benefits between ages 60 and 62) to take account of the longer period over which the benefit would be paid.

Effective date.—January 1973.

3. Increased benefits for those who delay retirement beyond age 65

The bill includes a provision which would provide for an increase in social security benefits of 1 percent for each year after age 65 that the individual delays his retirement.

Effective date.—For computation and recomputation after 1973 based on earnings after 1973.

4. Age 62 computation point for men

Under present law, the method of computing benefits for men and women differs in that years up to age 65 must be taken into account in determining average earnings for men, while for women only years up to age 62 must be taken into account. Also, benefit eligibility is figured up to age 65 for men, but only up to age 62 for women. Under the bill, these differences, which provided special advantages for women, would be eliminated by applying the same rules to men as now apply to women.

Effective date.—The new provision would become effective, starting January 1973 and become fully effective in January 1975.

5. Liberalization of the retirement test

The amount that a beneficiary under age 72 may earn in a year and still be paid full social security benefits for the year would be increased from the present $1,600 to $2,100. Under present law, benefits are reduced by $1 for each $2 of earnings between $1,680 and $2,800 and for each $1 of earnings above $2,880. The committee bill would provide for a $1 reduction for each $2 of all earnings above $2,100, there would be no $1-for-$1 reduction as under present law. Also, in the year in which a person attains age 72 his earnings in and after the month in which he attains age 72 would not be included, as they are under present law, in determining his total earnings for the year.

Future increases in the amount of exempt earnings would be automatic as average earnings rise.

Effective date.—January 1973.

6. Dependent widower's benefits at age 60

Aged dependent widowers under age 62 could be paid reduced benefits (on the same basis as widows under present law) starting as early as age 60.

Effective date.—January 1973.

7. Childhood disability benefits

Childhood disability benefits would be paid to the disabled child of an insured retired, deceased, or disabled worker, if the disability began before age 22, rather than before 18 as under present law. In addition, a person who was entitled to childhood disability benefits could become re-entitled if he again becomes disabled within 7 years after his prior entitlement to such benefits was terminated.

Effective date.—January 1973.

8. Benefits for a child based on the earnings record of a grandparent

Under the bill, benefits would be extended to grandchildren not adopted by their grandparents if their parents have died or are disabled and if the grandchildren were living with a grandparent at the time the grandparent qualified for benefits.

Effective date.—January 1973.

9. Disability insured status for individuals who are blind

Under present law, to be insured for disability insurance benefits a worker must be fully insured and meet a test of substantial recent covered work (generally 20 quarters of coverage in the period of 40 calendar quarters preceding disablement). The bill would eliminate the test of recent attachment to covered work for blind people; thus a blind person would be insured for disability benefits if he is fully insured—that is, he has as many quarters of coverage as the number of calendar years that elapsed after 1950 (or the year he reached age 21, if later) and up to the year in which he became disabled.

Effective date.—January 1973.

10. Disability insurance benefits applications filed after death

Disability insurance benefits (and dependents' benefits based on a worker's entitlement to disability benefits) would be paid to the disabled worker's survivors if an application for benefits is filed within 3 months after the worker's death, or within 3 months after enactment of the provision. It would be effective for deaths occurring after 1969.

11. Disability benefits affected by the receipt of workmen's compensation

Under present law, social security disability benefits must be reduced when workmen's compensation is also payable if the combined payments exceed 80 percent of the worker's average current earnings before disablement. Average current earnings for this purpose can be computed on two different bases and the larger amount will be used. The bill adds a third alternative base, under which a worker's average current earnings can be based on the 1 year of his highest earnings in a period consisting of the year of disablement and the 5 preceding years.

Effective date.—January 1973.

12. Optional determination of self-employment earnings

Self-employed persons could elect to report for social security purposes two-thirds of their gross income from nonfarm self-employment. Not more than $1,600 in income (farm and nonfarm) could be reported in this manner. (This optional method of reporting is similar to the option available under present law for farm self-employment.) A regularity of coverage requirement would have to be met and the option could be used only five times by any individual.

Effective date.—January 1973.

I. MEDICARE-MEDICAID AMENDMENTS

1. Medicare coverage for the disabled

Effective July 1, 1973, a social security disability beneficiary would be covered under medicare after he had been entitled to disability benefits for not less than 24 consecutive months. Those covered would include disabled workers at any age; disabled widows and disabled dependent widowers between the ages of 50 and 65; beneficiaries age 18 or older who receive benefits because of disability prior to reaching age 22; and disabled qualified railroad retirement annuitants. An estimated 1.7 million disabled beneficiaries would be eligible initially.

2. Hospital insurance for the uninsured

The bill will permit persons age 65 or over who are ineligible for part A of medicare to voluntarily enroll for hospital insurance coverage by paying the full cost of coverage (initially estimated at $33 monthly and to be recalculated annually). Where the Secretary of HEW finds it administratively feasible, those State and other public employee groups which have, in the past, voluntarily elected *not* to participate in the Social Security program could opt for and pay the part A premium costs for their retired or active employees age 65 or over. Enrollment in part B of medicare would be required as a condition of buying into the part A program.

Effective date: July 1, 1973.

3. Automatic enrollment in part B

Effective July 1, 1973, the bill provides (except for residents of Puerto Rico and foreign countries) for automatic enrollment under part B for the elderly and the disabled as they become eligible for part A hospital insurance coverage. Persons eligible for automatic enrollment must also be fully informed as to the procedure and given an opportunity to decline the coverage.

4. Protection against loss of medicaid because of increased earnings

An individual or member of a family eligible for cash public assistance and medicaid who would otherwise lose eligibility for medicaid as a result of increased earnings from employment would be continued on medicaid for a period of 4 months from the date where medicaid eligibility would otherwise terminate.

5. Medicare services outside of the United States

Effective January 1, 1973, the bill authorizes use of a foreign hospital by a U.S. resident where such hospital was closer to his residence or more accessible than the nearest suitable United States hospital. Such hospitals must be approved under an appropriate hospital approval program.

In addition, the bill authorizes part B payments for necessary physicians' services furnished in conjunction with such hospitalization.

The bill also authorizes medicare payments for emergency hospital and physicians services needed by beneficiaries in transit between Alaska and the other continental States.

6. "Skilled care" definition for medicare and medicaid

The bill would change the definition of care requirements with respect to entitlement for extended care benefits under medicare and with respect to skilled nursing care under medicaid. Present law would be amended to authorize skilled care benefits for individuals in need of "skilled nursing care and/or skilled rehabilitation services on a daily basis in a skilled nursing facility which it is practical to provide only on an inpatient basis." Coverage would also be continued during short-term periods (e.g. a day or two) when no skilled services were actually provided but when discharge from a skilled facility for such brief period was neither desirable nor practical.

Effective date: January 1973.

7. Physical therapy services and other services under medicare

Effective July 1973, the bill would include as covered services under part B, physical therapy provided in the therapist's office pursuant to a physician's written plan of treatment.

It also authorizes a hospital or extended care facility to provide outpatient physical therapy services to its inpatients, so that an inpatient could conveniently receive his part B benefits after his inpatient benefits have expired.

Benefit payments in one year for services by an independent practitioner in his office or the patient's home could not exceed $100. Effective January 1973, reimbursement for services provided by physical and other therapists would generally be limited to a reasonable salary-related basis rather than fee-for-service basis.

8. Coverage of supplies related to colostomies

The bill provides for medicare coverage of the costs of supplies directly related to the care of a colostomy.

9. Hospital admissions for dental services under medicare

The bill authorizes the dentist who is caring for a medicare patient to make the certification of the necessity for inpatient hospital admission for noncovered dental services under the above circumstances without requiring a corroborating certification by a physician.

This provision would be effective with respect to admissions occurring after the second month following enactment of the bill.

10. Extension of time for filing claim for supplementary medical insurance benefits where delay is due to administrative error

The bill provides that where a claim under supplementary medical insurance is not filed timely due to error of the Government or one of its agents, the claim may nevertheless be honored if filed as soon as possible after the facts in the case have been established.

This amendment would apply with respect to bills submitted and requests for payment made after March 1968.

11. Waiver of enrollment period requirements where individual's rights were prejudiced by administrative error or inaction

The bill authorizes the Secretary to provide such equitable relief as may be necessary to correct or eliminate the effects of these situations, including (but not limited to) the establishment of a special initial or subsequent enrollment period, with a coverage period determined on the basis thereof and with appropriate adjustments of premiums.

This provision would apply to all cases which have arisen since the beginning of the program.

12. Elimination of provisions preventing enrollment in supplementary medical insurance program more than 3 years after first opportunity

The bill eliminates the 3-year limit with respect to both initial enrollment and reenrollment after an initial termination. Enrollment periods would remain as presently defined and the restriction limiting individuals who terminate enrollment to reenroll only once would be retained.

This provision would apply to all those who are ineligible to enroll because of the 3-year limit in effect under present law.

13. Waiver of recovery of incorrect medicare payments from survivor who is without fault

The bill permits any individual who is liable for repayment of a medicare overpayment to qualify for waiver of recovery of the overpaid amount if he is without fault and if such recovery would defeat the purpose of title II or would be against equity and good conscience.

14. Coverage of chiropractic services under part B of medicare

The bill broadens the definition of the term "physician" in title XVIII to include a licensed chiropractor who also meets uniform minimum standards to be promulgated by the Secretary.

The services furnished by chiropractors would be covered under the program as "physicians' services," but only with respect to treatment of the spine by means of manual manipulation which the chiropractor is legally authorized to perform. Claims for such treatment must be verifiable with a satisfactory X-ray indicating the existence of a subluxation of spine.

The amendment would become effective with respect to services provided on or after July 1, 1973.

15. Medicare: Coverage of persons needing kidney transplantation or dialysis

The bill provides that fully or currently insured workers under social security and their dependents with chronic renal disease would be deemed disabled for purposes of coverage under parts A and B of medicare. Coverage would begin 3 months after a course of renal dialysis is begun.

This summary is by no means complete, because of space limitations. Any resident of the 14th Congressional District of New York who has a question or problem on their social security or any other Federal matter should not hesitate to write your Congressman about it. Inasmuch as it eventually has to be put into writing, a letter providing all the details and identifying numbers assists me in expediting your problem with less chance of misinterpretation of the case, because of wrong or incomplete facts. In the majority of cases the officials here in Washington will be asked to look into it; therefore, further expedition of the case can be made by addressing the letter to me at my Washington office, suit 2268, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

Some of these programs, such as medicaid, are Federal programs, but the responsibility for the actual administration of them rests with State and local officials, not Members of Congress or Federal officials. Your elected New York State senators and assemblymen and your New York City councilmen can assist you with your questions and answers in connection with these other programs.

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, 12 years ago a Springfield, Mo., surgeon was elected to the 87th Congress. He put aside the tools of his profession and headed for the Nation's Capital.

Our colleague, DURWARD G. HALL, who most of us have called "Doctor," did not take long to make his presence known on Capitol Hill.

Long active, not only in professional organizations, but also in local community affairs, Dr. HALL took a sharp bite on the bullet of his new responsibilities. He has not relaxed his bite in his dozen years in this Chamber.

Dr. HALL amassed an outstanding attendance and voting record—but that is only part of the story. His diligent attention to detail and the intricacies of every issue to come before his committees and the House made him one of the best informed and active Members.

He is a careful and gentlemanly questioner, but his gracious demeanor is not to be mistaken for weakness. On the contrary, he is tenacious and persistent in seeking elaboration on details of "the fine print."

Mr. Speaker, Dr. HALL has been a great force in Congress these past six terms. He did his homework and expected others to do theirs. He is one of the most gracious and honorable men I have had the pleasure of knowing.

A personal note, when my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., was pressing several years ago for legislation for a national historic site, we found Dr. HALL to be an historian as well. He was most cooperative and helpful to us in obtaining enactment of legislation to preserve the Ansley Wilcox Mansion, in which Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office after the assassination of William McKinley in 1901.

When the 93d Congress gets under way next year, holdover Members are going to look in vain for counsel from Dr. HALL in his aisle seat which he invariably occupied across the way. Dr. HALL decided not to seek reelection and he is going to be missed in many ways.

As he leaves these Chambers as an active Member, I extend my sincere best wishes to him and hope he will come back often to visit us. I am grateful indeed for his friendship and cooperation.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ANDERSON OF NEW MEXICO

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the closing hours of a Congress is a time for reflection, particularly with regard to

those with whom we serve who are retiring fom the Senate.

I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a man who has for 24 years rendered distinguished and outstanding service to this body and the Nation—CLINTON P. ANDERSON of New Mexico.

Few men in public life have been more influential in shaping legislation with such far-reaching impact on this country. When I first came to the Senate in 1953, CLINT ANDERSON was already involved in many of the dominant issues of the day. Having served in several important posts in his State, in the House of Representatives for 6 years, as President Truman's Secretary of Agriculture during the food crisis years of 1945–48, CLINTON ANDERSON brought broad experience and background to the Senate.

The senior Senator from New Mexico has served on the Agriculture Committee, the Interior Committee, the Finance Committee, the Space Committee, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration, and the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures. His longest service has been on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which I have the honor to chair, and of which he was chairman during the 87th Congress.

The important and innovative legislation bearing the stamp of CLINT ANDERSON, and his leadership on subjects such as statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, wilderness, medicare, atomic energy, reclamation, the space program, to name just a few, establish the Senator from New Mexico as a legent in his own time. He has been an effective representative of the people of his State, and his persuasiveness and dedication have contributed materially in the enactment of progressive legislation for the welfare of all the people. His wise counsel will be missed in this Chamber.

I extend my heartfelt wish that in retirement CLINT ANDERSON and his devoted wife, Henrietta, will enjoy health and happiness in the years to come.

A TRIBUTE TO CHAIRMAN GEORGE P. MILLER

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to pay tribute to a man of exceptional ability; a man of ability not only in such subjects as oceanography and astronautics, but also a man with the perceptive ability to coordinate scientific programs without benefit of precedent, past guidelines, or studies to lead him.

I speak of GEORGE P. MILLER, the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. In my four terms here in the House, I have observed with admiration the dedication, enthusiasm, and inspiring diligence of this outstanding legislator and it is with pride that I call him a friend. GEORGE MILLER will be missed here in the halls of Congress and by the people of the Eighth District of California whom he has served so well for almost three decades, has played a major role in the consideration and passage of many measures helpful to the people of his district and the best interests of his country.

Chairman MILLER came to the House 28 years ago following a career in the California State Legislature and, before that, as a civil engineer. As a leader in California politics, GEORGE MILLER served as a member of the State Land Commission and as executive director of the California Division of Fish and Game.

Here in the Congress, GEORGE has been a highly effective member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and a highly regarded member of the Armed Services Committee. Additionally, he has in the past served as chairman of the first Subcommittee on Oceanography, and as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

GEORGE MILLER took over as chairman of the newly created Committee on Science and Astronautics in 1961. If ever there was a time that innovative creativity was called for, it was at the beginning stages of our space program. Though there was much enthusiasm for space projects, no people, no government, and no legislator had had any experience in organizing and administering public projects of such magnitude. It was GEORGE MILLER who stepped into the breach and his leadership has come to be recognized by the people of his State and Nation, as well as by his colleagues in the House, as one of unparalleled excellence.

Under GEORGE MILLER's leadership, the Committee of Science and Astronautics reviewed the out-of-date charter of the National Science Foundation, revised and modernized it, and succeeded in securing its approval as public law. The Foundation is now able to more rigorously apply the results of basic research to the social needs facing our country.

GEORGE MILLER's committee has also been responsible for development of the concept of an Office of Technology Assessment. Congress has thus created for itself a new and sorely needed independent service institution within the legislative branch to insure a proper balance of power between the legislative and executive branches of our Government.

GEORGE MILLER is one of those infrequent figures in history, who can retire with the assurance that, through his efforts, mankind has benefited. There is no tribute higher than this. Mrs. Annunzio and I extend to GEORGE MILLER and Esther Miller our best wishes as they begin still one more new phase of their lives.

HERCULES CONTINUES TO FIGHT POLLUTION

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important problems facing people everywhere in the United States today is pollution. We can scarcely go a day without hearing someone or reading something dealing with our environmental crisis. Needless to say, most of the information regarding pollution deals with how bad the situation has become. Because of this emphasis, we usually never get to see or hear about the favorable side of the pollution battle. One tends to overlook those companies who are doing outstanding jobs of trying to clean up the environment. Such a company is Hercules, Inc., which operates one of its plants in my district at Parlin, N.J.

I believe that the talk which follows gives you an excellent example of what one company is doing to make this country a safer and healthier place in which to live.

I commend this talk to my colleagues:

We certainly appreciate the fact that you have taken time to come to Parlin today to see and hear about what we've accomplished so far in our program to be a better neighbor by reducing atmospheric pollution.

In the past there was no real need to keep the community informed of Hercules internal plant activities at any of our locations. However, with the increasing amount of public regulation of private business it has now become imperative that the public be fully informed of those areas of a business over which regulatory agencies exercise control.

Those of us in industry must educate society of the practical matters of concern to industry so government regulation will be reasonable and in the best interest of all concerned.

Although most industries are quick to recognize their responsibilities in pollution control, some firms are content to ignore the problem until enforcement action is threatened. Pollution control is, however, becoming less and less a matter of choice for every state has a Water and Air Control Board or Commission to set the standards and enforce them. Pollution control is a necessary requirement for doing business.

In the last five years restrictive legislation has increased significantly, and in the future there will be even greater pressure from regulatory bodies to limit the discharge of air and water polluting materials.

CORPORATE POLICY AND PROGRAM

The most important consideration in any industrial approach toward pollution control is a recognition by top management that pollution does exist at their plant facilities. A formal corporate policy was developed by Hercules in late 1967 and the directive from our president at that time was to "do more than just comply with the regulations. We want to fully carry out our responsibilities for air and water quality in the communities of which we are a part."

In order to carry out this Corporate Policy, Hercules set up an Environmental Health Committee. The Committee, formed in late 1967, monitors air, water and solid waste pollution abatement practices in 48 principal domestic plants located in 25 states. Although the Committee sees to it that each Hercules operating department pays attention to abatement problems and regulations, the plant manager is directly responsible for the pollution control in his plant.

At Hercules, each plant has a Pollution Abatement Coordinator responsible for all pollution control activities. An initial task of the Environmental Health Committee working with the Pollution Abatement Coordinator, was to see that a complete air and water pollution inventory was made at each plant. Such an inventory is vital as a basis to understanding the magnitude of the problem and to plan for its solution.

In a number of cases, the pollution inven-

tory turned up unexpected dividends; and many Hercules plants have made reductions in their use of water, have recovered by-products, and have also increased yields, thereby decreasing the amount of materials going into the waste streams.

In a study made last year we estimated that about 35 per cent of the cost of operating our pollution control facilities is returned to us by more efficient plant operations, the recovery of waste materials and the reduction in water usage and other utilities. *Unfortunately, in the case of the pollution abatement equipment which has been installed at Parlin, there is essentially no return on the cost of operating these facilities.*

Over three-fourths of Hercules' plant locations are in compliance with present air and water pollution controls and regulations. The other Hercules plant locations either are negotiating with the regulatory authorities to determine what appropriate action should be taken or, as in the majority of the cases, are now working on an approved schedule of compliance. I wish to mention that we do have some problems at several of our plants. These are under intensive study.

In order to accomplish our goals, Hercules spent approximately 9 million dollars on capital investment on air and water pollution control in 1971. It is estimated that we will spend in the neighborhood of 8 million dollars on capital investments in pollution control in 1972.

In addition to the capital investment, we are now spending over 4 million dollars a year to operate the pollution abatement facilities. Also, approximately three-quarters of a million dollars is being spent annually on environmental research.

It is well recognized that control facilities are expensive to build, costly to operate and represent non-productive expenditures. The expense for pollution control will be showing up in many ways, for example, prices of automobiles, gasoline, paper, water, heat, electric utility bills and in property taxes. *In one way or another, every one of us will pay the price for pollution control and I personally feel the price is worth paying.*

COMMUNITY-CORPORATE RELATIONS

We feel it is essential for plant and corporate management to establish good rapport with the state and federal regulatory officials and with the public in the communities we serve. It is important that industry informs the people of the environmental problems and the efforts being made to solve them. In the past, industry failed to tell what it was doing to protect the environment. We know that the public doesn't care about how much money is being spent—*the public wants results.*

Our philosophy at Hercules is to do something constructive about pollution abatement and then tell our story. The public should not expect overnight miracles in correcting situations that have slowly been established over many, many years. *I am thoroughly convinced, however, that the same technology that created many of todays ecological problems also has the capability of correcting them.*

Industry has made tremendous strides in improving the environment and I feel that these achievements must be told. Much of industries' criticism has resulted from a lack of proper communication. This is one of the reasons that we are holding this program today.

CONCLUSION

The people are demanding clean air and clean water and our representatives in Congress and the State are listening. Pollution control is going to be with us from now on and will be more restrictive in the future. In view of this, it is going to be even more important that we all cooperate and work together in the future to achieve the clean air and clean water that we all desire.

I hope that by being with us today you have learned a little bit about what one company is doing to protect the environment.

Thank you.

R. E. CHADDOCK,
Executive Coordinator, Environmental Health Committee, Hercules Inc.

AGRIBUSINESS VERSUS THE FAMILY FARMER

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the concentration of landownership in California, the most productive agricultural region in the world, is the result of a long history of State and National indifference to the social consequences of uneven land distribution. It also offers us a frightening insight into the future of all American agriculture unless action is taken to reverse existing trends.

Presently nearly half of the agricultural land in California and probably three-quarters of the prime irrigated land, is owned by 45 corporate farms. But the monopoly situation did not just happen—it was, and still is, abetted by State and Federal policies.

The subsidies for large corporate growers in California and the Nation are enormous. It began in California with the State and Federal Government practically giving away millions of acres of land to unscrupulous land speculators and defrauders. These land grabs—in sharp contrast to the pattern set in the Midwest by the Homestead Act—formed the basis for land distribution in California.

One could argue that these land deals, made behind closed doors by a few people, did not constitute a public policy favoring large landholdings. But the fact is that our governmental policies have continued to favor the large grower in California and the West ever since. Now a corporate invasion of agriculture threatens the destruction of rural America, as we know it, not only in the West, but across the country.

The Reclamation Act of 1902, designed to prevent and break up existing monopolies of land throughout the West by limiting delivery of water to homestead, owner-occupied farms of 160 acres or less, has never been enforced. Indeed, it has been subverted into yet another multibillion dollar subsidy for large landowners to the detriment of the family farmer it was intended to help.

But the water subsidy is only the most obvious. We have billions of dollars for reduced crop production, most of which goes to corporate giants who can afford not to farm. For example, in 1970 the J. G. Boswell Co. received $4.4 million, Tenneco, Inc., got $1.5 million.

We have tax policies which encourage the use of farms for tax loss purposes, as tax dodges, or for speculative investment. Finally, there is the most degrading and costly subsidy of all—human beings.

For over a century now Federal, State, and local governmental policy in California has found the human dignity of farmworkers to be less worthy of support than the interest of large growers in a plentiful and cheap labor supply for a few months a year. As a result the benefits which most American workers take for granted have been systematically denied to farmworkers.

In short, we have Government welfare for the corporations and free enterprise for independent farmers and farmworkers. Government policy has made the contest between the family farmer and the conglomerate incredibly unequal.

Agribusiness corporations, fat with subsidies, and some of whom are bent on controlling the market from "seedling to supermarket," are pushing farmers off the land with unfair competition.

Contrary to popular notion, and according to numerous USDA and university studies, the independent farmer is every bit as efficient in producing food and fiber as is the large corporate grower. But the Government is providing the corporation with the edge.

Over 7,000 corporations have entered farming in the past decade, while the rural outmigration has continued unabated at 800,000 persons a year over the same period of time. One million farms have shut down in the past decade—that is 2,000 families displaced—2,000 busted dreams—every week, year after year. And the trend continues unabated.

The question now is whether or not we are going to compound the errors and injustices of the past, or try to remedy them.

What are we going to do for the one-half of the remaining farmers who derive cash income from agriculture which is at or below the poverty level?

What are we doing to do to save a way of life which was at the foundation of this country, and which should continue to play a vital role in our society?

It is obvious by now that urbanization has not been the answer to a better way of life for all our people. And yet we greatly exacerbate our urban ills and tensions with policies resulting in forcing people off the land.

Some people see the decline of our rural society as the inevitable price of "progress."

Well, I do not believe it—I do not think we have to pay the price that agribusiness tells us we must pay; and I do not think that the type of mechanized society that agribusiness public relations men envision is "progress," or good for America.

Rural America can be saved and revitalized if only we have the will. As a beginning I would insist that existing laws like the residency requirement and 160-acre limitation concerning delivery of Federal water be enforced.

I would insist that special interest programs like the California State water project be totally paid for by their intended beneficiaries.

I would push to abolish discriminatory tax policies which allow farming corporations special advantages. I would encourage legislation to give the independent farmer access to needed levels of

credit. I would stop the Government from acting as the hiring agent for large, corporate growers.

I would seek greater technical assistance from the Government for the family farmer—current agricultural research is too oriented toward agribusiness, and is carried on with little regard for its social consequences.

If after all these steps had been taken, and the family farmer still found himself at a disadvantage—which I firmly believe would not be the case—I would then support subsidizing the family farmer at the expense of agribusiness. When the choice is between people and machines, I do not think there is any doubt as to where the Government should stand.

Finally, it should be noted that while Government policy does play a critical role in rural America, it should not be the sole or overriding force in determining its future. That is a proper role for various groups of affected people—farmers, farmworkers, rural businessmen, nonfarm mayors, consumers, environmentalists and, yes, even agribusinessmen. Together we can develop programs designed to benefit all the people of rural America, not just a chosen few.

But we do not have much time to waste. The average age of a farmer today is 58 years—compared to 38 for all Americans in the work force.

It would indeed be a national tragedy, if one day in urban America we awoke to discover that a rural America of owner-occupied farms and independent families had been replaced by machines controlled from board rooms in San Francisco, Houston, and New York.

We must take action now to see that this does not occur.

It was with this feeling, Mr. Speaker, that I testified earlier this year before the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor. That subcommittee is doing extremely important work in determining what are the conditions in rural America today, to what extent are Government policies responsible for these conditions, and how can we improve the lives of farmers, farmworkers, and all the people of rural America.

Mr. Speaker, because of my great interest in this subject, and in view of what I hope will become an increasing national awareness of the problems and changing structure of our rural society, I include my testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF HON. JEROME R. WALDIE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, CALIF.

Congressman WALDIE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Senator Taft.

I have a statement, Mr. Chairman, which I will submit for the record. I will not read the statement, I will talk around it.

Senator STEVENSON. Without objection, your statement will be entered in the record at the end of your testimony.

Congresman WALDIE. Thank you. I would first like to bring to the attention of the committee an issue that I suspect has been covered in considerable detail. This is the national policy of landownership and distribution, a policy which has allegedly existed since early American history.

I think it was premised on the recognition that those landownership policies in portions of our country that have concentrated land in single ownership have been undesirable. The most outstanding examples of undesirable landownership policies are the plantation system in the southern part of the United States and another of more recent date, but continuing period of time, landownership policies in the West.

By historical accident the concentration of landowhership in the plantation system in the south, stems from the land grants given to those who colonized that portion of America. Land grants in the West stem from a policy of Mexican land grants, for the most part. In contrast are the more equitable and beneficial land distribution policies found in the Midwest a direct result of the Homestead Act.

I think if we assume as an accurate statement that the historical evolution of landownership in the heartland of America was best for America, that small landownership and the resulting social benefits that ensue is the policy we should have encouraged as we distributed our public lands, then, I think, we know that we erred in the South when we did not redistribute the plantation system after the Civil War, and when we did not redistribute the western lands when they became incorporated as a part of the United States.

Having made that statement, and it is a statement which I deeply believe, I see the problem as how to correct the error, that when these lands came into the public domain they were not distributed properly.

We have determined, apparently, that we will not take the revolutionary advice that we have consistently given as part of our foreign policy, most notably in South and Central America and most recently in South Vietnam. We have insisted in our policies with those governments that stability of their societies would be largely dependent upon redistribution of the land ownership patterns from the concentrated pattern that exists in Central and South America and in South Vietnam, to a distribution of ownership among the people. This is a policy that we have consistently attempted to follow in our foreign affairs because we believe there is social value to it. But we have rejected it as a means of correcting historical error of land ownership in the South and the West. We have believed this policy to be too revolutionary for us to adopt, but we have insisted those foreign nations with whom we deal adopt it in order to bring stability to their society.

What we ought to do is accomplish that redistribution of lands and the ownership patterns of lands, partiularly in the West, by other policies, most notably by the proposed Land Reform Act, and the existing excess land laws that apply to water developed and delivered by the Bureau of Reclamation. This attempt at a national policy said, "We believe in America that a distribuion of land as widely and thoroughly among the people as is possible is the most equitable means of attaining equity and stability in our society." We will encourage that distribution of land by a national policy that suggests that, if the landowner desires revenues from the general treasury of the United States in the form of subsidies, in this instance a water subsidy he will comply with the national policy of redistributing his land by the acceptable means of selling all land in excess of the acreage limitation of 160 acres for one individual, 320 for multiples thereof, depending upon the family.

We have also determined as regards the excess landowner, that absentee ownership is a policy that lends itself to instability in society and that we would discourage absentee ownership in the West, a factor that had existed in the West along with concentrated land ownership since its early treaty. We would attempt to redistribute that land and to eliminate the absentee ownership factors of the land by applying the national policy involved in the excess land law. That law has been on the books since 1902. I think there is no one who believes that law has been in any way successfully implemented.

There are few who really believe in the law. As nearly as I can ascertain, there are hardly any persons, other than Paul Taylor of the University of California and a group of people who believe in him—and I am one of those—who believe that the excess land law is desirable.

The political leadership of California has continually resisted the application of the excess land law and the redistribution of these huge thousand-acre tracts, multithousand acres that are in single and now in corporate ownership. The political leadership of this State has expressed its disapproval in that law in mass terms.

They have said, for example, that the 160-acre limitation, though it has some validity in terms of the concept of the small farmer, should be modified. Governor Reagan's task force during his administration has come up with a figure of 640 and the multiples thereof. The point is, though, not there is a figure in excess of the 160-acre multiples available under the law that is desirable; the point is that nobody in political leadership in California who is able to effect reform in this particular area believes that reform is desirable. Or, if they believe it is desirable, they are not willing to call for that reform.

The national government, unhappily in my view, has aided and abetted the political leadership of California in their conservatism, in their outspoken and successful attempts to avoid the application of the excess land laws. They have done so in a variety of ways.

In the first instance, the placing of the administration of that law in the Bureau of Reclamation was an error of grievous proportions. It seems to me it was an error for these reasons: The Bureau of Reclamation, like any bureaucracy is desirous of maintaining its existence by engaging in as many projects as it can possibly include in the budget session of each year. The excess land law is a hindrance to developing water projects in the West because those who will benefit most by those water projects, the huge landowners of the West, are resistant to having their land ownership in any way denied to them or redistributed by the application of the excess land law.

In order to encourage the approval of projects throughout the West, the Bureau of Reclamation has been given the task of enforcing the excess land law and has been greatly remiss in the administration of that law. The law, simply stated, is that the lands in excess of 160 acres or the multiples thereof permitted under the law must be sold at a prewater price if you desire subsidized Federal water. Lands that are in excess of 160 acres or multiples thereof that utilize federally developed and delivered water must be occupied by the owner thereof. You cannot be an absentee owner, because the policy of absentee land ownership and the policy of huge land ownership is contrary to national policy.

Despite the simplicity and the clarity of the statement of the law, if you were to examine the record of the implementation of the law by the Bureau of Reclamation, you would assume that it is either extremely complex or that it is, in fact, nonexistent. They are aided and abetted in their reluctance to enforce that law by the Congress and all administrations. There seems to have been disagreement with the principles of the law by every administration and every Congress that has been in existence since 1902. No one can convince me that were Congress and the administration desirous

of implementing that national policy, that law would not have been implemented.

Beyond that, the law presumes that, if an individual owner who does not desire to break up his massive land holdings and is able to go it alone, he may do so. The law does not interfere with that opportunity or that individual decision. But that individual option was the precise reason for the development of the California Water Project, the application of which enables avoidance of the excess land law to the corporate landowners in the west side of the Central Valley. This powerful bloc of landowners was successful in persuading people in California to indebt themselves to huge sums to construct the water project and to huge sums that have accrued since that project has begun. The project was designed almost exclusively politically, certainly exclusively, to avoid the application of the excess land law.

That would be bad enough, but at that point, it would seem to me, the sins, to the extent they exist, are sins that reflect on the State government which designed the project and persuaded the people of California that it was in their best interest to enhance the value and to prevent the redistribution of these huge tracts of land in California.

Beyond that, however, the sin becomes expanded and the national government now has to assume a major share of that sin. The Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Interior, and most administrations, both the present one and the previous ones, have looked sympathetically upon the application of the State of California and the California water project for Federal funds to assist in the completion and construction of integral parts of that project.

The first such breach involved the San Luis Dam, when the joint use of that facility was approved by the Congress. Though it was never clearly determined that the excess land laws did not apply since there was an investment of Federal funds in this State project, that has been the result of that action. Excess land laws do not apply at the present time to the delivery of any water developed or delivered through the State water project.

At the present time there is pending before the Congress a bill (H.R. 2314) authorized by Craig Hosmer, a Congressman from Long Beach, to construct a facility in my district, a fact which you might construe to be unusual. It is a major project known as the Peripheral Canal. Many years ago as the feasibility report states, it was determined it would cost about $208 million, but it quite clearly will be many millions more than that now.

Mr. Hosmer has introduced a bill sponsored by the Department of Interior and sponsored by the California State administration to have the Federal Treasury come up with half the cost of the Peripheral Canal. The Peripheral Canal is the heart of the California water project because, without the Peripheral Canal, the quantities of water they proposed to deliver and contracted to deliver in the fifties cannot be delivered because salt would be pumped up out of the estuaries and out of the bay into which the draft of the pumps of the water project are now directed. The Peripheral Canal will place that draft 43 miles upstream in the Sacramento River and they will then not be troubled with such a deteriorated quality of water that they cannot deliver it and still be in compliance with the contracts for water delivery.

If the Federal Government agrees with the concept of the Peripheral Canal bill, that we will, in fact, pick up half of the cost of the construction of that facility, what we, in fact, have said to the State government is that we approve of the State of California's decision to avoid the national policy of application of the excess land law, and we are using Federal funds to assist them in the implementation of that scheme to avoid a critical and essential national policy of land reform.

We assist in the development of the California water project, in contravention of this national policy of long standing in area after area, we assist in tax policies that have application to issues of that nature. We assist through the Bureau of Reclamation in the planning of the project. We have attempted to coordinate the Federal projects in a manner that is most beneficial to the State water project in order to save the cost to the State of the State water project.

We have done everything we could, as a national government, to assist the State of California in acting contrary to a national policy of long standing and of tremendous beneficial impact on American society. It does seem to me that the Congress of the United States and the executive branch of the United States has to make up its mind, do we really believe in the small farmer in America, do we really believe that the development of landownership in the Midwest and in the heartlands of America was a proper development of landownership, or do we honestly believe that the plantation system in the South and the huge landownership system in the West are in the best interest of the people?

Clearly in California, what is in the best interest of the people was not given much consideration. The political influence of the people who own these massive tracts of land is enormous in California. That political influence has become greatly magnified as the ownership of those tracts of land moves into corporate ownership. The ability to prevent the continuation of a situation that, from its inception, was contrary to national policy is becoming remarkably diminished as we permit the developments of recent years to continue.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, and Senator Taft, that someone in the Congress must make a definitive statement that the excess land law and the policy of small ownership of agricultural lands in California and in the rest of the United States was a desirable policy when it was implemented, when it was executed and when it was formulated and is an even more desirable policy today. Whatever the reasons that existed historically for determination of the homestead method of landownership, those reasons are magnified in terms of the necessity of obtaining stability in American society today. All the desirability, the romance of owning land and farming on it that is the fabric of America, is now more dramatically necessary to our national well-being than ever before in our history.

I state, Mr. Chairman, that the contribution this committee has made, coming into California, a State that more than most has thumbed its nose at this policy is considerable. This State's political leadership from the beginning, at least, of my interest in and involvement in politics has repudiated that policy and has sought to prevent its application and has sought to prevent the consequences of that policy ever being implemented in California for Californians.

REPORT ON THE 92D CONGRESS

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, it has always been my policy at the close of each Congress to report to the people of the Eighth District on the results of our legislative efforts. This 92d Congress has been a momentous one marked by the passage of some of the most significant legislation in many years including the water pollution control bill, the revenue sharing as well as the massive higher education and social security amendments passed during the final days of the second session.

Yet, the agenda of unfinished business is equally impressive: the Federal highway bill, national health insurance, pension reform, consumer protection and comprehensive tax reform—all issues of concern to a large number of Americans.

Overshadowing and characterizing the 92d Congress has been the President's opposition to significant legislation demonstrated by his exercise of the Presidential veto and impoundment of funds to greatly curtail important health, education, manpower and agriculture programs. Congress devoted a substantial amount of time and energy in the fight to rearrange the President's priorities which have sent $60 billion to the war in Indochina or $1,200 for every American family of four while at the same time he opposed funding for vital domestic programs.

In addition, Congress persisted in the fight to end the war through legislative means but the 92d Congress began and has ended with conflict and bloodshed in Vietnam, and 1,808 American men still prisoners of war and missing in action.

The crowning achievement of the 92d Congress was the unprecedented 10-to-1 override of the Clean Water Act veto in the last hours before Congress adjourned.

BLATNIK persuaded the House and Senate leadership to hold Congress in session until midnight, October 17, the President's deadline to either sign or veto the Clean Water Act of 1972.

The veto came shortly before midnight and the Senate overrode it that night. The next day BLATNIK mustered forces in the House for an overwhelming 247-to-23 endorsement of the Blatnik clean water program.

The President also vetoed BLATNIK's 1971 jobs and economic development legislation, and may pocket veto the 1972 bill now on his desk. He has until midnight, November 1, to sign it; without signature the measure does not become law.

The Public Works Committee has charted solid legislative accomplishments under BLATNIK's chairmanship, in the fields of water pollution control, economic development, flood control, and disaster relief, despite constant opposition from the White House, during committee work on various measures, on the floor of the House, and despite the vetoes.

CLEAN WATER ACT

BLATNIK's Clean Water Act is now law. Authorized at $24.6 billion through June 1975, with a goal of clean water by 1985, it is the largest and most far-reaching piece of environmental legislation ever enacted.

"Much of the credit for this accomplishment must go to the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee, JOHN A. BLATNIK," said Rep. ROBERT E. JONES, Democrat of Alabama, who chaired the marathon 39-session House/

Senate conference. "BLATNIK, who has been leading the fight for clean water since we entered Congress together back in 1946, must surely regard this as a milestone in his career."

ENVIRONMENTAL HISTORY

BLATNIK called the House's overwhelming rejection of the President's veto "a turning point in environmental history." BLATNIK continued:

We have chartered a new course for the future of America and underwritten the pledge of a clean environment for the young people of today to enjoy tomorrow.

This is no ordinary vote. It is an overwhelming expression, by a 10-to-1 margin, of the profound commitment of the House and Senate to an effective, workable, realistic clean water program.

I join millions of Americans everywhere in expressing heartfelt hope that the President will abide by this Congressional mandate, backed by the will of the people, and make an equally strong commitment, by getting the construction program under way, and by carrying out the enforcement provisions of the law.

CLEAN BY 1985

The bill provides $18 billion for Federal grants to municipalities, for construction of waste treatment plants, including sewage collection systems. The Federal Government will contribute 75 percent of the costs of building a community's waste treatment plant, leaving it up to the States and local municipalities to work out the funding of the remaining 25 percent.

Under the Blatnik legislation, communities must install secondary treatment facilities for all municipal wastes by mid-1977, and more advanced disposal methods by mid-1983.

For industry, the bill establishes a two-phase program, with increasingly tightening restrictions on industrial pollution, coming in mid-1977 and mid-1983, backed up by fines and imprisonment for violators.

It provides for enforcement through a permit system administered by the Environmental Protection Agency and the States.

It requires an impact study of the environmental, technological, economic, and social effects that would result from enforcing the 1983 regulation on industry, and attaining the 1985 goal of pollution-free water.

The Blatnik legislation provides for citizen suits against the Government or a private interest for violation or failure to carry out mandatory provisions of the law, in accordance with the U.S. Supreme Court's 1972 decision, Sierra Club against Morton.

BLATNIK CLEAN WATER PIONEER

BLATNIK's Public Works Committee, which wrote the House version of the bill, devoted 9 months to public hearings, listened to 294 witnesses and received 135 additional statements, totaling 4,200 pages of printed testimony.

Following House passage of the bill in late March, by a vote of 376 to 14, the House and Senate held 39 grueling conference sessions ironing out differences between the two versions.

The final bill emerged from conference and passed both House and Senate on October 4, by votes of 366 to 11 in the House and 74 to 0 in the Senate.

BLATNIK, who alone pioneered the first national water pollution control program in 1956, and singlehandedly wrote the bill, marshaled support and drove it through both House and Senate and into law, considers the 1972 act a historic triumph not only because it finally provides adequate funds which are the basic requirement of a clean water program, and the enforcement mechanism but because it has the overwhelming support of Congress and the American people.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Job-creating economic development legislation has faced rough going from the administration since the beginning of the 92d Congress.

BLATNIK has given top priority to jobs and community development throughout the 92d Congress, concentrating on the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission, the Economic Development Administration, and the accelerated public works programs, all of which were created by BLATNIK's legislation and are under the jurisdiction of his committee.

A 2-year, $3.56 billion jobs and economic development bill, which authorizes $100 million annually for the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission, $250 million a year for the job-creating accelerated public works program, and extends the life of the Economic Development Administration through June 1974, is now on the President's desk awaiting signature or, possibly, pocket veto.

That it is on the President's desk is due largely to BLATNIK's determination to help jobless Americans and hard-pressed communities throughout the country. BLATNIK's Subcommittee on Economic Development wrote the bill, managed it on the House floor, and sent it to the Senate where it languished until the last days of the 92d Congress when BLATNIK by personal influence and persuasion, drove it out of committee and onto the Senate floor.

Then, in 2 days of hard bargaining, he beat back attempts to delete the provisions of the bill providing protection for workers whose jobs are lost due to enforcement of pollution control measures, and defeated an attempt to weaken the enforcement powers of the Occupational Safety and Health Act.

The battle ended between 9 and 11 Saturday night, October 14, when BLATNIK engineered the bill through both House and Senate and sent it to the White House under cloud of a veto.

UPPER GREAT LAKES REGIONAL COMMISSION

The Blatnik legislation authorizes $100 million annually through fiscal year 1974 for the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission—UGLRC—which provides grants and technical assistance for industrial parks, airports and access roads, vocational training schools, pollution control, health care facilities, and tourism. UGLRC covers 119 counties in northern Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan.

Regional Development Commissions are authorized a total of over $1 billion through fiscal 1974; $100 million annually is authorized for each of the regions like Upper Great Lakes whose development plans have been approved, and $20 million annually for regions still in the planning stage.

The Blatnik bill also provides $1.1 billion in direct and supplementary grants for long-term development and employment projects; $340 million for public works and business loans, and loan and lease guarantees; $100 million for technical assistance, including $15 million for operation of vocational education programs under EDA; $100 million for grant and loan assistance to economic development centers; and $40 million planning and administration expenses for economic development districts. All authorizations are through fiscal 1974.

ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS

The bill authorizes $500 million, through fiscal 1974, for accelerated public works—APW—a short-range immediate impact, job-creating program aimed at areas where unemployment is significantly higher than the national average.

The legislation extends the Economic Development Administration—EDA—which provides long-term development funds and technical assistance to areas suffering excessive unemployment or underemployment.

BLATNIK succeeded in restoring to the bill a provision authorizing $40 million for planning and administrative expenses of economic development districts like the Arrowhead Regional Development Commission in northeastern Minnesota.

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

This bill includes an important environmental effects title authorizing assistance to workers whose jobs are lost due to pollution-control measures. Under this title, a worker who has lost his job because of pollution-control requirements would be eligible for unemployment compensation for up to a year and a half at a rate of 60 percent of his former wages; temporary mortgage or rental payments for up to a year if he faces eviction because he cannot make the payments; reemployment assistance services; and reasonable moving expenses to a new place of employment.

The same title provides for long-term, low-interest loans to businesses throughout the country, to help them install pollution control equipment to comply with environmental standards, remain in operation, and preserve jobs.

OTHER BLATNIK COMMITTEE LEGISLATION NOW LAW

National dam inspection program—requires Federal inspection of the Nation's dams to help prevent recurrence of the flood disasters that struck Rapid City, S. Dak., and the threat that looms over other dams whose condition is a question mark. The bill directs the Army Corps of Engineers to begin the inspection program as soon as practicable and to report its findings to Congress no later than July 1, 1974.

Flood control—Authorizes funds for flood control projects and studies; establishes a procedure for deauthorization

of Corps of Engineers projects no longer considered necessary; and makes full provision for public hearings before a project is begun.

Emergency Highway Relief Act—Provides $200 million for this fiscal year to help the Nation recover from natural disasters such as the Rapid City, S. Dak., floods and tropical storm Agnes.

Disaster assistance to medical facilities—Provides financial assistance for reconstruction or repair of private nonprofit medical care facilities damaged or destroyed by a major disaster.

AWAITING ACTION

Federal-Aid Highway Act—Contains $3 million authorization for construction of underpass to replace hazardous railroad crossing in Anoka; $60 million for development of Great River Road, a scenic historic and recreational roadway along the Mississippi River; creates new program of economic growth center highways designed to stimulate new economic activity in smaller communities; over $2 billion for highway safety programs; $3 billion for capital grants for mass transit and $400 million for mass transit operating subsidies.

THE 93D CONGRESS: A LOOK AHEAD

BLATNIK has set, as his committee's No. 1 priority next year, hearings which will lead to development of a national growth policy.

Lacking such a policy, the Nation has so far continued to encourage concentration of population and industry in the already crowded, polluted urban areas. People are forced to move to cities for jobs and other opportunities, and industry locates where there is a large labor pool and market.

BLATNIK'S committee will probe existing programs, explore new ideas, and to try to develop a policy which will lead to balanced growth, and a better distribution of people and industry.

Programs under BLATNIK'S committee, such as water pollution, economic development and highways have a definite national impact on where people and businesses locate, and can play a large role in providing far wider choice of location and life style than is now available to the American people.

CONGRESS AND PRESIDENT HAVE DIFFERENT NATIONAL PRIORITIES

A sharp distinction between the legislative goals of the Congress and the President is apparent when reviewing this administration's unique record of 19 vetoes.

Vetoes of other Presidents have generally been reserved for bills designed to benefit private individuals or special interests. However, in President Nixon's case, there is a consistent pattern of opposition to significant legislation aimed at helping the working man, the student, the veteran, the poor and the elderly. Here are some revealing examples of how the President has exercised this critical weapon:

Vetoed three of the last four education appropriations bills;

Vetoed funds for manpower training and public service employment programs for 1970;

Vetoed a measure to include firefighters within the category of hazardous occupations for retirement benefits in 1970—although he signed this proposal into law in 1972—an election year;

Vetoed an authorization of $225 million to promote family practice medicine and to assist medical schools in relieving a shortage of doctors in general practice for 1971–73;

Vetoed job-creating accelerated public works bill, which BLATNIK authored, to provide hospitals and nursing homes, sewage treatment plants, and water and sewer lines in 1971;

Vetoed veterans and housing appropriations for 1971;

Vetoed economic opportunity amendments including extensive child day care facilities in 1971;

Vetoed a political broadcasting measure to limit expenditures for broadcast advertising for Federal and gubernatorial candidates;

Vetoed the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act for 1973—overridden;

Vetoed temporary 20-percent increase in railroad retirement benefits in 1972—overridden; and

Vetoed $24.6 billion water pollution control bill.

Congress passed these measures in response to serious problems which affect the lives, health, and well-being of the American people. President Nixon's record stands out from all other U.S. Presidents because his vetoes have been directed at legislation which benefits Americans who most need assistance: those on retirement pensions, those in need of health care, those attending schools, those needing training for jobs, those unemployed or underemployed.

FAR-REACHING LEGISLATION ENACTED

Among those measures passed by the Congress in vital areas are higher education legislation, revisions in social security law, as well as revenue sharing, veterans benefits, drug measures, the equal rights amendment and countless other bills.

EDUCATION

This session Congress passed massive higher education legislation authorizing approximately $20 billion through fiscal 1975 and setting new precedents for Federal support of higher education. The legislation strengthens and expands existing Federal higher education student assistance programs.

One of the important provisions of the bill is the establishment of a new program of financial assistance for needy students which will entitle any student admitted to an accredited institution of higher education to a Federal grant based on his need. In addition, for the first time it would provide general support for institutions of higher education on a continuing basis, depending on the number of basic grant recipients in its student body and amounts of other Federal student aid received by its students.

Strong provisions are also included to combat sex bias in colleges and universities, funds for innovative teaching techniques, emergency funds for institutions in temporary fiscal difficulties and special assistance for community colleges.

INDIAN EDUCATION

Title IV of this legislation, the Indian Education Act, is based on a bill which BLATNIK originally cosponsored to authorize grants for planning and demonstration projects to improve the educational opportunities afforded Indian children and to allow local control over their education programs. Over 1,200 Indian schoolchildren qualify for Federal assistance under this program in the Eighth Congressional District alone.

Although no budget request was forthcoming from the President to fund this act, BLATNIK and other Congressmen pushed for inclusion of these funds in the Labor-HEW supplemental appropriations bill and the conference committee finally agreed on $18 million to fund the Indian Education Act.

OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

The bill also emphasizes the importance of the occupational education field with the creation of a new section under the law which specifically authorizes many new occupational education programs and establishes a new Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education within the Office of Education.

In addition, Congress also passed into law the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1972 to extend and revise the authorization of grants to States for vocational and for expanded research and training with respect to handicapped individuals.

ELDERLY

After the White House Conference on Aging in December 1971, Congress took the lead in rapid implementation of some of the most urgent proposals which had come out of the Conference.

In June of 1972 Congress enacted a 20-percent across-the-board social security increase which BLATNIK had originally cosponsored and fought hard to enact. Congress also passed and provided full funding of $100 million for legislation to assure citizens over 60 at least one hot, nutritious meal 5 days a week. The House took the early lead and the Senate later passed a bill to create a National Institute of Health to conduct research on the special health problems of the elderly and to study the aging process.

As the session raced to a close, 2 years of hearings and committee work culminated in the approval of the comprehensive social security legislation, H.R. 1. The controversial welfare title which had caused delay of approval, was deleted from the bill and the final vote on the conference report was taken the week of adjournment. Included in the bill are the following provisions:

BASIC PROVISIONS OF H.R. 1

First. Raise widow's and widower's benefits to 100 percent of the spouse's entitlement—up from 82½ percent.

Second. Increase from $1,680 to $2,100 the amount a beneficiary can earn without loss of benefits. For income over $2,100, benefits would be reduced $1 for each $2 earned.

Third. Allow those working beyond retirement age to build up higher pensions. One-twelfth of 1 percent increase for each month after 65 an annuity is not paid.

Fourth. Establish a new minimum monthly benefit under social security up to $170 a month for 30 years' coverage. Designed to help those who have consistently worked at low wages.

Fifth. Reduce the waiting period to begin receiving disability benefits from 6 months after onset of disability to 5 months. Effective January 1973.

Sixth. Will federalize, effective January 1974, programs of assistance to about 3 million aged, blind, and disabled.

Seventh. Will extend medicare coverage, effective July 1973, to 1.7 million persons who have been eligible to receive disability benefits for at least 2 years.

Eighth. Provides for the payment of medicare benefits for inpatient hospital services, physicians' services and ambulance services for care furnished outside the United States if a foreign hospital is closer or more accessible from the patient's residence than a U.S. hospital.

Ninth. Permits individuals not now eligible for medicare/part A coverage—for example, State and municipal employees—to be enrolled on either a group or individual basis by paying a monthly premium of $33. Individuals must also enroll for part B in order to qualify for part A insurance.

BLATNIK introduced legislation concerning pass-along benefits and medicare which was incorporated in modified form as part of H.R. 1.

OLDER AMERICANS

In addition, Congress passed an extension of the Older Americans Act, originally enacted to institute a 5-year program to coordinate Federal activities dealing with the elderly. The bill provides greatly increased funding for States in the areas of transportation, nutrition, preretirement, recreation, and housing, as well as counseling and training for middle-aged and older workers.

BLATNIK also introduced legislation to establish a Joint Committee on Aging and to create a nonlegislative select committee in the House to investigate all matters pertaining to the elderly.

BLATNIK pointed out that the social and economic problems which plague America have special impact on her 20 million older citizens:

> We have a particular and very special responsibility to our senior citizens who have lived full lives and contributed to building our society only to be left in poverty with urgent health, transportation and housing needs.

BLATNIK also introduced legislation which was included as part of H.R. 1, the comprehensive legislation including social security, medicare, and aid to the aged, blind, and disabled.

REVENUE SHARING

Revenue sharing legislation, approved by the House and Senate in the final days of the session, contains approximately $10,780,656 for counties and communities in Minnesota's Eighth Congressional District for the first year of the 5-year program.

These revenue sharing funds are retroactive to January 1972 and will be portioned out in two half-year payments. The bill was passed with the limitation that the local and county share of the funds for operating and maintenance expenditures must be used in the following "priority areas" specifically cited in the law: public safety, environmental protection, public transportation, health, recreation, libraries, social services for poor or aged and financial administration.

The overall revenue sharing authorization will increase approximately $150 million a year nationally and as the population changes the individual State allocations will change proportionately.

This law will allocate approximately $103.9 million to Minnesota for the first year, of which $34.6 million goes directly to the State and $69.3 million to counties, municipalities and townships. Although preliminary amounts have been widely circulated, exact allocations have not actually been computed due to incomplete statistics regarding tax effort which is an essential part of the distribution formula. However, the final amounts should soon be computed and checks should begin arriving within a month.

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

Three years after women won the right to vote in 1920, the first equal rights amendment was introduced in Congress. It was not until October 12, 1971, that House Joint Resolution 208 passed the House. It passed the Senate in March 1972, and is currently awaiting ratification by the States. The amendment has been ratified by 21 of the 38 States required to approve a constitutional amendment which Minnesota is scheduled to consider at the 1973 session of the legislature.

BLATNIK, a strong supporter of the amendment, said upon passage:

> We have finally passed a measure to recognize women and men alike as human individuals with a right to equal protection and the accompanying social justice. From this point, we must move forward to provide equal rights and opportunities in employment, education and full participation in the economic and political life of the country.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

The House and Senate agreed on and sent to the President a veterans educational assistance bill. It increases benefits by 25.7 percent for veterans pursuing a full time course of education which will raise the educational assistance of a single veteran to $220, of a veteran with one dependent to $261, two dependents to $298 with $18 added for each additional dependent.

The bill, retroactive to September 1, 1972, also increases on-the-job training benefits by 48 percent and equalizes benefits between male and female veterans.

In addition, a 10-percent increase in monthly rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities has been signed as was a similar increase in additional allowances paid to service-connected disabled veterans with a 50-percent or more disability. The increases were effective July 1, 1972 and should have been in the August checks.

In the last few days of the session, the House cleared for signature by the President legislation which would provide improved medical care for wives and children or survivors of disabled veterans with service-connected disabilities, established eight new medical schools in affiliation with Veterans' Administration hospitals, and established a national cemetery system in the Veterans' Administration.

DRUGS

Congress actively considered legislation in the area of drug control and regulation this session of Congress. One of the first bills enacted into law was the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 which provides for a coordinated Federal attack on the problem of drug abuse. It creates a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention in the Executive Office of the President and authorizes slightly more than $1 billion through fiscal 1975 for these activities, research funds and State grants.

In addition, the Comprehensive Drug Abuse and Prevention and Control Act of 1970 provides an increase from $1 million to $4 million for the Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse. Also passed and enacted into law was legislation to require manufacturers and processors of drugs to submit lists of all drugs manufactured or processed for commercial distribution.

EMPLOYMENT

Also enacted into law this Congress is the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 which will provide for programs of public service employment. It serves the dual purpose of finding jobs for unemployed persons in time of high unemployment—4.5 percent or more—and also assist States and local communities in providing needed public services. Special provisions are included for returning veterans as well as for areas where the local rate of unemployment is above 6 percent. This was signed into law July 12, 1972.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The Rural Development Act of 1972 will provide for the development of rural areas and authorize funds for colleges and universities to coordinate rural research, training, and technical assistance. It will allow the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish technical assistance and cost sharing to public agencies and organizations for quality management, control and abatement of agriculture related pollution.

SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

National School Lunch Act amendments were enacted authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize up to $25 million in section 32 funds between May and September of 1972 for summer nonschool programs. The nonschool food programs were extended for 3 years, through fiscal 1975 and the Child Nutrition Act was amended to extend the school breakfast program for 3 years.

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join in this special

tribute to our good friend and colleague from Ohio (Mr. McCULLOCH). BILL MCCULLOCH has served with distinction in this body for a quarter of a century, and I do not use that term loosely. He has especially distinguished himself as a true friend and supporter of civil rights and has been most effective in his capacity as ranking Republican on the House Judiciary Committee.

Since I came to this body in 1961, I have always looked to BILL MCCULLOCH for his special expertise, wisdom, and guidance in the important areas of civil rights and civil liberties, and I think we will all greatly miss the benefit of his counsel and experience in the future. Certainly, no one in this body surpasses him in taking seriously the oath to uphold the Constitution, for he has daily demonstrated his deep dedication to preserving and extending the basic rights and liberties guaranteed under our founding doctrine. In this respect, his has always been the voice of courage and conscience, and the many great civil rights acts of the last quarter of a century stand as a living monument to his convictions and diligent efforts.

I think I have been especially privileged in working closely with BILL MCCULLOCH as a member of the Republican leadership, and also as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on which he has also served. These opportunities have given me a special insight into the character of this outstanding individual and legislator and moreover have yielded a close and warm personal relationship which I shall always cherish. We will truly miss him.

VETERANS LEGISLATION IN THE 92D CONGRESS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, there are presently over 28 million veterans in the United States. With the addition of dependents and survivors they comprise approximately 47 percent of our population. Keeping track of their needs and problems and finding solutions is one of Congress most important responsibilities. The 92d Congress, with the help and guidance of our national veterans' organizations, has been able to deal effectively with many of these needs, and at this point I would like to review some of our accomplishments.

One of our most important legislative victories and one in which I had the pleasure of participating directly, was the battle over the threatened cutback of VA hospitals. The House passed a resolution prohibiting the closing of VA hospitals without prior approval of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. We also included in the fiscal year 1973 appropriations, a congressional mandate that the VA maintain an average daily patient census of not less than 85,500.

In doing so we put ourselves clearly on record. Congress will not tolerate having the VA hospital system jeopardized by the President's budget cutters. This system serves not only our veterans, but our entire Nation as well, through its extensive research and medical training facilities.

The 92d Congress passed several other measures to expand and improve the VA medical system. The VA Medical School Assistance and Health Service Personnel Training Act of 1971 provides for assistance to States in establishing new medical schools which would be affiliated with VA hospitals. The purpose of this act is to help overcome the acute shortage of physicians and medical facilities within both the Veterans' Administration system and the country as a whole.

Another measure, the Medical Care Act of 1972 will also improve the ability of the VA to deliver quality medical care to veterans by expanding medical care coverage; improving the personnel system; providing a new emphasis of training and recruitment of health service personnel; and by improving the staff-to-patient ratio. This comprehensive legislation will bring about a major overhaul of the VA medical care authority, and will assure the veteran total quality health care, both now and in future years.

In the field of education, we were successful in passing the Veterans' Education and Training Amendments of 1972 which provided for an average overall increase of 14 percent in veterans education benefits. This legislation will be especially helpful in assisting many of our returning Vietnam veterans in obtaining a college education. It also provides assistance for vocational rehabilitation and apprenticeship or on-the-job-training programs.

Another measure we were successful in passing provides for increased grants for specially adapted homes from $12,000 to $17,500 for veterans seriously disabled from service-connected injuries. We have also provided for mortgage protection life insurance for these veterans.

During the 92d Congress we have increased compensation rates for service-connected disabled veterans. These increases, which average about 10 percent, became effective August 1, 1972.

Still another measure passed provides for liberalized payments for dependency and indemnity compensation. This act assures that approximately 176,000 widows will receive a 10-percent increase in their monthly dependency and indemnity compensation rates and that 46 percent of the children will receive a 5-percent increase. It became effective January 1, 1972.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of our record in the field of veterans' legislation. I have always supported every measure that comes before Congress designed to help these patriotic men and women who have served their country so well, and I look forward to continued support for veterans legislation in the 93d Congress.

TRIBUTE TO HON. FRANK BOW

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to the Honorable FRANK Bow, who is retiring this year from the House of Representatives. Congressman Bow has served 22 dedicated years in the House, and he will have completed his 11th consecutive term at the end of the 92d Congress—and I know he will be missed by his native State of Ohio and by the Nation he has served so well.

As the ranking minority member of the House Appropriations Committee, FRANK Bow gained the respect and the admiration of all Members of the House. In thinking back, I cannot seem to remember any important legislation involving appropriations over the years, that FRANK Bow was not involved in; he seemed to always know the specific details of all the important bills, and he was always able to discuss them in a way that indicated he took his job seriously and did his homework well.

It was no surprise to me when FRANK Bow was appointed as our new Ambassador to Panama. I am sure his great knowledge and ability will serve him well and I wish him luck—both in his new career, and in all future endeavors.

CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, in recent years much attention has been given to what has become known as "corporate social responsibility"—a company's response to the needs and aspirations of the community and country in which it is located. In past decades too many companies have had the attitude that their sole purpose was to make money or provide a specified service and that they were free to use both human and natural resources with no consideration to the effect of their actions on the public and the environment.

But, things have changed, and many companies have come to learn that good business includes an active social conscience.

Recently, a rating on corporate social responsibility was made by the National Affiliation of Concerned Business School Students. In the rating of 50 leading corporations, this group ranked Consolidated Edison, located in my district, 50th.

Con Ed was not very happy about their rating. And so, Robert Lehrman, Con Ed's public affairs vice president, wrote to Kirk Hanson, president of the National Affiliation of Concerned Business School

Students, stating Con Ed's side of the story.

Mr. Speaker, there have been several occasions when I have opposed, for environmental reasons, Con Ed's choice of sites to locate power plants. But, I do know that Con Ed has extended itself in a number of instances to assist the New York City metropolitan community. Therefore, I was very interested in Mr. Lehrman's response and its enumeration of various things Con Ed has been doing in an effort to meet its social responsibility. Because of the variety of community projects and employment opportunities listed by Mr. Lehrman and the interest they may hold for our colleagues and readers of the RECORD, I would like to extend my remarks to include Mr. Lehrman's response to Mr. Kirk. This letter has appeared in the September 12 issue of Business and Society, the publication in which the ratings were originally published on July 4.

Mr. Lehrman's letter follows:

DEAR MR. HANSON: In your recent poll of business school students, as reported in the July 4 issue of *Business and Society*, Con Edison ranked last among 50 corporations for social responsibility.

In light of the poll, we thought you might be interested in some of our efforts over the past few years:

More than 18 percent of our present work force are members of minority groups, up from 8 percent five years ago. New hires so far this year are running 40 percent or more minority.

We have trained, between 1967 and 1972, over 1500 disadvantaged men and women to become full-time employees. Our special training programs include remedial education, and many trainees have earned their high school equivalency diplomas.

We trained a number of welfare mothers and employed them half-days as keypunch operators.

In a pilot program, we provided jobs and special hours for Hasidic Jews whose religious obligations did not permit them to work regular hours.

We have established a minority vendor program to increase the number of contracts going to Black and Hispanic firms. We seek out minority bidders and also break purchases into packages small enough for struggling minority firms to handle. Our goal is at least $1 million in minority purchases in 1972, up from the $81,000 in our first year, 1969.

More than 100 Con Ed employees have served as volunteer Minority Business Counselors, assisting Black and Hispanic entrepreneurs with basic business problems.

We have loaned company vans for use as mobile labs to test for sickle cell anemia, lead poisoning and other illnesses.

Now in the fifth year of a joint program with the New York Yankees, by the end of the 1972 season we will have distributed the one-millionth free baseball ticket to youngsters from the City's disadvantaged areas. We also provide ball fields, sponsor bike rides and in many other ways encouraged recreation programs.

In 1971 Con Edison received one of the "Business in the Arts" awards given by Esquire Magazine and the Business Committee for the Arts "for outstanding corporate support for the fine and performing arts." The award was for our Community Holiday Festival at Lincoln Center during the Christmas Season when we sponsored entertainment groups from 37 local neighborhoods to perform at Lincoln Center. We distributed tickets to thousands of children from the same neighborhoods through dozens of local community organizations.

Our Consumer Affairs specialists work with schools, hospitals, block associations and community groups to provide advice on how to get the most value for a dollar, conduct sewing classes and other training. Our Consumer Affairs department has been singled out by the New York City Commissioner of Consumer Affairs for its outstanding and comprehensive education programs.

We have established an environmental engineering department headed by an Executive Vice President, one of the highest ranking officers in charge of environmental affairs in any company in the country. The department has six PhD's in the fields of air and water quality.

Since 1966 we have increased our deliveries of electricity by more than 30 percent while cutting in-City smokestack emissions of SO_2 and particulates by more than 50 percent. We expect to cut our emissions of these pollutants by at least 50 percent more by 1975.

We have more underground transmission and distribution lines than all the rest of the Nation's utilities combined; about 90 percent of our power is now delivered underground.

We have increased our research and development spending fivefold in the past five years.

We ask our customers to Save A Watt for the sake of the environment, to slow the drain on dwindling natural resources, to help avoid power shortages and to save themselves money. As of January, 1971, we started promoting power conservation, cancelled all sales promotion efforts, disbanded our sales force and launched the Save A Watt program. Since then more than 50 other utilities have followed suit to one degree or another.

Our efforts to be socially responsible go considerably beyond these examples. We know there is more to do, but we feel that those who judge us should know that we are aware of the need to help and that we are trying to be helpful.

Sincerely,

ROBERT O. LEHRMAN.

"DISTINGUISHED ALUMNUS": CONGRESSMAN McCULLOCH HONORED BY OHIO STATE COLLEGE OF LAW

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I was very deeply touched to read the beautiful words of appreciation and pride expressed by the College of Law of the Ohio State University when it named our illustrious colleague and friend, WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, a "Distinguished Alumnus."

No honor was more richly deserved, and I know that all who respect BILL for his long and courageous leadership in shaping some of the major legislation of our times will like to share this tribute with me.

It follows:

TRIBUTE

Presented to WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH in appreciation of the credit and esteem he has brought to The Ohio State University College of Law during his distinguished career of dedicated public service.

He will retire from the Congress of the United States after thirty-seven years of fruitful endeavors in high offices of the State of Ohio and the United States.

He graduated from the College in 1925, established himself in the private practice of law in Piqua, Ohio, and then was elected to six terms in the Ohio House of Representatives, serving as Speaker for three terms and Minority Leader for two terms.

He served in the United States Army as a Captain in Military Government during World War II, exercising command over that portion of the city of Paris, France, which included the Eiffel Tower and the Chamber of Deputies.

He was elected in 1947 to the first of thirteen consecutive terms in the United States House of Representatives and began a career of congressional leadership and legislative craftsmanship matched by few in our Nation's history.

He served as ranking Republican member of the House Judiciary Committee during one of its most productive periods. Working harmoniously with Chairman Emanuel Celler, his leadership helped to produce much major legislation affecting the federal courts, antitrust regulation, electoral reform and other areas of vital national concern. He personally made possible the passage of the Civil Rights Acts of 1964, 1965 and 1968 by conciliating various proposals for reform, drafting and redrafting the results and enlisting essential bipartisan support. Of his role in the civil rights legislative struggle, it has been justifiably written that "constitutional and human rights were more important than normal political advantage".

His constructive approach to national problems won him the trust and confidence of presidents of both major political parties. President Eisenhower appointed him to the Commission on Government Security and President Johnson named him to both the Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders and the National Advisory Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence.

Both the substance of the law and the administration of justice have been immeasurably advanced by his work and his career stands as a noble exemplar to all who would use the law as an instrument of human progress. For his service to his profession, his State and his Nation; for his rare combination of qualities of intellect, statesmanship and unselfish service; and for the honor and pride he has brought to The Ohio State University College of Law, he shall henceforth be known as one of its graduates who bears the title

DISTINGUISHED ALUMNUS

Dated this twentieth day of October, A.D. 1972.

JAMES C. KIRBY, Jr.,
Dean, the College of Law of the Ohio State University.

DAVID R. FULLMER,
Chairman, National Council of the College of Law of the Ohio State University.

TRIBUTE TO HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, JACKSON E. BETTS has served in this legislative Chamber for 20 years—10 successive terms. His devotion to public service has spanned almost four decades. For 12 years, I have been privileged to know him. I can say, without fear of

contradiction that his service has been exemplary.

Perhaps Mr. BETTS' most spectacular achievement of recent note was his spearhead of the fight against the Census Bureau's inclusion of questions in the 1970 census forms he considered invasions of privacy. That controversy opened the eyes of many a colleague to the dangers inherent in masses of seemingly unrelated computerized data.

Since the beginning of the Second World War, this country has found itself inextricably involved in international affairs. A thorough understanding of the inter- and intra-workings of the governments which we are pleased to call friendly has been essential. Mr. BETTS' contribution in that regard has been noteworthy. In November 1958, Mr. BETTS served as a delegate to the NATO Parliamentary Conference held in Paris. In 1970, he was a delegate to the 58th Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, held at The Hague, Netherlands, and again in 1971, to the 59th Conference of that Union.

JACKSON BETTS, ever the fine fellow to his colleagues, served his constituency, his party, and his country with distinction. Additionally, he was a leader in maintaining high standards of conduct, a model for his colleagues to emulate. He tempered that leadership with compassion and understanding, all the while refusing to compromise his high principles, as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

I wish JACKSON BETTS well in his retirement from the House of Representatives. Try as he may, I doubt that he shall ever retire from the public eye.

CAREY'S REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as is my custom, I am setting forth the complete text of my October newsletter for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope that my colleagues will find it of interest:

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON—OCTOBER 1972

The 92nd Congress unmistakably established new priorities for this nation. Our most productive new legislation builds a structure for meeting the human and environmental necessities and at the same time responds to public pressure for reduced foreign entanglements.

SCHOOL TAX CREDITS

The Ways and Means Committee has approved my bill for tax credits for families who have children attending non-public schools. Final passage of this measure, however, will depend upon favorable action by the next Congress. Non-public schools throughout our history and particularly in our district of Brooklyn have provided diversity of choice and healthy competition with public education. We cannot afford to have private schools go bankrupt and cause even greater burdens on our public education system. I will fight for the tax credit bill.

SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE

During my service on the Ways and Means Committee, there has been a 32% increase in Social Security benefits. This increase means an addition of approximately $120 million in annual payments for Brooklyn and an addition of $730 million for New York State.

Here is what the increase means to residents of the 15th District:

For an average single retired worker, payments jump from $133 a month to $161.

For the average couple, from $224 a month to $237.

For widows, average benefits rise from $114 to $137.

Maximum benefits also increase for an individual from $216 a month to $259 . . . for a couple from $324 to $389.

TAXES AND SPENDING

We *cut* Federal income taxes by $9.1 billion and reformed $6.6 billion more. Twenty one million poor families were removed from the Federal tax rolls through a low-income allowance. *All* tax brackets were reduced by five percent and the personal exemption increased to $750.

Tax revision will be the item of first priority on the Ways and Means Committee agenda when the new Congress convenes in January.

ZERO-BASE BUDGETING

We in Congress must be able to demonstrate to the taxpayers of this country that the benefits to be obtained from a particular program outweigh the benefits that could be obtained by spending the same amount of money for other purposes or by cutting taxes.

I therefore intend to submit to the New Congress a plan to implement zero-base budgeting procedures. My proposal would mean that all federal programs would be periodically reviewed from the ground up and not merely in terms of changes proposed for the budget year.

The purpose of zero-base budgeting is to discourage the Federal government from taking spending programs for granted and to encourage periodic review of the spending of government funds.

THE ECONOMY

Almost every poll has indicated that the economy is the No. 1 concern of Americans. The last 3 years have been characterized by inflation, high unemployment, and budget deficits which exceed the total combined deficits of the last three administrations. Congress has responded to these economic ills with a positive program designed to relieve unemployment and reduce inflation. Early in the 92nd Congress, the President was given authority to establish price and wage controls. As we know, President Nixon refused at first to use these powers, but he acceded when it became apparent that his administration's economic game plan was not working. Although I am far from satisfied with the manner in which price controls are being administered, particularly with respect to rent increases, Congress has given the President the tools he needs to curb rising prices.

To help ease unemployment, Congress passed four emergency bills:

The 1970 Public Service Employment Act; the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1971; the Emergency Employment Act; and the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act.

Unfortunately, President Nixon vetoed the Public Service Employment Act and the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1971 which were designed to combat unemployment by helping our cities build needed public facilities and sewer and water projects.

REVENUE SHARING

The Ways and Means Committee on which I serve has taken major steps to reduce the heavy city tax burdens upon American families. As a result of a new law, New York City will receive $248 million a year for at least five years from the Federal Government. Proper administration of these funds should also enable New York to substantially reduce crime and narcotics abuse which plague our city.

MEETING HUMAN NEEDS

The 92nd Congress overwhelmingly approved a 20-percent increase in social security benefits to help senior citizens keep pace with inflation. Legislation was enacted to provide nutritious meals for the elderly, and to extend comprehensive health, education, employment, and transportation services. A new National Institute of Aging was authorized to conduct research on the aging process and the special health problems of older persons.

The 92nd Congress responded vigorously to the needs of young people. Legislation was passed to create a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention; to establish school lunch and breakfast programs for needy youngsters; to provide comprehensive treatment and rehabilitation programs for veterans dependent on drugs or alcohol; and to increase veterans' education benefits; and, of paramount importance, was the constitutional amendment to extend the franchise to 20 million young Americans between the ages of 18 and 21. Under the new Higher Education Act, of which I was a sponsor, prospective college students will for the first time have a guarantee that a lack of funds will not prevent any person from obtaining a college education if he is willing to prepare himself for it.

JOB DEVELOPMENT—OUR NO. 1 NEED

I supported the Administration's move to halt arbitrary busing of school children. I remain inalterably opposed to any action that denies parents the right to send their children to quality neighborhood schools.

The efforts of the Ways and Means Committee to get our stagnant economy moving led the Revenue Act of 1971. My amendment recognized the urgent need for on-the-job training programs and the expansion of day-care facilities so that large new groups of men and women now unemployed or underemployed can take advantage of the increased opportunities.

It is of critical importance that private business be encouraged to provide facilities for both on-the-job training and day-care.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The 92nd Congress made new efforts to reassert congressional oversight of foreign policy. The House and Senate passed separate versions of the War Powers bill both of which require the President to report to Congress whenever he commits U.S. forces to action overseas without prior congressional consent. My experience as a combat infantryman taught me that our fighting men must be the world's best equipped. I have supported three presidents in making sure that our national defense is never weakened. At the same time I have fought waste and extravagance by the Pentagon.

I support the House resolution to bring White House pressure to bear on the Soviet Union to cease harassment of Jews who wish to immigrate to Israel.

With Congressman Peter Rodino, I sponsored legislation to amend immigration laws to enable families to reunite here in the United States. With Senators Kennedy and Ribicoff, I sponsored the resolution calling for peace with justice and an end to the bloodshed in Northern Ireland.

RALPH NADER—RAIDER OR GUERRILLA?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks of October 16, 1972, page E8785, I had raised the question of who controls Ralph Nader.

We now learn that this same Ralph Nader is the consulting editor for Hard Times—previously known as Mayday—a radical muckraking newspaper published in Washington, D.C., and self-described as "ammunition in an arsenal of guerrilla journalism." In such capacity Mr. Nader and his guerrilla journalism rubs elbows with some well-identified revolutionaries who are dedicated to changing the system of what they term the "imperialist United States."

I feel that our colleagues would be very interested in reviewing the U.S.A. report for January 16, 1970, by Alice Widener, "Will the Real Ralph Nader Please Stand Up?" which follows my remarks:

[From U.S.A., Jan. 16, 1970]

WILL THE REAL RALPH NADER PLEASE STAND UP?

(By Alice Widener)

Will the real Ralph Nader please stand up?

Is he celebrity Ralph Nader on the *Time* magazine cover last month, or is he Consulting Editor Ralph Nader for *Hard Times*, a radical muckraking newsletter published in Washington, D.C., a 4-page tabloid self-described as "ammunition in an arsenal of guerrilla journalism"?

Both Ralph Naders are one and the same man.

Which is the real one—"raider" Nader or "guerrilla" Nader? Is he, as *Time* says, "the self-appointed and unpaid guardian of the interests of 204 million U.S. consumers" and a person condemned by New Left revolutionaries "because he wants to improve the economic system rather than tear it down," or is Ralph Nader the intimate editorial associate of radical New Left editors and Communist revolutionary Socialist Scholars writing for *Hard Times*, which seeks to "change" the system?

Founded in October 1968, *Hard Times* was originally entitled "Mayday." Five months later, the publication announced it had been asked to cease using the trademarked international distress signal as a name and was changing it to "*Hard Times*." The publication did not, however, change its staff. From *Mayday* No. 1. October 11–16, 1968, to *Hard Times* No. 57, December 15–22, 1969, every issue carries on its masthead, "Consulting Editor, Ralph Nader."

Strangely, in the publishing business, the little newborn sheet *Mayday* received hard-to-get top publicity by the *New York Times, Washington Post, Newsweek and New York Magazine* almost immediately after uttering a very first outcry against our country, which *Mayday/Hard Times* continually describes as "the empire" and "the imperialist United States." On October 13, 1968, the *New York Times* reported about the two-day-old journal:

"The first issue of *Mayday*, a four-page weekly tabloid oriented toward muckraking and radical politics was published in Washington Friday under the editorship of three nationally known journalists.

"The editors are Andrew Kopkind, James Ridgeway, former reporters for the *New Republic*, and Robert Sherrill, correspondent for *The Nation* . . .

"Ralph Nader, lawyer and crusader for better consumer protection laws, is consulting editor. . . ."

The *New York Times* reported *Mayday* was "a shoestring operation" and quoted Mr. Kopkind as explaining, "The title is a triple pun that we hope will appeal to different constituencies. Mayday is the international distress signal, a call by radicals to take to the streets, and a reference to springtime for the counter-culture love generation."

The *Washington Post*, December 15, 1968, said Mayday also referred to the "People's Democracy [meaning Communist nations'] holiday." *The Post* reported that Mr. Kopkind said Mayday wanted to appeal to "distressed liberals, angry revolutionaries, and 'make love not war' types." *The Post* also said Ralph Nader "aids and abets" *Mayday* when he has time. Mr. Kopkind said he wanted *Mayday* "to change the system."

To try to accomplish that purpose, *Mayday/Hard Times* features material by Ralph Nader; by another consulting editor, Fred Gardner (West Coast) who recently testified in Chicago on behalf of Tom Hayden and Abbie Hoffman, U.S.-indicted defendants in the conspiracy-to-riot trial; by such "changers" of the system as Belgian revolutionary Marxist Ernest Manel, who is banned from France and the United States; and by Robin Blackburn, guest of honor, last September, as the Socialist Scholars Fifth Annual Conference, Hofstra University, New York. Two months later, Stanley Aronowitz told a Socialist Scholars meeting at Town Hall in Manhattan, "We, as revolutionary Communists, must defend all those taking part in revolutionary action."

Ernest Mandel, who last June wrote "Contradictions" for *Hard Times*, which described that number as "A Special Issue On Where America Is Going," was guest of honor at the Socialist Scholars annual meeting in 1968, where he said, "Students are detonators in the formula for triggering off a social explosion creating a revolutionary situation," for *Hard Times*, Ernest Mandel wrote:

"Today, profound forces are working to undermine the social and economic equilibrium which has reigned in the United States for more than 25 years . . . Some of these are forces of an international character . . . But from the point of view of Marxist method, it is important in the first place to stress those forces which are at work inside the system itself. This essay will attempt to isolate some of . . . the historic contradications which are now destroying the social equilibrium of the capitalist economy and bourgeois order of the United States."

Another writer for *Hard Times* is Robin Blackburn of London, who last September told the Socialist Scholars as their guest of honor, "We must have a decisive break which is the reverse of Puritanism. Such a socialist culture is impossible to achieve without the violent overthrow of the capitalism regime. . . . Anarchopopulism is very useful because it is undermining the archaic institution of private property."

Still other writers featured in *Mayday/Hard Times* are Norman Fruchter and Todd Gitlin of the communist revolutionary Students for a Democratic Society (SDS).

What about co-founder and editor Andrew Kopkind of *Mayday/Hard Times*, whom *Newsweek* praises as "a highly respected radical journalist," and with whom Ralph Nader works in close consultation? It is best to let Mr. Kopkind speak for himself in the October 20–27, 1969 issue of his muckraking tabloid:

"There were twelve people in our two-man cell at the Chicago Police Headquarters last Saturday after the SDS "Weatherman" march through the Loop. Our charges ran from disorderly conduct (my own) through possession of explosives to attempted murder. . . .

"Brian Flanagan, a bright and sensitive upper-middle "moderate" who found his way inside a Columbia building last year, and had now come to be charged with attempted murder (of Chicago's toughest judicial figure) rested in another corner . . ."

Brian Flanagan, aged 23, is indicted in Chicago for having kicked City of Chicago assistant corporation counsel Richard Elrod in the neck, an injury that paralyzed him from there down.

Editor Andrew Kopkind of *Hard Times* continues:

"The events of the afternoon were common to us all, whether we had been busted in the LaSalle Street melee, or a mile away (as I and two friends were). . . . That prótean rebellion which was born ten years ago in the South, that found forms to fit in Mississippi Delta, the Cleveland slums, the Berkeley campus, the hundred colleges and parks and Army posts, that appeared bloody last summer in Grant Park and stoned this summer at Woodstock, it ran that day in the Loop. Almost everyone else now thinks that that spirit of the Sixties has found its end. But at night in the cell-block, we believed it had found a new beginning.

" 'Weatherman' demands the willing suspension of disbelief. As an ideology of communism and a strategy of revolution, it . . . asks that radicals become revolutionaries, completely collectivize their lives, and struggle to death if necessary. . . .

"Now some say that the police attacked first, and others say the weathermen took the offensive, but it is true that the weathermen did not shrink from the fight, and we all thought in the cell block that night that simply not to fear fighting is a kind of winning."

So much for co-founder-editor "Weatherman"-friend Andrew Kopkind of *Mayday/Hard Times*, whose guerrilla-journalism sheet is aided and abetted by lawyer "raider" Ralph Nader.

A month later, Kopkind had a lot more to say in *Hard Times*, this time about his own role in the militant action of the Department of Justice during the November Moratorium in Washington, D.C.:

"Friday night's action clearly sparked the militance Saturday at the Justice Department. . . . by 4:30 it was time to move on out. The 'organizers' of the march—called to protest the 'Conspiracy' trial in Chicago and other political trials—handed out flags and banners, and four 12-foot puppets of Nixon, Agnew, Mitchell and Judge Julius Hoffman were raised to guide the march.

"The red banners and the NLF flags were streaming and the chants were quick and loud. 'Free Bobby Seale!' 'Off the Pig!' 'Stop the Trial!' 'Power to the People!' The line swung around the Justice building, then came up against the Mobe marshals 'protecting' the Constitution Avenue entrances. In seconds, the marshals were knocked aside . . . Someone ran an NLF flag up the flagpole, and every one cheered. Then a pretty pink smoke bomb went off in the bushes in front of the building. And then the gas attack began. This time, a few people panicked, and when the first barrage had settled they came back, in close. Then there was another wave of gas, and another, and the whole building and the streets in the heart of the Federal Triangle were thick with smoke. When it was clearly overwhelming, the crowds began moving back . . . And then a strange thing happened. In the middle of all that gas, with the rockets going off in front of us as well as behind, people joined arms and began chanting, 'Free Bobby Seale! Free Bobby Seale! Free Bobby Seale!' People were together in a way they hadn't been all week-end, for some maybe never before, and in the thick of the gas we

were laughing and cheering and not yet done."

There—in the two foregoing accounts of violence in which Andrew Kopkind himself says he took personal part, is the close editorial associate of "crusader" Ralph Nader.

What does Mr. Nader do for *Mayday/Hard Times?* It says he assists its "network" of foreign and domestic correspondents and researchers. He can do a lot for it, since *Time* reports his own staff, known as "Nader's raiders" has grown to "102 vacationing students in law, engineering and medicine." To judge by the interlocking by-lines and material itself, it seems *Hard Times* also is aided and abetted by the SDS Radical Education Project and its affiliate North American Congress for Latin America (NACLA), whose former employee, Pat Swinton, is now on the FBI's most wanted list for her alleged part in the 1969 bombings of private and public buildings in New York City. *Hard Times* evidently hasn't a hard time in getting guerrilla news.

The article "Pesticides: Slow or Sudden Death for California Farm Workers" by Ralph Nader and Jerome B. Gordon in the November 8–15, 1968 issue of *Mayday* is a muckraking, wildly exaggerated dilly of a guerrilla journalism piece. In the first four grim paragraphs, three concern incidents in present day Cuba, Tijuana (Mexico) and Colombia. The fourth occurred in San Diego and was entirely accidental.

Here are some samples of the Nader-Gordon guerrilla journalism in *Mayday:*

"By far the greatest use of pesticides in this country is in commercial agriculture. . . .

"The frequent victims of pesticide poisoning are children. In the period from 1951 to 1965, roughly 60 per cent of the accidental deaths attributable to poisoning from pesticides in California were among children."

The accidental death of even one child is tragic. But authors Nader-Gordon seem carefully to refrain from stating exactly how many accidental deaths of children from pesticide poisoning occurred in California during the 14 years between 1951 and 1965. After all, six out of ten is 60 per cent. Were there 10, 20, 100, or 1,000, or how many accidental deaths?

* * * * *

Comments about Ralph Nader's network are not all that James Ridgeway, co-founder and editor of *Mayday/Hard Times* has to say about Ralph Nader. In fact, it seems editor Ridgeway has a much deeper insight into his fellow editor Nader as a person than has *Time* Magazine, which says he is "an almost legendary crusader who would—and could—use a fly to instigate a congressional investigation." * * *

"What makes Nader so effective?" asks *Time,* and replies, "Much of the answer lies in his lawyer's dedication to hard facts."

There is another much more significant answer to *Time's* question, however, an answer furnished in profound detail by Nader's close editorial colleague, James Ridgeway in an article "Market Economy" for the December 1–8, 1969 issue of *Hard Times.* Mr. Ridgeway begins:

"During the Johnson Administration, Congress passed a series of laws to protect consumers. The measures were eagerly accepted since they cost no money . . . but they never came to much, even in terms of the minor technical alterations which were meant to substitute for a radical restructuring of the industrial economy."

Such a radical restructuring is what *Mayday/Hard Times* is all about. What it wants is a Marxist economy in the United States and everywhere else. Moreover, several unfair, unwise provisions of the consumer protection laws passed by Congress—which Ridgeway says cost "no money"—are punitively expensive for our great industrial companies and are forcing them to raise prices, an inflationary effect likely to cause a decrease in American consumer consumption.

A huge and crippling American decrease in consumption, one that would reduce us to the poverty-stricken status of citizens in the Socialist countries—is precisely what radicals seeking a "radical restructuring" of our industrial economy are striving to achieve by any and all means, even by disguising themselves as crusading humanitarians.

Hard Times means what its name says!

This is made explicitly clear in James Ridgeway's article on our market economy and Ralph Nader, an article in which Ridgeway reveals the motivating force behind his close editorial associate, Mr. Nader. Ridgeway writes:

"The most important advocates of consumer protection are the trial lawyers, who are loosely organized through the American Trial Lawyers Association. This is a maverick group with occasional populist-progressive tendencies.

"In recent years, the trial lawyers have mounted a devastating attack on American corporations. Their suits begin as simply damage claims, then broaden into attacks on the conduct of the corporation, tracing in the most fundamental radical manner the injury of individuals back through the corporation hierarchy. They show in great detail how corporate officials engage in calculated plunder and injury of the populace. Discovery procedures of the court enable the lawyers to obtain and introduce into court records documents revealing precise details of corporation activity. Juries are convinced and damages running into the millions have been set against companies. Congressional committees spend time assembling and reprinting documents from the cases."

And lawyer Nader's young student lawyers are busily "researching" them for him and for *Hard Times.*

James Ridgeway continues:

"The effects of this legal attack are profound. Not only do the courtroom victories enhance the power and prestige of the trial lawyer . . . but they turn the court into a legislature. . . .

"Since the court has become the arena where the post-industrial economy is adjusted, every citizen needs a lawyer—not a legislator—to look after his interests. Perhaps this helps explain the keen interest by Ralph Nader and many other young lawyers in restructuring legal education, 'improving' law schools, developing centers for the practice of law in the 'public interest,' and so on. In reality, they are working towards a new definition of a governmental system, in which 'lawyers' are a commanding elite. Nader's fundamental task is not so much to protect consumers as it is to organize his own constituency, the legal profession, for the assumption of power in a post-industrial society. . . .

What Ridgeway and the writers for *Mayday/Hard Times* mean by a "post-industrial society" is a Marxist "people's democracy."

Time magazine says "Nader insists that he is not 'anti-business' but simply 'pro-people.'" But *Time* does not elaborate on what Mr. Nader means by his being "pro-people." However, *Time* quotes him as saying, "My job is to bring issues out in the open where they cannot be ignored. There is a revolt against the aristocratic uses of technology and a demand for democratic uses. We have got to know what we are doing to ourselves. Life can be—and is being—eroded." * * *

His close colleague James Ridgeway, who certainly ought to know, says in *Hard Times* that Ralph Nader is the Ralph who is not so much protecting consumers as organizing "his own constituency," and "in that process, he must mediate between seemingly opposing lawyers, in order that they function as a single power elite . . ."

Mr. Ridgeway concludes his analysis of Ralph Nader by stating, "The evils of the business system—so well revealed by the trial lawyers—are its values, exploitation of masses of people in the interests of the very few. Consumer protection begins by understanding that one must fight the idea of consumption which is essential to exploitation."

There it is—the real doctrinaire Marxist philosophy of *Mayday/Hard Times* and a clear explanation of why "legendary" Ralph Nader is its consulting editor. Sincere, constructive protection of consumers is one thing; but arrogant consumerism for establishment of a lawyers' Marxist power elite over American consumption is another.

Nader style "consumerism" seems in reality to be designed to decrease our American consumption as a means of "changing the system" of American capitalism and creating a socialist "post-industrial" society run by a power elite.

"Over the long run," writes editor James Ridgeway in *Hard Times,* for which Ralph Nader is consultant, "safety is part of the sales mechanism." A fight against sales to the prosperous American consumer is a major part of what *Hard Times* is all about.

Ridgeway concludes his article about the American market economy and his associate Ralph Nader with the following statement:

"On the simplest level, it is not necessary to buy a car every year, to eat plastic food, to have clean smelling breath, and perfumed genitalia. Babies need not be fed food that is made to taste pleasant for their mother's benefit. Stores don't have to color oranges and lemons, and so on. As war is the method of extending empire abroad, mindless consumption is the method for colonizing us at home."

Evidently, what Weatherman-friend Andrew Kopkind and muck-racking James Ridgeway and "crusading" Ralph Nader of *Mayday/Hard Times* want us Americans to do is to rebel against being capitalist "colonial" consumers so we can become slaves of a "power elite" in a meager-consumption Marxist economy.

Will the real Ralph Nader please stand up? Will he tell his 204 million American audience that "raider" Nader and "guerrilla journalist" Nader are one and the same man and there are 57 varieties of the tabloid *Mayday/Hard Times* to prove it, and that its current promotion sheet announces for 1970 a special program to "muckrake" our wonderful space agency NASA?

There are more than 57 revolutionary varieties of Marxist by-lines on the tabloid's front pages to prove that it is exactly what it claims to be—"ammunition in an arsenal of guerrilla journalism" aimed at destruction of our free economic and social system.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, among the retiring colleagues I will greatly miss is the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL of Colorado. WAYNE and I were sworn in as freshmen Congressmen on the same day, January 3, 1949, and we were put on the Consent Calendar together. For nearly 24 years our party differences have made no difference in our friendship and I know of no Member on

either side of the aisle who has been more diligent or more dedicated in the work of legislation than WAYNE ASPINALL.

I regret that I was unable to be present when tributes to him were spoken earlier in this Chamber, but I have read with profound admiration his eloquent and typically modest response, in which he expresses the love and feeling which he has for the House of Representatives. I believe his words should be required reading for all new Members who come to this body, which as WAYNE stated is the repository of the strength and the hope of the American people.

He has certainly done more than his part in raising the standard of service here and I know that I speak for all Members in wishing him and his wife Essie many years of health and happiness. I happen to have a special fondness for Colorado's rugged mountains and ski slopes, so I know that Betty and I will see the Aspinalls again after they retire.

DON'T BE HALF A CITIZEN—VOTE THE ENTIRE BALLOT

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, by this time we all have heard a great deal about the importance of voting in the presidential election. I certainly agree and hope that all Americans, regardless of whom or what they support, will exercise their basic responsibility and right as citizens.

Unfortunately a great many of us cheat ourselves out of our constitutional rights by only voting for the partisan candidates. Important judicial, school board and city council offices are elected on the nonpartisan ballot. The ballot questions on the top of the machine include crucial questions on issues of long-term impact on taxes, education, citizen participation, and other matters affecting all of us.

Those who leave the ballot booth without voting for the nonpartisan candidates and the ballot questions make themselves second-class citizens. Use your full voter power. Vote Tuesday, November 7. And vote the entire ballot.

The voters in Detroit should be aware of the many issues contained on the ballot. At the top of the ballot, in the red portion, there are daylight time, abortion reform and other important issues such as:

Proposition F: A new county jail;

Proposition G: County juvenile justice facilities;

Proposal H: A new city charter for Detroit; and

Proposition L: Detroit school millage.

Detroit citizens should also vote the blue part of the ballot, the nonpartisan races which are also important: City council, Detroit School Board and judges. Finally, in a partisan decision, I would tell Detroit citizens to vote the party candidates of your choice, from President on down, on the white portion of the ballot.

CONGRESS ENACTS LANDMARK HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am setting forth the complete text of my special report to the people of the 15th District of New York concerning education for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope that my colleagues will find it of interest:

SPECIAL EDUCATION REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF THE 15TH DISTRICT ON THE EDUCATION RECORD OF THE 92D CONGRESS

CONGRESS ENACTS LANDMARK HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

The 92nd Congress passed the most important higher education bill since Abraham Lincoln signed the Land Grant College Act over a cenutry ago.

The new Omnibus Education Act can mean significant help for every Fifteenth District family planning to send a son or daughter to college in 1973 and the legislation will also bring much needed aid to every college and university in New York City and the nation.

This law has two basic goals:

(1) To assure that able students from both low and Middle income families who want to go to college won't be denied the chance because their families don't have the money; and

(2) To provide direct aid for operating expenses to institutions of higher learning, both public and private.

BENEFITS FOR BROOKLYN RESIDENTS

The new law creates a brand new program of Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (EOG's). Beginning in 1973, every college student will be entitled to a Federal grant of $1,400 a year, minus the amount his family can reasonably be expected to contribute. The Federal grant, however, cannot be more than one half the actual cost of attending the institution.

There are already in existence several other programs to help college students:

(1) Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants, providing grants from $1,000 to $1,500 to needy students. This is in addition to the EOG's described above.

(2) The College Work Study Program which provides part-time jobs for students.

(3) Direct loans to students (formerly the National Defense Student Loan program). These are low-interest loans to students, based on financial need.

(4) Guaranteed Student Loans, a program of insured loans with interest subsidies for certain needy students.

DIRECT BENEFITS FOR BROOKLYN COLLEGES

Under the new program of direct institutional aid, virtually all of the colleges and universities in Brooklyn will receive new federal money.

All campuses of the City University of New York (including Brooklyn College) will receive annually about $11.9 million; Brooklyn Law School, $121,000; St. Francis College, $275,000; St. John's University, $908,000; Downstate Medical Center, $134,329; Long Island University, $1,073,829; Packer Collegiate Institute, $6,532; Polytechnic Institute, $527,610; Pratt Institute, $666,053; and St. Joseph's College for Women, $76,449.

Brooklyn colleges and universities will be receiving a total of $15,688,802 in new federal money under this new bill.

OTHER FEATURES

The new law contains many other features, including:

Extension of all existing aid to higher education programs, including student assistance;

Aid for occupational and vocational education;

Special incentive grants to institutions enrolling veterans;

Incentives for state scholarship programs;

Emergency help to colleges in severe financial distress.

FURTHER INFORMATION

In order to answer any questions which you might have concerning college aid, and to provide help in applying for any of these grants, I have appointed a special staff member, Miss Karen Johnson, to serve as my student aid counsellor. You can contact her weekdays between 9 A.M. and 5 P.M. at my Brooklyn office, 225 Cadman Plaza East at 596–3839.

TAX RELIEF FOR PARENTS OF NONPUBLIC SCHOOL CHILDREN

Many low and middle income parents who now send their children to nonpublic schools bear a heavy financial burden. As they willingly pay taxes to support public schools, they cannot also afford the high cost of a nonpublic education. This has been an important factor in the closing of many nonpublic schools.

Nonpublic schools represent an integral part of our society. They provide a diversity of choice and healthy competition for public education. We cannot afford to have them disappear.

A commonly accepted method for easing a citizen's tax burden is allowing a tax credit. A tax credit is subtracted from the taxpayer's final tax bill for the year. Every dollar of tax credit reduces one's taxes by one dollar, regardless of tax bracket.

The tax credit has two advantages over a tax deduction:

(1) It may be taken even when the taxpayer does not itemize his deductions.

(2) It provides a greater benefit to middle income parents, who bear the greatest relative financial burden in sending their children to nonpublic schools, than an itemized deduction.

It is for these reasons that I introduced on August 2, 1972, H.R. 16141, a bill to provide a tax credit of up to $200 per year per child to parents for tuition paid elementary and secondary nonpublic schools.

My legislation would work as follows. If you paid $400 tuition to an elementary or secondary school for your child's education, you would be eligible for a $200 tax credit for each child. For example, if on your federal tax return, you owe the Federal Government $200, the subtraction of your tax credit would mean that your final liability is zero. If you have two children going to nonpublic school, you would take a credit of up to $400.

For the almost 110,000 families in Brooklyn with over 120,000 children in nonpublic schools, my bill would mean a total saving of $44 million in federal taxes for these families.

Chairman Mills joined me in sponsoring H.R. 16141, and extensive hearings were held in August and September. During the hearings, the legislation won wide support from the Administration, school officials, education experts, constitutional lawyers, and other Members of Congress. In an unprecedented appearance before a Congressional committee, Cardinal Cooke testified in support of H.R. 16141.

I am pleased to report to you that the Committee on Ways and Means approved my bill, and I am hopeful that desperately needed tax relief for nonpublic school par-

ents will promptly pass the new Congress which convenes in January.

ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS ENACTED BY THE 92D CONGRESS TO HELP ALL STUDENTS

Expanded Headstart program to enable children of working families to participate in voluntary day care centers.

National School Lunch Act Amendments to provide free and low price meals for needy children.

Vietnam Veterans Education Assistance to grant a major increase in aid for education and vocational training for returning veterans.

Your comments on this newsletter and any proposals you might have on any subject are of interest to me. Please write to me c/o House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.

If you need assistance, please call my Brooklyn offices at either 596–3839 or TE 9–2300 between 9:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. on weekdays.

WOLVES AND MEN IN NORTH AMERICA

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to the article "Wolves and Men in North America," by an expert in the field of wildlife conservation, Dr. Douglas H. Pimlott:

WOLVES AND MEN IN NORTH AMERICA

(By Douglas H. Pimlott, Ph. D.)

(NOTE.—The future of the wolf presents one of the most important conservation questions of our time: will the species still exist when the twentieth century passes into history, or will man have exterminated it in a final demonstration of his conquest both of the wilderness and of wild things that dare to compete, or that conflict with him? A few years ago in writing an article for the Canadian Audubon Magazine on the control of wolves in Canada, I used such words in an attempt to capture the interest of readers and to raise second thoughts about the place of these large predators in a man-dominated world.)

Six years later I still believe that preservation of the wolf is as important a work as conservationists have ever undertaken. This animal, one of the most adaptable, intelligent and interesting mammals that has ever existed, has been misunderstood, feared, maligned and persecuted for centuries. No other animal in history has had such a completely negative image in the human mind.

It is because of this negative image that preservation of wolves is so formidable a task. As the concept of preservation of nature has gradually developed, the species that have had particular attention lavished on them have been those which men cherished for the sport that the hunt afforded or those which, if of no direct value to him, have had an aesthetic or emotional appeal. On the other hand, man's attitude has been very intolerant when animals that competed with him were concerned. The long battle that conservationists have had to wage to preserve the birds of prey attests to the strength of popular prejudice. (In many areas this battle is still far from being won.) To obtain protective legislation for them it has almost always been necessary to prove that the birds are valuable to man ("They kill mice.") or, at least, are harmless to him ("They kill only species which man does not want.") Others that are branded as chicken hawks or as lamb killers are almost always excluded from the protective blanket of legislation, or therefore so protected and still blatantly shot in defiance of it.

The best insight into the behavior of wolves toward humans comes from scientists who have worked and lived close to them. In his book, *A Naturalist in Alaska*, Adolph Murie tells of his experience when he found the East Fork den in Mt. McKinley National Park. He followed the tracks of wolves after a late fall of snow in May. When he came close to the den he surprised a male wolf that ran off and, intermittently, howled and barked at him. As he stood a short distance from the den a female put her head out, withdrew, then came out with a rush and ran past him leaving a litter of pups behind. While he crawled in and removed three of the pups the wolves howled and barked from a nearby ravine but did not challenge him more seriously even though he took one pup away with him.

Our experiences in studying wolves in Ontario, and more recently on Baffin Island, have been similar to Dr. Murie's. Even though we have worked and travelled unarmed in wolf country, often living close to them, we have never been threatened in any serious way. Perhaps even more powerful testimony is that, in spite of one of the highest wolf populations in the world in that area, thousands of children canoe and camp in the wilderness section of Algonquin Park each year and there are no reports of any one of them having been attacked or even threatened by wolves.

The evidence for North America is quite clear—wolves present virtually no threat to humans. There can be no pretence that the killing of wolves is justified because they are dangerous to man. On this score at least, conservationists can set out to establish a positive image for the wolf by stating the case on the basis of the evidence that exists.

It is not always possible, however, to make the wolf into a "desirable" animal on the basis of its food habits. Studies made during the past three decades have shown that in most areas wolves live primarily on large mammals both in summer and in winter. In areas where hunting pressure is heavy it is likely that many animals killed by wolves would otherwise have been killed by hunters. Clearly, we should no longer try to defend the wolf by trying to prove that it does not compete with man-the-hunter for big-game animals, for in many cases it is conceivable that it does. At this point in time we should cease arguing that wolves live on rabbits or mice because many studies now indicate that this is an erroneous argument.

Research on Isle Royale and in Algonquin Park indicates that in situations where big-game are not hunted by man, wolves prey very heavily on old animals during the winter and on young ones during the summer. Hunting, at least in winter, is a process of continuous testing of animals that are encountered, until eventually an animal is encountered which the wolves somehow recognize as one that they can kill. It all boils down to the fact that the wolves kill animals that are easiest to catch, and during part of the year these are the old and infirm animals. On this phase of the question there now seems to be scientific justification for the statements, long made but undocumented, that wolves remove the weak animals from the herd.

It still is not clear what happens in areas where big-game animals are heavily hunted. In these situations not very many animals live beyond middle age, and no studies have yet been published that show what type of animals the wolves live on in such areas.

Before I discuss how nature lovers can help to dispel the wolf's negative image I would like to trace the history of its development:

HISTORICAL ASPECTS OF THE WOLF IMAGE

Although I consider that it is unfortunate that men throughout the world continue to have such a low regard for wolves I can understand how it has happened.

First of all, it is worth remembering that the wolf occurred in the northern hemisphere around the entire world. Virtually everywhere that there were men there were also wolves.

This relationship was probably quite an equitable one when men were primitive hunters whose survival, like the wolf's depended on their ability to catch wild things. I do not think that there is any evidence, for example, that the Eskimos or Indians of North America feared wolves. These people were at home in their environment. They utilized both the flesh and the fur of wolves, and it is quite likely that on occasion they also utilized the flesh of animals which the wolves had killed. I suspect that the big change came when man became a farmer.

Man-the-agriculturalist began to lose contact with the natural environment. He depended on vegetable crops and domesticated animals for food, and lived a very restricted existence. The world beyond his immediate doorstep was a strange place and he built up a great body of superstition and folklore about it. The habits of the wolf made an ideal subject upon which to build:

It lives on the largest of the mammals and the killing of one of them usually results in a mess of blood and bones that bears gory testimony to the prowess of the killers. After wild animals were replaced by domestic animals the wolves killed them and undoubtedly there were times when this threatened the food supply of a community. At the same time the people who had lost much of their hunting skill, undoubtedly felt very vulnerable in the presence of an animal that had the capacity to kill and then to fade into the forest for long periods before being heard of again. Under such circumstances, whether wolves actually killed people or not, it was inevitable that our ancestors would come to hate, fear and, on every possible occasion, to attempt to kill them.

For centuries the objective has been to exterminate wolves. Only within recent years have authorities in North America begun to state that the objective is "to control, not to exterminate" wolves. In Europe and Asia the goal is still extermination and in Russia intensive poisoning programs are being undertaken to achieve that goal.

CAMPAIGNS AGAINST WOLVES IN THE UNITED STATES

In the United States payments for the killing of wolves, commonly referred to as the bounty system, have been made for over 300 years. In his book, *The Wolf in North American History*, Stanley Young states that the first payments were made in Massachusetts in 1630.

It took over 200 years to exterminate gray wolves east of the Mississippi River; by 1850 they had disappeared from all but a few areas and by 1900 they had been exterminated throughout the east. Some persisted in northern Wisconsin and the Upper Peninsula of Michigan for another 50 years but, according to the best sources, are probably extirpated from these areas as well.

West of the Mississippi the wolf persisted in considerable numbers until the 1930's. It was thought that they would disappear from the Great Plains once the buffalo were gone. This did not happen because in the interim cattle and sheep industries had built up and the adaptable wolf substituted these domestic animals for food where big-game animals were scarce.

It is likely that the mountains would have provided a refuge for the wolf if grazing had not become such big business on National Forests and other public lands. The grazing interest would not tolerate predation of livestock and in 1915 Congress appropriated funds for the control of animals injurious to agriculture. It was the death knell for

the large predators in the western United States.

As recently as 1944, Young predicted that wolves would always occur in wilderness areas of the United States, but 20 years later they occur only in the Superior National Forest of Minnesota, on Isle Royale and in Alaska. (The story of the wolf of Isle Royale makes fascinating reading. In a recent publication, *The Wolves of Isle Royale* (Superintendent of Documents, Washington) David Mech recounts how the wolves are believed to have reached the island from Canada in the late 1940's. It also includes a detailed account of their interrelationships with moose, their principal prey.)

The wolf's final campaign in the United States may soon be fought in Minnesota. It is encouraging that in its last stand the wolf is finally receiving some support from people. Although the state harbours the last major population in the contiguous states, it has long paid a bounty of $35 for each wolf killed. In 1964 the state legislature passed a bill which would have extended bounty payments on foxes and wolves. Governor Karl Rolvaag vetoed the bill giving wolves, for a few years at least, a slightly better chance for survival. This year, however, there is a new governor and the anti-wolf forces are working to have the wolf bounty reinstated. There is a good chance that they will succeed. Massive public support for the wolf could help to turn the tide. Both the Minnesota Conservation Federation and the state division of the Izaak Walton League are working for the protection of wolves in the state. It is to be hoped that they will be joined by individuals throughout the United States. It is not entirely a state matter for the main wolf range occurs in the Superior National Forest. Since the wolf has now been placed on the list of rare and endangered species of the United States, action could be taken to protect it on this block of federal lands.

The story of the disappearance of the red wolf in the southern states makes equally unpleasant reading. The species originally occurred over a broad band of range from Florida to Texas and north to Missouri. As recently as 1964 these wolves were reported by an official of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as still being common in Louisiana, Arkansas and Eastern Texas. This optimistic report was not borne out by studies conducted in these areas and the red wolf has now joined the gray wolf on the list of rare and endangered species. So little is known about it that an intensive ecological investigation is required before it will be possible to state for certain that it has not already gone down the road to extinction.

It is another case where the average individual could play an important role by demanding action. A strong public demand for an intensive investigation of the status and ecology of the red wolf (in letters directed to Mr. Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, to U.S. Senator Karl E. Mundt, who has been a diligent worker for the preservation of animals, and to individual congressmen) could lead to the establishment of an emergency research program. It is urgently needed.

WOLF PRESERVATION AND NATURE LOVERS

I suggested at the outset that wolf preservation poses a major challenge to conservationists because our concept of conservation has been such a man-centered one. We have fought major battles only for species that had tangible value or that had an emotional appeal. What chance is there then that wolves can be retained as part of the fauna over large areas of Canada and Alaska or that they can be restored in parts of the United States? How can the battle for wolf preservation best be fought? The challenge that exists is to preserve wolves in spite of their negative image; it is to get the multitude of conservationists around the world to broaden their concept of conservation so that they see that it is as desirable to have wolves in a forest as it is to have moose, deer or elk; it is to get men to accept that the wolf that kills to live has just as much, or even a greater, right to a deer as has the man who kills for fun.

Part of our approach should be to argue the case for the rights of animals that share the world with us. More and more men are coming to recognize that we do not have the right to ask about an animal, "What good is it?" expecting an answer strictly in terms of human values. All naturalists should play a part by quietly refusing to answer the question in the form that it is asked. Perhaps we should ask instead, "What good is a man?" A period of reflection on man's inhumanity to man or the rapid rate at which our species is multiplying and despoiling the earth serves to put both questions in their proper perspective.

A second, and possibly the most important part is to work to establish a positive image of the wolf in the minds of men. It is not nearly as important to convert those who are confirmed wolf haters as it is to develop a positive attitude among the masses of people who are interested in nature but who have never thought that the preservation of an animal like the wolf really mattered. It can be done in many ways. Studies of the social behavior of wolves, for example, have shown that they have very strong family bonds. The male takes a very active part in caring for the pups and in this may be assisted by other members of the pack that do not have young of their own. It appears that, to a large extent, the pups learn to hunt as a result of experience rather than as the result of instinct. Wolves have somehow learned to control their own numbers so that populations never "explode" as they do with many species of animals. I have found that as people learn of these and of other fascinating aspects of their behavior, and realize that they are dangerous to man, interest mounts very rapidly. Such interest always results in positive thinking.

I have high hopes for the future of wolves in North America. Many men will cease to think of them as vermin and see them as they are—one of the most interesting and intelligent animals that has ever lived on our globe. Do you dare to become involved in such a noble cause?

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE "KILLS" ARKANSAS TOWN

HON. BILL ALEXANDER
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, for almost 2 years I have periodically brought to the attention of my colleagues actions by the U.S. Postal Service which are adversely affecting the people of our Nation. Today I would like to present for your consideration two more incidents. One is a letter from a young woman describing frustrations caused by the inefficient actions of the Postal Service. The other is a news story which describes the manner in which the U.S. Postal Service "kills" Arkansas towns.

One institution that is vital to the survival of a small town is the post office. Recently the Arkansas Gazette reported on this fact. In view of the mounting criticism of the United Postal Service I would particularly commend this article to my colleagues for their consideration.

WEST MEMPHIS, ARK.

DEAR MR. ALEXANDER: I sent my birthday invitations on a Monday and the next Friday the invitations hadn't arrived yet and I had to call everyone after wasting time making out the invitations. The mail used to get places on time but it sure doesn't any more. I think you should either put our annex back in West Memphis or try speeding it up in Memphis because it's terrible for people to have to wait weeks for mail and by the time it gets there it's too old to look at. Now all those girls are going to get their invitations days late (if they get them at all). Can't you do something about this?

ROCHELLE BUTLER.

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE "KILLS" ARKANSAS TOWN

(By Mike Masterson)

The death rattle was unmistakable and signs of a lost achievement were evident in the small community of Auvergne when all that remained of a once organized community vanished with the mid-September locking of its postoffice door.

Founded in the early 1900s, Auvergne, six miles south of Newport on Route 17, at first flourished amidst the soybean and cotton fields of Northeast Arkansas.

A railroad line was built through the community during its earlier years and businesses sprang up: A cleaning firm, a shoe repair shop, a cafe, and even a barber shop opened eager doors in Auvergne and some claimed the tiny educational academy in the town was one of the best in Arkansas. But it closed during the 1920s.

Three merchandise stores were opened, including the Clement's building in Auvergne. It closed during the 1930s. Old timers today can recall large crowds shopping on Saturdays in Auvergne and a few said they can even remember a bank being opened in the community.

As decades passed and children grew to raise their own—who later left—the expanding town of Auvergne began to falter. A majority of the town was destroyed in a great windstorm during the 1930s and some attribute the prolonged illness and resulting death of Auvergne directly to the loss of the railroad.

Claude Robinson of Auvergne, who lived in the town since 1921 leaned back in a porch chair and said: "The best I remember, the town started dying when the railroad pulled out during the 1940s. It was sure a booming town before that."

Joe Bridges, a native of Mississippi, but a resident of Auvergne since 1920, said he can remember the days in that community when stores lined both sides of the street. There was a Baptist church here too," he said.

Auvergne even boasted its own school system at one time and area children attended what was locally known as the Doswell School. "It was great," said one long-time resident, "a lot of people called it the little red school." The children of Auvergne now attend public school in Newport, where they are picked up and delivered to their doorsteps.

"The town was still holding its own 30 years ago," said Jessie Turner, a native of the area. "We still had lots of stores and people, but then it began dying. I don't really know why, it just did."

B. F. Sherrell, 68, a resident of Auvergne for the past 30 years, was upset by the closing of the local postoffice, calling it the last remaining sign of the town of Auvergne. "We've lost our church," he said, "and now our postoffice. When those things are gone, so is your town."

Sherrell said nothing was done by residents to stop the postoffice from closing and his voice reflected a twinge of bitterness when he spoke of it. "We just sat back and let

them take it," he said, "and now we've got nothing left."

He predicted the remaining grocery store in Auvergne would lose much of its present business as a result of losing the postoffice. "Lots of the folks would come to Auvergne to pick up their mail," he said, "and then stroll over to the store to buy groceries. Now there will be no need for them to come to Auvergne."

Postmaster Vaughn Jackson of Newport said closing the Auvergne branch office on September 16 proved somewhat more difficult than he had at first anticipated. "I told the superintendent of mails, who accompanied me to Auvergne that day, that we were about to undo something that people had worked for and kept alive for almost 60 years," said Jackson. "I guess anyone would feel a twinge of nostalgia and pity for those now gone, who worked so hard to establish a growing community."

Jackson said closing the postoffice in Auvergne was a necessary step for both economic and service reasons. "We can operate a door-to-door service to people in that rural route area for a lot less than what it costs to keep a branch office open in Auvergne," he said, "plus the people will benefit from the more efficient service."

Several Auvergne citizens have served as postmaster over the decades and it wasn't until 1966 that the office was placed under the jurisdiction of the Newport postoffice. "We have been operating the Auvergne office, with a clerk-in-charge for six years," said Jackson, "as is the case with some of the small communities around Newport."

The clerk-in-charge in Auvergne at the time the office closed its doors for good was Mrs. Patricia Sanders, who had served there for just over a year. "They just don't need the office any more," she said, "there are too many ranches and the rural route postman goes right past our door each day."

The Sanders purchased the old postoffice building and are now in the process of converting it into living quarters. "I don't know what I'll do now," Mrs. Sanders continued. "We may go back to Illinois so I can find work."

The cotton gin in Auvergne closed two years ago and the only remaining structures visible to passing motorists who don't turn their heads in conversation or blink momentarily, are a small one-room country store, a delapidated fish house and three large metal buildings, one of which once was the flourishing Clement's Mercantile Store.

The only money-making operation as such now in Auvergne is a large-scale fish raising corporation owned by O. R. Roden and Billy Welch, who both live in the community. Welch, who is Roden's son-in-law, said they began the fish raising operation in Auvergne because of the flat nature of the land. "The sunken terrain was a natural for us," he said, "but there's not much else around here to keep a man working now."

The creaking wooden porch of Bell's country grocery store in Auvergne reflect years of use and weather and it looks like any other rural store on the inside. The floor is covered with linoleum and a small air conditioner hums steadily in one corner. Several persons are seated in the middle of the room and each eyes an intruder with a glare of unfamiliarity.

Pauline Bell, the owner of the grocery, leaned over the counter and smiled. "People have to leave Auvergne nowadays," she said, "Why, the new modern farm machinery makes it so they don't need any help. The farmers in this area have become too self sufficient and all the young people leave here to find work. The older ones are slowly dying off and the community along with it."

"There used to be some of the darndest crap games you ever heard of in this here store," interjected the white-haired man seated toward the back of the store. "Of course that was back in the good old days. Ain't that right," he nodded toward an elderly man, who was leaning on an ice cream box near the front of the store. The man smiled and shook his head in agreement.

Asked how many persons remain in Auvergne, Mrs. Bell cleared her throat and said, "well we counted them up one time and it came out to exactly 67."

There are undoubtedly many Auvergnes along the highways of America. Communities that, for one reason or another, have lost their identities, but the residents of Auvergne are special in their own way.

They are people who fought the uphill battle to become a thriving community and lost. They managed to continue for years when their school folded, and held on even longer without a church, economy or future. The final gasp of life came on Saturday, September 16, when the community of Auvergne, population 67, lost its zip code, its dreams and its future.

DRINKING, DRIVING, AND YOU

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my very good friend and constituent, Mr. Anthony J. DelPopolo, Sr., recently retired after 27 years of Federal service and has joined the Northern Virginia Community College in Annandale, Va., as an associate professor of law enforcement and coordinator of drug and alcohol education programs.

Mr. DelPopolo recently delivered a speech at the Department of the Navy's Naval Training Support Detachment, Washington Navy Yard in Washington, which I believe would be of interest to our colleagues and all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I insert the text of his speech at this point in the RECORD:

DRINKING, DRIVING, AND YOU

(By Anthony James DelPopolo, Sr.)

(Speech delivered at the U.S. Naval Training Support Command, Navy Yard, Washington, D.C., on August 30, 1972, at 8 a.m.)

Before this speech is ended this morning at least two persons will be killed on the Nation's highways in an alcohol-related automobile accident. In fact, it is predicted that over 27,000 men, women and children will join these two in similar accidents in the next twelve months. I could easily say that, in the same period, over 800,000 highway crashes will result for the same negligence. Is this enough to fuss about? I think it is.

Would you believe that at least one billion dollars per month will be spent in direct economic losses caused by such accidents? Add to this the costs of public agency activities, such as the police, the courts, the hospitals, as well as the losses in future earnings by the drivers and their victims. And then, too, what about the suffering and heartaches, the loss of loved ones, the widowed and the orphaned! And to think that in all of these situations, the abuse of alcohol by drivers and pedestrians will be the major contributor. It's a pity to see mankind go to waste in such a manner—often because of "just one drink for the road."

"Is the Drunken Driver the Culprit?" This drinking driver is often misleadingly referred to as a "drunken driver." To some the term is not completely understood because a driver does not have to be obviously drunk to be under the influence of alcohol. How many of you here know drinkers who have mastered the technique of being able to walk straight, talk intelligently and coherently and give every appearance of sobriety, but in reality are under the influence of intoxicating beverages? These persons are not called "drunken drivers" because they do not exhibit the stereotyped behavior of the drunk. However, statistics clearly show that these are the "culprits" responsible for most of the property damage and fatal accidents on the highways.

The Social Drinker is the Problem Drinker. So you see, it is the social drinker, not the drunk who is the biggest problem behind the wheel of his automobile. Just remember, the social drinkers outnumber the actual drunks.

Drinking is a Tradition—Driving is a Necessity. Against drinking I am not. It has been a social custom over hundreds, or even thousands of years. I am not the one to try to change this tradition now. In this "space age"—that is, the space between places we travel on earth daily—life has been such that the automobile is an absolute necessity. How many of you would have been able to get to work this morning without the use of a car? So many of us rely on our "four wheelers" to take us to school and places of recreation, too. But, what I am one hundred percent against—is the mixing of drinking and driving. They *are* indeed a bad mixture. Even in the simplest of terms alcohol and driving are not compatible. They make for a poor "marriage." History has recorded thousands upon thousands of auto crashes from this explosive combination in a way louder and costlier than TNT.

Start a Crusade for Highway Safety. How can all this be prevented? I know of one way. First, we must have respect for life—yours and mine and that of others, too. Now you are on the way of becoming a life member of my Crusade for Highway Safety, whose motto is: Don't drive and drink: don't drink and drive. No dues, but the stakes are high. We must do whatever we can for ourselves, for our relatives and for our friends to avoid an appointment with death that alcohol and driving may be conjuring for us—and for potential victims through no fault of their own.

How Alcohol Behaves in the Body. Since we are talking about alcohol and how it affects the mind and body, especially when driving, let's consider for a few moments how alcohol does behave in the body. How many of us really know what happens to that beer, that Bloody Mary, that Scotch and soda, that vodka collins, or that Screwdriver after the beverage has been ingested.

When alcohol enters the mouth and then into the stomach, it is quickly absorbed through the walls of the stomach and the small intestine into the bloodstream. The blood carries the alcohol to all parts of the body, including the brain. This process from ingestion to the time the alcohol reaches the brain takes about two minutes.

As soon as the alcohol reaches the brain it first depresses the area of higher functions such as judgment, social and moral restraints, loss of care and sense of anxiety. A drinker may enter a stage of euphoria where everything is O.K. Alcohol often acts like a narcotic drug on the nervous systems. It can easily become addictive. Next, the alcohol attacks the simple motor functions and impairs the person's performance of skills, causing him to make more errors, take more chances, react to outside stimuli more slowly, lose his normal coordination, become more impulsive, and feel more drowsy. And to top it all his vision is also impaired.

Balance and sensory perception are the next faculties to be impaired. Here you will observe conspicuous intoxication, staggering gait, slurring of speech, emotions uncontrolled, faulty vision, as well as judgment and conduct being erratic. Excessive drinking

will eventually lead to deep sleep, to stupor, to coma—and finally, death. It's a high price to pay for several drinks, isn't it?

Factors Influencing Alcohol's Effect on the Body. There are many factors which affect the absorption of alcohol into the bloodstream. It could very well be the amount of food that is in the stomach at the time of drinking. Or, it may be the type of food eaten. And then it could be the type of alcohol beverage ingested—beer, wine, or liquor, or the amount of alcoholic content in each. Body weight and drinking habits are also important determinants. But we should not kid ourselves in thinking that these factors will keep the alcohol from reaching our brain. They may slow down the absorption rate, but not stop. And then again, they may speed the process.

But, most of all, we must be aware of the fact that the degree of alcoholic influence depends on the amount of alcohol absorbed into the blood, and the length of time allowed for its elimination. The human body works to change the alcohol into fuel and/or pass it out of the body, but the body can do so only at a relatively slow rate. Therefore, a person who has had many drinks in a short period of time may require several hours to eliminate all of the alcohol from his body. This process is known as "oxidation." A small percent of the alcohol, however, is eliminated through the lungs and kidneys, as well as through perspiration. But this amounts to only 10 percent. The other 90 percent must wait for complete oxidation through the liver. This combined process takes about three hours for each ounce of pure alcohol.

When is it "Driving Safe"? At what point in time and number of drinks does it still become "driving safe" on the highway. What time of day or how many drinks must one have to become a hazard on the road? As an instructor in Special Driver Education Program for persons arrested for driving under the influence of alcohol, I would respond, "Never!" This is more so, especially, if one expects to drive soon thereafter. I do not wish to be misunderstood. This does not mean that you can't have a drink with your dinner, and then an hour later, get behind the wheel of your car and drive home. In that hour most of the alcohol would have been eliminated from your body.

"Holding One's Liquors" We probably all know some persons who seem to "hold their liquor" better than others. They have convinced themselves that a few drinks will not seriously impair their driving ability. It is true that weight, fatigue, emotional condition at the time of drinking, as well as other physiological and psychological factors may cause an individual to show less visible signs of the effects of alcohol than otherwise. But these drinkers should not be so foolish as to think that they are not impaired in their driving a motor vehicle safely. Their bodies, without a doubt, contain alcohol, and alcohol makes no exceptions—Demon Alcohol has no conscience. Such persons should be prevented from driving an automobile in their condition.

Is Alcohol a Stimulant? So many people have the mistaken notion of the stimulating effects of alcohol. But they are only fooling themselves when they say that alcohol is a stimulant. It gives you a lift! It makes you a better driver! Let us set the record straight. Alcohol does not stimulate; it acts as a depressant. It depresses the central nervous system. It removes inhibitions and social restraints.

Overcoming the Effects of Alcohol. Contrary to popular belief black coffee or other stimulants, cold showers, physical exercise will not help overcome the effects of alcohol. All this does is to make a person a more wide awake drunk. Only time and the normal body process will assist in the elimination of alcohol from the body and cause a person to be sober again.

Does a Small Amount of Alcohol Sharpen One's Skill? Just why doesn't a small amount of alcohol sharpen one's driving skill? Well, it doesn't. In fact accurate studies have shown that even a small amount of blood/alcohol concentration can lower the level of driving performance. The peak of driving ability may be achieved when no alcohol is taken. How many of you have heard those famous last words?: "Boy, you should have seen me make that tricky maneuver on the curve I *almost* made."

Will One Drink Hurt? "One drink won't hurt, will it?" How untrue a statement this is. The first drink makes it easier to take the second—and then the third—and then the fourth—and so on until a person gets completely drunk. Today the majority of medical authorities agree that some loss of ability begins when the blood/alcohol level nears three tenths of one percent (0.03%). (The approximate effect of a bottle of beer, a glass of fortified wine or a cocktail.)

"Under the Influence." When should a person be considered "under the influence" of alcohol? I would say, as soon as the alcohol taken, whatever the amount, begins to affect in any way a person's mental or physical process. However, when you are talking about from a legal point of view, the "presumptive level of intoxication" is determined by the blood/alcohol level at the time. Many states, like Virginia, have placed this level at one-tenth of one percent (0.01%). If the blood/alcohol level reaches fifteen hundredths of one percent (0.15%), driving ability is seriously impaired. But when the blood/alcohol concentration reaches forty to fifty hundredths of one percent (0.40% to 0.50%), coma is probable and death may occur.

The "Implied Consent Law." You've heard of the "implied consent" laws, what do they mean? "Implied consent" is applied when a motorist is arrested on suspicion of driving under the influence of alcohol. This presumes that the motorist has given consent to an immediate chemical test for blood/alcohol level. This automatic permission is given police authorities when a motorist applies for a driver's license in the particular state or chooses to drive his car through that state. However, it is the prerogative of the motorist to refuse the test, but he risks the loss of his license. This kind of test is good, because, by determining scientifically whether a suspect's blood/alcohol concentration is above or below the legal "intoxication" level, it serves as a protection to both the public and the motorist.

Measuring the Amount of Alcohol in Blood. The amount of alcohol in a person's blood can be measured by various scientific tests. This corresponds to the quantity of alcohol in his brain. This conclusion is arrived at by analyzing the blood, the urine, or the breath. These methods are considerably more accurate than trying to guess the number of drinks that person has consumed. In many state courts, the results of these tests serve as *prima facie* evidence—good evidence. Some of these scientific devices used to test drunkenness are called "Drunkometer," Intoximeter," "Alcometer," and "Breathalyzer."

The Drunken Driver is Dangerous. If we assume that the drunken driver is a dangerous character on the road, just what makes him so dangerous? How does the alcohol in his body affect his driving? From my own observations, the drunken driver's judgment is destroyed, so much so that he finds it difficult to estimate both distance and speed. Such erratic action cannot be afforded on a busy highway.

His inhibitions and restraints are relaxed. Such bravado makes the inebriate feel that traffic signals and regulations exist only for fools. His reflexes slow down in such a way that he may find it difficult to brake the car at the proper time. A delay of half a second in braking a car going 60 miles an hour will cause it to travel an extra 44 feet. His ability to size up a traffic situation is highly reduced. He becomes the victim of blurred vision, double vision, or tunnel vision. His self-confidence increases. So he takes chances he wouldn't ordinarily do.

The drunken driver loses muscular coordination and timing. Either of these faults may cause him to steer into a ditch or hit a tree. This person becomes less able to give full attention as required for careful driving.

Some drivers believe their hearing improves after a few drinks. In fact they think they can hear "better than usual." But the truth of the matter is he hears softer noises better than before. As more and more of the alcohol is absorbed into the blood stream, the driver's ability to hear is reduced in the same way as all other reactions that are related to the central nervous system. So . . . sober driver beware . . . of the drunken driver.

Special Driver Education Program for DWI Offenders. Week after week, young men, women and young people keep coming to the Special Driver Education classes conducted at the Northern Virginia Community College for persons who have been arrested for driving under the influence of alcohol. The course is sponsored by the Fairfax Alcohol Safety Action Program (ASAP) directed by the Highway Safety Division of the Commonwealth of Virginia. These offenders all seem such nice people. But what happened on that day or night of frightening terror. They must have been having a gay time drinking and laughing . . . and then they got into their car to drive it . . . probably home. But on the way they were stopped by a Police Officer . . . and arrested for driving under the influence of alcohol. The humiliation of being arrested, being handcuffed like a common criminal, spending a night or two in jail, getting a relative or lawyer to bail them out, and going up before a judge is enough to want to drink water, orange juice and soda pop the rest of your life.

At this point I am willing to predict that the drinking driver will eventually be involved in a big car crash. By all measures, the higher the blood/alcohol level in a person's body—

1. The greater the chance he will crash;
2. The greater the chance that the crash will be severe and fatal.

With these facts laid before you, can you afford to take chances with drinking and driving? I know I can't. Won't you join my crusade for highway safety? Have respect for life!

REFERENCES

Lindsay R. Curtis, *Alcohol and Highway Safety*, (Dallas, Texas: Tane Press, 1970).

Tane, Inc., *Guide of Abused Drugs*, (Dallas, Texas: Tane Press, 1970).

Gene Mariken, *A Doctor's Sensible Approach to Alcohol and Alcoholism*, (Chicago, Illinois: Bridlong Press Co., 1969).

Maxwell Halsey and Richard Kaywood, *Let's Drive Right*, (New York: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1958).

Tane, Inc., *The Problem—Alcohol and Narcotics*, (Dallas, Texas: Tane Press, 1971).

American Automobile Association, *Sportsmanlike Driving, Fifth Edition*, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965).

Kenneth A. Rouse, *The Way to Go*, (Chicago: Kemper Insurance Co., 1970).

Mark Keller, *How Alcohol Affects the Body*, #3, (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University, Center of Alcoholic Studies, 1955).

Q and A, Alcohol, Medicines, Driving, (Washington, D.C.: Highway Users Federal for Safety and Mobility/Automotive Industries Division, 1970).

Drinking and Driving, (Washington, D.C.: Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Motor Vehicles, Government of the District of Columbia, No Date).

Anthony J. DelPopolo, Sr., *Just One for the Road* (Annandale, Virginia: Northern Virginia Community College, 1972).

ANNUNZIO ADVOCATES 9-MONTH SESSION OF CONGRESS

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, concurrent resolutions have been periodically introduced in both Houses of Congress, especially in the last 20 years, to establish a date certain for the adjournment of Congress. Most of these bills suggest 9 months as a reasonable limit on each session of Congress. The Reorganization Act of 1946 states:

Except in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President, the two Houses shall adjourn sine die not later than the last day, Sunday excepted, in the month of July in each year unless otherwise provided by Congress.

This law was observed only in the Congress immediately following the passage of this act. Every Congress since then has nullified this vital adjournment provision.

Up through the 92d Congress, reasonable adjournment bills have not been acted upon either in the House or the Senate, but in the next session of Congress, serious consideration must be extended to legislation of this kind.

A Congressman is elected by his community as its representative in the national Congress. He becomes not only a Member of Congress but remains a member of his community. A Congressman, ideally, is an intermediary between the citizen and his Government. My point here is that when Congress remains in session 11 months out of the year, there is little opportunity for a Congressman to keep himself current with the effects of new legislation on those he represents.

Especially in the last 10 years, Congress has passed many new and vital programs to meet what have become needs that are national in scope. These programs, for the most part, have been good, basic starts toward the management and solution of problems stemming from overpopulation, technological innovation, and any number of other sources. Many of these problems could not have been forseen over 20 years ago.

It is essential that a Congressman have the time available to investigate the effect of new Federal programs in his district. He must have the time to find answers to such questions as: Is the intent of Congress being followed? Is waste and redtape increasing or decreasing? Is there inefficiency or duplication of effort? Are the needs and wants of the citizens who are directly affected being considered? Is the legislation passed being effectively implemented?

The prestige and effectiveness of Congress has been declining in recent years because it has not been able to insure this followthrough oversight process. Executive departments such as HEW and HUD have 10 regional offices to insure their own oversight process. Effective oversight of laws that Congressmen themselves have enacted must be strengthened if Congress is to maintain itself as a balance to the power of the executive branch of our Government.

As a leader in his community, a Congressman must respond as well as lead. This requires time. Big corporations and big government must not be allowed to acquire a momentum of their own.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to my colleagues to join me in consideration of these proposals. The Congress can and must remain the responsive and creative innovator of national policy that the Founding Fathers envisioned it to be.

THE FAILURE TO PROVIDE ESSENTIAL MUNICIPAL SERVICES

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I brought to the attention of the sanitation department appalling conditions on Manhattan's Lower East Side that included among other things: streets cluttered with abandoned cars, lack of trash cans at street corners, and a glass strewn playground at Junior High School No. 71.

The residents of the area sent me many letters confirming my observations. Shortly thereafter, the Environmental Protection Agency designated this area for a special 3-week sanitation campaign—September 18 to October 7. Pamphlets announcing the campaign were distributed to generate interest among the residents.

Although some of the above conditions have been temporarily dealt with the sanitation mess is far from over. My staff revisited this area after the special program terminated—the impact area had as its perimeter 12th Street on the north, Fourth Street on the south, Avenue B on the west, and Avenue D on the east—and found in a spot check the following:

Seventeen abandoned buildings not sealed, or only partially sealed.

Fifteen vacant lots that are partially fenced or completely unprotected.

Two broken hydrants.

A total of only eight sanitation baskets along Avenue B between 10th to First Streets and none on Avenue C between the same streets.

The worst conditions are on Fifth Street where five buildings are abandoned and unsealed and seven separate lots are not fenced.

In their present condition, these abandoned buildings are fire and safety hazards and havens for junkies. Vacant lots that are unfenced become dumping grounds for garbage, and dangerous playgrounds for children.

A tragic but dramatic example of how unsealed buildings become fire hazards occurred just after my staff examined the area. Two unrelated fires, one on East Third, the other on East Fourth, started in abandoned buildings. One fire spread to an adjoining occupied building forcing the evacuation of three families.

I have forwarded a list of abandoned buildings and vacant lots to the bureau of code enforcement of the buildings department.

How can people have faith in government if the very essential municipal services required to be provided by the city are not provided in this poverty stricken area which needs them so desperately.

While municipal governments are occupied with developing new programs to beautify and change the contours of their cities, they actually will find themselves falling behind in the total picture if they let other neighborhoods deteriorate because of the failure to provide basic municipal services. If this is allowed to happen, as I am afraid it already is in too many cities, the impact of the millions of dollars spent in Federal funds on programs like urban renewal and community development will be tragically diminished.

GET THE UNITED STATES OUT OF THE U.N.—III

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, "Recognizing that the provision of peace forces by the special agreements called for by article 43 of the Charter should be considered in close relationship to the question of the general reduction and regulation of armaments, and that the ultimate objective of disarmament should be the reduction of armaments to the level of these peace forces together with the forces necessary to maintain domestic order and tranquility under law * * * resolves, under the authority conferred by article 22 of the U.N. Charter, to establish as a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly a Permanent Disarmament Commission."—Draft resolution on disarmament prepared by the staff of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations General Assembly, dated November 26, 1946, and then classified "top secret."

Included in this delegation to disarm us in the U.N. were such notables as Charles W. Yost and Senator Warren Austin, assisted by the Director of the Office of Special Political Affairs, Alger Hiss. It is interesting to note that then as now, our internationalists classified "top secret" their intent to surrender to the United Nations our sovereignty and weapons of national defense.

On July 9, 1947, a Congressman from California introduced in the House of Representatives a concurrent resolution calling for "a general conference of the United Nations pursuant to article 109 for the purpose of making the United Nations capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law to prevent war." That Congressman was Richard M. Nixon. Less than 30 days later in the Senate, Wayne Morse of Oregon was urging passage of a resolution authorizing the

United States to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court. Not only were we to adhere to the World Socialist Court, we were to be disarmed so that we would have no other choice.

Again Richard Nixon acted toward this end by introducing House Concurrent Resolution 170 on March 16, 1948. Section 4 of his resolution proposed that our sovereignty be "replaced by mutual confidence in a United Nations strong enough to guarantee any member nation, however large or small and whatever its form of government, against armed violence by any other nation." Our once proud Nation, which always looked to the Creator to guarantee our inalienable rights, was now to suppress our God-fearing sovereignty in favor of that seat of atheism called the United Nations where God knocked on the door in 1945 and was turned away.

It was the U.N. which was in command of our Armed Forces fighting in Korea. When the Senate permanent Subcommittee on Investigations was looking into Korean war atrocities, Senator Charles Potter of Michigan stated on December 2, 1953:

> The long forced marches—the cold-blooded massacres—the inhuman tortures—and the animal-like treatment inflicted upon our prisoners of war by the North Koreans and Red Chinese violate every code of civilized humanity.

It was after learning about Americans shot in the head with their hands tied behind their backs that General MacArthur warned North Korean Communist Premier Kim Il Sung:

> I shall hold you and your commanders criminally accountable under the rules and precedents of war.

That promise could not be kept by General MacArthur, any more than assistance could be rendered to those in Hungary the Communists slaughtered, because people like Richard Nixon, Henry Cabot Lodge, and others would rather hand over the authority to deal with an enemy committing such atrocities to an international organization in which that very enemy's own representatives often played a predominant role, and which consequently never has investigated and never will investigate Communist tyranny. It is no wonder that the man who chaired the Committee on Government Operations that exposed such atrocities had to be destroyed by the machinations of the same kind of people who were promoting the U.N. That man was Senator Joseph McCarthy, whose name has been blackened to a whole generation of young people who never knew him, because he dared to tell the truth about the nature of the Communist enemy and the extent of that enemy's penetration of our Republic.

In August 1970, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency put out the Nixon administration's update of the infamous State Department Document 7277 of September 1961, in which that Agency's goal is still stated as "the total elimination of all armed forces and armaments except those needed to maintain internal order within States and to furnish the United Nations with peace forces—by the time the plan was completed, it would be so strong that no nation could challenge it."

If Americans think that Richard Nixon will not follow through on disarming us, they need only look to Senator JACOB JAVITS' speech on April 19, 1972, praising him in these words:

> The President's commitment to peace and a new world order have been most dramatically shown by his history-making and precedent-setting initiative toward the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union. . . . The strategic arms limitation talks (SALT), initiated by the President, have made outstanding progress which should be consummated in major part by the President's Moscow trip.

JACK KEMP'S OUTSTANDING RECORD AND CONCERN FOR OUR ENVIRONMENT

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the last few years have brought an increased awareness of the importance of environmental protection and this awareness has brought to the Congress a number of vigorous, young legislators who have demonstrated a determined interest in restoring the American heritage of clean air, clean waters, and abundant wildlife.

As minority leader, it has been my observation that one of the most articulate and most productive of these environmentally oriented Congressmen has been JACK KEMP of the 38th Congressional District of New York State.

During the course of only one term, he has accumulated an outstanding legislative and voting record on environmental issues.

Since his district touches Lake Erie, he knows from personal experience the tragic effects of pollution on one of our Nation's most precious resources, the Great Lakes; and one of JACK's top priorities in Congress has been the promotion of legislation which would put into effect the Environmental Protection Agency's special Great Lakes cleanup program. He twice introduced legislation which would have provided the necessary funds and when these efforts did not succeed, JACK persisted and testified before the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi's (Mr. WHITTEN) Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. The committee subsequently developed a plan which would make the $100 million and the Great Lakes special crash cleanup program, which JACK had testified on behalf of, a reality.

JACK also introduced legislation and presented testimony which has resulted in congressional approval of two Kemp measures which will cut several years of delay off flood control and environmental improvements in the 450-square-mile Buffalo River basin and along Ellicott Creek in his district. JACK's efforts will mean the beginning of the cleaning and restoration of a river which was described in 1966 by the Commissioner of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration as "the worst polluted river in the country."

During his first term in Congress, JACK has personally introduced or cosponsored an impressive list of environmental legislation. Among these have been his own version of the tough Senate clean waters bill; the Marine Protection Act of 1971, which would regulate the dumping of materials in the oceans and other waters; the National Land Use Policy Act of 1971; the Consumer Pollution Control Tax Credit Act, which would provide a tax credit for homeowners, businessmen, and others who purchase and install certified pollution devices; two bills which would insure the procurement and use by the Federal Government of recycled paper and other recycled products; legislation to establish an environmental financing authority; the Toxic Substances Control Act and others.

One of JACK's major environmental concerns has been the damage to the ocean environment and wildlife caused by off-shore oil spills and he joined with an ad hoc group of like-minded Congressmen to meet with Secretary of the Interior, Rogers C. B. Morton, concerning coastal hazards of offshore drilling. From these efforts, legislation was developed which JACK cosponsored in the House which would authorize an investigation and study of these possible dangers to the marine environment.

Early this year JACK again contacted Secretary of the Interior Morton, this time to urge a delay in the approval of the proposed Alaska pipeline and ask a complete review of the possibility of a trans-Canada route.

JACK has been a leader in the House concerning protection of the underground environment and has both submitted testimony and introduced legislation regarding regulation of the disposal of wastes by subsurface injection.

When responsible legislation comes to the floor concerning ecology or wildlife, JACK's vote can always be counted on.

He voted in favor of the clean water amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972.

He voted to override President Nixon's veto of the final version of the clean water bill.

He voted in favor of the Noise Control Act.

He voted in favor of the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

He voted in favor of marine dumping regulation to set up controls on the dumping of wastes in the oceans and establish a marine sanctuaries program.

He voted to provide for a national environmental data system as a national clearinghouse for information on environmental subjects and a program of environmental centers to be run by the States.

He voted for the Ports and Waterways Safety Act to more strictly regulate pollution and provide for greater marine safety.

He voted to create a Joint Committee on the Environment.

He voted for S. 1116 to protect wild horses and burros.

He voted to provide increases in ap-

propriations ceilings for the National Park System and voted to establish a national recreation area in Idaho.

He voted to strengthen the penalties for violations of the Bald Eagle Protection Act.

He voted to provide for the acceleration of tree planting programs on national forest lands in need of reforestation.

He voted to provide effective enforcement of prohibition of the hunting, capture, or harassment of birds, fish, or other animals from aircraft.

He voted to establish a Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge in California.

He voted for the authorization of an additional $3.5 million in annual appropriations for water resources planning.

He voted for the curtailment of toxic chemical use for predator control.

He voted to transfer surplus Liberty ships to States for use in marine life conservation programs.

He voted to establish a national program for the management and protection of the land and water resources of the Nation's coastal zone.

JACK has also been instrumental in obtaining an impressive amount of grants and funds for environmental projects in his district. These include approval of a $25.3 million grant, EPA's largest, for Buffalo's secondary water treatment plant now under construction; approval of a National Science Foundation grant for Dr. Kenneth Piech of Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory and other researchers to conduct an optical study for measuring pollutants and other properties of Lake Ontario; approval of a $37,122 Federal grant for Dr. Robert Sweeney, director of the Great Lakes laboratory, to conduct a study of water quality with respect to the changes in the phosphate content of detergents, and approval of a total of $4,466,000 for flood control and environmental projects which were included in the public works appropriation bill.

These projects included $50,000 to continue a survey of flood control work on Cayuga, Cazenovia, and Buffalo Creeks; $30,000 for a study to determine the feasibility of constructing reservoirs and retention pools on Tonawanda Creek; $25,000 for planning channel improvements and the construction of levees on Scajaquada Creek to protect Cheektowaga; $5,000 for flood control work on Cattaraugus Creek to protect flood-plagued Sunset Point; $300,000 for continuation of a study for construction to preserve Niagara Falls; $3 million for continuation of a demonstration project aimed at extending the navigation season on the Great Lakes; $530,000 for a waste water management study on Lake Erie and Lake Ontario; $356,000 for completion of a study of water levels on Lake Erie and the other Great Lakes; $80,000 for Cattaraugus Harbor improvements and $20,000 for small boat harbors on Lake Erie.

And, in addition to his legislative activities here in Washington, JACK is working with many citizens' environmental organizations and is actively promoting the Department of the Interior's Johnny Horizon program among young environmentalists. He also is a member and patron of the Sierra Club.

Mr. Speaker, concern for the environment is certainly one of the most important yardsticks by which a legislator can and should be measured. My friend and colleague, JACK KEMP, has an impressive environmental record and I am sure that we can expect still greater accomplishments from him in the years ahead.

ED GARMATZ' RETIREMENT

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of ED GARMATZ will leave the 93d Congress greatly diminished. A Member of Congress for more than 25 years, EDWARD GARMATZ has achieved national recognition as champion of America's merchant marine and the entire maritime industry.

Through sincere dedication and careful guidance, Chairman GARMATZ has led a personal crusade for the revitalization of America's merchant marine fleet. No other Member of this Chamber has had such a broad and compassionate grasp of the problems of the maritime industry. Indeed, ED GARMATZ has been a hopeful inspiration to an industry, doomed to obsolescence. No other public figure has fought so courageously, so diligently to rebuild the merchant marine. ED GARMATZ is singularly responsible for the enactment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, a landmark in legislative history. This act was the first concrete reconstruction program of the merchant marine fleet since 1936. Designed to build 300 modern merchant vessels within the next decade, this act rescued a dying cause.

The personal achievements of Mr. GARMATZ are not limited to his success in championing the merchant marine and maritime industry. He has won international respect for his vanguard efforts to upgrade safety standards aboard passenger ships and to encourage other nations to accept the higher American safety standards. Fighting vigorously and consistently to protect American fishermen from illegal seizure and harassment at the hands of Latin Americans, ED GARMATZ has become a household word in countries like Peru and Equador.

A Member of the U.S. House of Representatives since 1947, ED GARMATZ has represented the Third District of Maryland, including the great seaport of Baltimore. In a public service career that has spanned a quarter of a century, he has served his constituency and his Nation with dedication and purpose.

I join my colleagues in saluting ED GARMATZ for his determination, his courage, and his perseverence in revitalizing the merchant marine fleet. We all wish him well in his retirement and in his future endeavors.

SUPERSTAR OF RACING—BOBBY ALLISON

HON. JAMES B. ALLEN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, one of the fastest growing sports in the United States today is that of auto racing. In Alabama, we are quite proud that the superstar of racing is Hueytown's Bobby Allison. Alabama is also the location of the fastest track in auto racing, Alabama International Motor Speedway. AIMS is a modern 2.66-mile track located in Talladega County. It was developed by William H. G. France, former president of NASCAR.

Mr. President, I have known Bobby Allison for several years. I know him to be an outstanding citizen, a man devoted to his family and friends. He is a man that gives much of the credit for his success to his God and to his coworkers.

Mr. President, much has been written about the superstars in sports produced by the great State of Alabama. South, the news magazine of Alabama, a great publication, included in its October 1972 issue an excellent article about Bobby Allison. I wish to thank Mr. Robert B. Ingram, president and editor in chief of South for such an outstanding story on one of Alabama's sports superstars.

I ask unanimous consent that the article which appeared in South magazine be included in the RECORD.

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

HUEYTOWN'S BOBBY ALLISON—A SUPERGUY SUPERSTAR WHO JUST POKES ALONG—ON THE INTERSTATE

Robert Arthur Allison is 34 years old, happily married and the proud father of four children with the stairstep ages of 5, 7, 9, and 11. He stands 5–11, weighs a trim 175 pounds. He has dark wavy hair, eyes that have an amused twinkle most of the time, and a crooked grin that charms the hide off of all beholders.

Robert Arthur Allison lives in a $50,000 home (with swimming pool) in Hueytown, Alabama, which is on the way to nowhere. To get to Hueytown you simply have to be going there. He drives a big Lincoln automobile and also owns a twin-engine airplane.

Robert Arthur (call him Bobby) Allison lives so well because he drives so well. And so fast. For those who are not knowledgeable on the subject, accept as fact that Bobby Allison is a genuine, honest-to-goodness superstar in the sport of stock car racing. The state of Alabama has justifiably boasted of the many sports superstars it has produced—the Namaths, the Aarons, the Mays, et al—but it is probable that none of these have attracted such a loyal following as has Allison. He is very, very big in what has become a very, very big sport.

And what is perhaps most intriguing about this good looking guy other than his very heavy foot is that in no way at all does he fit the imagined mold of the stock car driver. Mention stock car drivers to the average non-fan and immediately comes to mind the coarse talking, fast living hot-rodder who very likely got his start driving some souped-up Ford with a Cadillac engine over a backwoods road hauling contraband liquor, with

the revenuers in hot but hopeless pursuit. He has grease under his fingernails, even more of the same on his hair, and his vocabulary consists of a few grunts and a few more four-letter words. No self-respecting man would want his daughter to marry a stock car driver.

But if you are expecting that sort of guy when you meet Bobby Allison, brace yourself for a shock. In no way does he fit that mold. Aside from his ruggedly handsome features, Allison speaks both softly and well. He is amusing in a quiet sort of way, and is remarkably patient with those who wouldn't know a carburetor if they saw one and haven't the vaguest notion what is meant by a 327 cubic inch engine, much less a 400 cubic inch engine.

Nor has Allison allowed his sudden and dramatic rise to the role of a superstar to affect him in any way. He is the first to give credit to his equipment, to his pit crews, and most emphatically, to his God, in what may come as a surprise to those who view stock car racing in a sinister light. Allison is a deeply religious man, and unashamedly so. A devout Catholic, Allison quite simply but very sincerely expressed what his faith meant to him.

"The Lord knows I make a lot of mistakes, but I try to live a Christian life seven days a week. And I sincerely believe that being a Christian gives me a competitive edge when I race. Because of my faith, my mind is uncluttered with the problems others might have and I can devote my complete attention to the race."

Another side of Allison not nearly so surprising: He is a winner. Easy going and personable as he might be off the track, when he gets behind the wheel of his Monte Carlo he is a fierce competitor.

"If you don't enter every race with the intention of winning, there is no use being in the race at all. I have never seen a good loser who wasn't a bad driver . . . winning is what it's all about."

Another very candid observation by Allison, when asked which of the top drivers he most enjoyed beating:

"That's easy . . . Richard Petty. He is sort of the established King, so that makes it fun to beat him. Also, he hates to lose, so that makes it even more fun."

When it was suggested that Bobby Allison also hates to lose, Bobby Allison grinned and replied with force: "You better believe it."

Perhaps one of the reasons why Allison has been able to so admirably take in stride his sudden stardom is the simple fact that it took him so long to get to the top.

Young Allison, born in the Miami area (he was one of 10 children), was taken to his first auto race when he was nine years old. He was instantly hooked on the sport, and remains so to this day. He drove in his first race in 1955 at the age of 17, much to the consternation of his parents, and in his third week as an amateur driver he won his first race. His car was a 1938 Chevrolet, and he won with an average speed of about 55 miles per hour. (Today Allison reaches speeds of 220 miles per hour on the straightaway in Grand National events.)

After graduation from high school, Allison got a job in Wisconsin with an outboard motor firm. By coincidence, the owner of that firm, Karl Kiekhaefer, was a racing enthusiast. His cars were big winners on the then new NASCAR Grand National circuit. Allison soon became a mechanic on the race cars, and in this capacity he got his first taste of big-time stock car racing. Later he returned to Florida and joined the NASCAR modified-sportsman division.

It was about this time that Alabama entered Bobby Allison's life, and vice versa. Stock car racing was not big in the Miami area. There were few tracks, infrequent races and the purses were quite small. Allison had heard that racing had become a big sport in Alabama, so he packed up and headed for the Birmingham area. He and wife Judy found a house in Bessemer they liked, but before they could close the deal someone else bought it. The enterprising real estate agent was not dismayed—he said he had a house just like it in Hueytown. For that reason it is Hueytown rather than Bessemer that Bobby Allison is now putting on the map.

Allison very quickly established himself as a superb driver. In 1962 he won the national modified-special championship, and won that title again in 1963. In 1964 and 1965 he was the nation's modified champ. It was in 1966 he made the decision to move up to the big leagues—the Grand National circuit. Bucking tradition, Allison competed against the big factory-sponsored teams in a homemade Chevelle, and three times he did the impossible—winning major races as an independent. That record was enough to convince one and all that Allison was something special, and in 1966 he became a factory driver.

During the next few years, while he scored some victories, Allison for the most part was in a serious slump. He was plagued with all kinds of mechanical breakdowns and bad luck. Nothing seemed to go right. At the conclusion of yet another heartbreaking defeat, Allison decided that it would be best to give up the game. It was at this low point in his career that he was approached by the Holman-Moody Ford-Mercury racing team. He accepted the offer to join that team and it has been straight up ever since.

In 1971 he won an astounding 11 Grand National events, the purses totaling $235,000. Already in 1972 he has won eight more Grand Nationals with purses totaling more than $240,000. For the record, no driver in NASCAR history has ever won $200,000 or more for two consecutive years.

Allison quickly points out that he doesn't get to keep all that money. And he forthrightly volunteered to give the specifics of his present sponsorship (with Coca Cola).

"They provide the car and the pit crews, and all I do is drive," he said. "I receive 50 percent of the purse."

Which means that Allison's income from driving this year totals around $120,000. His bank account is further padded by personal appearances around the country; from his new but booming business (Bobby Allison Racing Co., where he builds cars for other drivers), and from the sale of Bobby Allison T-shirts, jump suits, jackets, etc. Which is to say Bobby Allison ain't hurting.

While Allison is in fact an adopted son of Alabama, there are few native sons who love the state quite as much.

"Man, this is home to me. Those years I lived in Florida was just a time when I was away from home."

How much longer does Allison plan to endanger life and limb racing around a track in heavy traffic: "About 40 or 50 more years. Seriously, I see no reason why I can't continue to race for a long time. We have some drivers on the circuit now who are over 50. I will know when it is time to quit."

Is he an utterly fearless individual: "Are you kidding? I've been scared plenty of times. I pray a lot . . . but not just on race day."

Would he want his sons to be stock car drivers: "Sure, if they wanted to be. Racing has been good to me, and while there are some risks involved, it is not nearly as dangerous as some people imagine."

How come he has never participated in the Indy-type races: "For one thing, I have been so busy, so tied up in stock car racing that I really haven't had the time. For another, I realize how quickly you can get killed in that type of racing."

How does he train for a race: "First, you have got to be in excellent shape to participate in this sport, physical as well as mental. Now somebody like Joe Namath goes into a game, plays a few minutes, then leaves the game to catch his breath when the other team has the ball. In a 500-mile race which might take four hours, you don't get any such time-outs. Maybe you can relax just a bit when the caution flag is out, but otherwise it is four hours of tremendous physical and mental exertion. Certainly I watch my diet, and as for training, the best way to prepare for a race is to race. That is why I drive in as many races each week as I can. I am not a Sunday racer like Petty and some of the others. I race four or five times a week if I can."

What has been his greatest thrill in racing: "Four or five victories come to mind, but I would have to say winning the Southern 500 recently in Darlington was the biggest. That is sort of the granddaddy of them all, the one that everybody most wants to win."

And a question a non-fan would surely ask, how fast does Allison drive his personal car on the Interstate: "Most of the time right around 70 . . . but sometimes it creeps up to 80. But most of the time when I have to make a trip I fly . . . it's safer."

And finally, a question which perhaps caught him by surprise but nonetheless seemed to please him: When does Bobby Allison plan to get into politics?

"One of these days . . . maybe pretty soon."

(For the record, right now Allison is doing what he can to make sure that George McGovern is not the next President of the United States.)

As to his own entry into politics you have got to figure that with his looks, his speaking ability and his name, Bobby Allison would be a worthy foe in that kind of race as well.

EMANUEL CELLER

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1972

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in the tribute to our distinguished colleague, EMANUEL CELLER.

When history records the great leaders, who have served in this House, the name of EMANUEL CELLER will most certainly be on that list.

A champion of civil rights, a defender of civil liberties, EMANUEL CELLER leaves this House secure in the knowledge that he has written new chapters in the history of this great Nation.

His monumental accomplishments were outlined in an editorial in the Washington Post. I should like to place that editorial in the RECORD at this time and to personally extend to my distinguished colleague—every best wish in the years ahead:

CHAIRMAN CELLER STEPS ASIDE

Very few members of the House make such an imprint on the nation's laws and on the Congress itself that their departure may fairly be termed the end of an era. One man who has attained that stature is Rep. Emanuel Celler, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee and dean of the House, who is retiring at the age of 84. Defeated in his Democratic primary, Rep. Celler could have run for reelection as a Liberal Party candidate. Instead, he has decided to step aside at the end of a full half century in the House.

Simply in terms of length, Rep. Celler's record is exceptional. He has served longer in

the House than anyone, except former Rep. Carl Vinson of Georgia, who served for 50 years and two months. He has chaired the Judiciary Committee for so long—a record 22 years—that many don't recall the time when that powerful panel was run by anyone else.

But durability is only one of his distinctions. "I think I have accomplished quite a lot," chairman Celler told Post staff writer Richard L. Lyons recently. Indeed, he has steered through the House four constitutional amendments, every major civil rights bill of this century, and such other landmark laws as the abolition of national-origins quotas for immigration and the Celler-Kefauver antitrust act. All in all, he has had a hand in the enactment of some 400 laws, and that is "quite a lot."

Rep. Celler's legislative record is that of a New Deal liberal and a champion of civil rights. Yet in many ways the gentleman from Brooklyn has had far more in common with the rural conservatives of his own generation than with the younger breed of urban liberals. A shrewd, strong-willed, witty and courteous chairman, he has never hesitated to use his considerable powers to advance some bills and kill others—some by scorn, some by apathy, and some, such as the proposed prayer amendment of 1964, by the smothering consideration of long hearings. On the House floor he has been scrappy and articulate, with a zest for sharp debate salted with Shakespearean quotes. His floor confrontations with "Judge" Howard Smith, former Rules Committee czar, over civil rights produced a brand of impassioned debate now heard only rarely in the House.

Some of chairman Celler's opinions did outlive their time. His stubborn opposition to the equal rights amendment made him the archvillain of women's liberation groups and lent great irony to his primary defeat this summer by Elizabeth Holtzman, a 30-year-old lawyer. Perhaps most memorably, chairman Celler persisted in practicing law part time throughout his congressional career, operating out of the famous Brooklyn law office with two doors—one door, bearing his name, for private cases, and the other, listing his partners but not himself, for cases involving government agencies.

As chairman Celler goes to practice law full time, the House Judiciary Committee is further diminished by the retirement of Rep. William McCulloch, the panel's ranking Republican. Working as a team, there two veterans—so different in background, so alike in their essential liberality—have been responsible for a remarkable body of vital legislation, capped by the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Theirs is a legacy of enlightenment which will stand as a challenge to those who next assume the seats of leadership on that crucial committee.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it has been my privilege to know the senior Senator from New Mexico, CLINTON P. ANDERSON, for many years, serving with him in the official family of President Tuman as well as in the U.S. Senate.

Few men have had such successful careers in both public and private life. CLINTON ANDERSON'S career in private life has included such diverse activities as being one of the Nation's best bridge players, a distinguished newspaperman, and a highly successful, self-made businessman who became president of Rotary International at the age of 36.

Senator ANDERSON'S public life began in New Mexico, first as an appointed official in that State, then as the elected representatives of that State to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1940, 1942, and 1944.

In 1945, CLINTON ANDERSON was appointed Secretary of Agriculture by President Truman and served in that post with great success.

In 1948, he was elected to the U.S. Senate from the State of New Mexico. His service in the Senate can only be characterized as distinguished; he has left his mark on every committee on which he has served and his skill in floor debate is legendary.

As a member and chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, he played a leading role in the development of the nuclear submarine, in the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and in indemnity legislation. In short, CLINTON ANDERSON provided leadership for the expansion and acceleration of the use of atomic energy in the United States.

CLINTON ANDERSON has been a conservationist throughout his public career. As a member of the Senate Interior Committee and as its chairman during the early 1960's, he fought unceasingly to use our resources wisely and to preserve our great outdoors.

As a member of the Finance Committee, CLINTON ANDERSON'S name is connected with some of the country's most progressive social legislation.

As a member and chairman of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, CLINTON ANDERSON has been and is a firm and consistent supporter of the Nation's aeronautical and space programs. Yet as chairman, he does not hesitate to probe deeply and critically into these affairs. As chairman of this committee, his leadership has had much to do with our country's being foremost in both space exploration and space achievements.

Mr. President, CLINTON ANDERSON'S achievements are indeed remarkable and yet he has accomplished these things while beset much of his life with very difficult health problems.

CLINTON ANDERSON soon will retire from the Senate. We are sorry to see him go. We will miss his leadership and counsel but he will be long remembered for he is one of the more able men who has served in this Chamber.

CLINTON ANDERSON

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it is hard for me to say goodby to my old and cherished friend, Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, who is retiring today after what I am sure history will record as one of the great careers of public service in this century.

Few men have had wider impact on the times in which they have lived and labored. A newspaper editor, a successful businessman, an organization leader who became president of Rotary International, a New Mexico State official, the director of Federal relief programs there during the depression years, a three-term Member of Congress, Secretary of Agriculture under President Truman, a four-term Member of the U.S. Senate—his opportunities for public service have been immense, and this remarkable and gifted man from the Southwest has made the most of every one of them. He has worked for four decades with enormous effectiveness and with unquestioned compassion and commitment.

I shall not try to evaluate the Anderson legacy to his country. Historians will treat him well, I am sure. I would prefer to recall his great acts of friendship to me—particularly when I was a new member of the Senate Interior Committee. It was mainly through his intercession that I chaired, for 2 years, what was then called the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation. In so doing I gained some of the experience and expertise which have served me during the ensuing years both in this body and in my own State. I can honestly say that I never asked him for advice or assistance down through the years that he did not give generously of his wisdom and good, practical commonsense.

CLINT ANDERSON has been a most trusted friend, and a most honorable Member of this body. Phyllis and I wish for him and his wonderful wife, Henrietta, many happy years ahead.

CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

HON. JOHN M. SLACK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, with adjournment of the 92d Congress we will no longer count among our membership Congressman CHARLES GRIFFIN of the Third Mississippi District. During the past 4 years I have enjoyed my association with him and join with the many other Members who regret very much his departure from the House of Representatives.

Our loss will be the gain of his many Mississippi friends, and I wish him all good prospects for happiness and success in his new endeavors.

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a real honor and privilege to make a few brief comments with regard to a gentle-

man whose tireless devotion to duty and to the ideals in which he believes will be greatly missed by all of us in the next Congress. BILL COLMER'S commitment to the residents of his district, the State of Mississippi, and to the Nation will not be forgotten by all of us who have served with him here in the House.

I have been extremely fortunate in having the pleasure to serve with him on the Rules Committee as a member and then as chairman. His personal friendship, advice and counsel have meant a great deal to me over the years, and this friendship will truly be one of the outstanding memories of my service in Congress.

I am sure I join with many in extending my best wishes for much health and happiness in the years to come to BILL. I know that he will be able to reflect with much pride and personal satisfaction on his outstanding career here in the House of Representatives.

BERKELEY CONCERN ON U.S. INVESTMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, in what seems to be the first move by any city council in the United States to condemn all Government and private involvement in South Africa, the Berkeley, Calif., City Council has passed a resolution by a large margin calling for a full investigation. This follows the decision of the city council in Dayton, Ohio, to stop using Gulf Oil products in municipal undertakings, because of Gulf's involvement in Angola, where it is supporting the Portuguese colonial war against the African liberation movements.

I would like to insert the full text of the resolution, No. 45,348, for the thoughtful attention of my colleagues:

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BERKELEY—
RESOLUTION NO. 45,348, N.S.

(Resolutions regarding the Republic of South Africa)

Be it resolved by the Council of the City of Berkeley as follows:

The Berkeley City Council condemns the use of any arm of our local, state, or national government to support or protect those who are working against the interest of the people of South Africa.

The Berkeley City Cuncil condemns those American businesses giving direct or indirect aid or support to the racist government or the economy of South Africa, without regard to the general well-being of the South African people.

The Berkeley City Council fully supports the House Joint Resolution 1139, introduced in the House of Representatives, by the Honorable Mr. Diggs, Jr., March 29, 1972; and supports House Resolution 13147, a bill introduced in the House of Representatives on February 16, 1972, by the Honorable Mr. Dellums.

The Berkeley City Council supports the just struggle of the South African people in their struggle for self-determination and the establishment of a nation free apartheid and oppression.

The Berkeley City Council charges the City Manager with the responsibility for investigating if and to what extent any of the companies, corporations, or individuals the City of Berkeley does business with is engaged in business enterprises of any kind in South Africa and will make recommendations to the Council pursuant to his findings.

Copy sent 9–25–72, Bailey, City Manager.

Dated September 12, 1972.

WARREN WIDENER,
Mayor and President of the Council.

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I take joy in joining with my colleagues in paying tribute to our friend, GEORGE MILLER, as he leaves us at the end of this Congress. There have been so many good things said about GEORGE that I will not try to add anything further except to say that I join in those tributes to our colleague.

His contributions will last throughout the decades and centuries ahead. His activities have been extended far beyond his own responsibilities of those committees on which he has served and he has rendered great services throughout all the days he has been here in Congress.

I have always found GEORGE MILLER to be understanding and friendly, ready for a light remark when it was in order and for a serious one when it was in order.

In accomplishments, GEORGE MILLER ranks with the most dedicated and effective Members with whom I have served here on the Hill. It was my pleasure to be a part of his Committee on Science and Astronautics for 2 years. He was an inspiration and I was always pleased to be present under his chairmanship and to have his advice when I could not be present.

He shall be missed as much as anyone who has served here in Congress during the last quarter of a century. I join with my colleagues in wishing for him and his wonderful companion, Esther, the best of everything in the days ahead.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR LEN JORDAN OF IDAHO

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the close of this session of the Congress marks also the retirement of Senator LEN B. JORDAN of Idaho, who has represented his State in the Senate and served his Nation the last 10 years with quiet dignity, with keen intelligence, and the capacity for hard work and practical judgment developed over a lifetime of experience in dealing with the rugged problems of the real world.

LEN JORDAN is a pioneer-type man. He worked as a ranch hand after graduating from high school; enlisted in the Army during World War I, earning an officer's commission; worked his way through the University of Oregon where he was a star athlete as varsity halfback and Phi Beta Kappa as well.

Raising his family during the depression on a ranch in the remote reaches of the Snake River below Hell's Canyon, LEN JORDAN rebuilt the old stone ranchhouse with his own hands—just as he later built his own life stone by stone on the firm foundation of principle which guided his quarter-century of public service—a service illuminated by the partnership of his talented wife, Grace, who made the home, taught school to the children around the kitchen table, and found time to become a successful author in her own right.

I have served with LEN JORDAN on the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct and know his integrity, responsibility, and faith in principle. But beyond his work on any committee or specialized problem, I have come to know LEN JORDAN for his quiet strength—as solid and dependable as the land from whence he came.

We like to think at times that men's characters are formed by the land from which they spring, and certainly by their families and their own hard experience. In this case that character has been of great value to the Senate and to the Nation, and while its membership will change, we hope that the character of the Senate will continue to be formed, like the national character, by men like LEN JORDAN.

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened to hear of the death of a much beloved and respected former colleague, the late Karl M. LeCompte of Iowa, who served in the House from 1939 through 1958. He was a quiet but effective legislator whom I remember best for his kindness and helpfulness to new Members. He passed away at the age of 85 after enjoying his retirement years and I want to pay tribute to his memory and express my sincere condolences to his wife, Dorothy, and to other members of his family, and his many friends.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR B. EVERETT JORDAN

HON. MARLOW W. COOK

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, I am proud to have this opportunity to offer a few words of tribute to a fine gentleman from North Carolina, my colleague B.

EVERETT JORDAN. Senator JORDAN is leaving the Senate this year after 12 distinguished years of service to his State and the Nation.

I have had several opportunities to work with EVERETT, and I have found him always reasonable, understanding, and compassionate. He has proven to be a man of principle, who displays great diligence in furtherance of those principles.

Although I have only been a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration for a short time, I have been extremely impressed by the manner in which EVERETT JORDAN engenders a spirit of cooperation and trust on the committee. It has been a very enjoyable experience to work under his chairmanship.

Finally, EVERETT has always joined in efforts to protect the tobacco growers from the continuing attack on the tobacco subsidization program. He has spoken out both on the Senate floor and at various committee hearings, in support of the tobacco farmer and the tobacco industry. EVERETT was largely responsible for the passage of the acreage-poundage legislation, which was so vital to the tobacco support program, and a bill which authorized the lease of tobacco acreage allotments, considered a major victory for the leaf growers.

Others will pay more detailed tributes to EVERETT JORDAN, so I will only say that he has been a credit to his State, a great asset to the U.S. Senate, and we will miss him tremendously. We wish him Godspeed in the future.

TRIBUTE TO HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the 92d Congress, Capitol Hill will lose one of its most talented, dedicated and effective Members of Congress when ALEXANDER PIRNIE of New York leaves us.

I have known him since his first day here on the Hill. I have always been charmed and pleased by his friendly presence. ALEX just naturally brings forth the best thoughts and feelings of companionship when one is in his company. His pleasant smile, his friendly handshake and other personal qualities have endeared him to all of us. However, ALEX PIRNIE is not only a friendly man, but he is a very able and effective worker. His work here on the Hill and for his people has endeared him to all throughout the years. He has done a great job and he has done it in a most understanding and effective manner.

Every Member of this Congress who has known ALEX shall miss him very much. Those of us who retire with him envy those who will enjoy his friendly presence in the days ahead. I wish him and his loved ones the best of happiness.

FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF SWAZILAND

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the African Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I would like to take the occasion to salute Swaziland which has recently celebrated its anniversary of independence.

On September 6, 1972, Swaziland celebrated the fourth anniversary of its independence. I offer my warmest congratulations to His Majesty King Sobhuza II, Prime Minister Prince Makhosini, and the Government and people of Swaziland on the occasion of this anniversary. During this period, the Government of Swaziland has made great strides in bringing the fruits of economic development to all its people, especially those in the rural areas of the country. I am particularly pleased that the United States is cooperating with this effort.

In August 1969, I visited Swaziland during a special study mission to southern Africa, noting the country's desire for closer relations with the United States, especially on the matter of raising the level of our diplomatic representation.

On this occasion, I am happy to note too that relations between our countries remain excellent and that, within the last year, U.S. representation to Swaziland was raised for the first time to the ambassadorial level. Located as Swaziland is in southern Africa, its course as a majority-ruled state is one which our Government must continue to support.

I would strongly urge that the United States, on this fourth anniversary of Swaziland's independence, reaffirm U.S. efforts to stimulate and enhance this development. I am sure that the people of the United States join me in conveying to the Swazi nation best wishes for the future of their country.

DR. WERNHER VON BRAUN RETIRES FROM NASA

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, Dr. Wernher von Braun recently retired after many years of selfless devotion to science in the service of his adopted land, the United States of America. I wish at this time to state my own profound respect and admiration for this man who, at the age of 60, has left the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—NASA—for private industry.

Dr. von Braun was one of the original 118 members of the team of German-born scientists and engineers who came to this country after World War II. He provided much of the drive, energy, knowledge, and strength behind the successful entry of the United States into the space age. His background in the development of the German V–2 rocket and its early but awesome technology was a direct and all-important contributor to the progress America has made in its spectacuar satellite programs, rocketry, and moon-landing ventures.

Of his long and triumphant career as a proponent of space exploration, I believe it can be fairly said that the Saturn 5 moon rocket was the crowning and major engineering achievement. The Marshall Space Flight Center at Huntsville, Ala., under Dr. von Braun developed skylab, America's first earth orbiting station, which will become the Nation's major space project after the final Apollo moon landing later this year.

It is not every day that America is so enriched by the arrival on our shores of men like Dr. Wernher von Braun. His contribution to our safety and welfare, to our national security is a large one, indeed. As Dr. James C. Fletcher, NASA Administrator said of him at the time Dr. von Braun retired:

> For more than a quarter of a century, he has served the United States as the leader in space rocket development.

He will be missed at NASA. However, it is comforting to know that he will maintain his associations with others of his team who have done so much to give our great Nation its lead in the exploration of space. He deserves and has won the admiration and thanks of the people of our country.

A DEDICATED AND DECENT MAN

HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President. The conclusion of the 92d Congress marks the end of a distinguished public career of our colleague and my longtime personal friend, B. EVERETT JORDAN. The fruits of EVERETT'S labor of 15 years in the Senate vineyards will be savored and enjoyed by generations to come because his life's dedication, as it was in the Senate, was to serving the public interest.

While EVERETT'S dedication and effectiveness comes as no surprise to those of us who have served with him, it is gratifying to learn that, in the words of the Durham Sun, "this dedicated and decent man," is given additional public recognition as he and his lovely wife, Katherine return home to North Carolina.

In order to share a recent tribute to Senator JORDAN with others, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial "Praise for a Man and His Work," from the October 10, 1972, edition of the Durham, N.C., Sun, be printed here in the RECORD.

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

PRAISE FOR A MAN AND HIS WORK

Most public attention these days is centered on the upcoming November elections, but the retirement of B. Everett Jordan from the United States Senate should not be allowed to go unnoticed and unmarked. As a member of the Senate for 15 years he has rendered devoted and distinguished service to his state and to his nation.

The 92nd Congress in its closing days took notice of that fact, as a reading of the Congressional Record will reveal. Senators of both major parties, Democrats and Republicans, in the past few days frequently took occasion to pay tribute to him and to the work he has done.

To note only a few of the remarks on the Senate floor gives an idea of what his colleagues think of him:

Sen. James B. Allen of Alabama, referring to the senator as a "kind, gracious, and considerable colleague whom we all know and so greatly admire," said "the Senate will miss the valuable contribution of his sound counsel and judgments in matters affecting the best interest and welfare of our nation," and that "his state and our nation are losing the services in the Senate of a great and good public servant." He said he and others "cherish his friendship, respect his sound judgments, and admire his integrity and profound sense of duty and dedication to the public interest and to his ability . . . to cut through the redtape and high-sounding phrases and get to the real issue involved, to which he would always apply a commonsense, down-to-earth approach." He said, "He has represented the people of North Carolina with great distinction. He has reflected credit upon the people of North Carolina, upon the Senate and upon the nation."

Sen. Mike Mansfield of Montana, the majority leader, said he is "a man of understanding and character . . . a man who conducted himself with dignity, integrity and dedication" and a man "who has contributed so much to his state, his region, and to the nation as a whole."

Sen. Ernest Hollings of South Carolina termed Senator Jordan a man of "dedication and commitment," who "labored long and hard, with diligence and with a quiet persuasiveness that enabled him to be a distinguished legislator." He said he is a man who "always puts first things first—and at the top of his list was a deeply held commitment to the concept of America and the well-being of its citizens."

Sen. Milton R. Young of North Dakota called him "a great legislator and one of the best-liked members of the Senate," a "friendly, kindly and very decent person," who "played a key role" in shaping much important legislation.

Sen. Margaret Chase Smith of Maine said the Senate has never known "a kinder, more considerate person." She said he is "a wonderful human being" and "He is endeared to us for his great courage—moral and physical."

Sen. Harrison A. Williams Jr., of New Jersey likened Senator's Jordan's work to the accumulating grains of sand that have built the towering dunes on North Carolina's Outer Banks. He said he has "worked tirelessly to put the grains of sand together to make sturdy mountains. He has worked for the authorizations and completion of the Scott Reservoir, the New Hope Dam, the Falls of the Neuse Reservoir and many other water control projects, he has fought for the interests of farmers and agricultural processors . . . North Carolina is quickly developing as a leader in our nation's maritime industry, but the mountains of jobs and industry created by her maritime development would not have been possible without Everett Jordan combining the grains of sand." He said the senator "was largely responsible for the development of the ports at Wilmington and Morehead City and the improvement of navigation on the Cape Fear River," and that Senator Sam Ervin of North Carolina was correct when he said "surveys and planning for most other flood control, navigation and beach protection projects now authorized or in progress in the state likewise bear the distinctive Jordan stamp."

What a man is and what he has done can be judged by what his peers think of him. And it is typical of Senator Jordan, we think, that he sidetracked many similar remarks by calling to the attention of the Senate that two other North Carolina congressmen are retiring this year. He said Rep. Alton Lennon was retiring as a member of the House of Representatives after previously having served in the Senate, and that "North Carolina and the nation have benefited greatly from his service." And he said that Rep. Charles R. Jonas, a Republican, is retiring "after a illustrious 20-year career" and that "he has shown throughout his career a capacity for putting the needs of the state and country above purely partisan politics." He said Rep. Jonas has waged a "continuing battle against carelessness and waste in government spending" and that "if the taxpayers of the nation knew how many millions of dollars Charlie's prudence had saved them they would rise up and thank him with one resounding vote."

Senator Jordan left the floor of the Senate like he first went there 15 years ago—a dedicated and decent man.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM M. COLMER

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my privilege to address a letter of tribute to our colleague, Congressman WILLIAM M. COLMER of Mississippi. Such tribute follows:

OCTOBER 27, 1972.

Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: What can a friend write to his respected, admired, able and beloved co-worker and friend when his friend is about to leave this sphere of labor and achievements? To say 'thank you' sounds all too formal and brief. And, yet, in these two words when sincerely used, as I now use them, is wrapped up all of the honest emotion and personal appreciation that words can express.

So, to you, my admired and cherished friend, I say 'thank you' from the depths of an appreciative heart for the unselfish, effective and talented service which you have rendered to a needy nation and its all too often unappreciative and shortsighted citizens.

Bill, you have been a tower of strength to me—always understanding of my responsibility and shortcomings. I have enjoyed our years of work together and our mutual endeavors to be understanding and helpful to each other as we have attempted to serve our people.

As we go our separate ways, I wish for you and your wonderful helpmate life's best gifts love and happiness—in the years ahead.

Sincerely,

WAYNE ASPINALL.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, may I say that BILL COLMER is his own man. He loves people, but he also loves principle as he sees it. No one can ask for more in a friendship which he is willing to give; neither can anyone ask for more when his colleague stands on the principles which are so dear and meaningful to him.

This House, this Congress, this Government, and its people are all the beneficiaries of a great service rendered by our colleague.

I wish for him and his loved ones the most happy of experiences as BILL leaves us and goes into the joys of retirement.

SENATOR FRED HARRIS

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in the departure of FRED HARRIS from this body, the Senate loses one of its most brilliant, energetic, and hard-hitting Members, and a man who is not afraid to stand up anywhere for his beliefs and convictions.

Few Members have been more courageous in expressing their views, or more indefatigable in trying to translate them into legislation. He has been a great fighter for humanity, and he has pled his cause with skill and eloquence. The blacks, the minorities, the elderly, the poor—those who cannot always speak up well for themselves—are losing a great champion in the departure from the Senate of the vigorous and deeply committed man from Oklahoma.

I have enjoyed his friendship, and that of his lovely wife, Donna. I shall watch with interest to see the endeavors he now turns his time and his indisputed talents to. I wish him well.

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, GEORGE MILLER is truly one of the fathers of the U.S. space program. As chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, he has very skillfully and ably led the effort to keep this Nation in the forefront of this new and exciting frontier. In his very affable and outgoing manner, GEORGE has endeared himself to his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. We will miss him greatly in the House, and I personally will miss his friendship and wise counsel. Future generations of Americans will remember GEORGE MILLER for his leadership in the space program, in putting America first on the moon. His countless friends in the House and throughout Washington will remember this accomplishment, but will always cherish his keen wit and affable nature. Mr. Speaker, we wish for GEORGE MILLER continued success, every happiness, and the best always.

RADIO KRAK CELEBRATES 10TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, radio KRAK, northern California's country-western music and news station headquartered in Sacramento, Calif., this year celebrates its 10th anniversary.

I join with its many listeners and devotees in wishing it a happy anniversary and best wishes for another decade of broadcasting.

I can remember my days as a California State legislator when my office radio was constantly tuned to KRAK.

Country-western music is peculiarly American folk music. Much of America is revealed in the lyrics of country-western songs—its weakneses as well as its strengths. But predominant in those lyrics is the theme of honesty—of "telling it like it is."

Radio KRAK is a part of many peoples' day. It has been an enjoyable part of mine.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HARRIS

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, Senator FRED HARRIS has added much to the debate and interest in national problems before the Senate. It is not necessary for one in the U.S. Senate to agree with every other Member, but it can be said that Senator HARRIS has brought before the Senate and the country human problems relating to opportunities for all, settlement of racial strains, and a wider participation in the affairs of our Government, which are problems which must receive the attention of the Congress and our country in the years ahead. A strong and unrelenting debater for his beliefs, he is nevertheless a kind and tolerant man. He has been greatly aided by his wife, Ladonna, who has won the admiration of all of us. Our best wishes go with them.

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to pay tribute to a great American, the Honorable WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, who is retiring after 22 years of service to the Nation and to his 22d District of Illinois.

As ranking Republican on the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, BILL SPRINGER has applied the steady hand of reason to some of the most important pieces of legislation of our time. His hard work and his wealth of skill and legislative craftsmanship have been an inspiration to every Member of the Congress.

BILL has always given unselfishly of his time for his party, serving as a member of the House Republican policy committee and vice chairman of the Republican congressional campaign committee.

BILL SPRINGER'S record is that of a dedicated public servant. We will miss him greatly as a productive Member of this body and as a friend. I join my colleagues in wishing him excellent health and every possible happiness in the years to come.

SOMALIA: CELEBRATION OF ITS NATIONAL DAY

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the African Subcommittee of this House Foreign Affairs Committee, I would like to take the occasion to extend congratulations to Somalia which recently celebrated its National Day.

The National Day of the Somali Democratic Republic will be celebrated on October 21. I wish to take this occasion to call attention to the efforts of Somali President Mohamed Siad Barree to resolve the Uganda-Tanzania dispute. It is actions such as President Siad's which help to reduce international disputes. I recall with pleasure the friendly reception given me when I visited Somalia in February 1971. On behalf of my colleagues in the Congress of the United States, I would like to extend congratulations and best wishes to President Siad and the Somali people on their National Day.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1972

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, to think of Congress without EMANUEL CELLER is to think of a meal without bread. With his retirement, this body will lose a contributing Member whose influence has been outstanding for so long that few can remember otherwise.

I join with my colleagues in all of the tributes which have been paid to him. Those who have already evaluated his personality and service have done it better than I could ever think of doing. I just wish to say "Thank you, MANNY," for what you have done for all of us not only on the Hill, but throughout the Nation and, yes, throughout the world. May your days ahead be enriched not only with your future successes, but also with your remembrances of yesterday.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR B. EVERETT JORDAN

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I am pleased to join in paying tribute to an esteemed and revered Member of this body, the distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina, B. EVERETT JORDAN, who is retiring after 14 years of service to the Senate.

As chairman of the important Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, and as a member of the Committees on Agriculture and Forestry, and Public Works, Senator JORDAN has distinguished himself as a man of honesty, sincerity, and integrity. He is well known for his quick wit and affability, and for a keen sense of purpose when it comes to representing the best interests of the people of North Carolina.

The Senate will miss B. EVERETT JORDAN, and I wish him continued health and happiness in the future.

EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

HON. MARK O. HATFIELD

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, earlier this year, I had the pleasure of a visit with a young Oregonian, Craig Walker, who was here in Washington attending the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. As first-place winner in Oregon's "Ability Counts" essay contest, sponsored each year by the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, this 17-year-old Parkrose Senior High School student received an expense-paid trip to Washington, D.C., and a $330 scholarship to the Oregon college of his choice. Craig devoted a great deal of thought and time to the research for this paper, and we would all do well to give consideration to his findings. With this in mind, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, Craig Walker's essay, "Employment of the Hanadicapped: How Well Is My Community Informed?"

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

EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

Public awareness is the first step toward solving a problem that involves the community. To help the handicapped, it is necessary to educate and make the public aware of them and their needs.

The handicapped person's three major areas of contact with people are in Vocational Rehabilitation, Employment and Employers, and the general public; therefore, these are the areas which must be explored in order to understand how well my community is informed about the handicapped.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Division (DVR) maintains several offices in the Port-

land area. Mr. Ron Weiss and Mr. Gilbert Foss, at Eastmont, in our community, felt that the public was not well informed about what is available for the handicapped. A major problem is that many times the layman assumes that the characteristics of one handicapped group are shared by other groups; for instance, two stereotypes are that all handicapped people are in wheelchairs or that they are mentally retarded. Many times a double-stereotype takes place in employment. This process is demonstrated when an employer automatically limits an individual's opportunities because of a certain disability. He also groups all work positions in his company in one category; such as manual labor or production-line work. There may be other jobs, but he stereotypes them all as being of one kind. This bias is the major stumbling block to overcome in changing the attitudes of all concerned; and the bias will be erased only if stereotyping is eliminated and the potential of the individual is realized.

Also of major importance is that quite often the negative aspects in favor of hiring the handicapped are brought out instead of the positive reasons. Two examples would be, "he won't quit because he can get no other job" and "he is less likely to get hurt". Instead of stressing these things, it should be shown how a handicapped worker will perform better in a certain job than a non-handicapped person. One should be careful, however, not to make the gap in people's minds between the handicapped and non-handicapped worker wider than it is. Instead, the gap should be closed by demonstrating that the disabled person is no different than anyone else. Mr. Don Ware, of the Salem DVR office, stated that in his opinion the public is "poorly informed about what is available" to the handicapped in terms of rehabilitation services. He felt that the public knows very little about how well various types of handicapped people can perform in jobs. However, DVR administrator Norm Silver indicated that industry and business in general are making the move toward hiring these people. The main thrust of DVR should be to focus on the *residual* ability more than the *disability* of the individual.

Mr. Rolla Reedy, from the Gresham office of the State Employment Division, serves as the handicapped counselor for this area. He secures positions for the job-ready, those with a skill. Those who are not prepared for placement are sent to the Vocational Rehabilitation office to be trained. Mr. Reedy felt that DVR is doing a good job of training the handicapped for employment. The point that he stressed was that "a person may have a disability, but if he's properly placed in employment it is in something in which the disability is not a handicap." In short, he should be put where his disability does not handicap him in the execution of his job. This is called Selective Placement; fitting the right person in the right job.

The attitudes of the employers I talked with were very good towards the handicapped. They all seemed very anxious to help these people, and said they considered them no different than any other person in jobs where their disability does not hinder them.

Mr. Bob Martyn, the personnel manager at Tektronix, Inc., expressed the opinion that the public is fairly well informed about the hiring of the handicapped. He did, however, feel that being informed does not necessarily mean that the public is convinced of the need, or to take any action. Mr. Martyn said that their disabled workers have been no more of a problem than non-handicapped employees. "Good community support" is how Mr. William Weigers, the head of the Human Resources Division of Goodwill Industries, terms the public's cooperation with Goodwill. He feels that people know a fair amount about Goodwill, and indicated that there are always many requests from groups like the Kiwanis Clubs for speakers to talk about how the public can help the disabled. Their trucks run constantly with donations from individuals, and the annual Boy Scout collection drive brings in enough items for nearly three months. Goodwill is very pleased with the support.

The Bonneville Power Administration personnel director indicated the same results: "When they are properly placed to utilize their abilities, they are as effective and productive as other workers."

I asked several questions of sixty people that I used as a test group. An overwhelming 72% of those in the community asked, felt that the handicapped were not treated the same as a non-handicapped person when applying for a job. Several people felt that they should be given special consideration over non-handicapped people when applying for some jobs. The remaining 28% felt that they were treated equally. There were many comments about how sometimes an employer might "roll out the red carpet" to a disabled person, and then later shut out someone just the same as "too much trouble." The survey indicated that most felt this attitude was improving.

Another question put to the community sample group asked how well they thought they were informed about the employment of the handicapped. Half of them replied "not very well." "Fairly well aware" of this topic is the reply from 34%, while 16% felt that they knew a good deal about the problem. Several said, however, that even if the public was well informed, there would still be the attitude barrier to break down, and the community would still have to be motivated to help.

It seems that the public agrees that there has been an improvement in the treatment of the handicapped, and that there still needs to be more change. Most of the people I talked with felt that the employers should extend more help, while the employers believed that they were helping the handicapped sufficiently. The problems of the handicapped have been growing more and more important over the years, as the victims of war and accidents have increased in number. If these people are to be helped, the ideas and attitudes of the general public and employers must be focused on the many positive aspects of the disabled. Handicapped people can help themselves only when the community has helped by eliminating the prejudices in themselves and others.

TRIBUTE TO HON. PAGE BELCHER

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, at the end of this Congress, Capitol Hill will lose one of its senior and most able colleagues, PAGE BELCHER, as he retires permanently to Oklahoma.

PAGE is not only a great representative of his State of Oklahoma, but he is a fine representative of the people of the United States generally. He has been a very effective ranking member of his committee and he has been highly respected by all of the Members of the Congress in which he has served.

Quiet, principled, talented, dedicated—these are words which to me best explain this great Oklahoman. We are all his debtors, because of his service among us, and I wish him well in the days ahead.

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, JACKSON E. BETTS, is retiring at the close of the 92d Congress after 22 years of dedicated service in the U.S. House of Representatives.

JACK BETTS was born in the district he now represents. After graduating cum laude from Kenyon College and securing a law degree from Yale, he began a rapid ascension in law and public service. He served as Hancock County, Ohio, prosecuting attorney, as member of the Ohio General Assembly, as speaker of the Ohio House of Representatives, and in 1950 was elected to the U.S. Congress.

While serving as second ranking Republican on the House Ways and Means Committee, JACK BETTS has provided skillful, responsible leadership on some of the most important pieces of legislation to come before the Congress in recent years. We will miss his guidance and the inspiration of his tireless efforts on behalf of the people of his district and his Nation. But I am sure the Nation will benefit from his counsel and leadership from his position as a private citizen. I wish him health and happiness in the years ahead.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR KARL E. MUNDT

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I must say farewell at the adjournment of this Congress to many colleagues with whom I have served and worked in the Senate. Among those whose service in the Senate is coming to a close is Senator KARL E. MUNDT of South Dakota.

Five times elected to the House of Representatives and four times to the U.S. Senate, KARL MUNDT is the third-ranking Republican in the Senate, and his long tenure of service to his State and the Nation is its own testimonial to his efforts and beliefs.

I served with Senator MUNDT for a time on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; he was a champion of the farmer on that committee, on the Appropriations Committee, and in the Senate itself. We also served together on the Foreign Relations Committee.

KARL MUNDT was a teacher and a teacher's teacher before he came to the Senate—where he occasionally gave us all lessons in debate and in elocution. Dynamic and forceful, he held strongly to his beliefs and articulated them with

vigor. He was always a fighter, and his strong will and courage have never forsaken him. We honor also the constant and unsurpassed devotion of his wife, Mary, who has stood with him in every achievement and every trial.

The Congress needs strong men to hammer out solutions on the anvil of debate—and KARL MUNDT was a strong advocate for the people of his State, his party, and his country's honor.

SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF LESOTHO

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the African Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I would like to take the occasion to salute Lesotho which has recently celebrated its anniversary of independence.

On October 4, 1972, the Kingdom of Lesotho celebrated the sixth anniversary of its independence. On this occasion, I wish to extend by congratulations and best wishes to His Majesty King Moshoeshoe II, the Prime Minister, Chief Leabua Jonathan, and the people of Lesotho. During these first half dozen years of independence the people of Lesotho have struggled mightily for the economic development of their country. Their determined efforts have attracted international attention, and I am proud to observe that the United States is one of the nations which has contributed to the struggle of Lesotho's valiant people.

Lesotho's growing role in the community of nations is commendable. I have long urged that the United States continue and expand its support for Lesotho as a majority-ruled State of southern Africa. The United States values its close and friendly relations with Lesotho. In August 1969, I visited Lesotho during a special study mission to southern Africa and found that the country desired closer relations with the United States and desired U.S. ambassadorial representation to Lesotho. During the past year, I am pleased to note the U.S. representation to Lesotho was raised for the first time to the ambassadorial level.

I am confident that the people of the United States join me in warmest independence anniversary greetings and best wishes for peace and prosperity for the people of Lesotho.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THE 160-ACRE ANTIMONOPOLY WATER LAW

HON. FRED R. HARRIS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, there has been a recurring request made by persons newly concerned with acreage limitation and residency provisions of Federal reclamation law for a bibliography on relevant source materials. Mr. Charles L. Smith sent to me on October 10 an extensive and excellent bibliography on the subject of the Federal reclamation law. I think this bibliography will be of great use to Members of the Congress and I am pleased to bring it to their attention. I request that the first portion of the bibliography be inserted in the RECORD at this time.

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

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THE 160-ACRE ANTI-MONOPOLY WATER LAW

(By Charles L. Smith)

Congress passed the National Reclamation Act of 1902 to help water development in the West by federal subsidies. These subsidies to privately-owned lands are now running from $1,000 to $2,000 an acre, according to studies by the U.S. Bureau of the Budget.

In order to prevent monopoly by the few of water, of subsidies, and of unearned increment, Congress included provisions in the National Reclamation Act to limit the benefits any individual may legally receive. These protections against monopoly of the government-supplied water are sometimes called "excess land law," "acreage limitation," or "160-acre law."

The U.S. Supreme Court, in 1958, described the law's purpose in these words: "The limitation insures that this enormous expenditure will not go in disproportionate share to a few individuals with large land holding. Moreover, it prevents the use of the federal reclamation service for speculative purposes." 357 U.S. 275, 297 (1958)

BIBLIOGRAPHIES RELATED TO 160-ACRE LAW

Browne, Mary Lilla, *Materials, Federal-State Relationships and Conflicts in regard to Water Resources,* Bibliography and Digest, 1970, Dept. of Water Resources, Law Library, Sacramento.

Tompkins, Dorothy Campbell, *Water Plans for California—A Bibliography,* 180 pp., 1961, Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley 94720.

U.S. DOCUMENTS

Federal Reclamation Law, June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388).

"Fact-finders report," *Federal reclamation by irrigation,* Senate document no. 92, 68th Congress, 1st session, 1924.

Excess Land Law, Omnibus Adjustment Act of May 25, 1926, 43 U.S. Code 423E, 44 Stat. 649–650.

LaFollette Committee, Report of the Senate Comm. on Education and Labor, S. Res. 266, 74th Cong. 2nd Sess., Rept. 1150, pts 1–5; 78th Cong. 1st Sess., S. Rept. 398, pts. 1–5; 88 *Cong. Rec.* pp. 8311–8338, Oct. 19, 1942.

Historical Background of California Agriculture and Its Labor Problem, Senate Comm. on Education and Labor on Violations of Free Speech and Rights of Labor, 77 Cong. (2) Sen. Rept. 1150, pt. 3, pp. 219–229, June 15, 1942.

U.S. Senate Subcomm. on Military Affairs, *Hearings* on Central Valley Project 160-acre limitation, San Francisco, April 7, 1944, 121 pp. mimeo, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Sacramento.

Hearings on H.R. 3961, Subcom. Senate Comm. on Commerce, 78th Congress, 2nd Sess. 635 (1944), S. Res. 295, July 24–29, 1944, 503 pp.

Small Business and the Community, Goldschmidt, Walter R., (Arvin-Dinuba Study). Report of Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business, U.S. Senate 79:2 Print No. 13, S. Res. 28, Dec. 23, 1946, 139 pp.

U.S. Senate Comm. on Public Lands, Subcomm. on Irrigation and Reclamation. Proposed Exemption of Central Valley Project and other Projects from land-limitation provisions. *Hearings* S. 912, May 5–June 2, 1947, 1329 pp. 80:1

Shelley, Jack, et al., House Public Lands Comm., *Hearing* on H. Res. 93, 80 Cong., 1st Sess., Committee Hearing No. 27, 1947.

Central Valley Basin, Senate Doc. 113, 81st Cong. 1st Sess., A comprehensive Dept. Report, Bureau of Reclamation, Aug. 1949.

U.S. Dept. of Interior, *Excess Land Provisions* of Federal Reclamation Laws and Payment of Charges, 2 parts, May 1956. Prepared at the request of House Gov't Operations subcomm of Public Works and Resources. (Located in Committee files, at Dept. of Interior and Library of Congress.)

Central Valley Project Documents: House Doc. 416, 84 Cong. 2nd Sess. 1956; House Doc. 246, 85 Cong., 1st Sess. 1957.

U.S. Senate, Subcomm on Irrigation and Reclamation, *Hearings* on San Luis Unit, CVP. 85 Cong. 2nd Sess. 1958; 86th Cong. 1st Sess. S. 44.

Acreage Limitation (Reclamation Law) Review. Hearings on S1425, S2541, S3448, Subcomm on Irrigation and Reclamation, Senate Comm on Int. and Insular Affairs, 85th Cong. 2nd Sess., April 30 and May 1, 1958, 271 pp. and appendix.

Report of a Special House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation on Central Valley Project, California, as a result of *Hearing* held Oct. 29, 30, & 31, 1951 (1951 House Special Report, 105 *Cong Rec.* 7486 (1959).

U.S. House of Representatives, Interior and Insular Affairs, *Hearings,* H.R. 399, H.R. 7155, 86th Cong., 1st Sess., 1959.

Westlands Water District Contract, *Hearings,* Senate Comm. on Int. and Ins. Affairs, July 8, 1964, 37–049. 88:2

Temko, Allen, *Statement* to White House Comm. on Urban Problems, Hearings in San Francisco, July 5, 1967. Vol. 2, p. 210–215.

Construction of San Felipe Division, San Luis Unit, *CVP,* re ground water improvement, Senate insert, July 10, 1967. *Cong. Rec.*

Hearings, House Subcomm., Cons. and Nat. Res., Comm. Gov't Operations, 91st Cong. 1st Sess., May and Aug. 1969 (Hon. Henry Reuss, Chrmn.) Paul S. Taylor: Part 1, pp. 229–237; Part 2, pp. 529–536. Sacramento diverters

Hearings, Subcomm. on Migratory Labor, Comm. on Labor & Public Welfare, 91st Cong., 1st and 2nd Sess., Border Commuter Labor Problem, May 21, 1969, 9 vols.

S1631, Murphy Bill to amend Acreage Limitation, using Engle formula Senate insert *Cong. Rec.* March 24, 1969.

Hearings on Reclamation Lands, Authority Act S. 2863, *Cong. Rec.* 3–9–72; May 17 and 18, 1972.

Hearings, Water Resources Council, interest rates for federal water projects. San Francisco, March 13, 1972.

U.S. Senate, Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, Comm. on Labor and Public Welfare, *Hearings* in San Francisco and Fresno, Jan. 11, 12, & 13, 1972.

CALIFORNIA DOCUMENTS

Senate Joint Resolution No. 18, adopted Feb. 16, 1878, Chap. 23, California Legislature.

Report to Legislature of 1931 on State Water Plan, California Dept. of Public Works, Div. of Water Resources, *Bulletin No. 25,* 1930.

State Water Plan Association, *Manual for Speakers* in Support of Central Valley Project Act, Special Election, Dec. 19, 1933, Dec. 7, 1933.

Proceedings, Governor's Conference on Water, 1945, Sacramento.

Central Valley Project: Federal or State? Assembly *Interim Comm. Repts.* 1953–55, Vol. 13 (6) 1955.

California Assembly Interim Comm. on Water, *Hearings,* 1959, Statements by large

landholders and their representatives. 75 pp., mimeo.

Assembly Journal, March 8, 1960, Ackerman Minority Report on California Water Plan.

Governor's Task Force, *Report on Acreage Limitation Problem*, Jan. 4, 1968, 23 pp., (Governor's office, State Capitol, Sacramento, Ca. 95814) reprinted: *Cong. Rec.* March 24, 1969, Senator Murphy S3047–53.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

88—Oct. 19, 1942, 8311–8338.

104—1958, 17723–17735, San Luis Debate.

105—1959, Senate, 7483–7498, 7665–7691, 7849–7877. 7986–8001, San Luis (Westlands).

106—1960, House, 10448–10471, 10553–10566.

108—April 2, 10, May 4, 1962, 5687–5725, 6237–6240, 7809–7814, Application of excess land law to Calif. "state service area" of Calif. Water Project.

July 21, 1964, Congressman Phil Burton, Keith Murray articles in Liberal Democrat, March 1962; May, July 1964.

110—August 5 and 7, 1964, 17493–17503, 17912–17922, Westlands Debate.

111—August 23, 1965, 20592–20608.

January 25, 1968, February 1, 1968, H. 420; S. 775, McGovern.

March 22, 1968, E2155, Paul S. Taylor letter to State Board of Agriculture.

April 30, 1968, S4652, Senator Nelson.

July 30, 1968, S9742–9749, Senator Morse, P. S. Taylor, KPFA.

March 24, 1969, S3047–3053, Senator Murphy: Governor's Task Force.

August 4, 1969, E6591–92, Eckhardt: P. S. Taylor, Texas Observer. 95–10126, Jackson, Salt River Project.

October 20, 1969, E8597–98, Cohelan, P. S. Taylor, National Water Commission, Planning: Resources.

November 17, 1969, 34492.

March 18, 1970, Charles S. Gubser: Committee for Economic Justice, California Church Council.

October 9, 1970, E9090–93, Senator Metcalf, Water Grants for Education.

April 21, 1971, S21297.

October 18, 1971, E10987, Water Politics in California.

November 16, 1971, S18638–41.

December 2, 1971, 12889–92, Kastenmeier: Decision Against Absentee Landowners.

December 10, 1971, S21297–304, Senator Harris, Federal Reclamation Act of 1902.

March 8, 1972, S3642–44, H2856–57, daily edition.

May 13, 1972, E4359–60, Kastenmeier: Water, Water for the Rich.

May 17, 1972, E5391–5429, Senator Harris, Reclamation Lands Authority Act.

May 18, 1972, E5431–5461, Senator Harris, hearings on land reform in Salina, Kans., and Los Angeles, Calif.

MISCELLANEOUS BOOKS, ARTICLES, AND REPORTS BY AUTHOR

Ackerman, Adolph J., *Final Report* on the Feather River—Southern California Aqueduct, Oct. 20, 1960, 27 pp. mimeo. (Available at Water Resources Library, Univ. of Calif., Berkeley.) (See also: Using Engineering to Enslave You by A. J. Ackerman, *Civil Engineering* magazine, July 1964.)

Angel, Arthur D., *Political and Administrative Aspects of Central Valley Project*, Doctoral thesis, UCLA, 1944, 398 pp., biblio. pp. 371–398.

Apter, Robert L., *The California Water Plan*, Task Force Information, 6 pp., Friends of the Earth (451 Pacific, San Francisco 94133).

Arashiro, Francis and Anatole Antol, The Great Water Project Scandal, How Reagan Robbed the State Education Funds, *Open Process* v. 4(9) Jan. 22, 1969. (SF State College, 1600 Holloway, SF 94132.)

Bain, J., R. E. Caves, and J. Margolis, *Northern California's Water Industry*, the comparative efficiency, for Resources for the Future, Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1966, biblio.

Baker, Geo. L. and Dennis Campbell, Water Act Has Many Loopholes *Sacramento Bee*, Feb. 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, 1971.

Ballis, George, *California Water Plan: An Evaluation*, Public Affairs Institute, (312 Penn. Ave., SE, Wash. 20003) 1960, 7 pp. Preface by Paul S. Taylor, Foreword by Dewey Anderson.

Bancroft Library of Western History, Univ. of California, Berkeley Regional Oral History Project: Interviews and personal papers of prominent persons involved with water and land problems.

Clipping file and additional items on the Central Valley Project, compiled by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Barnes, Peter, Water, Water for the Rich (Imperial Valley) *New Republic*, May 8, 1971, v. 164. (Repr. *Cong. Rec.* May 13, 1971, E4359–60.) Series of three articles: Land Reform: 1, The Great American Land Grab; 2, The Vanishing Small Farmer; 3, the Case for Redistribution, *The New Republic*, June 5, 12, 19, 1971, v. 164, (23), (24), (25).

Beamon, Frank, The California Water Project, *Daily Commercial News*, sixteen articles, July 9–30, 1968, (125 12th St., SF 94103).

Berger, Samuel R., *Dollar Harvest*, (book about the Farm Bureau) Heath Pub., 1971.

Berkman, Richard L. and Kip Viscusi, *Damming the West*, Nader Task Force report on the Bureau of Reclamation, 1971.

Brubaker, Sterling L., *The Impact of Federal Government Activities on California's Economic Growth*, Ph. D. Thesis, Univ. Calif. Berkeley 1959.

Bryce, (Lord) James, *American Commonwealth*, Ch. 90 in unabridged edition only, 1922/23.

Business Week, "Valley Divided", May 13, 1944, pp. 21, 24.

Casey, Jack Tull, *Legislative History of the Central Valley Project, 1933–1949*, Doctoral dissertation, U.C., 1950.

Central Valley Project, (whole issue) *California Law Review*, v. 38 pp. 728, 730–732 (1950).

Committee on Water, National Research Council, National Academy of Science, *Alternatives in Water Management*, 1966, 50 pp. Reviewed, *Civil Engineering*, June 1969, pp. 80–82. (The Committee: 2101 Constitution Ave., Wash. D.C. 20418.)

Commonwealth Club, 7 *Transactions*, 108 (1912–13), speech of Pres. Theodore Roosevelt, March 27, 1911.

Cooper, A. Margaret, *Land, Water, and Settlement in Kern County, California*, M. A. Thesis, UC, Berkeley, 1954.

Cooper, Erwin, *Aqueduct Empire: Guide to Water in California* (description of Calif. Dept. of Water Resources) A. H. Clark, Glendale, 1968, 439 pp.

Daily Californian, Simon Calls Irvine Deal Unjust, Oct. 9, 1970.

Davison, Stanley R., *Leadership of the Reclamation Movement, 1875–1930* Ph. D. Thesis, UC, Berkeley, 1951.

Degnan, James P., Water: Who Pays? Who Profits? The Many Pay, The Few Profit, *Frontier*, v. 18 (2) p. 8–11, Dec. 1966.

De Haven, J. C. and J. Hirshleifer, Feather River Water for Southern California Land Economics, v. 33, p. 198–209 (Aug. 1957).

de Roos, Robert, *The Thirsty Land*, Stanford University Press, 1948, 265 pp.

Downey, Sen. Sheridan, *They Would Rule The Valley*, 256 pp., 1947.

Draper, Anne and Hal, *The Dirt on California*, Agribusiness and the University Independent Socialist Clubs, 1968, 32 pp. (P.O. Box 910, Berkeley 94701.)

Fellmeth, Robert C. ed., *Power and Land in California*, Ralph Nader Task Force Report on land use in California, 2 vols. 1971. (Center for Study of Responsive Law, 1156 19th St., N.W., Wash. D.C. 20000.)

Frizzell, Alice Joy, *Some Economic and Political Aspects of Water Resource Development in the Central Valley of California*, M.A. Thesis, UC, 1949.

Gates, Paul Wallace, "Homestead Act in an Incongruous Land System" 41 *American Historical Review* 652 (1936).

Gilliam, Harold, West Side (of San Joaquin)—Canaan or Super Junk Yard? This World, *SF Sunday Examiner and Chronicle*, Dec. 8, 1968.

Great Tragedy of our Wasted Water, *This World*, Sunday, Oct. 3, 1971 (repr. *Cong. Rec.* Oct. 18, 1971, E 10987).

Goldberg, B. Abbott, Interposition—Wild West Style, *Stanford Law Review*, v. 17, p. 1–38, 1964.

Goodschmidt, Walter, *As You Sow*, Free Press, Glencoe, 1947.

Goodall, Merrill R., Land and Power Administration of the CVP, *Journal of Land and Public Utility Economics*, v. 18 (3) p. 299–311, Aug. 1942.

Gordon, Kermit, (U.S. Budget Director), speech on cost effectiveness, Committee for Economic Development, 1964 (Quoted in Joseph Alsop column "And the Rich get Richer" *SF Examiner*, Nov. 20, 1964).

Harris, Michael, Plan to Revive the Small Farm (National Coalition for Land Reform) *SF Chronicle*, Dec. 3, 1971.

Hightower, Jim, *Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times* (failure of Land Grant Colleges) Agribusiness Accountability Project, 1972, 308 pp., paper. (1000 Wisconsin Ave., N.W., Wash. D.C. 20007).

Hirshleifer, J, J. C. De Haven, and J. W. Milliman, *Water Supply*, Economics, Technology, and Policy, Univ. of Chicago Press, 2nd ed., 1969, 386 pp. (See especially Cost-Benefit discussion.)

Holmstrom, David, Who Owns California? a series of four articles on Ralph Nader Report on California, *Christian Science Monitor*, Sept. 22, 25, Oct. 1, 5, 1971.

Hosmer, Helen, Imperial Valley: Triumph and Failure in the Colorado Desert, *American West*, v. 3, (1) Winter 1966.

Howe, Chas. W. and K. W. Easter, *Interbasin Transfers of Water: Economic Issues and Impacts*, Resources for the Future, Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1971. Summary: Water from the Pacific Northwest? In *Resources*, No. 38, Sept. 1971 (1755 Mass. Ave. N.W., Wash. 20036.)

Hundley, Norris, Jr., *Dividing the Waters—A Century of Controversy Between U.S. and Mexico*, Univ. of Calif. Press, Berkeley, 1966.

Kastenmeier, Con. Robert, *House Resolution 5236*, 92nd Con., 1st Sess.

King, Seth S., The Family Farm is not Dead, *Saturday Review*, v. 45 (31) July 29, 1972.

Koch, Beverly, Nader's Raiders Look at California Land, *San Francisco Chronicle*, Feb. 26, 1971.

Lilliston, Lynn, (LWV) Second Thoughts on (California) Water Project, *Los Angeles Times*, Oct. 4, 1970.

Long, Robert, (senior vice president, Bank of America) Acreage Limitation, Petty Political Tyranny, *Western Water News*, Sept. 1969.

Lorenz, James D. Jr., Attorney for Plaintiffs, U.S. District Court, Northern California, *Suit* by Bowker, Bulbulian, Stamenson and Bettencourt against Hickel, et al, 1971.

Maass, Arthur A., *Muddy Rivers*, Harvard, 1951 (Army Corps of Engineers).

——— King's River Project in the Basin of the Great Central Valley—A Case Study, App. 7 to App. L, Task Force on Natural Resources, *Report* of the U.S. Commission on Organization of the Executive Office of Government (Hoover Commission) Gov't Printing Office, Wash., D.C. 20402, 1949. (Reprinted in *Reader in Bureaucracy*, R. K. Merton, et al., Free Press, Glencoe, 1952, p. 291–297.)

Main, Chas. T. *General Evaluation* of (Calif.) State Water Resources Development System, Interim Report, Boston, 1960.

McCune, Wesley, *Who's Behind Our Farm Policy?* Praeger, 1956.

McIntyre, Joan, *California Task Force Information*, Bulletin No. 1, May 1970 3 pp., Friends of the Earth (451 Pacific, SF 94133).

McWilliams, Carey, *Factories in the Fields*, Little, Brown, 1939, 334 pp.

Montgomery and Clawson, *History of Legislation and Policy Formation* of the Central Valley Project; Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, March 1946.

Moore, C.V. and J. H. Snyder, Corporate Farming in California, *California Agriculture*, March 1970.

Morgan, Arthur E., *Dams and other Disasters:* A century of the Army Corps of Engineers in Civil Works, Porter Sargent, Boston 1971. (Reviewed by *Christian Science Monitor*, Sept. 23, 1971.)

Movement, The, Who Owns California? The Kern County Land Company Today, v. 2 (2) Feb. 1966 (449 14th st., San Francisco, Ca. 94103).

National Irrigation Congress, 1910, *Proceedings*. Statements: Judge Frank H. Short, page 165–166; Judge Francis J. Heney, page 360; Gifford Pinchot, page 295.

Neuner, E. Jr., Economics of the Proposed Feather River Project, *Proceedings* of 31st Annual Conference, Western Economic Association, August 1956, Salt Lake City. 1957.

New York Times editorials, Farm Revolutions, Dec. 27, 28, 1971.

Packard, Walter E. *The Economic Implications of the Central Valley Project*, Haynes Foundation, Los Angeles, 1942, 91 pp., maps.

Partsch, F.L., Firms as Farms, Agricorporations Run in Growing Criticism, *Wall Street Journal*, May 2, 1972.

Penney, Brooks, Why California Needs Land Reform, *The Movement*, v.2 (6) July 1966.

Perelman, Michael, California Water Plan, *Freedom News*, v. 4 (9) 4 pp., Sept. 1970, (P.O. Box 1087, Richmond, Ca. 94802).

Peterson, Elmer, *Big Dam Foolishness*, The Problem of Flood Control and Water Storage, Devin Adair, 1954, 224 pp. (23 E. 26 St., N.Y. 10010).

Pinchot, Gifford, *Breaking New Ground*, Harcourt, 1947, 522 pp.

Porteous, Hartt, New Era in California Agriculture, *California Farmer*, Sept. 18, 1971.

President's National Advisory Committee on Rural Poverty, *The People Left Behind*, Sept. 1967. See Recommendations 5 and 6 on Excess Land in Irrigated Areas.

Press Democrat (Santa Rosa) Representatives (Waldie and Harris) Request Land Monopoly Break Up. May 12, 1972. (U.S. Appeals Water Ruling, *SFChronicle*, May 13, 1972).

Reich, William, *Land, Water and Power Monopoly in California*, series of ten programs given on KPFA (Berkeley) and KPFK (Los Angeles) Feb.-Aug. 1967. (Reprinted in *Farm Labor* v.5 (3) 1967.)

See Paul S. Taylor, one of ten programs, April 23, 1967, Cong. Rec.

Roberts, Keith, The California State Water Project, *Clear Creek*, April 1971 (617 Mission St., San Francisco, Calif. 94105.)

Roberts, Polly, *Power and Land in California*, a summary, 52 pp., 1971, California Action, Inc., (28 McAllister, San Francisco 94102).

Roosevelt, President Theodore, speech to Commonwealth Club, 7 *Transactions* 108 (1912–13).

San Francisco-Chronicle, The Legal Loopholes in Farm Subsidy Limits, July 5, 1971.

Sasuly, Richard, The Family Farm in California, 1962, 58 pp. California Farm Research and Legislative Committee, (740 Hilmar St., Santa Clara, Calif. 95050).

Sax, Joseph L., *Water Law Planning and Policy*, Cases and Materials, Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, 1968, 520 pp. (law text).

Schacht, Henry, $5 Billion City Next to Crops—Irvine Properties *SF Chronicle*, March 31, 1971.

——— Planned Urbanization lives with agriculture, *SF Chronicle*, April 12, 1971.

Schultze, Chas. L., (former U.S. Budget Chief) Report on Farm Subsidies, Brookings Institution, 197–.

Seckler, David, ed., *California Water*, Univ. of Calif. Press, Berkeley 1971.

——— *California Water:* a strategy, Planning and Conservation League, 1970, 19 pp., (909 12th St., Sacramento, Calif. 95814).

Seidenbaum, Art, Nader Boys have Say about California Land Development, *Los Angeles Times* West magazine, Oct. 4, 1970.

Shoup, Carl S., *Public Finance*, Aldine Pub., Chicago, 1969 (farm subsidies).

Sierra Club, Minutes of the Executive Committee, March 17, 1968, (1050 Mills Tower, San Francisco, Calif. 94104).

Stanford Research Institute, *Proceedings*, Environmental Pollution Symposium, speech by Dr. Joel F. Gustafson (of SF State Univ.) Jan. 26, 1972.

TRIBUTE TO HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with our colleagues as we pay our tributes to THOMAS PELLY, Congressman from the State of Washington.

I became acquainted with this fine gentleman and understanding colleague soon after he came to this body. He has been an able, talented, and effective Member of the House of Representatives. He has represented his district, his State, and the Nation well. His contributions have already been referred to by my colleagues and are a matter of record. Along with my colleagues, I glory in his accomplishments.

As he leaves, I wish to let him know that it has been a pleasure to work with him, to understand his desires to serve his people and to be a part of the congressional operation.

Mrs. Aspinall and I wish him the best of happy days in his retirement from Congress.

TRIBUTE TO H. ALLEN SMITH OF CALIFORNIA

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, when the 93d Congress convenes in January of 1973, some of the finest Members of Congress will be absent. One of these is the Honorable H. ALLEN SMITH, who is retiring after 16 years of outstanding service in the U.S. House of Representatives.

ALLEN SMITH has a distinguished record of public service. After obtaining his undergraduate and law degrees from the University of Southern California, he practiced law, served as a special agent of the FBI, and served four terms in the California State Assembly before being elected to the 85th Congress in the fall of 1956.

Any student of American Government knows the importance of the House Rules Committee in the democratic legislative process. ALLEN SMITH served as ranking Republican on this committee, and in that capacity he displayed a knowledge as detailed as anyone and better than most, of the machinery of the U.S. House of Representatives. He has represented the people of California's 20th District and the people of America well.

We will miss the energy, wisdom, and expertise of ALLEN SMITH. I wish him the best of good health and happiness in the years ahead.

VISITING THE LIBERATED AREAS OF GUINEA-BISSAU

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, Barbara Cornwall, author of a detailed study of African liberation movements called "The Bush Rebels," has written some comments regarding two articles which were submitted for the RECORD by the Honorable JOHN G. SCHMITZ of California. These articles express the Portuguese point of view with regard to the visit by a United Nations mission earlier this year to the liberated areas of Guinea-Bissau.

In view of the personal investigations carried out by Ms. Cornwall in the liberated areas of the Portuguese colonies, she is in a unique position to put the record straight. I would like to submit for the serious attention of my colleagues her comments:

COMMENTS ON AFRICAN LIBERATION

(By Barbara Cornwall)

OCTOBER 2, 1972.

I would like to call attention to two articles submitted by the Hon. John G. Schmitz of California and published in the Congressional Record of July 17, 1972, page 24090.

These articles, which appeared in the London "Daily Telegraph" on May 2, 1972, and in the April issue of the magazine, "Portugal," were offered by the Hon. Mr. Schmitz as evidence that a United Nations fact-finding team sent to Portuguese Guinea never, in fact, set foot on Portuguese Guinea territory and that, while remaining in the neighbouring republic of Guinea (former French Guinea) they were duped into believing that they were touring liberated zones held by the PAIGC, the liberation movement now fighting in Portuguese Guinea and which claims to hold three-quarters of that territory.

As the Hon. Mr. Schmitz has offered these two articles as evidence that Portugal "has seen fit to set the record straight" on the UN "inspection" of its Guinean province, I would like to examine these articles more closely.

Since the arguments put forward in the "Telegraph" were almost identical to those in the magazine "Portugal" which appeared a month earlier, I shall discuss mainly the "Telegraph" piece.

Having spent a month myself in the liberated zones of Portuguese Guinea while preparing a book about liberation movements in Africa (*The Bush Rebels*, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, April 1972), I would like to assure the House that my own experience and conclusions were very similar to those of the UN Special Mission, except that Portuguese bombardment undergone by the UN investigating team was far more intense than that undergone by myself (See also UN Commis-

sion on Human Rights, document No. E/CN.4/AC22/RT.102, January 21, 1971, which contains evidence given by me before the UN Human Rights Commission in Geneva).

I submit that, in its efforts to conceal the fact that it is losing its hold on Portuguese Guinea, and that the PAIGC does administer the territory under its control, and in order to castigate the United Nations for dispatching a fact-finding mission to establish the actual situation in the country, the evidence offered by Portugal through the two articles quoted is misleading and in many cases, does not correspond to reality.

Concerning the "Telegraph" article, its author, Mr. Bruce Loudon, says: "By their own admission, they (the mission) wore camouflage uniforms supplied by their Communist-backed guerrilla hosts."

(I would like to state that the PAIGC is supported, not only by Communist and other Eastern bloc countries, but by the Organisation of African Unity (OAU), Scandanavia, certain countries of North Africa, and by private church and social organisations in Western Europe and the United States which send food, clothing and medicine for civilian use. It is also natural that the UN mission would wear camouflage uniforms, as the liberated zones have been under Portuguese bombardment for several years. The black inhabitants are subject to raids by helicopter-borne Portuguese troops, aerial reconnaissance and jet strikes).

Mr. Loudon continues ". . . they tramped through mosquito-ridden and snake-infested areas of Portuguese Guinea under the firm "control" of the rebels—making "contact" with the local people, seeing "programmes of reconstruction" being promoted by the PAIGC . . . and the educational facilities it is developing."

(In "tramping through" the southern front of Portuguese Guinea, which the UN Mission also visited, I have also contacted and talked to the local people, seen reconstruction programmes being carried out as far as possible under wartime conditions and which include economic, agricultural and cultural planing, and noted the bush schools organised for a population which was 98 percent illiterate after 500 years of Portuguese presence).

The article continues: "Portugal says that the mission was a violation of the UN charter and 'illegal' and that by sending investigators to "free" Guinea without referring to Portugal, the UN was violating the sovereignty of a member state.

(Colonialism itself is a violation of the UN charter, and despite Portugal's claim that the African territories of Portuguese Guinea, Mozambique and Angola are "integral parts of the motherland" the fact is that they are colonies. In addition, Portugal's behavior concerning the African inhabitants is contrary to repeated UN resolutions on human rights.)

Continuing, Mr. Loudon says that the investigators' account of seven days and seven nights in "free" Portuguese Guinea is vague, and that one glaring omission is that the investigators failed to say where they went after secretly crossing the frontier from the Republic of Guinea.

(I would agree with Mr. Loudon that the mission would not wish to name villages visited for fear of Portuguese bombing reprisals. In testifying before the Human Rights Committee of the UN, I also refrained from mentioning specific villages, although the names were known to me. According to what their inhabitants themselves told me, the Portuguese have bombed villages not only to intimidate them into withdrawing support from the PAIGC, but to punish them for rebelling against Portugal. It seemed to me that to pinpoint specific villages would have invited reprisal against them—certainly the Africans thought so—and I did not wish to be responsible for this).

The article goes on: "They speak of going everywhere secretly and on foot—a 'secrecy' which is surprising in view of the 'control' they say is exercised by their rebel hosts. And always on foot? If the PAIGC 'controls' three quarters of Portuguese Guinea, surely it could have produced a bicycle or a horse, or something, to carry their VIP guests?"

(I also went everywhere secretly, and on foot. The secrecy is not surprising. This is a jungle war fought in the interior, and there is always the possibility of infiltration by black Portuguese agents. However well-controlled an area may be, to expose a visitor, and his escorts, to unnecessary danger by announcing his itinerary is foolhardy. Further, the PAIGC have never claimed to control the air—the Portuguese clearly have superiority here. What the organisation does claim is administrative control on the ground, despite relentless bombardment by their opponents. Regarding transport facilities in the interior, there were few roads in the former Portuguese colony except country lanes which connected one fort with another, and because of aerial reconnaissance and air strikes, guerrillas and civilians rarely use them. And to ride a bicycle down a tangled jungle path is most unsatisfactory as I discovered after being offered one. About horses —this is a tse-tse belt).

The article in the "Telegraph" then questions the seven-day beards worn by the investigators when they re-emerged into "Sekou Toure's Guinea republic," claiming that PAIGC advances in "free" Portuguese Guinea would certainly have included the provision of simple washing and shaving facilities.

(There has never been indoor plumbing or piped water in the Portuguese Guinea interior under the Portuguese administration and in the course of jungle warfare one cannot expect the PAIGC to concentrate upon this refinement. What *is* provided is a bucket of water, often carried over long distances, for each man for washing and laundry purposes. Nor are there barber shops, hair dressers or supermarkets or cinemas or pavements or opera houses or museums. And there are very few mirrors. What is considered important here is simple human survival, food, clothing and water, and as far as humanly possible under the circumstances, provisions for education and medical care. Since life expectancy under the Portuguese administration was age 35, and 50 percent of children were dead of disease by the age of five, one can understand why medical supplies and field hospitals would be given priority over shaving facilities, however unkempt the UN mission may have appeared after emerging from the bush).

Next, Mr. Loudon, like the Portuguese government, questions the mission's claim to have crossed the frontier at all . . . "for the oldest of Africa hands know only too well how difficult it is to define frontiers." As the Lisbon "Diario de Noticias" has pointed out, "straw huts look the same on either side of the frontier."

It is very possible, as the Portuguese government well knows, to enter Portuguese Guinea through the Republic of Guinea, and that the frontier is known to Portuguese aircraft, the Republic of Guinea, and members of the PAIGC, as well as African inhabitants on either side of the border. One main frontier point, which is designated, and which I have seen myself, is much like crossing a state line in the U.S. The argument that in Africa "straw huts look the same on either side of the frontier" is like saying that one Howard Johnson's looks the same on either side of the state line, therefore one must still be in Michigan.

(Further, when the frontier is crossed from the Republic of Guinea into Portuguese Guinea, the language immediately changes to Balante, Creole or Portuguese; the type and availability of commodities change abruptly, and both guerrillas and peasant militia are armed. The country is on a war-footing, obvious to the visitor, with villages, bases, hospitals and trade centres being camouflaged because of Portuguese bombardment.)

In conclusion, I would like briefly to discuss certain remarks which appeared in the "Portugal" magazine, under the headline "UN's 'Alice in Wonderland' Committee was never inside Portuguese Guinea with PAIGC."

General Antonio Spinola, the governor and commander-in-chief of Portuguese Guinea, was quoted as saying that he saw no way in which the UN team could have crossed into Portuguese territory.

He had personally bivouacked on the frontier during the mission's alleged visit, he said, his men were on permanent patrol duty while he overflew the area constantly by helicopter, and he sincerely believed that any penetration across the frontier would have been spotted.

(I submit that as the frontier is relatively long, it would have been impossible to station a man at every possible infiltration point in this thick jungle area, even if all 30,000 of the Portuguese troops stationed in Portuguese Guinea were rushed to the border for this purpose. And who would have protected the remaining towns and forts still held by the Portuguese, their military installations and bases, from guerrilla attack in the north and east? Or all of those innocent civilians being indiscriminately killed by the PAIGC, as Portugal claims?)

(And since the southern front and the frontiers with the Republic of Guinea are not only guerrilla-infested, but in fact controlled by the PAIGC, only helicopter-borne troops, under constant harassment from guerrillas, could have bivouacked in the frontier area, and then only briefly. Having seen this region myself, I believe that it would not be impossible to slip a mission across the border, especially at night).

(What was possible, I believe, was continual aerial bombardment of the frontier area and the southern front itself by Portugal, combined with quick helicopter sorties into regions thought to be on the UN mission's itinerary, with the aim of either capturing or killing the mission. What diplomatic mileage could be gained from the latter! Since Portugal does not admit to bombing her black civilian population, she could simply tell the UN that the blacks ate up its mission. That there was unusually heavy bombardment, shelling and helicopter sorties at the time of the UN visit is known, unless of course Portugal was bombing the independent republic of Guinea instead. And just out of curiosity, I would like to know whether General Spinola shaved while bivouacking on the Portuguese Guina frontier).

TRIBUTE TO HON. JAMES KEE

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, at the end of this Congress the last member of his family to serve here on the Hill—at least for some time—is saying his goodbye to the House of Representatives. I, of course, refer to my good friend and colleague, JAMES KEE.

It has been my pleasure to serve with his father, later on with his wonderful mother who was a talented and charming member of the committee of which I am chairman, and then with her retirement, with our colleague, JIM.

Many good things have been said about JIM and they are well deserved. I would like to add, however, that he has been a talented, dedicated and able member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He has been most loyal to me and before my colleagues, I wish to make this acknowledgement. If we could not agree, we were able to disagree in a friendly manner. In agreement, we have been able to present our positions effectively.

I could say many things about the kindly and honest personality of this great West Virginian. To what my colleagues have already said, I shall simply say that he is one of the most honest, loyal and friendly people whom it has been my pleasure to have known. I shall miss him very much, and I wish for him and his fine family the happiest of bright and sunny days ahead.

GEN. WILLIAM C. WESTMORELAND

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I would like to pay my personal respects to a fine American and a distinguished soldier—Gen. William C. Westmoreland.

After a career that spanned some 36 years of service to his Nation, through three wars and the peacetime years between, General Westmoreland has gone on to an honored retirement.

He was born in Spartanburg County, S.C., March 26, 1914. After attending the Citadel, the military college of South Carolina, for 1 year, he was appointed to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, where he had a distinguished record and was chosen at first captain and regimental commander of the corps.

Commissioned a second lieutenant of field artillery upon graduation in 1936, he saw action in World War II in North Africa, Tunisia, Sicily, France, Belgium, and on to Germany itself. He fought in Korea in 1952 and was promoted to brigadier general at the age of 38. In December 1957, he was given his second star and became the youngest major general in the Army.

After serving as Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, he became commanding general, U.S. Army Vietnam, and commander, U.S. Military Advisory Command, Vietnam in 1964—a position of extreme complexity and enormous difficulty, where he served for 4 years during the period of some of the heaviest fighting of that long and tragic conflict.

He returned to the United States as Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, from July 1968 to July 1972—a post for which the President of the United States honored him with this third Oak Leaf Cluster to his Distinguished Service Medal. As the President said in presenting the medal to the general:

His loyal and illustrious service to the United States, in successive positions of the greatest responsibility, reflects the highest credit upon himself, the Army, and the Nation.

It was my honor to first meet General Westmoreland when he was in command of Fort Campbell, located in Kentucky and Tennessee. He was respected and loved by the people of that area, as he was by those he commanded in the field. I knew him later when he was Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, when he was in command in South Vietnam, where I visited him on two occasions, and when he was recently Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army. He has represented the best in the military tradition of our country, responsible to civilian authority, brave and able as a military commander and as a citizen and a soldier holding great loyalty, pride, and faith for our country and its future.

He has been helped and sustained by a great wife, Kitsey, a woman with outstanding qualities. My wife and I have been honored to know them as friends and to be inspired by them, as I am sure has been the experience of countless others.

TRIBUTE TO HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, was a Member of Congress when I took my oath in 1949. He had already established himself as a dedicated, conscientious, able, and effective member of this body. He has continued to render such service throughout the years. He has truly represented the people of his district, and at the same time, he has endeavored to be understanding and fair to the people of other parts of our great country. We are all his debtors.

TOM has a most pleasing personality and whether it has been on the floor, in the cloakroom, in his office, or elsewhere, as he has gone about his daily tasks, it has been a delight to be with him to enjoy his companionship and to benefit from his wise counsel.

I wish for him the very best of everything in the days ahead.

TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF MALI

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the African Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I would like to take the occasion to solute Mali which has recently celebrated its anniversary of independence.

The Republic of Mali celebrated the 12th anniversary of its independence on September 22, 1972, and it is a pleasure for me to extend to President Moussa Traore and to the citizens of Mali congratulations and best wishes for the future. Mali, under the leadership of the Military Committee of National Liberation, which came to power in November 1968, is energetically striving to forge ahead economically on a solid footing and in cooperation with neighboring countries. Mali recently played a key role in helping to create two regional development organizations, one in conjunction with Mauritania and Senegal, the other with Niger and Upper Volta, as well as the West African Economic Community, which officially came into existence at a ceremony in Bamako last June. Through such efforts Mali seeks to devise projects, in cooperation with foreign governments and international organizations, that will provide viable economic opportunities for west Africa's landlocked, inland nations.

On April 1970, I was privileged to visit Mali as part of a special study mission to west and central Africa. At that time, during my meetings with various members of the government, I was very impressed by the warmth, hospitality, and friendship our group experienced.

Our bilateral relations with Mali continue to improve. Moreover, President Traore's government gives firm support to international efforts to deter criminal acts against civil aviation and to combat the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs. Bilateral cooperation between Mali and the United States is based upon friendship, mutual respect, and realistic appreciation of mutual needs. For these reasons we are happy to congratulate President Traore and the people of Mali as they pass another landmark in their nation's history.

REFORMING SOCIETY—A JOB FOR POLITICS OR THE COURTS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting and pertinent article has been brought to my attention. At issue is the contribution young lawyers can make in the improvement of our society—is this improvement to come through politics or through law? The article quite rightly questions the criticism that the courts have overreached themselves in responding to social need—that the courts should be passive not active in ruling on critical questions.

I hope that my fellow Members will find this article nourishing food for thought:

[From the Orange County Reporter, Santa Ana, Calif.]

CAN YOUNG LAWYERS REFORM SOCIETY THROUGH THE COURTS?

(By Mathew O. Tobriner)

(NOTE.—I am indebted to Harold Cohen of the California Bar for invaluable help in preparing this paper.)

To realize that the law reflects the society which it governs and that the society, in turn, reflects its law, one need only to glance

briefly at the course of history. The societies of the past have left architectural monuments that are grand evidence of the integration of society and law. Only a few weeks ago I looked from my hotel window at Athens across the flat-roofed city to the balanced columns of the Parthenon and the Erectheum They surely spoke the balance that was the essence of ancient Greek society—a society that rested upon status, a society in which each person, slave and freeman, was born into, and assigned for life, a special place.

Perhaps the buttresses and fine-spun intricacy of a Notre Dame or Westminster, coordinating into the Gothic harmony and unity of the whole structure, typify the unifying and dominant role of the feudal church. And, perhaps, too, the jagged skyline of New York symbolizes the dynamism, as well as the confusion, of American society. I submit that the monuments declare that the architecture, art, cultural expressions and law of a society interrelate, affect each other, and, in a subtle way, form and create each other.

POLITICS—OR LAW?

How strange it is, then, to hear it said that young lawyers should not expect to bring about improvement in our society through the practice of law but that they should go "into politics" rather than "into law."[1] How questionable is the criticism that courts have overreached themselves in responding to society need; that courts should be "passive," not "active" in ruling upon crucial questions.

In my view such criticism and advice, however well intentioned, is ill-conceived; law, as an instrument of social control, must, by necessity, respond to the emerging pressures for change within our society, and, if the legal system is to remain viable in the face of today's rapidly shifting mores, we acutely need the advocates of change.

SPIRIT OF THE TIMES

History has demonstrated that the effective court is the one that correctly interprets the spirit of its time. In this regard, the common characterization of courts as either "passive" or "active" is naively misleading; no matter which way a court rules on a particular issue, its decision inevitably affects the contemporary society.

The vice of the United States Supreme Court of the 1920's and early '30's was not that it was either too active or too passive, but that it failed to understand the spirit of its time and retreated into doctrinal rigidity, a rigidity which prohibited all realistic attempts to solve the debilitating problems of that day. The legal profession as a whole, and particularly the young lawyers who are most directly in touch with the emerging needs of society, bear a heavy responsibility to ensure that the legal system does not similarly falter today—or tomorrow.

The suggestion that those who seek to change conditions in modern America ought to turn to legislative bodies, rather than to the courts, necessarily rests on the notion that the reforms sought by the young today can be achieved only by the adoption of new, revolutionary legislative programs. But a major part of this dissatisfaction stems not so much from a disagreement with the basic principles of our institutions, but rather with the failure of the society uniformly to adhere to those principles, a failure to afford existing legal rights equally to all members of society—poor, as well as rich, black, brown and yellow, as well as white, female as well as male, the individual consumer as well as the corporate producer.

OUTRAGED SOCIETY

Like the current disaffection with American foreign policy in Vietnam, much of the outrage with the realities of our domestic society derives not from a rejection of the stated goals of current leadership—who among us disagrees with the stated aim of "a generation of peace" or of "equal educational opportunity for all"—but from a realization that in practical terms we pay only lip service to these high-sounding ideals, that the *action* taken by our society speaks louder than its idealistic claims.

For all too long, legal principles of theoretically general application have in practice been reserved only to those whose wealth, or political power, or acumen, secured effective legal representation. Today, with the emergence of local legal aid and public defender offices, and various public interest law firms, to represent both distinct minority groups and the public interest, these general legal principles are fortunately becoming available for the first time to large segments of our people.

Perhaps the most visible evidence of the efficacy of this movement to date are the successful actions which have been prosecuted by local poverty lawyers against a broad range of federal and state agencies, requiring a multitude of welfare agencies, housing authorities, highway commissions and the like, to comply with applicable constitutional, statutory or regulatory provisions. Such litigation, in requiring recalcitrant agencies to follow through—in practical, day-to-day terms—with the promises of reform legislation, is essential to the translation of statutory enactment into radical change in the actual operation of government.

PLIANT SOCIETY

Indeed, those who would negate the role of the courts in altering society overlook significant legal trends in diverse fields. The society in which courts now function is in the throes of accommodating itself on the industrial side to the computer and the conglomerate, to mechanized production and monopoly management; our society, in the social and political spheres, is tearing away obsolete cultural patterns and attempting to design new democratic procedures for the poor, the minorities and the neglected. The combination of the demand for fair treatment for minority segments and the need to preserve the individual rights of all, has led in the face of an expanding mass technology, to deep changes in the law of today and portends even more radical changes that will come with the law of tomorrow.

LISTENING TO ALL

In specific areas of the law the courts have recognized that the principles of equal protection of the law and due process of law have in the past shed their light largely upon the mansions of the established and not upon the squalid quarters of the poor. The principle that significant rights should not be annulled without the chance of the deprived at least to be heard has now been applied to the economically disinherited. First, the United States Supreme Court extended that right to the worker whose wages were attached, then to the procedure of claim and delivery and to the attachment of necessities. Recently the United States Supreme Court has said that the loss of a driver's license works a crucial denial in a day when a car may be necessary for access to a job; the high court held that the drivers involved in an accident must be heard before the license is cancelled.

But beyond this area there are those where the light of due process has fallen only in part and where large expanses still lie in darkness. The student of the public university gets the right to be heard before he is expelled, but what of the student of the private university? May the tenant of the public housing project be ejected without a hearing? May the public employee otherwise fit for the job be arbitrarily suspended or discharged? And, turning to the most forlorn and forgotten class of all—the prisoner—does he get the right of due process before his parole is revoked or before he is condemned to the torture of the isolation cell?

JOB AND SHELTER

And far beyond the areas where the grey light of due process partially reaches, lie the lands of total night: the private tenant, the individual employee of the huge corporation; does he have the right to be heard before he loses his shelter or his job?

And so the light of due process, as a realistic protection of the economically weak reaches only so far and awaits the possible extension of the future.

Let me submit another illustrative field: the readjustment of the relationship between the consumer and the producer. We have taken the giant step of ruling that the producer is strictly liable to the consumer for injuries caused by the defective product. We have taken another step; that the consumer class in the field of insurance should have the right to that kind of insurance that the carrier has led him reasonably to expect. We are experimenting with class actions to provide a realistic access to the process of law for the individual consumer. This emerging right of consumer protection awaits further articulation by the courts.

SOCIETAL READJUSTMENT

Yet the examples given above—few as compared to the number available—show that courts are capable of creative judicial response to pressures for readjustment of societal relationships, and that reform of society need not be confined to legislative halls. In recent years the judicial system has proven itself capable of grasping the significant movements that have changed the complexion of our culture, and of shaping legal relationships to accommodate new social patterns and to preserve cherished freedoms. In the near future there will be, if anything, an increasing need that the demands for social reform—and even for social "revolution"—be pressed in the judicial sphere and framed in the context of legal relationships.

ALTERNATIVE APPROACH

In sum, I must completely disagree with those who would encourage all reformers of society to abandon the legal profession and "to stick to politics." It is true, of course, that given the widespread deficiencies of our present society many of the future solutions to our problems should come in the form of new imaginative legislative programs. But the genius of our judicial system lies in its capacity to function as an alternative, complementary institution in reformulating the framework of society's rules to achieve newly-embraced values and goals. To close this path now, when the call for reform is ever rising and when the need for change is increasingly clear, would place an intolerable strain upon our current governmental system. Those who would steer reformers away from the courts may be unwittingly condemning the disadvantaged and disaffected in our society—groups largely unrepresented in the political process—to "take to the streets" as the only viable solution to their problems.

Thus the Parthenons of the law are yet to be built; the spires of the legal Notre Dames and Westminsters will yet pierce the skies of America. There is so much to be done; so many searing problems to be solved. The Cassandras that cry that our society is beyond hope of further achievement and that

[1] See, e.g., Interview with Chief Justice Warren Burger, N.Y. Times, July 4, 1971, § 1, pp. 1, 20: "Young people who decide to go into the law primarily on the theory that they can change the world by litigation in the courts I think may be in for some disappointments. It is not the right way to make the decision to go into the law, and that is not the route by which basic changes in a country like ours should be made. That is a legislative and policy process, part of the political process. And there is a very limited role for the courts in this respect."

revolution must level the structure, ignore the fact that ours is a dynamic, not decadent country. No iron shadow of dictator or colonel falls across our pathway to tomorrow.

Young lawyers will probe, question and challenge the legal rules and the mores of the day. They will challenge outmoded doctrines; they will bring to light the need of legal adjustment of socially intolerable conditions; they will press for the acceptance of new social values.

HON. WALTER S. BARING

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, WALTER BARING of Nevada, with whom I have served since 1949, is leaving at the end of this Congress. With the exception of 4 years, WALTER BARING has been a member of the committee on which I have served and of which I have been chairman for the last several years. WALTER has been one of the most dedicated subcommittee chairmen. His understanding, his knowledge, and work with public lands has been outstanding. He is dedicated to the best interests of the West and undoubtedly knows the problems of his home State of Nevada as well as or better than any other public servant that we have had here in Congress. He has been one of the most loyal members of the committee. It has been a pleasure to work with him. He has not been afraid to express his wishes, but he has been most understanding in contributing to the solutions of the problems which have been before us.

I have known his good wife, Geraldine, ever since our first days in Congress. As we say goodbye, I wish for each of them and their family the finest of things that life can possibly hold for them.

A TRIBUTE TO SENATOR CLINTON P. ANDERSON

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, one of the great losses to the U.S. Senate is the departure of Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON of New Mexico. For 30 years he has served his country as a Member of the House of Representatives from 1942 to 1945, as Secretary of Agriculture in 1945, and in the U.S. Senate since 1948.

During his service in the Senate he has served on the Interior Committee, the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, the Finance Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—among the most influential in the Senate. His work and initiative on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy fostered the development which has made the United States the leading power in the world in the nuclear field, both for the security of our country and for its peaceful uses which offer so much opportunity for mankind.

Anyone who has any interest in agriculture will always recall that CLINTON P. ANDERSON, born in Centerville, S. Dak., and living for a great part of his life in New Mexico, has never forgotten the necessity of production of food and fiber for the people of our country and for the health of people throughout the world. This, unfortunately, has become so commonplace in our economy that many do not realize how much we owe to agriculture production of the United States and to such men as CLINTON ANDERSON who understood it and who helped increase and develop it throughout his service in the Congress. Senator ANDERSON is, in every sense, a leader. He has a mind of depth and quickness. He has been a man of conviction who fought for his convictions and, because of these qualities, his influence in the Senate has been great. His feeling for New Mexico and the Southwest was always evident, but his interests were also national and international and he served all people of our country.

His wife, Henrietta, is a strong and able woman, and a great helpmate. It has been my honor and that of my wife to know them well since 1957, and we have appreciated their friendship.

New Mexico, the Congress, and the country are proud of their achievements and wish them all happiness in the years ahead.

SOUTH AFRICAN HOMELANDS LEADER SPEAKS OUT

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the serious attention of my colleagues the thoughtful expressions of Chief Gatsha Buthelezi, Chief Executive Councillor of the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly, in a recent letter to the editor of the South African newspaper, the Natal Mercury, and published in the October 2 edition of that paper. The editorial to which Chief Buthelezi responded had stated:

The patience and forbearance with which leaders of the Bantu homeland governments endure the frustrations of separate development is often admirable. They have a good case and sound arguments on their side. It is therefore all the more regrettable when they occasionally lapse into extravagant and nonsensical overstatement, as Chief Gatsha Buthelezi did this week when he referred to Whites as "those who keep me in the shackles of slavery."

Even allowing for a generous measure of hyperbole, that statement bears no relation to reality. This sort of talk antagonises even moderate and enlightened Whites and does not serve the cause of African advancement.

The real slavery of most of Black Africa, including countries that have won their political freedom, is the bondage of ignorance and primitiveness from which it is slowly and painfully emerging.

The impact of an advanced Western civilisation territorially superimposed on the primitiveness of Africa has given the African new standards, now desires and new expectations without necessarily giving him the means of realising them through his own efforts.

In reply, Chief Buthelezi reminded the editor:

More than 60 per cent of the African workers are paid wages below the poverty datum line in a country that produces about 70 per cent of the world's gold. . . . All your wealth is based on our cheap labour.

He further commented:

Can it be denied that in a sense that is the position of Blacks in relation to the all-powerful Whites in this country? We have no meaningful vote in decision-making in this country since we have no vote. We are subject to the laws in whose making we have no say. Some of these laws restrict our movements. Africans cannot move freely in South Africa because of the pass laws and Influx Control Regulations. These are laws passed by an all White Government representing an all White Electorate.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert the full text of Chief Buthelezi's response:

CHIEF BUTHELEZI REACTS TO "MERCURY" LEADER

Sir. I wish to react to your editorial under the title "Evolutionary Currents" in which you take me to task for having ended my speech at Inanda with the words that gifts such as the one Mobil Oil Corporation gave to the School were a help not only to Blacks but even to "those who keep me in the shackles of slavery."

You have decided to interpret it to mean all Whites for reasons best known to yourself. First of all I wish to make it quite clear that I used the expression figuratively. I can still use it if I have another opportunity and I apologise to no one for using it.

The whole tone of your editorial is not only 'nonsensical' to borrow from your glossary, but is an example of the kind of White paternalistic arrogance that is responsible for the rejection of all Whites by many of our Black youths today.

If you and your friends whom you describe as "moderate and enlightened Whites," are angry with me for that one sentence in a speech, then we can do without your kind of "moderate and enlightened Whites." We do not need you. We have suffered sufficient humiliations without needing your addition of insults to so much injury.

SLAVE DEFINED

According to the Concise Oxford Dictionary a slave is defined as a person who is the legal property of another or others and is bound to absolute obedience. Although I did not use the term literally, can it be denied that in a sense that is the position of Blacks in relation to the all powerful Whites in this country? We have no meaningful voice in decision-making in this country since we have no vote. We are subject to the laws in whose making we have no say. Some of these laws restrict our movements. Africans cannot move freely in South Africa because of the pass laws and Influx Control Regulations. These are laws passed by an all White Government representing an all White Electorate.

THE REASON

We are enslaved by disease, poverty and ignorance as Blacks. This is because Whites or their Governments have even after three centuries of the civilisation" they brought, not given us a free and compulsory education. Whites in spite of "an advanced Western civilisation" still compel their children to go to school. It is a crude joke on your part to write of "the bondage of ignorance and primitiveness," to which we have been sentenced by Whites through their selfishness.

More than 60 per cent of the African workers are paid wages below the poverty

datum line in a country that produces about 70 per cent, of the world's gold. You could not have the wealth that you wallow in were it not for the sweat of the Black man. Your enterprise would not have gone far without us; why? Even your wives are hardly housewives because we do your cooking. All your wealth is based on our cheap labour. In other words we have subsidized all the wealth you are boasting of.

NOT GOD

You are not God to categorically state that you brought progress and struck an evolutionary spark in a dormant wilderness. You cannot state for certain that we could not have made advances without you had we been left to ourselves. Your people were "primitive" when civilisations thrived on parts of the Continent of Africa and India.

I agree with you that the disparity to levels of advancement is simply a fact of history. In other words we were dispossessed through the gun and you are determined to maintain the status quo through the same gun. Well, fair enough and frank enough.

My speech at Inanda as reported by both Natal newspapers was an explanation of the kind of debates I was involved in when people overseas agitated for withdrawal of all corporations from South Africa because of what they regard as modern Black enslavement. I pleaded that doing what Polaroid did and Mobil Oil has done was much better than withdrawal. This has earned me quite a fair amount of criticism from some of my own people.

To be rapped over the knuckles by you in addition, is bound to disillusion many more of my people about "White civilisation" and "White Christianity" and I wonder if Black people will not be tempted by your types to finally agree that violence is the answer.

ANTI VIOLENCE

I personally do not believe in violence as a solution, but writing in the vein in which your editorial is written closes the way even for some of us to other options which do not entail violence. In fact you bluntly tell us that there are none.

According to Dr. David Welsh in his book entitled "The Roots of Segregation" on page 41 he quotes an editorial of "The Natal Mercury" of March 6, 1858, which stated among other things: "We believe in the divinely purposed supremacy of the White over the Black race; and all history interprets and illustrates this belief."

It does not seem as if your newspaper has made much progress editorially in its views in the last one hundred and fourteen years since the above quoted editorial was written, judging by the editorial under discussion.

M. GATSHA BUTHELEZI,
Chief Executive Councillor, Kwazulu Legislative Assembly.

TRIBUTE TO HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I would be derelict and unappreciative to the highest degree if I did not join in the tributes that have been given to our colleague, WILLIAM MCCULLOCH of Ohio.

I was born not far from the district where BILL was born, raised, worked, and has now served for so many years here in Congress. He is a great Ohioan, a great student of the needs of people, a great Member of Congress, and a great friend. He is a former Speaker of the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio and because I occupied such position in the Colorado State Legislature, this perhaps has brought us much closer than we otherwise might have been. His training there has served him well here in this great legislative body. Others have enumerated his accomplishments as a Federal legislator; I glory in them, also, and thank him for such service.

Some time ago, BILL was stricken by an illness that would have laid others low. He had the courage and tenacity to return and once again become an effective Representative. This shows the kind of mental, physical, and moral fibers with which he is possessed.

As he leaves this body, I join with his legion of friends in wishing him and his loved ones well in the days ahead.

McNAMARA ON THE "STATE OF DEVELOPMENT"

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert for the thoughtful attention of my colleagues the second half of the recent address, on October 18, 1972, by Mr. McNamara, President of the World Bank, before the United Nations Economic and Social Council:

STATE OF DEVELOPMENT

My view is this: The state of development in most of the developing world today is unacceptable—and growing more so.

It is unacceptable, but not because there has not been progress. There has been. The total economic growth, measured in GNP terms, for the developing countries during the First Development Decade was impressive. For some of these countries during the First Development Decade was impressive. For some of these countries it was the most successful decade—measured in these gross economic terms—in their history.

But such economic measurements, useful as they are, can be seriously inadequate.

What is inadequate about them is that they do not, in themselves, tell us much about what is happening to the individual lives of great masses of people in the developing countries.

But the improvement of the individual lives of the great masses of people is, in the end, what development is all about.

What are we to say of a world in which hundreds of millions of people are not only poor in statistical terms, but are faced with day-to-day deprivations that degrade human dignity to levels which no statistics can adequately describe?

That is in fact the world of today for the more than two billion human beings who live in the developing nations. The personal catastrophe that affects the individual lives of hundreds of millions of these individuals is such that we can no longer take much satisfaction in the simple statistical achievment of the overall GNP growth goal of 5% by the end of the First Development Decade.

To begin with, that average figure conceals the fact that the growth rate was very uneven among the developing countries, and that income grew the least where it was needed the most: in the poorer countries, with the largest aggregate population.

In the Bank's poorer member countries, for example—those with a per capita GNP of less than $200, but with an overwhelming 64% of the total population of our developing country membership—the overall average GNP growth rate was only 4.1%.

And when that overall figure is adjusted for population increases, it becomes clear that the *per capita* income growth was so small as to be bearly perceptible: a miniscule 1.7%.

It was to raise these per capita figures that the members of the UN adopted as a target for the Second Development Decade an overall annual GNP growth target of 6%. To make possible the achievement of such a rate the development countries were to increase their aid, provided in the form of Official Development Assistance, to .7% of their GNP's by 1975.

Where do we stand in that effort?

The truth is that the objective of .7% will not be reached. There seems little likelihood that in 1975 Official Development Assistance will exceed .37% of GNP: only half of the Second Development Decade target.

This is a most unwelcome conclusion. But we must face facts. Not only is there no evidence that ODA as a percentage of GNP will rise above half of the target rate, but unless there are prompt and marked changes in attitudes, it is difficult to foresee any great improvement in the second half of the decade.

Was the .7% target too ambitious? Are the difficulties within the domestic economies of the developed countries such that it is unrealistic to assume they can afford this degree of assistance to international development?

Certainly not.

During the First Development Decade, the total GNP of the world increased by $1,100 billion. That is an increase in income almost beyond comprehension.

But how was that growth in income distributed throughout the world?

Eighty percent of the increase went to countries where per capita incomes already average over $1,000—and they contain only one-quarter of the world's population.

Only 6% of the worldwide increase went to countries where per capita incomes average $200 or less—but they contain 60% of the world's people.

One can grasp the magnitude of this distortion by reflecting that per capita income in the United States rises more in a single year than it will in India in a century.

The collective GNP of the developed countries in 1970 totaled roughly $2,000 billion. In constant prices, it is projected to grow to at least $3,000 billion by 1980.

Granted these facts, are we to say seriously that these wealthy countries reach the ODA target of .7% of their combined GNPs?

It is clearly not a case of their being unable to afford it. But whatever the ultimate reasons for this shortfall in Official Development Assistance may in fact be, one can quite accurately predict the results.

The ODA deficit will penalize the poorest countries—those with per capita incomes of less than $200—the most. They can have almost no hope of reaching the growth target. Their need for ODA is the greatest, and if it stagnates at its present level, they will feel the effects the most severely.

And even for those developing countries which are somewhat better off, a deficiency in ODA will force them to seek external finance from less desirable sources—particularly sources demanding high rates of interest or early repayment. Such financing adds to short- and medium-term debt burdens by mortgaging larger proportions of export earnings, and, in the event of an unexpected decline in those earnings, it can cause severe strains on the whole of the economy. Mounting debt problems for the developing countries appear inevitable.

IV. SOCIAL EQUITY AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

Given the deficit in ODA, and the consequent increase in the debt burden—all of this compounded by the delay in dismanting discriminatory barriers to trade from the developing countries—many of the poorer nations will fail to reach the Second Development Decade's 6% growth target altogether, and many others will reach it only with very severe difficulties.

But let us suppose for a moment that this were not the case, and that all the developing nations did actually achieve a 6% rate of growth by 1980.

Would that achievement, in itself, provide a significant improvement in the conditions of life for the majority of the two billion people of the developing world?

The answer is no.

The answer is no because increases in national income—as essential as they are—will not benefit the poor unless they reach the poor.

They have not reached the poor to any substantial degree in most of the developing nations in the past. And the reason is that there has been severely skewed income distribution in virtually all developing countries.

How severe is this income disparity?

The statistics are admittedly incomplete. But what evidence is available indicates the maldistribution is great and that the poverty of the low-income strata—roughly the poorest 40%—is far worse than the national averages suggest.

Our studies, for example, indicate that:

In 10 countries, with per capita incomes averaging $275, the poorest 40% of the population receive incomes of only $50.

We are dealing here with problems so immense that their scope is difficult to grasp.

We are talking about hundreds of millions of desperately poor people. We are talking about 40% of entire populations. Development is simply not reaching them in any decisive degree. Their countries are growing in gross economic terms. But their individual lives are strangling in human terms.

Now what can be done about this situation?

One view is that governments in developing countries should make rapid economic growth the first objective, and that income redistribution and increased employment can be achieved later through fiscal and institutional changes.

Others argue that the growing pressures of poverty are so overwhelming that their widespread relief should be the central objective of development strategy, even if that entails major sacrifices in the pace of overall growth.

It would be comforting, of course, to continue to believe that there is no conflict between rapid overall growth and comparable improvement in the incomes of the poor. But, unfortunately, the evidence suggests that there is.

There is a natural tendency for growth to be concentrated in the modern sectors of the economy with little current benefit to the lowest income groups. What data there are—while admittedly incomplete—indicate that that pattern of growth has developed in many countries.

But if few dispute the fact that there does exist some conflict between maximization of growth and the rapid reduction of poverty, many argue that in the long term the conflict is irrelevant. They say, given sufficient time, it can be resolved. They say, in the long run, rapid growth will increase productivity, and furnish the resources which can be redistributed to those who cannot yet be accommodated in the high-productivity, high-wage, modern sector.

The same view holds that even in the shorter term—in a decade, say—it is possible at least to reduce the conflict between rapid growth and more equitable income distribution by shaping an economy which provides the proper incentives, which prices labor and capital correctly, which strengthens the fiscal system, and which emphasizes the right adaptive technologies.

But although this argument may be correct as far as it goes, it doesn't go far enough. A decade may be the short term for a development planner. But it is the long term for a subsistence tenant farmer whose children are most likely to die before the age of five, whose diet is already so inadequate that he cannot stave off chronic ill health, and whose illiteracy limits his future.

Having said this, one must also recognize that if a government were to initiate policies to increase the income growth of the lowest 40% of the population—with a view to assuring that, at a minimum, their share of the nation's overall economic growth does not decline as it has in the past—there are legitimate questions as to what the impact of such policies would be on the rate of overall national growth.

We cannot fully answer those questions. But while we do not know as much as we want to know about the relationship of more equitable income distribution to overall growth, we do know enough to reach two conclusions:

First: It is possible to design policies with the explicit goal of improving the conditions of life of the poorest 40% and this can be done without unacceptable penalties to the goal of national growth, and

Second: Without specific emphasis on such programs, there will not be significant progress in reducing poverty within acceptable time periods.

What then, can be done to attack more directly the problem of massive poverty within the developing world?

I will suggest five steps that can and should be taken:

The first step should be to establish specific targets, within the development plans of individual countries, for income growth among the poorest 40% of the population. I suggest that the goal should be to increase the income of the poorest sections of society in the short run—in five years—at least as fast as the national average. In the longer run—ten years—the goal should be to increase this growth significantly faster than the national average.

Secondly, given the intimate link between poverty and massive unemployment, unemployment and underemployment must be attacked head-on. With 20% or more of entire populations already jobless or virtually idle—and with the population explosion pouring a growing stream of new entrants into the labor pool each year—unless policies and programs are devised to absorb surplus labor into productive jobs, little can be done to improve the lot of the poor. Job creation must therefore become a direct objective in itself. It will be necessary to organize rural and urban public works: the building of market roads; construction of low-cost simple housing; reforestation programs; expansion of irrigation and drainage facilities; and similar low-skill, labor-intensive, and economically useful projects. The Bank will assist in financing such projects.

Thirdly, institutional reforms to redistribute economic power and critically required in many developing countries: land reform, corporate reform, tax reform, credit and bankihg reform, and many others. Continuation of the existing land tenure patterns, tax laws, and financial regulations will simply assure that the present distribution of assets and income will be perpetuated. The bank will support reforms in these areas with technical and financial assistance.

Fourthly, shifts in the patterns of public expenditure represent one of the most effective techniques a government possesses to improve the conditions of the poor. Too often these expenditures—on health, on transport, on water supply, on education—end by benefiting the already privileged far more than the mass of the disadvantaged. The Bank will assist in designing and financing programs which will improve the distribution of public services.

And finally, policies should be undertaken to eliminate distortions in the prices of land, labor, and capital which provide subsidies to the rich and penalties for the poor.

These, then are the general measures which all of us in the international development community should move toward—realizing, of course, that in the end each country must make its own decision as to how and when to deal with its internal inequities. The problems of poverty are rooted deeply in the institutional frameworks, particularly in the distribution of economic and political power within the system. Outside agencies can assist but cannot solve such problems. It is governments that have the responsibility. To postpone reform on the grounds of political expediency is to invite political extremism. To remain indifferent to social frustration is to foster its growth.

V. CONCLUSION

Let me quickly summarize and conclude the argument I have put before you on the state of development, and the relationship of economic growth to social equity.

Current development programs are seriously inadequate. They are inadequate because they are failing to achieve development's most fundamental goal: ending the inhuman deprivation in hundreds of millions of individual lives throughout the developing world.

Why are these programs failing?

There are two overriding reasons: the developed nations are not moving effectively enough to assist the developing nations; and the developing nations are not moving effectively enough to assist the poorest 40% of their own populations.

The developed nations have, of course, their own domestic priorities. But their growing incremental income is so immense, their technological capacity so powerful, and their whole range of advantages so disproportionately gigantic, that no rational argument can be made for their refusal to do more to assist the disadvantaged nations.

If the rich nations do not act—through both aid and trade—to diminish the widening imbalance between their own collective wealth and the aggregate poverty of the poor nations, development simply cannot succeed within any acceptable time frame.

The developed nations, then, must do more to promote at least minimal equity in the distribution of wealth among nations.

But the developing nations must do more as well. Their internal equity problems are no less important than those of the international community at large.

The task for the governments of the developing countries is to reorient their development policies in order to attack directly the personal poverty of the most deprived 40% of their populations. This they can do without abandoning their goals of vigorous overall economic growth. But they must be prepared to give greater priority to establishing growth targets in terms of essential human needs: in terms of nutrition, housing, health, literacy, and employment.

Such a reorientation of social and economic policy is primarily a political task, and the developing countries must decide for themselves if they wish to undertake it. It will manifestly require immense resolve and courage.

The task of political leadership in the wealthy world is to match that resolve and courage with a greater commitment to equity between their own nations and the developing nations.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that what I have proposed here this morning—which in essence is what I proposed both to the UN Conference on Trade and Development, and

to the World Bank Group's own Governors—is either a facile formula for instant success in the development process, or an all-purpose set of solutions that will automatically eliminate immensely complex problems.

What I do believe is that all of us in this Council chamber, all of us in the family of agencies of the United Nations, indeed all within the international development community have a grave responsibility to the hundreds of millions of individuals throughout the disadvantaged world for whom these issues are not mere abstractions—but day-to-day realities.

Collectively, the international development community—and the governments that comprise it—have the capability of touching those lives, and rendering them more livable. We in the Bank hope to contribute our share to that collective effort.

Thank you.

TRIBUTE TO HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the friendly personality and the contributions of our colleague, JACKSON E. BETTS of Ohio, who is leaving Congress at the end of this 92d session.

For several years now, we have occupied offices on the same corridor of the Rayburn House Office Building. It has always been a personal pleasure to see and be with our colleague as our paths have crossed.

JACKSON BETTS is a fellow Ohioan of mine; a former speaker of the State of Ohio before he came to Congress. To be a fellow Ohioan is somewhat perhaps an accident of life. To be a fellow speaker—he in Ohio and I in Colorado—carries somewhat of another connotation. In any event, these two situations have brought us closer together than we otherwise might have been.

Also, JACKSON's first grade school teacher in Findlay, Ohio, was a cousin of mine. I know that I have to go a roundabout way to claim any particular credit for the work of my cousin inasmuch as she is somewhat older than I, but I doubt not that a part of JACKSON's success and greatness is due to this relationship that he and I have. At least I have never failed to let him know otherwise.

It has been a personal pleasure to be with JACK and his lovely wife, Martha. I shall miss them very much, and my wife, Essie, and I wish them the best of everything as they leave Capitol Hill.

TRIBUTE TO B. EVERETT JORDAN OF NORTH CAROLINA

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, among my associations in the Senate has been one of particular friendship with Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN—for we served together for several years on three committees—Agriculture and Forestry, Public Works, and the Senate Committee on Rules of which he was chairman. I mention this because we do get to know each other well, through the work we undertook, sitting around the same table and grappling with problems which come before our committees. Of course, EVERETT JORDAN and I worked together time and again over the years on tobacco problems, rivers and harbors and highway projects, and difficult questions of Senate administration and rules. But beyond these particular common interests and enterprises, I have known EVERETT JORDAN as a friend and a conscientious public servant.

Beloved by his colleagues, EVERETT JORDAN is known to all of us—and I am sure to the people of his State—as a good and gentle man, fair and straightforward, patient, and dedicated to the discharge of his duties. His 15 years of service in the Senate have been marked by honor and dignity. He always had time to be helpful to every colleague and constituent in any way that he could.

Our work together was always lightened by his prevailing sense of humor. Senator JORDAN always brought also to our deliberations that practical, down-to-earth commonsense which is so much a part of his character. Open, friendly, courteous, devoted—a good man and a fine man—I know he and his wife Katherine will be missed by all.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR GAMBRELL

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have appreciated very much knowing DAVID H. GAMBRELL who is retiring from the Senate. It was my good fortune to know his father, the Honorable Smythe Gambrell when we attended the Harvard Law School together. He became one of the great lawyers of our country and his son, Senator GAMBRELL, has followed in his footsteps. He served as president of the Georgia Bar Association before his election to the U.S. Senate.

Senator GAMBRELL impressed the Senate with his sense of reason, attitude of study upon the issues before the Senate, and his fairness and good judgment. We are sure that he will continue his service to his State and Nation in many valuable capacities.

WASHINGTON REPORT

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress closes, I wish to include in the RECORD my Washington Report and opinion poll results, which I think will be of interest to many.

This is the 92d Congress that was—some 20 months in session during 1971–72, more than 18,000 bills introduced in the House and Senate, of which only about 500 became law; speeches and floor debates that filled over 63,000 pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and some 800 recorded votes and quorum calls in the House alone. It took three volumes totaling almost 3,800 pages to contain the hearings held in 1972 by my Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee. The 1972 hearings my Defense Appropriations Subcommittee conducted produced nine volumes, more than 8,500 pages of testimony, better than eight times longer than the Cleveland telephone directory's white pages section.

The 92d will be remembered for three landmark pieces of work: Enactment of President Nixon's innovative revenue-sharing plan; legislation giving 18-year-olds the right to vote, and a constitutional amendment, now awaiting approval by the States, guaranteeing equal rights for women. This Congress was noteworthy, too, for putting its stamp of approval on the President's bold breakthrough for world peace. The Senate ratified the Nixon Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty curtailing defensive nuclear weapons and both Chambers passed a related temporary agreement freezing offensive nuclear weapons.

Important new safety, health, and senior citizen laws enacted during the second session include creation of an independent five-member Consumer Product Safety Commission, authority to the Environmental Protection Agency to keep chemicals harmful to health or the environment off the market, enforcement of the ban on flammable fabrics, automobile bumper safety standards, $24.6 billion for water pollution control funds to help build sewage treatment plants over the next 3 years. For the elderly: a $2.1 billion program of aid to help provide jobs, transportation, sound nutrition, recreation, and housing. A 3-year program authorizing $4 billion for vocational rehabilitation, including new programs of aid for kidney transplants, spinal cord injuries, and centers for the deaf.

Footnote to the 92d Congress: It was the last in which House Members shouted "yea," "nay," or "present" as the Reading Clerk called our names on votes and quorum calls. When the 93d Congress convenes, early in January, voting will be done electronically, with scoreboards on the walls of the House Chamber carrying a running tally. The new system will mean a considerable break to taxpayers by saving each Member 91 hours a year—time far better devoted to work than to waiting through the half hour it takes to call the long roll of 435 Members.

Looking ahead to the 93d Congress. Watch for these much-needed items of unfinished business to again make headlines when the new Congress gets under way: Quality education and a ban on forced school busing, tax credits for children attending private schools, outlawing the "Saturday Night Special," the cheap handgun used in 70 to 80 percent of holdups and murders, a limit on

Federal spending, protection for private pension plans, national health insurance, with debate centered over whether it should be encouraged through tax credits or become a massive $100 billion-plus program under complete Federal control supported by stiff taxes.

Minshall priorities will also include continued votes to cut wasteful, unnecessary Federal spending, genuine tax reform—including lower property taxes—to help middle-income wage earners, a crackdown on crime through reform of our permissive court system, stronger laws to wipe out smuggling and sale of hard drugs, welfare reform that places emphasis on the work ethic as a cornerstone of American progress and achievement. Hard working citizens are justifiably fed up with having their tax dollar used to reward indolence. All of us accept the humanitarian responsibility to help those who cannot help themselves—but not able-bodied freeloaders who would rather take a welfare check than a job.

Thank you for participating in the Minshall opinion poll. Results of the more than 22,000 questionnaires received are as follow:

MINSHALL OPINION POLL RESULTS

1. Do you support the President's pledge to withdraw all U.S. forces from Vietnam within 4 months after a cease-fire and release of our POW's?

Yes	79.1
No	16.5
Undecided	4.4

2. Do you approve of the Strategic Arms Limitation Agreements signed by the President with the Soviet Union?

Yes	75.7
No	12.7
Undecided	11.6

3. Should the United States officially recognize Cuba?

Yes	31.7
No	49.7
Undecided	18.6

4. Do you favor complete amnesty for all who refused to serve in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam War?

Yes	16.3
No	78.3
Undecided	5.4

5. Do you favor a Federal "no fault" automobile insurance law?

Yes	62.7
No	16.6
Undecided	20.7

6. Should price controls be placed on all food products, starting with controls on farm prices?

Yes	58.9
No	26.3
Undecided	14.8

7. Do you support a "redistribution of income" program, giving federal cash payments to assure minimum annual incomes for low-pay and welfare recipients?

Yes	13.4
No	75.5
Undecided	11.1

8. Do you favor a Federal law legalizing abortion?

Yes	48.0
No	42.6
Undecided	9.4

9. Should the sale and use of marijuana be legalized?

Yes	18.6
No	72.7
Undecided	7.7

10. Should the death penalty be abolished for all capital crimes?

Yes	12.3
No	83.8
Undecided	3.9

11. Do you think charitable deductions should continue to be tax-free?

Yes	79.5
No	15.4
Undecided	5.1

12. Should interest earned from state and municipal bonds be subject to Federal income tax?

Yes	40.9
No	49.8
Undecided	9.3

13. Should business continue to receive 7% incentive tax credit for new investments in plants and machinery?

Yes	55.0
No	32.6
Undecided	12.4

14. Do you approve of a proposed $2.9 billion Federal child day-care program?

Yes	31.7
No	57.4
Undecided	10.9

15. If the 1972 presidential election were held today, who would be your choice for President?

	Percent
Nixon	65.0
McGovern	15.5
Other	7.7
Undecided	11.8

16. What is the most important issue facing the Nation today?

	Percent
(1) The Economy	28.6
(2) Law and Order	28.6
(3) Vietnam	17.3
(4) Welfare abuses	2.9
(5) The Environment	2.8
Miscellaneous	14.2
No opinion	5.6

TRIBUTE TO HON. CHARLES R. JONAS

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1972

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, CHARLES R. JONAS of North Carolina, has been a most valuable Member of this body throughout the years. He has stood like the Rock of Gibraltar for the things in which he has responsibilities. This, of course, has had to do with practically every activity here on the Hill. His imprint upon our activities will last throughout the years ahead.

He has been a great representative for his people, for his State, and for the Nation generally. We are all his debtors.

CHARLIE is a friendly man but he does not take friendship lightly. His presence among us has been of tremendous value to each one of us. The Hill will miss him and I join with his legion of friends in wishing him well in the days ahead.

SENATOR B. EVERETT JORDAN

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I deeply regret that with the end of the 92d Congress the Senate career of EVERETT JORDAN of North Carolina comes to a close.

He has served his Nation and his State with vast distinction. He has used fully his great natural ability in the solving of the problems facing the Nation and his area of the country, and he has been steadfast in defense of the South's industries and resources. I have admired his judgment, his integrity, and his tremendous dedication.

One of the things I like best about EVERETT JORDAN is his willingness to listen to the other Members of the Senate, and to try to see their problems through their eyes. In his position as chairman of the Senate Rules and Administration Committee, I have gone to him several times to ask him to consider legislation in which I have had special interest—and he has always been cooperative and gracious. His warm friendship and understanding have been a joy to me.

I am sorry that this genial, able, and wise man is leaving the Senate and I hope for him many more years of happiness and usefulness.

NATIONAL GUARD CIVILIAN TECHNICIANS PROTEST THE WEARING OF MILITARY UNIFORMS WHILE PERFORMING CIVILIAN WORK

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on September 6 more than 500 civilian technicians in the New York National Guard ignored orders to report to work in military uniforms.

Maj. Gen. John Baker's order issued August 5, 1972, which requires all National Guard Federal technicians to wear the prescribed military uniform while performing their civilian technicians' job during the normal work week has met with stiff opposition from the membership of the Association of Civilian Technicians, Inc. A poll of the local chapters of ACT, Inc. was taken and the result was that military uniforms were not worn on September 5. The Association of Civilian Technicians, through its president, Vincent J. Paterno, has expressed unalterable opposition to the policy of requiring civilian technicians to wear uniforms.

In February of this year, I introduced H.R. 13325 which provides that the Army and Air Force National Guard technicians shall not be required to wear the military uniform while performing their duties in a civilian status. That bill has been referred to the Armed Services Committee where it is awaiting action.

I introduced that bill for several reasons. It has always been my contention that this devoted corps of civilian technicians do not need to wear a uniform to perform their duties. They are the most capable, hardworking, and dedicated group of men I know. Their spirit and drive far surpasses any possible advantages one can imagine from making it mandatory that they wear service uniforms.

A second reason why I am opposed to the requirements to wear a uniform is that no argument has been made as to why this should be mandatory. Our philosophy of government and our ability to make decisions is based on the premise that reasoned judgment is a sounder basis on which to make a decision than is deciding an issue without substantiation.

Since September 6, 80 technicians have received adverse action notices and each has chosen to answer the charges at a hearing. I am told that each hearing costs about $600 in time and other expenses.

The truly sad part of this situation, Mr. Speaker, is that all this is taking place while the union has been trying to reach contract agreement with the chief of staff to the Governor of New York. One item, interestingly enough, which is still on the table for negotiation is the wearing of the military uniform by civilian technicians while performing civilian work.

It is my hope that this matter will be resolved quickly and amicably and that the civilian technicians who serve our country with such devotion can continue to do so without further difficulties.

OUR COMMUNITY FIRST

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that the emergence of the People's Republic of China into the realm of international diplomacy has exacted no little difficulty for the Nationalist Chinese Government in Taiwan.

While there is little chance of armed conflict between the two Chinese Governments, the pressures on Taiwan both politically and diplomatically will not abate in the near future.

But what will be the impact of this changed diplomacy on the Chinese-American community?

I believe that that question is well answered in a recent editorial in East-West, the Chinese-American Journal.

This article was sent to me by Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Won, longtime friends and constituents of mine.

I would hope that every Member reads this excellent article for new insights into foreign affairs.

The article follows:

OUR COMMUNITY FIRST

Premier Kakuei Tanaka of Japan has concluded his visit to Peking. The accord signed by Chou En-lai and Tanaka began a new era of Sino-Japanese relationship.

Later, Bonn announced that the West German government would also establish relations with Peking. Now, with the exception of the United States, practically all the major nations in the world have recognized the People's Republic.

These are dark days for the Nationalist government in Taipei. Although we think that it would be most unlikely that there would be armed confrontations in the Taiwan Strait at this time, we believe that Peking will step up its economic and political pressure on Taipei. Whether this will lead to any sort of peace talks is anybody's guess. With the rich resources in Taiwan and its seemingly healthy economic situation, the Taipei government may remain in its present status for many years to come.

It is not our desire to conjecture on China's political future. As Chinese-Americans, we are naturally more interested in our communities in the United States. During past decades, Chinese-Americans tended to be silent on political issues because of the conflicts between the two sides in China. Activists from both sides were more interested in promoting the causes of their respective Chinese governments than in solving the problems in Chinatown. The results are the polarization of our community and the dissipation of the efforts of many of our fine leaders.

The recognition of Peking by Japan and West Germany proves to us once again that Chinatown elders, regardless of how pro-Nationalist they are, have little influence in reversing this political trend. We are calling again to them, to channel their energies into promoting the welfare of our community. America, much like a giant multi-color mosaic, has a place for all of us. Let Peking and Taipei settle their differences. Let us, regardless of our previous political commitments, work together in concerted efforts to bring about a better future for Chinese-Americans.

TRIBUTE TO HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, CHARLES H. GRIFFIN, has not been with us here on the Hill too long, but in these few years, he has left the imprint of his knowledge, dedication to work, genial personality, and his effectiveness as a leader upon all of us.

It was my privilege to become acquainted with CHARLES when he first came to Congress and I have enjoyed his friendship and companionship very much.

CHARLES shall be missed by those who have worked with him during these last few years and, in his leaving, we lose a valued Member as he goes to his new fields of endeavor. We wish him the best of everything.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR EDWARDS

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President. I join my colleagues in expressing respect and admiration for the service of Senator ELAINE S. EDWARDS in the U.S. Senate. It was my good fortune and that of the Senate Public Works Committee that she was assigned to membership on that committee. Immediately upon her arriving in the Senate and assignment to our committee, she entered into its duties with great interest, hard work, and participated actively in our debates and development of bills which were reported to the Senate. She was faithful in her attendance to our committee and it was always noticeable that she was faithful in her attendance on the Senate floor. Several times she presided over the Senate with great skill and effectiveness and was able to maintain fine order and keep the Senate at work.

The Senate will miss her as a member who served conscientiously and contributed to its work and tradition.

CRITIQUE OF THE ARTICLE "DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES"

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, considerable discussion has prevailed over the variance in prices between certain drugs manufactured in Europe, and those in the United States. I insert the following article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the general public, and Members of Congress will have a fuller understanding of the facts in this matter.

DRUG PRICES COMPARISON

The justification for this article, is stated to lie in a Task Force on Prescription Drugs' recommendation:

"Consequently, an examination of various factors that influence drug prices is relevant for both society in general and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for the SSA in particular. This analysis of domestic and foreign drug prices represents one approach for reviewing the economic dimensions of the problem."

The report falls far short of achieving these goals. No important "factors that influence drug prices" have been examined, nor has a valid "approach for reviewing the economic dimensions of the problem" been delineated. And there are also serious questions regarding the accuracy of the data and scientific validity of this paper.

The report ostensibly compares prices for each of 20 prescription pharmaceutical products in the United States and principally in eight other countries. These comparisons involve one or more products of specified pharmaceutical manufacturing companies.

The authors assert that the basic data "demonstrate the great variation from country to country in prices for a single product by the same company," and also that "the study shows that prices in the United States for these drugs are generally higher than in any other country studied."

Technically, the paper does not meet the criteria for accepted procedures of economic science. Contrary to the implications of the limited data cited and related analysis, the 20 items selected from among thousands are not representative. And even for those entities, the authors do not uniformly trace prices charged for actual products by American manufacturers in different countries. As well, despite the fact that research by ex-

perts shows that carefully constructed price indexes are essential if international price comparisons are to have merit, the report offers no such indexes. The necessary conditions for preparing such indexes have not been observed.

The following paragraphs outline some of the key shortcomings of the study, and their effects on the acceptability of the report.

EXCHANGE RATE ILLUSION

Comparison among countries of specific economic aspects, such as levels of living or prices, simply on the basis of "official" exchange rates can be most misleading. One reason is succinctly set forth in an Organization for European Economic Cooperation document.

"It is important . . . for critically interpreting this report's results, to consider why international comparisons of income levels based on conversions by exchange rates must be suspect. In order to produce even approximately correct results, it would be essential for the average relationship of the internal purchasing power of currencies to be the same as the exchange rates used to convert the national products to common currency units. There are many reasons why this equivalence is highly improbable, if not impossible."

An exchange rate expresses the relation of a foreign currency to the United States dollar only with regard to transaction across international borders. It may result from demand and supply factors related to goods and services flowing between nations, or in effect, it may be established and maintained arbitrarily by fiat. An exchange rate does not indicate the relative purchasing power or the cost of doing business inside a country. Real purchasing power differentials go a long way toward explaining why commodities and services display different local prices when the attempt is made to convert these prices to a common basis by use of "official" exchange rates. Actually (if certain of the data errors are disregarded) there seems to be a significant statistical correlation between the product price level ranking for the countries tabulated (page 20 of the report) and a ranking of the same countries on the basis of real economic variables—GNP, per capita income, hourly wage rates and cost of living.

President Nixon announced on August 15, 1971, that the dollar would be allowed to float. Subsequently, there has been an effective devaluation of the dollar in most of the currencies involved in the SSA article. This has resulted in "raising prices" in most developed countries relative to the United States even though actual prices charged within these countries have remained unchanged. (It should be further noted that rarely, if ever, will any exchange rate provide a proper comparison for items manufactured in rather than imported by, countries contrasted.)

INTERNATIONAL DRUG PRICE COMPARISONS

A British Ministry of Health report to Parliament explicitly rejected international comparisons of the prices of drugs:

"There are many reasons why international comparisons of prices are extremely difficult to make and even more difficult to interpret: The use of current rates of exchange as a means of putting prices expressed in different currencies on a comparable basis gives rise to many ambiguities. There are even greater problems if one adopts other bases for comparisons. The great differences in habits and in per capita incomes lead to differences in the elasticities of demand, and the differences in the assortment of medicines consumed in different countries reduced the significance of comparisons. For these and other reasons, we have not thought it useful to attempt an elaborate comparison of international prices, for in this field figures can easily be used to arrive at any desired result.

COMPARATIVE COST OF CHEMOTHERAPY

It might be feasible, by use of sophisticated analytical techniques, to develop a comparative index of chemotherapy costs, indicating in "real" terms whether or not Americans are paying more for their drugs than the residents of another country:

Selecting 20 products in one country (United States) and pricing these in other nations, as the SSA authors do, can give no meaningful result unless adjustments, representative of demand-supply and other factors, are made to allow for the varying importance (weight) of each product in each country. The Social Security Bulletin article makes no allowance for such variations. The significance of this shortcoming is demonstrated by the fact that while the two leading therapeutic categories in this country are antibiotics and psychotherapeutic cardiovasculars and hormones occupy the like places in Germany. If one looks at the largest countries as a unit, one finds that vitamins and nutrients are second in importance to antibiotics. In the U.S. they rank fifth.

The picture is no different when the comparison is in terms of "leading products." For Japan, among the largest pharmaceutical markets, the top item is a vitamin product. In the United States, a tranquilizer leads the list. In France, the leader is a cardiovascular.

Thus, as a British economist has stated "a study of the makeup of any two markets by type of product and distribution of sales between therapeutic groups and disease quickly illustrated the dangers of assuming that a 'representative' list of important drugs exists anywhere but in the minds of men bent on proving a particular point.* * * The selection of a few drugs will prove any point one wishes."

PRICE LEVELS

Price is determined by the interaction of supply and demand. Thus, difference in either supply or demand conditions will cause variations among countries and markets. Many of these real economic factors are mentioned by Gilbert and Kravis in their international study cited previously. Among these causes are: varying demand elasticities; differences in general price trends; tariffs; excise taxes; transportation costs; processing and distribution costs; sources of raw materials; and sizes of market.

On the role of demand elasticities, implicit in the British Ministry of Health statement quoted above, is a relevant economic principle. Namely, an industry with intersectoral markets and with substantial and unallocable overhead costs, will find that prices based on marginal costs may not be high enough to cover average costs, and the difference between marginal cost and price needs to be higher in inelastic markets and lower in markets where demand is more elastic to price.

Additionally, it should surprise no one to find differences among the prices of products which have different factor costs. This occurs internationally in comparing products manufactured and consumed in the United States with those exported in finished form, as well as with those manufactured abroad. In the case of pharmaceuticals, a great deal of production is local. Because the labor intense part of manufacture and marketing, accounting for the largest part of the total cost, is typically carried out abroad, foreign prices of American firms may appear to be lower than their U.S. prices. Obviously, varying tariff and non-tariff barriers, costs of capital, and like variables will make a difference in costs and prices country by country.

PRICING POLICIES OF AMERICAN MANUFACTURERS

This study asserts that the prices of products marketed by the same company show great variations from country to country. This leads one to believe the SSA analysts examined the pricing practices of American companies. On the contrary, this is not true. Of thousands upon thousands of prescription drug products being available, only 20 products were selected for review. Fourteen pharmaceutical companies were identified as producing one or more of the products; ten of the 14 being represented by just one product. Thus, one would have to stretch the "sample" data beyond logical limits to arrive at the report's implied generalizations about pricing practices of an industry.

Three of the 14 pharmaceutical manufacturers are U.S. subsidiaries of foreign firms, and have no voice in supply and demand functions affecting pricing elsewhere in the world. Twenty-five percent of the drugs focused on in this study are produced by this non-U.S.-owned group.

Moreover, the principal table "Comparison of Selected Pharmaceutical Prices in the United States and Eight Foreign Countries, January 1970" contains 177 price entries. Of these, at least 100 (or over half) are in error, identified as follows:

Type of Error and Percentage

Incorrect Price	86
Wrong Product	6
Wrong Company	3
Other Reasons*	5
Total	100

*Other Reasons indicates cases where the product shown is not available in the country indicated or cases where no transactions have taken place.

DIFFERENT COMPANIES AND TIME PERIODS

The unrepresentatives of the products selected is apparent when it is observed that only in nine instances are pharmaceutical products (with or without different trademarks) compared in all countries.

The time span for the data is clearly indicated as being for one month (January 1970)—with no reference to representativeness of the time chosen. The reader is led to believe that all 177 entries were collected at the same time from comparable sources. Yet, the period involved apparently extended for 1967 through 1970. Thus, the prices shown cover a three year period. In view of changes that have occurred, including price increases or decreases, the picture portrayed is incorrect.

INTERNATIONAL PRICES

In addition to comparisons with the United States, foreign countries are compared among themselves. Thus, the SSA report ranks "Ireland and the United Kingdom . . . lowest . . . Sweden and Australia—ranking fourth and fifth highest, respectively. . . . Italian prices generally ranked third highest. . . . Brazilian prices generally are among the lowest four of the nine countries. Canadian prices are second highest. . . .

It has already been demonstrated that consumption patterns differ among countries. Thus, it is unfair and, in fact, illogical to compare and rank any two foreign countries on the basis of drug products of *some* importance in a third country (United States).

For instance, following the approach of the Social Security Bulletin article, if pharmaceutical prices in Germany were compared with those in the United Kingdom, it would appear that German prices were higher. This is, in fact, partially indicated in this article.

A review of marketing research audits reveals that ten of the products cited in the report can be found in Germany and the United Kingdom. A comparison of their prices seems to support SSA's conclusion, that prices in the United Kingdom and Ireland are the lowest. Invariably, for these ten products, prices were higher in Germany than in England. Yet, the British economist Michael Cooper concluded on the basis of

his study of 145 "directly comparable drugs" that "there can be little doubt that our [British] prices are higher than . . . Germany. . . ."

CONCLUSION

The Social Security Bulletin article is a scientifically naive exercise which suggests with insufficient critical analysis that drug prices vary from nation to nation, a fact common to almost all manufactured goods which are sold internationally. This is a generally recognized phenomenon. The reasons for these variations are identifiable, but the SSA report has failed to identify the factors, and to provide the scientific inputs necessary to clarify the degree of real discrepancies in international drug prices.

Furthermore, despite the introductory paragraph of the report, there has not been provided "an examination of various factors that influence drug prices." Nor have they observed the recommendation of the HEW Task Force on Prescription Drugs to the effect that studies of this sort should be conducted *jointly* with other government agencies.

Until efforts to apply modern economic techniques to this phenomenon are made, perhaps jointly with other agencies, SSA will have made no contribution to understanding the causes of price variations. Until those causes are elaborated, policy decisions with respect to the reasonableness of drug prices are likely to continue to be made on the basis of suspicion and prejudice.

TRIBUTE TO HON. FRANK BOW

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1972

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress, my colleague, FRANK Bow, had already been here. He was away from the Hill temporarily, because of the vagaries of politics, but he soon returned and it has been my pleasure to know him and his fine wife, Caroline, ever since. We have worked together, we have relaxed together, and I have listened to the effective presentations of FRANK Bow on the floor of the House as he has so ably discharged his responsibilities as ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

FRANK is his own man and he is not hesitant to let you know how he feels about his responsibilities. However, he does this in an earnest, friendly, and understanding way. He has been a great servant of the people and of the Congress, and he will be sorely missed.

Some years ago, it was the good fortune of Mrs. Aspinall and me to go to Panama with FRANK and Caroline. As he leaves us, he now becomes Ambassador. It was a great experience for Mrs. Aspinall and me to be with them in Panama and I wish him well in the responsibilities which will be his in his new position.

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, when we pay tribute to a man like CLINTON ANDERSON, the biggest difficulty is finding a starting place.

Which of his many achievements and distinguished careers is most important?

He served ably in the House of Representatives.

He was an outstanding member of President Harry Truman's Cabinet when he was Secretary of Agriculture.

He has been one of the giants of the Senate, serving 24 years in a variety of key committee chairmanships and leadership posts.

And somewhere along the line he found time to become a successful businessman.

But perhaps most important when all is said and done, he was a warm and generous person, a man who truly dedicated his life to serving his State, his Nation, and his fellow man.

Senator ANDERSON's performance in the Senate alone is testimonial enough not only to his fine leadership qualities but to his competence as a top-notch legislator.

As chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy he was instrumental in establishing this panel as a watchdog of Atomic Energy Commission policies. He was a pioneer in stressing the invaluable peaceful uses of atomic energy. And he had the foresight to fight for the development of the nuclear submarine. In short, the United States is indebted to CLINT ANDERSON for the leadership it holds in the field of nuclear energy.

Senator ANDERSON also served as chairman of the Interior Committee, overseeing programs of natural resource conservation and development so critical to the Nation and the West.

But he did not rest there. He also accepted leadership of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, presiding over the Nation's space programs in a period that was marked by historic advances in space exploration.

In view of these monumental accomplishments, it is indeed fitting that Senator ANDERSON has been honored by having a major space-nuclear facility in his own beloved State of New Mexico dedicated to his name.

It was CLINT ANDERSON's own decision to step down and mark a close to his fine public career. But we are saddened at his departure, and we will greatly miss his visionary leadership and warm friendship.

It has been my own rare privilege to work side by side with CLINT ANDERSON for 18 years in the Senate. I wish him the best of happiness in retirement, for he has certainly earned that reward.

SENATOR JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it has been a great pleasure for me to serve in the U.S. Senate with JOHN SHERMAN COOPER. He is a man of unquestioned ability, of integrity and of fine conscience. He has given the country and the people of Kentucky a high quality of leadership—and it will be hard for anyone who follows him to live up to the standards he has set.

I particularly enjoyed the years I served with Senator COOPER on the Senate Public Works Committee. We often found ourselves of like mind on an issue, and I appreciated his legislative skill in helping get through the committee and the Senate legislation on water and air pollution control, water resources development, and highways. It is understandable that the Newsweek magazine poll of 50 Washington news correspondents covering the Senate once named him the ablest Republican in the Senate.

We shall miss this gentleman from Kentucky in the Senate—miss his expertise, his dedication, and balanced approach to the problems of our day. I hope he will enjoy the retirement he has so well earned.

FRANK T. BOW

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bid farewell to our distinguished colleague, the Honorable FRANK T. Bow of Ohio. FRANK Bow has served with distinction in the U.S. House of Representatives for 22 years now, and the Nation and his 16th District of Ohio is much the better for his service.

As ranking Republican on the House Appropriations Committee, FRANK Bow has been a real inspiration to many of us on the committee through his steadfast work toward bringing economic stability to our Government. Late last July, FRANK Bow responded to President Nixon's request for a $250 billion statutory budget ceiling on expenditures in fiscal year 1973 by introducing legislation to carry out the President's budget initiative. It was my privilege to acknowledge FRANK Bow's leadership by cosponsoring this important piece of legislation.

When FRANK spoke on the floor of the House in support of this legislation, he said:

> The greatest national interest—greater than any desirable federal program in any of our bills—is continued progress to overcome inflation, increase real wages and provide general prosperity.

FRANK Bow meant what he said, and he pursued his beliefs with tenacity and skill throughout his tenure in the House.

I am pleased to note that the Nation will not be losing the service of this great American. He will step from the Halls of Congress into the role of Ambassador to Panama. We can look forward to his applying the same skills to this position as he has displayed during his outstanding term of service in the Congress. I wish FRANK every success in the days ahead.

HON. PAGE BELCHER

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, PAGE BELCHER has served the Nation and the great State of Oklahoma with distinction for 22 years. He leaves this body voluntarily with the highest respect and affection of his colleagues. As the senior member of his party on the great Committee of Agriculture, PAGE BELCHER has taken a leading role in improving the standard of rural life. City people as well as our rural population have benefited from the results of his skillful leadership.

He has been committed to improving the quality of life for all Americans, both city and rural. We will miss PAGE BELCHER, Mr. Speaker, miss his friendship and wise counsel. Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for him continued success, every happiness, and the best always.

HILLEL ACADEMY'S 20TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter that I have sent to Dr. David Twersky, dean of Hillel Academy in Perth Amboy, N.J. Hillel Academy has just celebrated their 20th anniversary, an anniversary that I feel should not go unnoticed. This institution has been a model of educational excellence throughout the years, not only in Perth Amboy, but also throughout the United States as well.

I am sure that the entire community joins with me in noting this praiseworthy event.

The letter follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *October 18, 1972.*

DR. DAVID TWERSKY,
Dean, Hillel Academy,
Perth Amboy, N.J.

DEAR DR. TWERSKY: Over the past twenty years I have watched Hillel Academy grow from a small school with a handful of children in a nursery to a dynamic Hebrew Day School offering a blending of religious and secular courses aimed at preparing the Jewish child for his role in American society.

I have seen the influence of the school spread far beyond the boundaries of Perth Amboy, its home. For example, where students were once drawn from Perth Amboy alone, young men and women now come from all corners of Middlesex and Monmouth Counties. Where Hillel Academy once depended on the ideas and programs of other similar Day Schools for programing and administration, your curriculum and your administrative procedures are now becoming the model for schools of its type across the country.

I also want to commend you for your constant striving for academic excellence, your pride in your low pupil-teacher ratio and your many significant academic achievements in curriculum.

I know that Hillel Academy is not content merely to fill the child with facts and dates but rather to teach the child the significance of what happens in the world and its relevance to the child's role as an American and as a Jew.

As one of our great American Presidents Franklin Roosevelt once said:

"I believe in the value of the endeavor to extend and improve religious education among the children and youth of Jewish faith. In teaching this democratic faith to American children, we need the sustaining, buttressing aid of those great ethical religious teachings which are the heritage of our modern civilization. For not upon strength nor upon power alone, but upon the spirit of God, shall our democracy be founded."

At a time when there is great public discussion about the role of private religious schools in American society, I want to take this opportunity during this—your 20th Anniversary—to reaffirm my support for the continuation of institutions such as Hillel Academy.

In honor of your 20th Anniversary, I am placing a copy of this letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Please accept my best wishes for 20 more years of excellence.

Sincerely,

EDWARD J. PATTEN,
Member of Congress.

HON. LEN B. JORDAN

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it has been my privilege to work closely with LEN JORDAN as a fellow westerner and member of the Senate Interior Committee. I know him as a quiet and effective man—an outstanding legislator sincerely dedicated to the wise use and conservation of the Nation's invaluable natural resources. His wisdom and ability will be sorely missed when he retires at the close of the 92d Congress.

From those early days when LEN JORDAN battled the Idaho wilderness as a pioneer rancher to his distinguished service in the Idaho legislature and the Governor's mansion, LEN JORDAN was a visionary leader. Those attributes were magnified, if anything, during his decade in the U.S. Senate.

Although LEN JORDAN served his beloved State effectively, he worked equally hard in the interests of his Nation. I counted heavily on his quiet strength and good judgment on the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee during our many field trips and often stormy hearings on controversial park proposals. The fine record written by the committee on park development and preservation of scenic resources would have been impossible without him.

Above all, LEN JORDAN is a fine human being and my close personal friend. The people of Idaho will miss his fine service, and the Senate will be the poorer for his absence. I am deeply sorry to see him retire, but it is his choice. If I know LEN JORDAN, he has a great deal more success and achievement ahead of him, and I wish him well.

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, TOM ABERNETHY has certainly been a hardworking and dedicated Member of the House and I know I join with many in saying that he will be greatly missed.

It has been a pleasure to serve with him on the District of Columbia Committee and more recently on the Agriculture Committee. His membership on these committees has been outstanding and his absence will certainly create a void.

I extend to TOM my best wishes for a most healthy and happy retirement and for much success in any future undertakings.

TRIBUTE TO HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, others have set forth the great contributions to this body by our colleague, JOHN BYRNES of Wisconsin. I cannot add further to those accolades, but I can say that as a Member of Congress, it has been a pleasure for me to hear presentations by this great American who has served on the great Committee on Ways and Means for so long. He has assumed his responsibility as ranking minority member of this committee as capably as anyone who has ever served in any capacity on any committee.

He shall be sorely missed here on the Hill in the days ahead. On the other hand, he deserves the retirement which he seeks and, in paying my respects to his contributions, I wish him to know that I wish for him and his loved ones the good fortune and happiness which he so richly deserves.

TRIBUTE TO HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, others have given well deserved tributes to

H. ALLEN SMITH of California. I am pleased to join with them in paying my respects to such service.

ALLEN and his lovely wife and my wife and I live in the same apartment house. We seldom see each other at such times, but here on the Hill, in the Committee on Rules where he is the ranking member and on the floor of the House, it has been a very pleasing experience to me to know that H. ALLEN SMITH is among us and is working as he always has.

I have known many ranking members of his great committee, but none has served more ably and effectively than he. It also has been my pleasure to call ALLEN SMITH my friend and as he leaves Capitol Hill, my wishes for all things good for him and his loved ones go with him.

SALUTING CALCASIEU'S VETERANS

HON. JOHN B. BREAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to place in the RECORD an editorial, written by Mr. Truman Stacey of the Lake Charles American Press, which points up the contributions veterans have made to this country both in times of war and in times of peace. I feel that these simple yet eloquent words are particularly timely now, and I commend them heartily:

SALUTING CALCASIEU'S VETERANS

Veterans organizations have estimated that 50,000 citizens of Calcasieu Parish have served in the nation's armed forces—counting all wars from the Spanish-American War to date.

The nation will observe Veterans Day on Monday, and for Louisiana citizens who have served their country, and for others it ought to be an occasion for serious thought and reflection upon the significance of the veteran, the armed services and the United States role in the community of nations.

If we transpose local figures to the national scene, we find that more than one-eighth of the nation's population is made up of those who have served their country.

Veterans Day means a recognition and an honor to all of those who helped to man the nation's defenses—both the living and the dead. Any observance of this day ought to include a special expression of public appreciation to the growing group of men and women who have served during the period of the Vietnam War. They have served the nation in the finest traditions of their forefathers, and they have done so during a particularly trying time—a time when their efforts have commanded less and less support and recognition on the part of the nation as a whole.

The traditions of the nation's armed services were forged in times of trial and distress—during the revolutionary struggle with the British Empire, when more than once the cause seemed hopeless and all but lost. A steadfast loyalty and determination was needed during those costly years before victory was won and peace was achieved.

Each succeeding generation has been called upon to make its sacrifice for the nation's safety—some of them much greater than others. In our century, finally, we have arrived in a melancholy time that seems to breed war and conflict, when peace is an ideal that seems far away and almost unattainable.

There has never been a time, regardless of the sacrifices demanded, when the vast majority of Americans have not gladly and willingly offered themselves as sacrifices for the safety of the nation. In times of stress, men hear a higher call, and respond to a more demanding drummer, than in the calm days of peace.

As the nation pauses to pay tribute to her veterans, it might be well for our veterans to pause, too, and consider their roles in the nation today. "Peace has its victories no less reknowned than war." And the victories of peace sometimes demand the same kind of sacrifice and the same kind of courage that has been needed in the past to win a hard-fought battlefield.

We would like to advance these thoughts to the veterans of Southwest Louisiana who will pause on Monday and recall their past efforts for the nation. Some of them will recall them with a spirit of exhilaration and a feeling of adventure. To others, the day will recall drudgery and boredom, burdens willingly shouldered.

The preservation of personal freedom and individual dignity is as necessary in times of peace as in times of war, and the fact that this task has engaged the efforts of so many citizens can be traced to the old-fashioned brand of patriotism that puts service to country and neighbor before self.

This nation is perhaps unique in its attitude of continuing recognition and public esteem of its war veterans. The word "veteran" itself carries a general connotation of honor, of service and of ability. It has come to symbolize an American willingness to sacrifice to further the national purpose, and to develop the strength and the stature necessary for the nation itself, as its citizens, to stand as the ultimate guardian of freedom in a restless and turbulent world.

The veterans of past wars have always demonstrated themselves to be willing and able to serve the nation in continued capacities of trust and leadership. This was true of the Revolutionary generation, of the Civil War generation, and of the generations who fought in the first two great wars of the century.

We firmly expect that it will be no different for the men who fought in Korea and who are currently fighting in Vietnam. The ideal of this nation is the civilian rather than the soldier, and with few exceptions those who temporarily joined the ranks of the armed services always considered themselves to be civilians.

For this reason the contribution of the veteran to his country does not come to an end when the shooting stops. The qualities of loyalty, courage and service, which made the veteran willingly shoulder a gun, are the same qualities that make him a conscientious performer of the duties of citizenship.

When we pause to recoginze the contributions of the nation's veterans, therefore, we should not stop at paying tribute to their war service. We should recognize them as builders as well as defenders of the nation.

RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE ON THE PRESENT CRISIS IN THE PHILIPPINES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I recently reported to my people on the crisis in the Republic of the Philippines, caused by Communist subversion. My guest was His Excellency Eduardo Romualdez, Ambassador of the Republic of the Philippines to the United States.

I insert a transcript of this report for inclusion in the RECORD at this point:

Mr. RARICK. The American newspapers of late have been filled with details concerning the internal problems in the Republic of the Philippines. I feel certain that our people would be interested in obtaining the background as well as the true facts of the situation from an accredited representative of the Republic of the Philippines. We have with us today as our honored guest, His Excellency Eduardo Romualdez, the Ambassador of the Republic of the Philippines to the United States. Mr. Ambassador, it is indeed a pleasure to have you with us as a representative of a people who have always been friendly to the United States, and especially us in Louisiana. Mr. Ambassador, perhaps you would give our listeners some background information about the reported internal problems which plague your country and what has caused them?

Ambassador ROMUALDEZ. First of all, Mr. Congressman, I would like very much to thank you for this pleasure of being with you on this program today. Indeed it is a privilege to be able to greet the good people of Louisiana whom you very ably represent, and through you, the people of the United States. We send them greetings from the President of the Philippines and the people of my country. You ask me about the recent situation in the Philippines which called for the declaration of martial law by President Marcos on September 21. We were faced with a threat to the established government, a subversive threat, and the President had no option but to use what the Constitution provided in situations of this nature. He had previously called on the Army to assist him in quelling the disturbances which were being waged by the subversive elements. He had suspended the writ of habeas corpus in August last year. But, instead of stopping the subversive elements in their effort to seize power through force, they intensified their efforts and so, the President, using the powers provided him by our Constitution, declared martial law.

Mr. RARICK. Your President felt that if he didn't take immediate and drastic action, the constitutional government of your Republic could be imperiled. Is that correct?

Ambassador ROMUALDEZ. Yes, Mr. Congressman. That's exactly it, yes. We were faced with subversion aimed at destroying the existing order ordained under our Constitution, and the dissidents were attempting to do this by force. They were sowing fear among the people by their terrorist acts. There were bombings and kidnappings, and such a degree fo violence that business and life in general could not be carried on, on a normal basis. The President had to act quickly and decisvely, using the powers given him by the Constitution to cope with precisely such a situation.

Mr. RARICK. In other words, law and order and the safety of the citizens themselves were imperiled?

Ambassador ROMUALDEZ. Right, Mr. Congressman. This was quite widespread, not only in the city of Manila but also in the provinces.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Ambassador, have your intelligence people or your government completed sufficient investigation to be able to conclude just what it is that has provoked or caused this internal disorder?

Ambassador ROMUALDEZ. Yes, when the subversive elements were confined to the provinces and to the villages, our armed forces could very well take care of them without the President having to resort to martial law. But, in recent months, they had begun to infiltrate not only into the city of Manila, but also into the national government itself. In addition, we had positive evidence that external assistance was being extended to these dissident or subversive elements. A shipload of arms was intercepted by government forces at Palanan, in the province of Isabela in northeastern Luzon. This placed the military on strict alert with respect to the movements of these dissident and subversive elements.

Mr. RARICK. You are satisfied, then, that there existed a real threat of a violent revolutionary overthrow of your Republic?

Ambassador ROMUALDEZ. As a matter of fact we do know that out of the several thousand weapons that these boats carried, about one thousand have already been slipped into Manila.

Mr. RARICK. Well, has your President or your national intelligence people identified this nation without your borders who was supplying these weapons?

Ambassador ROMUALDEZ. The people know the nation concerned. In the Philippines, the communist movement has two factions. One is the self-proclaimed Maoist movement. The other faction is Moscow-oriented.

Mr. RARICK. In other words, these aren't disadvantaged or exploited Philippine people. You feel these are actually communists who are organized for subversion and revolt?

Ambassador ROMUALDEZ. Yes, Mr. Congressman, they were positively identified as such.

Mr. RARICK. Well, can you relate these revolts or these disorders to any other international or national situation or crisis that the world has recently undergone?

Ambassador ROMUALDEZ. Subversive activities have been going on in the Philippines for some time now. The dissidents could, perhaps, have been emboldened by the recent news of changes in the foreign policies of nations, big and small.

Mr. RARICK. Would our country have been one of them?

Ambassador ROMUALDEZ. Possibly. In the case of your country, you are quite open with respect to the foreign policy that you want to follow. You have been working for some kind of detente with countries which used to be your adversaries in Asia. At the same time, you announced that your new Asian policy was to disengage yourselves from that area. This has been understood, and naturally those elements that had ill intentions towards established order seized upon the opportunities which they thought these changes in the international scene opened to them.

Mr. RARICK. Would it be safe to say that as our country attempts to bridge the gap with communist powers—I believe the word we are hearing now is "super powers"—and we disengage ourselves from our former friends, other free republics around the world are having domestic and internal problems such as you are encountering. Would that be a safe statement?

Ambassador ROMUALDEZ. Mr. Congressman, I naturally must concede, and we assume, that in so far as your own policies are concerned, you would wish to be dictated by the best interests of your country. On the other hand, as far as we, the smaller nations are concerned, we have been given notice that we can no longer take for granted the protection which we used to rely on. So, we are gearing ourselves toward a situation where we could take care of our own internal problems and our own internal troubles and cope with the situation as best we can on our own and within the limited resources that we have.

Mr. RARICK. It appears President Marcos of the Philippines has taken positive action. What else do you feel President Marcos will have to do, or has he gone far enough to restore law and order and maintain peace in your country?

Ambassador ROMUALDEZ. President Marcos has a long-range as well as a short-range program. A program of land reform, a program of restructuring our society, a program of re-distributing wealth. As you may know, Mr. Congressman, only 4% of the population owns 90% of the total wealth of the country. The President is very eager that a new society should evolve in which a broad and strong middle class would develop. He has started with the government. We do need a reorganization within government. He endeavored to do this even during his first term in office, but as you may know, Mr. Congressman, we are fighting against vested interests. We are fighting the influence of a long period of colonialism. We cherish the blessings of democracy. We adhere to the tenets and principles of democracy. But we feel that we are running out of time with respect to certain reforms that must be made in our society.

Mr. RARICK. You feel that democracy should have certain rules to preserve the country and protect the people?

Ambassador ROMUALDEZ. Our constitution provides for a democratic system of government and a democratic society. But it also provides for adequate means with which democracy can be protected.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Ambassador, this may be an unusual question, since I realize you are here in Washington, D.C., but is it your feeling that President Marcos, in taking this new position, has the support of the people?

Ambassador ROMUALDEZ. I can say positively that he is being supported by the people, including those who belong to the opposition. The people realize that great social benefits are being derived from the present state of things. We all know that this is going to be a temporary situation. We certainly must return to the normal processes of democracy and our republican form of government. Our courts are still in session. Our schools have just been reopened. Some colleges and universities have not yet been reopened because, as you undoubtedly know, some of them have become centers of disorder and unrest.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Ambassador, we in the United States have always felt a closeness to the East, and I think it's safe to say have always felt partciularly close to the Philippines because, after all, your country is probably the most western frontier—most of your people speak English, a great number of your people are Christian in faith. Being a stamp collector myself, I can remember when your postage stamp even said that you were a Commonwealth of the United States. So, we in the United States do have a particular interest in the Philippines. We're proud that your people have pursued the republican form of government—a constitutional republic—and I am pleased that you would give this explanation of the current conditions in your country that we're all hearing about and reading about. What, if anything, Mr. Ambassador, can our people do to help your people at this time? Do you have any recommendations—anything that we could do?

Ambassador ROMUALDEZ. Mr. Congressman, what we ask from the people of the United States is an understanding of our efforts to solve our internal problems by ourselves and an appreciation of the objectives that we have set in charting the destiny of our people. You have our firm assurance that the democratic institutions which you helped us establish will remain strong and secure in our country, although we may adapt them to fit our culture, our needs, and our changing circumstances.

Mr. RARICK. Thank you very much, Mr. Ambassador. I'm sure that our people in Louisiana will benefit from what you have brought to us here today. Certainly the experiences of the Philippines is a clear and present indication of the great lengths that those who are bent on destroying the duly constituted government of a nation will go.

TRIBUTE TO HON. WILLIAM SPRINGER

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, WILLIAM SPRINGER of Illinois, is leaving at the end of this term after enumerable years of valuable service here on the Hill.

BILL has been a most dedicated, able, and effective legislator. He has always been willing to state his position at the appropriate time. Because of this ability of his to state his position at the time of his responsibility, he has been most effective. He has contributed greatly to the welfare of his committee and has given of his efforts to see that the legislation which has been reported out of it has been the best possible.

I have enjoyed my relationship with BILL very much and I join with his countless friends in wishing for him and his loved ones many happy days as he leaves the arduous responsibilities here on the Hill.

VOTING AND ATTENDANCE RECORD DURING SECOND SESSION OF THE 92D CONGRESS

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the second session of the 92d Congress, 1972.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of the bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constitutent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

The report follows:

Rollcall No.	1972	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 18	Call of the House	Present.
2	do	H.R. 8787: To approve the bill providing that Guam and the Virgin Islands should be represented by a Delegate in the House of Representatives (passed 232–104).	Yes.
3	Jan. 19	Quorum call	Present.
4	do	S. 382: To approve the conference report on the Federal Election Campaign Act (passed 334–20).	Yes.
5	Jan. 25	H.R. 765: To adopt the "rule" under which to consider the conference report on S. 2819, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1971 (passed 246–123).	Yes.
6	do	S. 2819: To approve the conference report on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1971 (passed 203–179).	Yes.
7	Jan. 26	Quorum call	Present.
8	do	H.R. 6957: To approve the bill to establish the Sawtooth National Recreational area in Idaho (passed 369–9).	Yes.
9	Jan. 27	Quorum call	Present.
10	do	H.R. 8085: To adopt the bill giving the President authority to make certain exceptions to the ban against a maximum age limit for Federal employment (defeated 81–249).	Yes.
11	Jan. 31	Quorum call	Present.
12	do	H.R. 10086 (S. 2601): To approve the bill providing increases in appropriations ceilings and boundary changes in certain national parks (passed 303–2).	Yes.
13	Feb. 1	H. Res. 786: To adopt the "rule" under which to consider S. 2010, the bill amending the International Development Association Act (passed 335–30).	Yes.
14	do	S. 748: To approve the bill authorizing payment and appropriation of the U.S. contribution to the fund for special operations of the Inter-American Development Bank (passed 285–102).	Yes.
15	do	S. 749: To approve the bill authorizing U.S. contributions to the special funds of the Asian Development Bank (passed 255–132).	Yes.
16	do	S. 2010: On an amendment to International Development Association bill which would have reduced the U.S. annual contribution from $960,000,000 to $480,000,000 (defeated 165–191).	No.
17	do	S. 2010: To approve the bill providing for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association (passed 208–165).	Yes.
18	Feb. 2	H.R. 7987: To pass the bill providing for the striking of medals in commemoration of the bicentennial of the American Revolution (passed 387–1).	Yes.
19	do	Quorum call	Present.
20	do	H.R. 11394: To approve an amendment to the bill on U.S. district judgeships providing for an additional judge in the northern district of Indiana (passed 217–168).	No.
21	Feb. 3	Quorum call	Present.
22	do	do	Do.
23	do	H.R. 12089: On an amendment to the bill establishing a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention which would have prevented the Director from any authority over the Veterans' Administration (defeated 174–196).	No.
24	do	H.R. 12089 (S. 2097): On final passage of the bill to establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse (passed 380–0).	Yes.
25	Feb. 7	Quorum call	Present.
26	do	S. 1857: On a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill enlarging the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission and to increase its authorized funds (passed 329–36).	Yes.
27	do	S. 1163: To suspend the rules and pass the amendment to the Older Americans Act of 1965 (passed 350–23).	Yes.
28	do	H.R. 7088: To suspend the rules and pass the bill providing for the establishment of the Tinicum Environmental Center in Pennsylvania (passed 361–8).	Yes.
29	do	H.R. 12186: To suspend the rules and pass the bill extending additional protection to bald and golden eagles (passed 352–7).	Yes.
30	do	H.R. 12741: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to extend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act through June 30, 1972 (passed 338–7).	Yes.
31	Feb. 8	Quorum call	Present.
32	do	do	Do.
33	do	H. Res. 164: On adoption of the resolution to establish a House Select Committee on Privacy, Human Values, and Democratic Institutions (defeated 168–216).	No.
34	do	H.R. 10243: To approve the bill establishing an Office of Technology Assessment in the legislative branch (passed 256–118).	No.
35	Feb. 9	Quorum call	Present.
36	do	do	Do.
37	do	H.R. 12910: To approve the bill raising the temporary debt limit to $450,000,000,000 through June 30, 1972 (passed 247–147).	Yes.
38	do	Quorum call	Present.
39	do	H. Res. 796: On adoption of the "rule" under which to consider H.J. Res. 1025, providing a procedure for settlement of the Longshoremen's strike on the west coast (passed 203–170).	Yes.
40	do	H.J. Res. 1025 (S.J. Res. 197): To approve the resolution providing a procedure for settlement of the Longshoremen's strike as amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and substituting the Senate-passed S.J. Res. 197 (passed 214–139).	Yes.
41	Feb. 16	Quorum call	Present.
42	do	do	Do.
43	Feb. 17	do	Do.
44	do	do	Do.
45	do	H.R. 12350: On an amendment to the Economic Opportunity bill which would have provided a straight 2-year extension of present OEO programs (defeated 159–206).	Yes.
46	do	H.R. 12350: On final passage of the bill to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (passed 234–127).	No.
47	Feb. 22	Quorum call	Present.
48	Feb. 23	do	Do.
49	do	H.R. 12931: On an amendment to the Rural Development Act of 1972 which sought to prevent profitmaking pollutors from receiving subsidies (defeated 151–224).	Absent.[1]
50	do	Quorum call	Present.
51	do	H.R. 12067: To adopt the conference report on the foreign assistance appropriations, 1972 (passed 213–167).	Yes.
52	Feb. 23	H.R. 12067: On agreeing to the Senate amendment to the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act providing that no aid shall go to Ecuador unless the President determines it is in the national interest of the United States (passed 230–138).	Yes.
53	Feb. 29	Quorum call	Present.
54	do	do	Do.
55	do	H.R. 11021: On final passage of the bill to control the emission of noise detrimental to the human environment (passed 356–32).	Yes.
56	Mar. 1	Quorum call	Present.
57	do	H. Res. 849: To adopt the resolution authorizing the sum of $525,000 for use by the Committee on Internal Security (passed 303–102).	Yes.
58	do	H. Res. 847: To adopt the resolution authorizing the sum of $1,128,000 for use by the Committee on Education and Labor (passed 318–77).	Yes.
59	Mar. 2	Quorum call	Present.
60	do	H.R. 11384 (S. 979): To approve the bill extending and expanding the High-Speed Ground Transportation Act of 1965 and to authorize appropriations of $315,200,000 for a 3-year period (passed 360–14).	Yes.
61	Mar. 6	Quorum call	Present.
62	do	H.R. 2589: To suspend the rules and pass the bill requiring prospective jurors in Federal courts to state their race and occupation on the qualification form (passed 316–27).	Yes.
63	do	H.R. 12828: To suspend the rules and pass the bill increasing benefits, etc., under the Veterans' Education and Training Act (passed 358–0).	Yes.
64	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
65	do	S. 659: On a motion to table the motion instructing House conferees to insist upon the provisions on busing in the bill as approved originally by the House (defeated 139–270).	No.
66	do	S. 659: On a motion to instruct the House conferees to insist upon the busing provisions in the bill as originally passed by the House (passed 272–139).	Yes.
67	do	H.R. 1746: To approve the conference report on the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 (passed 303–110).	Yes.
68	do	H.R. 11624 (S. 3244): To adopt the bill increasing from $3,000,000 to $5,000,000 the authorization of appropriations for the International Transportation Exposition (passed 278–109).	Yes.
69	Mar. 9	Quorum call	Present.
70	do	H.R. 10420: On passage of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1971 (passed 362–10).	Yes.
71	Mar. 13	Quorum call	Present.
72	do	H.R. 12410: To approve the bill providing for the evidentiary use of prior inconsistent statements by witnesses in trials in the District of Columbia (passed 291–32).	Yes.
73	Mar. 14	H.J. Res. 1097: To approve the Urgent Supplemental Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1972 (passed 364–16).	Yes.
74	Mar. 15	Quorum call	Present.
75	do	do	Do.
76	do	H.R. 12910: To approve the conference report on legislation to increase temporarily the public debt limit (passed 237–150).	Yes.
77	do	H.R. 11417: On the adoption of an amendment to the National Railway Passenger Corporation bill which requires that all officers paid in excess of $60,000 be paid only from net profits of the corporation (passed 235–136).	No.
78	do	H.R. 11417: On final passage of the amendments to the National Railway Passenger Act (passed 312–63).	Yes.
79	Mar. 16	S. 2097: To approve the conference report on the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (passed 366–0).	Yes.
80	Mar. 20	H.R. 8395: To suspend the rules and pass the bill amending the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (passed 327–0).	Yes.
81	do	H.R. 11948: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing not more than $50,000 annually for U.S. participation in the Hague Conference on Private International Law (passed 315–18).	Yes.
82	do	H.R. 4174: To suspend the rules and approve a bill amending the Uniform Time Act to allow an option in certain cases (passed 332–7).	Yes.
83	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
84	do	H.R. 13120: To pass the bill modifying the par value of the dollar (passed 342–43).	Yes.
85	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
86	do	do	Do.
87	do	H.R. 13592 (S. 2676): To pass the National Sickle Cell Anemia Prevention Act (passed 391–0).	Yes.
88	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
89	do	H.R. 13995: To approve the 1973 Legislative Appropriations bill (passed 362–9).	Yes.
90	Mar. 27	Quorum call	Present.
91	Mar. 28	do	Do.
92	do	H.R. 11896: On an amendment to the Water Pollution Control Act which would have required industry to use by 1981 the best available waste treatment technology (defeated 140–249).	No.
93	do	H.R. 11896: On an amendment to the Water Pollution Control Act which sought to empower the Environmental Protection Agency to review and veto individual discharge permits issued by the States (defeated 125–267).	No.
94	do	H.R. 11896: On an amendment to the Water Pollution Control Act which sought to require private firms which discharge into municipal treatment systems to pay user charges from their share of the capital costs of any federally funded municipal treatment facility (defeated 66–337).	No.
95	do	H.R. 11896: On an amendment to the Water Pollution Control Act which sought to provide permits to control the discharge of wastes into the Nation's waterways (defeated 154–251).	No.
96	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
97	do	H.R. 11896: On an amendment to the Water Pollution Control Act which sought to strike the contract authority provision for $18,000,000,000 for waste treatment grants and to substitute authorization for "no-year" appropriations but on a 1-year advance basis (defeated 161–232).	Yes.

Rollcall No.	1972	Measure, question, and result	Vote
98	Mar. 29	H.R. 11896: On an amendment to the Water Pollution Control Act that provides public hearings to be held for employees who lose their employment in the case of an industry moving to meet the alleged results from any effluent limitation or order issued under this act (passed 274–118).	Yes.
99	do	H.R. 11896: On an amendment to the Water Pollution Control Act that directs the Environmental Protection Agency to encourage regional resource management that utilizes spray irrigation and recycling of wastes (passed 250–130).	Yes.
100	do	H.R. 11896: On an amendment to the Water Pollution Control Act that would preserve the rights of States to control discharges from vessels (passed 210–173).	Yes.
101	do	H.R. 11896 (S. 2770): On final passage of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (passed 380–14).	Yes.
102	Apr. 11	Quorum call	Present.
103	do	H.R. 9552: To pass the bill amending the cruise legislation of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (passed 374–0).	Yes.
104	do	H.R. 13324: To pass the bill authorizing appropriations for 6 programs of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce (passed 364–13).	Yes.
105	do	H.R. 13188: To adopt the bill authorizing appropriations for the U.S. Coast Guard (passed 373–1).	Yes.
106	Apr. 12	H.R. 13336: To adopt the bill authorizing $22,000,000 to finance the operation of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for a 2-year period (passed 349–20).	Yes.
107	Apr. 17	Quorum call	Present.
108	do	H. Con. Res. 471: To suspend the rules and pass the resolution expressing the sense of Congress relative to the plight of the Soviet Jews (passed 360–2).	Yes.
109	do	H.R. 13752: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to provide for the interim licensing of certain thermoelectric generating plants (passed 284–78).	Yes.
110	do	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
111	Apr. 18	do	Present.
112	do	H.R. 45: On a motion to recommit to the Committee on the Judiciary the bill establishing an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice (defeated 133–252).	Yes.
113	Apr. 19	Quorum call	Present.
114	do	H.R. 10488: On an amendment to the Public Buildings Amendments of 1972 to require payment of "the fair market value" of Postal Service property turned over to the city of New York (passed 196–170).	Yes.
115	do	H.R. 10488 (S. 1736): On final passage of the Public Buildings Amendments of 1972 (passed 331–40).	Yes.
116	Apr. 20	H.R. 14070: On a motion to resolve the House into the Committee of the Whole House to consider the NASA authorization bill (passed 349–2).	Yes.
117	do	Quorum call	Present.
118	do	do	Do.
119	do	H.R. 14070: To approve the bill authorizing appropriations for NASA in fiscal year 1973 (passed 277–60).	Yes.
120	Apr. 25	Quorum call	Present.
121	do	H.R. 14108: To pass the bill authorizing appropriations for the National Science Foundation (passed 329–16).	Yes.
122	Apr. 26	Quorum call	Present.
123	do	H. Res. 918: On a motion to lay on the table the resolution directing the President and Secretary of Defense to furnish the House of Representatives full information concerning certain specific military activities of the United States in Southeast Asia (passed 270–113).	Yes.
124	do	H.R. 14582: To pass the bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1972 (passed 344–16).	Yes.
125	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
126	do	do	Do.
127	do	H.R. 12202: On an amendment to the Government Employees Health Benefits bill to include Postal Service employees in the bill (passed 197–148).	No.
128	do	H.R. 12202: On an amendment to the Government Employees Health Benefits bill which would have reduced the Federal Government's share to a straight 50 percent (defeated 124–219).	Yes.
129	do	H.R. 12202: On final passage of the Government Employees Health Benefits bill (passed 238–110).	No.
130	May 1	S. 2713: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to authorize the Attorney General to provide care for narcotic addicts on probation or parole (passed 323–0).	Yes.
131	do	H.R. 12652: To suspend the rules and pass the bill extending the life of the Commission on Civil Rights and expanding its jurisdiction to include discrimination because of sex (passed 264–66).	Yes.
132	do	H.R. 9676: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the State of Tennessee for use of the University of Tennessee (passed 318–9).	Yes.
133	do	H.R. 13334: To suspend the rules and pass the bill creating certain new positions in the Department of the Treasury (passed 271–56).	Yes.
134	May 3	H.R. 13591: On a bill to designate the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases as the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases, and other purposes (passed 357–10).	Yes.
135	do	H.R. 13089: To approve the bill providing for acceleration of programs for planting trees on national forest lands (passed 371–5).	Yes.
136	May 4	H.J. Res. 1174: To approve a supplemental appropriation of not more than $1,600,000,000 to adjust U.S. contributions to international financial institutions because of the devaluation of the dollar (passed 291–62).	Yes.
137	May 8	Quorum call	Present.
138	do	H.R. 14718: To authorize a subsidy up to $3,000,000 for the District of Columbia bus companies (defeated 50–270).	No.
139	May 9	H.J. Res. 55: On adoption of a resolution authorizing the erection of a memorial in the District of Columbia in honor of the Seabees (passed 364–4).	Yes.
140	do	H.R. 4383: On adoption of the bill authorizing the Office of Management and Budget to establish a system governing the creation and operation of advisory committees throughout the Federal Government (passed 357–9).	Absent.[1]
141	May 10	H.R. 9212: To agree to the conference report on the Black Lung Benefits Act of 1972 (passed 275–122).	No.
142	do	H. Res. 963: To adopt the "rule" under which to consider H.R. 7130 concerning the minimum wage law (passed 338–57).	Yes.
143	May 11	S. 659: On a motion to table a motion instructing House conferees to insist upon the House antibusing amendments to the Higher Education Bill (defeated 126–273).	No.
144	do	S. 659: On a motion to instruct House conferees to insist upon the House antibusing amendments to the Higher Education Bill (passed 275–124).	Yes.
145	do	H.R. 7130: On approval of an amendment to the Erlenborn substitute (H.R. 14104) for the minimum wage bill which altered the dollar amounts in the bill (passed 216–187).	Yes.
146	do	H.R. 7130: On approval of an amendment to the Erlenborn substitute (H.R. 14104) for the minimum wage bill which sought to provide overtime pay for transit employees who work over 44 hours a week and on Jan. 1, 1974, for all over 40 hours a week (defeated 184–208).	No.
147	do	H.R. 7130: On an amendment to the Erlenborn substitute (H.R. 14104) for the minimum wage bill that sought to strike language which establishes youth subminimum wage rates (defeated 170–227).	No.
148	do	H.R. 7130: To accept the Erlenborn substitute (H.R. 14104) as amended for the minimum wage bill reported by the committee (passed 217–191).	Yes.
149	do	H.R. 7130: On final passage of the minimum wage bill as amended by the substitution of Erlenborn proposal (H.R. 14104) as amended (passed 330–78).	Yes.
150	May 15	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
151	do	H.R. 7378: To suspend the rules and pass the bill establishing a commission to study the geographical boundaries of the U.S. Court of Appeals (passed 317–25).	Do.[1]
152	do	H.J. Res. 812: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to participate in planning a national monument to President Franklin D. Roosevelt (passed 330–8).	Do.[1]
153	May 16	Quorum call	Present.
154	do	do	Do.
155	May 17	H.R. 14582: To agree to the conference report on the Supplemental Appropriation Bill for 1972 (passed 339–33).	Yes.
156	do	H.R. 14582: To agree to a Senate amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill reducing from $270,000,000 to $170,000,000 funds for grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (passed 300–70).	Yes.
157	do	H.R. 14734: To approve the bill authorizing appropriations for the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency (passed 305–65).	Yes.
158	May 18	Quorum call	Present.
159	do	H.R. 14989: On an amendment to the Department of State and related agencies appropriation bill which would have increased the U.S. contribution to the United Nations from $151 087,250 to $176,190,750 (defeated 156–202).	Yes.
160	do	H.R. 14989: On an amendment to the Department of Justice appropriations bill to add $1,000,000 for salaries and expenses for the Bureau of Prisons (passed 178–165).	Yes.
161	do	H.R. 14989: On an amendment to the Department of Justice appropriation bill which would have added $9,500,000 for the U.S. Probation Office (defeated 142–198).	No.
162	do	H.R. 14989: On an amendment to the appropriations bill for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary which would have deleted $450,000 for the operation of the Subversive Activities Control Board (defeated 106–206).	No.
163	do	H.R. 14989: On an amendment to the appropriations bill for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary which sought to prohibit payment of U.S. Government employees salaries appropriated by this act who refuse to testify before Congress (defeated 132–180).	No.
164	do	H.R. 14989: On an amendment to the appropriations bill for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, etc., which sought to prohibit use of funds for wiretaps on conversations of members of Congress or the Federal judiciary (defeated 17–231).	No.
165	May 22	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
166	do	H.R. 6788: On passage of the bill to establish mining and mineral research centers (passed 272–33).	Do.[1]
167	do	H.R. 11627: On passage of the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act (passed 254–38).	Do.[1]
168	May 23	Quorum call	Present.
169	do	H.R. 15093: To approve the appropriation bill for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for space, science, and veterans agencies (passed 367–10).	Yes.
170	May 24	H. Res. 991: To approve the "rule" under which to consider the appropriation bill for the Department of Transportation and related agencies (passed 358–6).	Yes.
171	do	H.R. 15097: To approve the appropriation bill for the Department of Transportation and related agencies (passed 367–1).	Yes.
172	May 30	Quorum call	Present.
173	do	H.R. 9669: On adoption of the bill extending and expanding the powers of the Subversive Activities Control Board and changing its name to the Federal Internal Security Board (passed 226–105).	Yes.
174	May 31	Quorum call	Absent.
175	do	do	Do.
176	June 1	do	Present.
177	do	H.R. 13918: On an amendment to the Public Broadcasting Act of 1972 which sought to prohibit the Corporation from making grants to or contracts with any corporation or institution which pays its officers, employees, or performers over $42,500 per year (defeated 163–182).	Yes.
178	do	H.R. 13918: On an amendment to the Public Broadcasting Act of 1972 which sought to reduce the authorization to $40,000,000 for fiscal year 1973 and delete the authorization for 1974 (defeated 166–183).	Yes.

Footnotes at end of table.

Rollcall No.	1972	Measure, question, and result	Vote
179	June 1	H.R. 13918: On an amendment to the Public Broadcasting Act of 1972 that prohibits the Corporation from conducting voter polls or public opinion surveys relative to any elections (passed 203–135).	Yes
180	do	H.R. 13918: On an amendment to the Public Broadcasting Act of 1972 while in the Committee of the Whole to prohibit the authorization of any funds after fiscal year 1973 until GAO audits funds through fiscal year 1972 (passed 169–165).	Yes.
181	do	H.R. 13918: On an amendment to the Public Boradcasting Act of 1972 to prohibit the authorization of any funds after fiscal year 1973 until GAO audits funds through fiscal year 1972 similar to roll call 180 in Committee (defeated 166–170).	Yes.
182	do	H.R. 13918: On final passage of the Public Boradcasting Act of 1972 (passed 256–69).	No.
183	do	H. Res. 985: To agree to the resolution authorizing travel by certain members and staff assistants of the Committee on Public Works to the United Nations Conference on Human Environment to be held in Stockholm in June 1972 (passed 192–80).	Yes.
184	June 5	Quorum call	Present.
185	do	S. 1736: To approve the conference report on the Public Buildings Amendments of 1972 (passed 277–40).	Yes.
186	do	H.R. 12674: To suspend the rules and pass the National Cemeteries Act of 1972 (passed 310–4).	Yes.
187	do	H.R. 10310: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to establish the Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge (passed 314–0).	Yes.
188	do	H.R. 14731: To suspend the rules and pass the bill prohibiting the shooting of certain birds, fish, and other animals from aircraft (passed 310–5).	Yes.
189	do	H.R. 14106: To suspend the rules and pass the bill amending the Water Resources Planning Act to authorize increased appropriations (passed 317–0).	Yes.
190	June 6	Quorum call	Present.
191	June 7	do	Do.
192	do	H.R. 15259: On approval of the District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1973 (passed 302–67).	Yes.
193	do	H.R. 14990: On approval of the bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission (passed 367–2).	Yes.
194	June 8	Quorum call	Present.
195	do	S. 659: On adoption of the conference report on the Higher Education Act (passed 218–180).	No.
196	June 12	H. Res. 995: To adopt the "rule" under which to consider H.R. 12846 relative to the Armed Forces drug treatment program (passed 303–0).	Yes.
197	do	H.R. 10792 (S. 3166): To approve the bill increasing the Small Business Loan ceiling (passed 320–0).	Yes.
198	do	H.R. 12846: To approve the bill relating to the Armed Forces drug treatment program (passed 322–1).	Yes.
199	June 13	Quorum call	Present.[1]
200	do	H.R. 15418: To approve the 1973 appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies (passed 367–3).	Yes.
201	June 14	H.R. 15417: On a motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House to consider the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and related agencies (passed 367–0).	Absent.[1]
202	do	Quorum call	Do.[3]
203	June 15	H.R. 15417: On an amendment to the HEW appropriation bill which sought to cut $20,000,000 for the expenses for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (defeated 160–206).	Yes.
204	do	H.R. 15417: On an amendment to the HEW appropriation bill to exempt firms employing 25 persons or less from compliance with the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (passed 213–154).	Yes.
205	do	H.R. 15417: On an amendment to the HEW appropriation bill to add $364,000,000 for various education programs (passed 212–163).	No.
206	do	H.R. 15417: On an amendment to the HEW appropriation bill which sought to add $15,000,000 for bilingual educational programs (defeated 143–205).	No.
207	do	H.R. 15417: On a motion to recommit to committee the HEW appropriation bill (defeated 137–209).	Yes.
208	do	H.E. 15417: On final passage of the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies (passed 277–60).	No.
209	June 19	Quorum call	Present.
210	do	H.R. 13694: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing additional appropriations and expanding the authority of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission (defeated 174–165; a 2/3 vote being necessary).	Yes.
211	do	S. 3343: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to increase the maximum amount of the grant payable for specially adapted housing for disabled veterans (passed 341–0).	Yes.
212	June 20	Quorum call	Present.
213	June 21	do	Do.
214	do	H. Res. 996: On the motion to call for the previous question on the "rule" under which to consider H.R. 14370, the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972 (passed 223–185).	Yes.
215	do	Quorum call	Present.
216	do	do	Do.
217	do	do	Do.
218	June 22	do	Do.
219	do	H.R. 14370: On a motion to recommit the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act to the Committee on Ways and Means (defeated 157–241).	No.
220	do	H.R. 14370: On final passage of the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972 (passed 274–122).	Yes.
221	do	Quorum call	Present.
222	do	H.R. 15585: On an amendment to the Treasury, Postal Service, and general Government appropriations bill which sought to reduce $2,000,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of Telecommunications Policy (defeated 148–188).	No.
223	do	H.R. 15585: On an amendment to the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government appropriations bill which sought to delete $100,000 for the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries (defeated 135–196).	No.
224	June 22	H.R. 15585: On an amendment to the Treasury, Postal Service, and general Government appropriations bill which sought to cut the number of personnel paid between $21,000 and $42,500 in the Executive Office of the President from 908 to 549 (defeated 122–210).	No.
225	do	H.R. 15585: On an amendment to the Treasury, Postal Service, and general Government appropriations bill which sought to prohibit the use of funds for chauffeur-driven automobiles except for the President of the United States (defeated 121–205).	No.
226	do	H.R. 15585: On final passage of the appropriations bill for the Treasury Department, Postal Service, and general Government (passed 321–11).	Yes.
227	June 26	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
228	do	H.R. 15507: To approve the National Capital Transportation Act of 1972 (passed 282–75).	Do.[1]
229	do	H.R. 11586: On final passage of the appropriations bill for Public Works, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related agencies (passed 345–17).	Do.[1]
230	June 27	Quorum call	Do.[4]
231	do	H.R. 15495: On an amendment to the military procurement authorization bill which sought to cut $350,000,000 for Safeguard procurement (defeated 116–258).	Do.[2]
232	do	H.R. 15495: On an amendment to the military procurement authorization bill which sought to delete $445,000,000 for the further development of the B–1 bomber (defeated 94–279).	Do.[2]
233	do	H.R. 15495: On an amendment to the military procurement authorization bill which sought to prohibit the building of an ABM site in Washington, D.C. (defeated 129–261).	Do.[2]
234	do	H.R. 15495: On an amendment to the Military Procurement Authorization bill which sought to terminate funds on Sept. 1, 1972, for deployment of U.S. military personnel or conduct of U.S. military operations in Southeast Asia (defeated 152–244).	Do.[2]
235	do	H.R. 15495: On final passage of the bill to authorize appropriations for military procurement (passed 334–59).	Do.[1]
236	do	H. Res. 1021: On the motion to call for the previous question on the "rule" under which to consider H.R. 15390, the Public Debt Limitation bill (passed 206–180).	Do.[1]
237	do	H.R. 15390: On final passage of the bill to provide for a 4-month extension of the present temporary level in the public debt limitation (passed 211–168).	Do.[1]
238	June 28	Quorum call	Do.[4]
239	do	H.R. 13955: On adoption of the conference report on the Legislative Branch appropriations bill (passed 380–8).	Do.[1]
240	do	H.R. 13955: On a motion to table a preferential motion which would provide funds for preparation of final plans for the extension of the west front of the Capitol (defeated 186–206).	Do.[2]
241	do	H.R. 13955: On a motion which would provide funds for preparation of final plans for the extension of the west front of the Capitol (defeated 181–197).	Do.[1]
242	do	H.R. 14734: On adoption of the conference report on the Foreign Relations Authorization Act (passed 314–77).	Do.[1]
243	do	H.R. 15587: On final passage of the bill to provide for a 6-month extension of the emergency unemployment compensation program (passed 273–110).	Do.[1]
244	June 29	Quorum call	Do.[4]
245	do	do	Do.[4]
246	do	H.R. 15690: On an amendment to the Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection appropriations bill which sought to provide a limitation of $20,000 in farm subsidies excluding sugar and wool (defeated 189–192).	Do.[1]
247	do	H.R. 15690: On an amendment to the Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection appropriations bill which sought to prohibit the issuance of food stamps to households who need assistance because any member of such household is on strike (defeated 180–199).	Do.[1]
248	do	H.R. 15690: On final passage of the bill making appropriations for the Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection programs (passed 345–33).	Do.[1]
249	do	H. Res. 1019: On adoption of the resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 14163 to indemnify farmers and ranchers whose domestic animals are killed by predatory animals (defeated 102–260).	Do.[2]
250	do	Quorum call	Do.[4]
251	do	H. Res. 1030: To adopt the "rule" under which to consider H.R. 15692 concerning the interest rate on Small Business Administration disaster loans (passed 348–6).	Do.[1]
252	do	H.R. 15692: On a motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union to consider the interest rate on Small Business Administration disaster loans (passed 341–1).	Do.[1]
253	do	H.R. 15692: On an amendment to the committee amendment on the bill to reduce the interest rate on Small Business Administration disaster loans which sought to move the retroactive date from July 1, 1971, to June 1, 1972 (defeated 161–163).	Do.[1]
254	do	H.R. 15692: On final passage of the bill to reduce the interest rate on Small Business Administration disaster loans (passed 325–9).	Do.[1]
255	June 30	Quorum call	Do.[4]
256	do	H.R. 15585: On adoption of the conference report on the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government appropriations bill (passed 341–3).	Do.[1]
257	do	H.J. Res. 1238: To approve the resolution making supplemental appropriations for disaster relief (passed 355–1).	Do.[1]
258	do	Quorum call	Do.[1]
259	do	H.R. 15390: On a motion to substitute for the Senate amendment to the Public Debt Limitation bill a 10-percent increase in social security benefits (defeated 83–253).	Do.[2]
260	do	H.R. 15390: On a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the Public Debt Limitation bill providing a 20-percent increase in social security benefits and other changes in the social security law (passed 302–35).	Do.[1]
261	July 17	Quorum call	Present.
262	do	H.R. 15635: To suspend the rules and pass the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act (passed 337–12).	Yes.
263	do	H.R. 15657: To suspend the rules and pass the Comprehensive Older Americans Services amendment (passed 351–3).	Yes.

Rollcall No.	1972	Measure, question, and result	Vote
264	July 17	H.R. 13152: To suspend the rules and pass the bill for the Control and Conservation of Predatory Animals (passed 277–74).	Yes.
265	July 18	H. Res. 1027: On adoption of the "rule" under which to consider H.R. 15081, the National Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung, and Blood Act of 1972 (passed 373–4).	Yes.
266	do	H.R. 15081 (S. 3323): On approval of the National Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung, and Blood Act of 1972 as amended (passed 380–10).	Yes.
267	do	H.R. 14455: On adoption of the bill extending and revising the program for the control and prevention of communicable diseases (passed 386–2).	Yes.
268	do	H.R. 14424: On passage of the bill to establish a National Institute of Aging (passed 380–10).	Yes.
269	July 19	H. Res. 1018: On adoption of the "rule" under which to consider H.R. 13853, the Emergency Communitity Facilities and Public Investment Act of 1972 (passed 259–122).	No.
270	do	Quorum call	Present.
271	do	H.R. 13853: On an amendment to the Emergency Community Facilities and Public Investment Act to forbid funding in any fiscal year where the projected deficit exceeds $20,000,000,000 (in Committee of the Whole) (passed 197–194).	Yes.
272	do	H.R. 13853: On an amendment to the Emergency Community Facilities and Public Investment Act to forbid funding in any year where the projected deficit exceeds $20,000,000,000 (in House as such) (passed 205–192).	Yes.
273	do	H.R. 13853: On final passage of the Emergency Community Facilities and Public Investment Act, as amended (defeated 189–206).	No.
274	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
275	do	H.R. 15641: On final passage of the bill to authorize construction at military installations (passed 371–17).	Yes.
276	do	H.R. 15580: On a motion to recommit to committee the bill amending the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act in order to make the pay increase retroactive to Mar. 1 (defeated 164–201).	Yes.
277	July 24	Quorum call	Present.
278	do	H. Res. 1024: On adoption of the "rule" under which to consider H.R. 13366 providing compensation for losses resulting from the ban on cyclamates (passed 270–77).	Yes.
279	do	H.R. 13366: On approval of the bill providing compensation for losses resulting from the ban on cyclamates (passed 177–170).	Yes.
280	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
281	do	H.R. 14542: To approve the bill relating to Air Force officers authorized strength (passed 268–128).	Yes.
282	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
283	do	H.R. 12807: On an amendment to the architect and engineers selection bill which sought to require agency heads to solicit design proposals including life cycle costs and qualifications with 3 architect-engineer firms (defeated 114–276).	No.
284	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
285	do	H. Res. 1057: On adoption of the "previous question" on the "rule" under which to consider the conference report on H.R. 12931, the Rural Development Act of 1972 (passed 214–162).	No.
286	do	H.R. 12931: To approve the conference report on the Rural Development Act of 1972 (passed 339–36).	Absent.[1]
287	July 31	H.R. 5741: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing the transfer of surplus Liberty ships to States for use in marine life conservation programs (passed 325–2).	Yes.
288	do	H.R. 11300: To suspend the rules and pass the bill permitting certain hydrofoil vessels to receive additional mortgage benefits under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (passed 332–1).	Yes.
289	do	S. 2227: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to provide the Congressional Record to libraries of the highest appellate court of each State (passed 333–1).	Yes.
290	Aug. 1	H.R. 7130: On a motion to disagree to the Senate amendments to the minimum wage bill and to ask for a conference with the Senate (defeated 190–198).	No.
291	do	H.R. 15474: To approve the National Cooley's Anemia Control Act (passed 377–11).	Yes.
292	Aug. 2	H.R. 15418: To adopt the conference report on the 1973 appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies (passed 378–9).	Absent.[1]
293	do	H.R. 14146: To amend the Coastal Zone Management bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to administer the program in lieu of the Secretary of Commerce (passed 261–112).	Do.[1]
294	do	H.R. 14146: To amend the Coastal Zone Management bill to provide free and ready access to public beaches (defeated 190–191).	Do.[2]
295	do	H.R. 14546 (S. 3507): On final passage of the Coastal Zone Management bill (passed 376–6).	Do.[1]
296	Aug. 3	H. Res. 1071: To adopt the "rule" under which to consider H.R. 15989, the International Economic Policy Act of 1972 (passed 372–3).	Yes.
297	do	H.R. 15989 (S. 3726): On an amendment to the International Economic Policy Council bill which limits the existence of the council to fiscal year 1973 (passed 192–174).	No.
298	do	H.R. 15989 (S. 3726): On an amendment to the International Economic Policy Council bill removing the President's authority to control the export of cattle hides (passed 177–158).	No.
299	Aug. 7	Quorum call	Present.
300	do	H.R. 12101 (S. 2854): To suspend the rules and pass the bill relating to annuities of widows of Supreme Court Justices (passed 281–97).	Yes.
301	do	H.R. 15883: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to provide for expanded protection of foreign officials and other purposes (passed 380–2).	Yes.
302	do	S. 3645: To suspend the rules and pass the bill amending the United States Information and Exchange Act of 1948 relating to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty (passed 375–7).	Yes.
303	Aug. 7	S. 1819: To suspend the rules and pass the bill relating to the Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1970 (passed 374–10).	No.
304	do	H.R. 11357: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to extend coverage and protection to employees of nonprofit hospitals under the National Labor Relations Act (passed 285–95).	Yes.
305	do	H.R. 15376: To suspend the rules and pass the bill revising the method of computing wage rates under the Service Contract Act of 1965 (passed 274–103).	No.
306	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
307	do	do	Do.
308	Aug. 9	H.R. 1 690: On adoption of the conference report on Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection appropriations for 1973 (passed 317–80).	Yes.
309	do	H.R. 15417: On adoption of the conference report on the Labor-HEW appropriations for 1973 (passed 240–167).	No.
310	do	H.R. 15417: On agreeing to the Senate amendment on payment to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in the Labor-HEW appropriations bill (passed 373–27).	Yes.
311	do	H.R. 15927: On an amendment to the bill relating to the Railroad Retirement Act which sought to increase the amount paid by employees and the railroad from 9195 percent to 13.3 percent (defeated 104–289).	Yes.
312	do	H.R. 15927: On approval of the bill providing a 20-percent increase in annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act (passed 398–4).	Yes.
313	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
314	do	H.R. 16029: On an amendment to the Foreign Assistance bill which sought to eliminate aid for Brazil (defeated 65–325).	No.
315	do	H.R. 16029: On an amendment to the Foreign Assistance bill that sought to change the effective date of U.S. pullout from Indochina from Oct. 1, 1972, to Dec. 31, 1972 (defeated 109–304).	No.
316	do	H.R. 16029: On an amendment to the Foreign Assistance bill to strike from the bill the section calling for the United States to pull out from Indochina by Oct. 1, 1972 (passed 228–178).	Yes.
317	do	H.R. 16029: On an amendment to the Foreign Assistance bill to strike out language that restores the President's authority to regulate Rhodesian chrome imports (passed 253–140).	Yes.
318	do	H.R. 16029: On final passage of the Foreign Assistance bill as amended (passed 221–172).	Yes.
319	Aug. 14	S. 2956: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to make rules governing the use of the armed forces of the United States in the absence of a declaration of war (passed 344–13).	Yes.
320	do	H.R. 6957: To adopt the conference report on the bill to establish the Sawtooth National Recreation Area in the State of Idaho and other purposes (passed 361–0).	Yes.
321	do	H.R. 15692: To approve the conference report on the bill reducing the interest rate on SBA disaster loans (passed 359–1).	Yes.
322	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
323	do	do	Do.
324	do	do	Do.
325	do	H.R. 16254: To approve the Disaster Relief supplemental appropriation bill (passed 392–0).	Yes.
326	do	H.J. Res. 1278: On approval of the bill making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1973 (passed 379–8).	Yes.
327	do	S. 3824: To pass the bill authorizing 1973 appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (passed 377–8).	Yes.
328	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Present
329	do	H. Res. 1094: On a motion to adopt the resolution providing for the consideration of conference reports on the same day reported (defeated 159–223).	Yes.
330	do	H.R. 16071: On an amendment to the Public Works-Economic Development bill that sought to reduce the time any employee may receive unemployment benefits from 78 weeks to 52 weeks (defeated 161–209).	Yes
331	do	H.R. 16071: On an amendment to the Public Works-Economic Development bill that would compensate individuals who lose their jobs as a result of Federal environmental orders, setting up a special category for "unemployment compensation" (defeated 161–201).	Y
332	do	H.R. 16071: On final passage of the Public Works-Economic Development bill (passed 285–92).	No
333	do	H.R. 15417: To override the President's veto of the 1973 appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, HEW, and related agencies (defeated 203–171; a ⅔ vote being necessary).	No.
334	Aug. 17	Quorum call	Present
335	do	do	Do.
336	do	H. Res. 1090: On adoption of the "rule" under which to consider the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1972 (passed 318–72).	Yes.
337	do	Quorum call	Prese
338	do	H.R. 13915: On adoption of an amendment to the Equal Educational Opportunities Act which defines the neighborhood as the appropriate basis for determining public school assignments rather than an appropriate basis (passed 254–131).	Yes.
339	do	H.R. 13915: On adoption of an amendment to the Equal Educational Opportunities Act which sought to increase the authorization by $1,500,000,000 annually for title I (defeated 129–252).	No.
340	do	H.R. 13915: On an amendment to the Equal Educational Opportunities bill to strike out language that authorizes busing, other than busing to the school nearest to the student's residence (defeated 174–211).	No.
341	do	H.R. 13915: On an amendment to the Equal Educational Opportunities bill which would allow court orders and school desegregation plans already in effect to be reopened and modified to comply with the provisions of this bill (passed 245–141).	Yes.
342	do	H.R. 13915: On an amendment to the Equal Educational Opportunities bill that specified that provisions of the bill comply with the 14th amendment to the Constitution (defeated 154–223).	No.

Footnotes at end of table.

Rollcall No.	1972	Measure, question, and result	Vote
343	Aug. 17	H.R. 13915: On an amendment to the Equal Educational Opportunities bill which sought to provide for freedom of transfer regardless of race, creed, or color (defeated 123–255).	No.
344	do	H.R. 13915: On an amendment to the Equal Educational Opportunities bill which would have specified that nothing in the bill was intended to violate any provision of the Constitution (defeated 178–197).	No.
345	do	H.R. 13915: On final passage of the Equal Educational Opportunities bill as amended (passed 282–102).	Yes.
346	Aug. 18	H.J. Res. 1227: On adoption of the resolution approving the acceptance by the President of the interim agreement between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics relative to the limitation of strategic offensive arms (passed 329–7).	Yes.
347	do	H. Res. 1102: On approval of the "rule" under which to consider the conference report on the bill to extend and amend the Export Administration Act of 1969 and to establish the Council on International Economic Policy (passed 194–111).	Yes.
348	do	S. 3726: On adoption of the conference report on the bill to extend and amend the Export Administration Act of 1969 and to establish the Council on International Economic Policy (passed 183–124).	Yes.
349	do	H. Res. 1095: On adoption of the "rule" under which to consider H.R. 14847, the bill relating to the levying and collection of charges on persons traveling by air (passed 213–23).	Absent.[1]
350	Sept. 5	H.R. 13089: To approve the conference report on the bill to provide for acceleration of programs for the planting of trees on national forest lands in need of reforestation (passed 303–1).	Yes.
351	do	H.R. 12350: To approve the conference report on the bill to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (passed 223–97).	Yes.
352	Sept. 6	H. Res. 1106: On adoption of the resolution expressing the sense of the House on the tragic killings of the Israeli Olympic team members at the 20th Olympiad at Munich (passed 346–0).	Yes.
353	do	H.R. 13514: On passage of the Wheat Research and Promotion bill (defeated 122–235).	No.
354	Sept. 7	Quorum call	Present.
355	do	H.R. 2: To approve the conference report on the bill to establish a Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (passed 309–13).	Yes.
356	Sept. 11	Quorum call	Present.
357	do	H.R. 15550: On a motion to recommit to the Committee on the District of Columbia the bill conveying to the city of Alexandria, Va., certain lands of the United States (passed 213–38).	Yes.
358	Sept. 12	Quorum call	Present.
359	do	H.R. 16188: On a motion to recommit to the Committee on the Judiciary the bill amending the Immigration and Nationality Act (defeated 53–297).	No.
360	Sept. 13	H. Res. 1115: On adoption of the "rule" under which to consider H.R. 15495, military procurement authorization for fiscal year 1973 (passed 347–23).	Yes.
361	do	H.R. 15495: To approve the conference report on the bill for military procurement authorization for fiscal year 1972 (passed 336–43).	Yes.
362	do	H.R. 14896: To approve the conference report on the Child Nutrition Act (passed 379–0).	Yes.
363	do	H. Res. 1114: On adoption of the "rule" under which to consider H.R. 16593, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1973 (passed 342–34).	Yes.
364	Sept. 14	Quorum call	Present.
365	do	H.R. 16593: On an amendment to the Defense Appropriations bill which added $100,000,000 of funds transfer authority for the further use of civilians in KP duties (passed 265–116).	Yes.
366	do	H.R. 16593: On an amendment to the Defense Appropriations bill which sought to terminate U.S. troop involvement in Indochina within 4 months conditioned upon the release of all American prisoners of war and a full accounting of the missing in action (defeated 160–208).	No.
367	do	H.R. 16593: On an amendment to the Defense appropriations bill that proposed a 5 percent reduction of funds in the bill actually spent in fiscal year 1973 (defeated 98–256).	No.
368	do	H.R. 16593: On final passage of the bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1973 (passed 322–40).	Yes.
369	Sept. 19	Quorum call	Present.
370	do	H.R. 16654: On an amendment to the Labor-HEW appropriations bill to exempt firms employing 15 persons or less from compliance with the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (passed 191–182).	No.
371	do	H.R. 16654: On an amendment to the Labor-HEW Appropriations bill which sought to add $15,000,000 for bilingual educational programs (defeated 162–207).	No.
372	do	H.R. 16654: On final passage of the bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for fiscal year 1973 (passed 324–51).	No.
373	Sept. 20	Quorum call	Present.
374	do	do	Do.
375	do	H.R. 15003 (S. 3419): On final passage of the Consumer Product Safety Act as amended (passed 319–50).	Yes.
376	do	H. Res. 1122: On adoption of the "rule" under which to consider H.R. 16705, making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related programs for fiscal year 1973 (passed 239–98).	Yes.
377	Sept. 21	Quorum call	Present.
378	do	do	Do.
379	do	do	Do.
380	do	H.R. 16705: On an amendment to the bill making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs which sought to prohibit the use of funds to guarantee or insure future foreign investments (defeated 141–167).	No.
381	do	H.R. 16705: On final passage of the bill making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for fiscal year 1973 (passed 169–141).	Yes.
382	Sept. 25	H. Res. 1132: On adoption of the "rule" under which to consider H.R. 16754, making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1973 (passed 276–15).	Absent.[1]
383	do	H.R. 16754: On final passage of the bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1973 (passed 292–13).	Do.[1]
384	do	H. Res. 1133: On adoption of the resolution authorizing the President to approve an interim agreement between the United States and U.S.S.R. with respect to limitation of strategic offensive arms (passed 307–4).	Do.[1]
385	Sept. 26	Quorum call	Present.
386	do	H.R. 1121: On final passage of the bill to establish the Gateway National Seashore in the States of New York and New Jersey (passed 350–4).	Absent.[1]
387	Sept. 27	H.J. Res. 1306: To approve the joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1973 (passed 351–4).	Yes.
388	do	H.R. 16012: On passage of the bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain various Federal reclamation projects (passed 293–64).	Yes.
389	Sept. 28	Quorum call	Present.
390	do	H.R. 13694: On an amendment to the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission that would have specified that all decisions would be made by the full commission in lieu of an executive committee (defeated 145–182).	No.
391	do	H.R. 13694: On passage of the bill to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission (passed 300–19).	Yes.
392	Oct. 2	Quorum call	Present.
393	do	do	Do.
394	do	do	Do.
395	do	H.R. 16742: On a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to amend sec. 4 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (defeated 230–140) a 2/3 vote being necessary.	Yes.
396	do	H.R. 15276: On a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to amend sec. 591(g) of title 18, U.S. Code, in order to exclude corporations and labor organizations from the scope of the prohibitions against Government contractors in sec. 611 of title 18 (passed 249–124).	No.
397	do	H.R. 16191: On a motion to suspend the rules and pass the Anti-Hijacking Act of 1972 (passed 354–2).	Yes.
398	do	H.R. 15859: To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing assistance for planning, development and initial operation, research, and training projects for systems for the effective provisions of health care services under emergency conditions (passed 244–122).	No.
399	Oct. 3	Quorum call	Present.
400	do	do	Do.
401	do	H.R. 16645: On an amendment to the bill to provide for the construction of a civic center in the District of Columbia which sought to delete language providing for the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Bicentennial Civic Center (defeated 183–199).	No.
402	do	H.R. 16645: On an amendment to the bill to provide for the construction of a civic center in the District of Columbia which prohibits construction of the civic center unless approved by the Senate and House Committees on the District of Columbia and Appropriations (passed 250–137).	Yes.
403	do	H.R. 16645 (S. 3943): On passage of the bill to provide for the construction of a civic center in the District of Columbia (passed 210–169).	Yes.
404	do	H.R. 7130: On a motion to disagree to the amendments of the Senate to the Fair Labor Standards Act and ask for a conference with the Senate (defeated 188–196).	No.
405	Oct. 4	Quorum call	Present.
406	do	H. Res. 1142: On ordering the previous question on the resolution conferring authority on the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend rules and waive the rule requiring a ⅔ vote for consideration of reports from the Committee on Rules on the same day reported during the period Oct. 10, 1972 (passed 214–171).	No.
407	do	H.R. 15927: To override the President's veto of the bill amending the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 (passed 353–29).	No.
408	do	S. 2770: To approve the conference report on the bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (passed 366–11).	Yes.
409	do	S. 1316: On an amendment to the Federal-State Meat and Poultry Inspection bill which provides for Federal Inspectors to report results of their inspections of State-regulated plants to the State administrative agency (passed 188–149).	Yes.
410	do	S. 1316: On a motion that the Committee of the Whole House "do now rise" and report the Federal-State Meat and Poultry Inspection bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out (passed 172–170).	Yes.
411	do	S. 1316: On agreeing to the motion to strike the enacting clause from the Federal-State Meat and Poultry Inspection bill (passed 172–169).	Yes.
412	Oct. 5	Quorum call	Absent.[2]
413	do	do	Present.
414	do	H. Res. 1145: To order the previous question on the "rule" under which to consider H.R. 16656, the Federal Aid to Highways Act (passed 200–168).	Yes.
415	do	H.R. 16656: On an amendment to the Federal Aid to Highways Act that sought to strike language which would prohibit judicial review of administrative actions relating to the construction of the Three Sisters Bridge (defeated 125–173).	No.
416	do	H.R. 16656: On passage of the Federal Aid to Highways Act (passed 263–30).	Yes.
417	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Present.
418	do	H. Res. 1149: On adoption of the "rule" under which to consider H.R. 16810, to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit and to place a limitation on expenditures and net lending for fiscal year 1973 (passed 309–65).	Yes.
419	do	Quorum call	Present.

Rollcall No.	1972	Measure, question, and result	Vote
420	Oct. 10	H.R. 16810: On an amendment to the Public Debt Limitation bill that sought to require the President to tell Congress by Jan. 2 what spending cuts he would make to bring down the 1973 budget expenditures to $250,000,000,000 and require Congress to consider legislation dealing with the proposed budget cuts (defeated 167–216).	No.
421	do	H.R. 16810: On passage of the bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit and to place a limitation on expenditures and net lending for fiscal year 1973 (passed 221–163).	Yes.
422	Oct. 11	H. Res. 1156: On adoption of the "rule" under which to consider H.R. 17034, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1973 (passed 345–19).	Yes.
423	do	H.R. 16654: On a motion to lay on the table a motion instructing House conferees to insist on House language which forbids salaries for Federal employees who inspect firms employing 15 or less employees for compliance with the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (passed 197–167).	Yes.
424	do	H.R. 17034: On passage of the bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1973 (passed 362–11).	Yes.
425	do	H.R. 16924: On passage of the bill revising the special pay structure relating to members of the uniformed services (passed 337–35).	Yes.
426	do	Quorum call	Present.
427	do	H.R. 16724: On a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill providing for acquisition by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority of the mass transit bus systems engaged in scheduled regular route operations in the National Capital area (defeated 226–129) a ⅔ vote being necessary.	Absent.[1]
428	do	H.R. 6482: On a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to provide for the regulation of strip coal mining, for the conservation, acquisition, and reclamation of strip coal mining areas (passed 265–75).	Do.[1]
429	do	S.J. Res. 247: On a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases (passed 208–92).	Do.[1]
430	Oct. 12	Quorum call	Present.
431	do	H.R. 16987: On a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 1973 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce (passed 350–3).	Yes.
432	do	H.R. 14370: To approve the conference report on the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972 (passed 265–110).	Yes.
433	do	H.R. 14370: On a motion to the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972 to place a $2½ billion ceiling on social service grants (passed 281–86).	Yes.
434	do	H.R. 16593: To approve the conference report on the bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1973 (passed 316–42).	Yes.
435	do	H.R. 16754: To approve the conference report on the bill making appropriations for military construction for fiscal year 1973 (passed 333–10).	Absent.[1]
436	do	H.R. 14989: To approve the conference report on the bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year 1973 (passed 333–3).	Do.[1]
437	do	H.R. 10729: To approve the conference report on the bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (passed 198–99).	Do.[1]
438	Oct. 13	Quorum call	Present.
439	Oct. 13	H. Res. 1153: On adoption of the resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives with respect to House consideration of certain Senate amendments, to provide for the delegates from Guam and the Virgin Islands (passed 281–57).	Yes.
440	do	H.R. 16654: On a motion to agree to the amendment of the Senate making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal year 1973 (passed 289–41).	No.
441	do	Quorum call	Present.
442	do	S. 1478: On a motion to suspend the rules and pass the Toxic Substances Control Act of 1972 as amended (passed 240–61).	Yes.
443	do	H.R. 7287: On a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to prohibit trading in Irish potato futures on commodity exchanges (defeated 116–150).	No.
444	Oct. 14	On approval of the Journal of proceedings for Oct. 13, 1972 (passed 248–3).	Yes.
445	do	H.R. 17034: To approve the conference report on the bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1973 (passed 250–15).	Yes.
446	do	Quorum call	Present.
447	do	H.R. 12006 (S. 2318): On a motion to suspend the rules and pass the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act as amended (passed 198–71).	Absent.[1]
448	do	H. Res. 1147: On adoption of the resolution authorizing overseas travel by the Committee on Public Works (passed 202–46).	Do.[1]
449	do	S. 4062: On a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill providing for acquisition by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority of the mass transit bus systems engaged in scheduled regular route operations in the National Capital area (passed 184–60).	Do.[1]
450	do	Quorum call	Do.[2]
451	do	H.J. Res. 1331: To approve the joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1973 (passed 163–73).	Do.[1]
452	do	H. Res. 1166: On a motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution agreeing to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 16071, to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 with amendment (passed 155–64).	Do.[3]
453	do	Quorum call	Do.[3]
454	Oct. 17	do	Present.
455	do	H.R. 1: To approve the conference report on the Social Security Amendments of 1972 (passed 305–1).	Yes.
456	do	H.R. 16810: To approve the conference report on the bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit and to place a limitation on expenditures and net lending for fiscal year 1973 (passed 166–137).	Yes.
457	do	H.J. Res. 1331: To approve the conference report on the bill making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1973 (passed 188–80).	Yes.
458	Oct. 18	Quorum call	Present.
459	do	S. 2770: On reconsideration of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 to pass the measure, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding (passed 247–23).	Yes.
460	do	H. Con. Res. 726: On adoption of the resolution providing for a sine die adjournment of the 2 Houses of Congress on Wednesday, Oct. 18, 1972 (passed 239–21).	Yes.
461	do	Quorum call	Present.
462	do	do	Do.

[1] If present, would have voted "yes."
[2] If present, would have voted "no."
[3] Speaking engagement.
[4] Official trip to China.

BILL COLMER—REPRESENTATIVE FOR AMERICA

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, from my point of view, there is only one benefit to be derived by the retirement of BILL COLMER from Congress, and that is this opportunity to express in appropriate detail my deep regard, respect, and admiration for a truly remarkable statesman, politician, tactician, educator, and barrister, who is also my personal candidate for the position of congressional all-American. This last attribute is unique to BILL COLMER because he has with superb ability always represented the best interests of the Fifth Congressional District of the great State of Mississippi as well as the best interests of the United States of America—and, in all honesty, I must add that the world itself has benefited immeasurably from the presence of this great and wise southern gentleman in the Halls of Congress.

His masterly chairmanship of one of the most powerful committees in the world's most important legislative body will be amply recorded in the history of our time. The fact that he fulfilled the duties of his high office with time-consuming precision and excellence has, however, in no way detracted from his courtly and meticulous attention to the friendly and gracious chores that go along with being the good and effective friend of hundreds of thousands of human beings.

Yes, BILL COLMER has never lost the common touch—he can confer with the mighty of this earth and he can converse with his fellow citizens in every walk of life with equal wisdom and facility.

Mr. Speaker, if I may add a purely personal note, going back to the fall of 1932, I can remember with great clarity a very vigorous young man who conducted a remarkably meaningful campaign. His name was BILL COLMER, and, of course, this was the start of one of the most successful congressional careers in the history of Congress. I was there in Pascagoula when he ran for his second term because in just 2 short years I had come to admire and respect this fine Congressman. It is true that his politics can be characterized as conservative, but I really think that he and I share a position which should be considered progressive. In other words, we both believe in progress for the American people within the framework of the guidelines set down for us in the Constitution in the best traditions of our pioneering forefathers.

In so many ways, BILL COLMER has typified the dedication, tireless effort, and concern for his fellow man that are indeed part of his very nature. This is nowhere more notable than in the tumultuous period following World War II. Half of the world was in ruins and international economic systems were in chaos. We were engaged in a massive attempt to make the necessary shift from a wartime economy to peacetime consumer-oriented industry with a minimum of displacement and hardship. As if this were not enough, the United States had also accepted the burden of world leadership, helping people everywhere, both friend and foe, who had suf-

fered the dreadful devastation of global conflict. So that the House of Representatives could successfully perform its proper legislative role in this great undertaking, the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning was formed under the watchful and capable leadership of BILL COLMER. For 4 years, this committee was vital to the orderly postwar economic reconstruction of the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, I have one last comment, which is that all of the foregoing and the long list of BILL COLMER'S significant accomplishments that are so well known to his admiring colleagues are the natural consequence of a fine and warm human being endowed it is true by his Maker with exceptional talents and abilities, but an individual nevertheless whose intelligence, forcefulness, and deep concern have the unique stamp of BILL COLMER. For him conscience and country are merged in one patriotic duty. For the Members of Congress his remembered precepts will be our future guide—as though his voice were still reverberating from these walls—a gentleman from Mississippi who has been a Representative for America, and who has in fact been our arbiter and standard of legislative order and excellence during 40 years that were crucial to America.

A BALANCED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MAKES SENSE FOR ALL

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I feel that there are two very important points which bear further mention with regard to the recent consideration by this body of the conference report to H.R. 16656, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1972.

As a Congressman from suburban Philadelphia, I am fully aware of the significant improvements which might have become a reality had the House moved to allow local governments the option to use urban highway system funds as they saw fit—whether for highway-related projects or for rail and bus mass transit. Rather than being a blatant raid on the highway trust fund, this provision offered a practical solution to a critical problem now facing our Nation's cities. Certainly, it makes more sense that the local areas—the urban areas for which the funds are earmarked—should decide their own priorities rather than the Congress. Unfortunately, however, we have again limited their expenditures to strictly highway needs.

Second, the failure to permit urban areas to utilize these moneys for their own particular needs cannot be offset by the provision in the conference report which would have provided $3 billion in mass transit authorization and $400 million in operating subsidies. I take exception to the claim of many of my distinguished colleagues that this was a great step forward for public transportation. Such a statement is, in fact, a usury, for although the authorization would have been made, the conference report actually did not appropriate the funds. To the contrary, the mass transit amendment on which we sought to gain action would have provided that $700 million in existing funds—funds now available in the highway trust fund—would have been used.

I do not mean to underestimate the importance of highways to our country's future growth. However, I do feel that the time has come when we must recognize that highways alone simply will not be able to handle the requirements of our rapidly increasing population in the years ahead, nor do they necessarily present the best possible solution for all areas. Improved public transportation is needed now if our cities are to survive in the future.

Certainly, if local governments were given the flexibility to use urban highway system funds for mass transit purposes, our highways, too, would benefit. By attracting a sizable portion of people to public transportation, the number of private automobiles traveling into the urban areas would be reduced, and thus both modes of transportation would benefit from this balancing effect.

Instead of continuing the haphazard planning and unequal funding assistance of the past, it is essential that steps be taken now to provide our country with a carefully designed and balanced transportation system of the future. This should be our basic goal and this is the principle on which we should all focus our attention when the Congress again considers the Federal Aid Highway Act next year.

DR. BENJAMIN WATKINS, HARLEM'S MAYOR SPEAKS OUT ON WATER POLLUTION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Benjamin W. Watkins, the distinguished mayor of Harlem, has written an incisive article for the Amsterdam News on the threat posed by water pollutants to both fish and human life. Dr. Watkins heads the Harlem Red Cross and has long been involved in community affairs. In view of our recent debate on comprehensive water pollution legislation, his words are especially timely. I am pleased to share his article with my colleagues in Congress:

SOMETHING IS FISHY IN RIVER WATERS

(By Dr. Benjamin W. Watkins)

Although our city's water supply contains worm-like insect larvae, copper and magnesium deposits, coliform bacteria, microscopic shrimp, a dash of arsenic, and God knows what else, we have been told by water officials to drink up and be merry.

The authorities tell us that not only is the all purpose liquid absolutely safe, but that most of it measures up to connoisseur's standards for taste and appearance.

They say that for drinking, it's better than the water in almost all major U.S. cities because its softness helps to bring on the bubbles from the soapsuds.

While we are inclined to believe the expert advice of these authorities, we are nevertheless a bit upset over the recent findings of a medical team out in the midwest.

According to the latest issue of the Medical World News, an important medical journal, the team reported that something fishy is going on in our waters.

A recent article in the journal poses the following question:

If a river is polluted enough to cause cancer in a high proportion of the fish that live in it, what danger is there to people who drink it, swim in it, or eat the fish they take from it?

According to the article, all these are unanswered questions raised by a study of the Fox River watershed in Wisconsin and Illinois where a team of investigators discovered that 16 per cent of the fish they examined had tumors.

The study was prompted after Dr. Eric R. Brown, professor and chairman of the Chicago Medical School's microbiology department, took his children fishing in the Fox, which is near Chicago.

They apparently had a good day of fishing, but two of the fish they took bore strange-looking growths that the doctor immediately detected to have tumors, saying:

"I'd never seen this before, and my own field being cancer, I started to look at them and then began trying to find out whether other people had found tumorous fish, too."

SOME HELP

A short time later, after spreading the word about, the doctor had interested an impromptu research team—which had highly trained investigators from the Illinois-Benedictine College in Lisle, Ill., and the University of Manitoba medical school in Winnipeg, as well as his own celebrated institution—and they all got to work.

Dr. Brown was able to get some help from Dr. J. B. G. Kwapinski, professor of microbiology at Manitoba, who studied the fish population of a Western Ontario watershed that is almost entirely unpolluted, for comparison.

The study went well because it also had the help of a network of sport and commercial fishermen who fish the two rivers, and who send in fish suspected of having tumors.

The investigators sampled the waters of both river systems, and Dr. James Hazdra, chairman of the chemistry and bio-chemistry departments at Illinois-Benedictine, analyzed high proportions of fecal material, with a bacterial count as high as 39,000 per 100 ml of water.

Also found in the waters were carcinogenic compounds of the benzanthracene group, herbicides, insecticides, phosphates, nitrates, gasoline, and ether, as well as unsafe quantities of such minerals as lead, mercury, calcium, cadmium, zinc and antimony. Many fish were found to have two or three types of solid tumor.

Afterwards, Dr. Brown declared:

"We haven't seen much leukemia, which is my own field, but then it's very hard to detect leukemia in fish blood. In fact it's a lot harder to identify a fish tumor than you might think, except for the large external ones."

The study did not make any specific conclusions, except to say that people should not fish in waters that are polluted. We believe that a similar study for our city's nearby rivers, as well as the water system itself, would definitely be in order in light of these rather ugly findings.

PAGE BELCHER

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, PAGE BELCHER has served 22 years in the U.S. House of Representatives, and during those 22 years, he has been a valuable Member of Congress and a valuable member of the Oklahoma congressional delegation. I have served with PAGE since my election to Congress 2 years after his, and serving with him has been a helpful and rewarding experience.

As ranking minority member of the House Committee on Agriculture, PAGE BELCHER has become an expert in this area which is so vital to Oklahoma, and in this capacity he has served the State energetically and well.

For much of the time that he has served in Congress, PAGE has been the only Republican member of the Oklahoma delegation. He has demonstrated how well Members from both sides of the aisle can work together when they are vitally concerned for the good of their State. He has worked effectively with all of us from Oklahoma, and he has worked effectively with Members from every State.

PAGE BELCHER's 22 years in Congress have been years of dedicated public service to Oklahoma and to the Nation. These years of accomplishment and hard work have earned him the right to a happy and rewarding retirement, but he will be missed by the Oklahomans he has served so well, and he will be missed in Washington.

INDONESIAN BUSINESSMAN ADDRESSES JAPAN-CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, Julius Tahija, one of Indonesia's leading businessmen, made a very perceptive speech recently on the economic relationship between Indonesia and Japan.

I believe that Mr. Tahija's remarks are quite interesting and most important reading for anyone concerned with the economic growth of the Pacific nations, and the meaning of that growth for U.S. businessmen and Government officials.

At this time, I would like to introduce Mr. Tahija's speech into the RECORD:

SPEECH BY MR. JULIUS TAHIJA AT NAGOYA, SEPTEMBER 21–23, 1972

Gentlemen, to us in Indonesia it has become apparent that the economic development and growth of the developing nations in South East Asia and in the Pacific Basin will be highly influenced by the nature of the relationship between Japan and United States in the future.

Indonesia, has a Government which has accepted the Free Economic System and the role of Private enterprise as an important stimulant as part of the recovery of our economy, after a period when private enterprise was almost eliminated.

We, Indonesia, are in fact, of the opinion that the very future of the free economic system in this part of the world, where there is still much poverty and where the political leaders are still seeking and searching for the best system to raise the living standard of their people, is particularly dependent on the future relationship between the United States and Japan.

After independence we accepted almost blindly the Western type of democracy where political leaders have often served the interest of their respective political parties rather than the good of their country. We then tried the so-called "Guided Democracy" moving slowly into a camp where private ownership and private enterprise could not be tolerated.

We have been most fortunate that since 1966, we have been able to recover from the past trend of development and within less than five years have been able to prove what an important role the free economic system can play in the growth of our country's economy.

Mr. Suhud and I are much honored today to have the opportunity meeting such a prominent group of business leaders from Japan and the United States, who are playing such a positive role in the development of the Pacific Basin and South-East Asia.

There is more at stake than just trying to develop business from day to day. It is of paramount importance that political and business leaders of Japan and the United States should maintain an open and frank communication. Their wisdom, maturity, restraint, farsightedness and ability to retain their sense of proportion will be taxed to the maximum from time to time.

Hopefully, working towards a common goal will inspire these leaders to serve, and serve well, the interest of not only Japan and the United States but also that of the nations in the Pacific Basin and South East Asia, which vitally affects other parts of the world.

This gentlemen, is the way we in Indonesia look upon the importance of this Conference and upon the role which both Japan and the United States should and can play to assure political stability in the Pacific Basin and South East Asia and to develop a sound and strong economy in the developing nations of these two regions.

Japan and the United States have been and are most instrumental in placing Indonesia back on the road of economic recovery since the stabilization policies of October 1966 and particularly since 1968. Indonesia has achieved notable results in terms of an expansion of production and aggregate income and a substantial increase in total export earnings while inflation has been brought under strict control.

For the past 4 years 1968 to 1971, Gross Domestic Product, in real terms, increased by an average of 7% per year. On present indications, GDP for the current year 1972 is expected to rise again between 7 and 9%. The population census of 1970 indicated an average population increase of 2.7% per annum.

Hence the overall standard of living, the per capita income, has risen by over 4% per annum since 1967. This is in sharp contrast to the preceding years from 1960 to 1967, a period marked by stagnation and even retrogression where the increase of aggregate production and income had been less than the increase of population.

This income of the GDP during the past 4 years and which is expected to continue this year is due to the following contributing factors: an increase for the period between 1968 through 1971 in

1. public investments averaging 80% per year.

2. total export proceed averaging 14.4% per year.

3. External sources (official development assistance and private capital inflow), averaging 25% per year.

The overall expansion of our economy was accompanied by a highly successful control of inflation. In 1966 the inflation rate was 650%, 110% in 1967, 85% in 1968, 10% in 1969, 9% in 1970 and 2.5% in 1971. With the support of Japan, the United States and other nations. Indonesia has been able to increase production, raise national income and to restore her financial stability.

The balance of payment also looks encouraging. The exports for the current year 1972 are expected to reach a level of approximately $1.83 billion, compared to $1.3 billion in 1971, an increase of 40%, considerable more than the annual average increase of 14.4% during 1968 through 1971.

Adding the $720 million of external funds committed for 1972 from IGGI, Indonesia' capacity to import this year will be roughly $2.5 billion, not including the inflow of private capital. Nevertheless, at present there are weaknesses in the composition and pattern of Indonesia's export. Substantial increase in export proceeds are mainly due to the natural resources of oil and timber. In 1972 the export value of oil will increase over 80% above 1971. The export value of timber for 1972 will rise 27% over 1971.

More than 80% of our total export earnings in 1972 depend on three commodities. Crude oil 55%, rubber 13.5% and timber 11.5%. The concentration on only three commodities makes Indonesia's economy in the future very vulnerable to fluctuations in external markets. Also, 40% of our total exports, including 80% of our timber, go to Japan, while in previous years this figure was 26%.

The export of our traditional commodities such as rubber, copra, palm oil, coffee and tea, have increased only marginally. Rubber and copra showed a sharp decline in 1972 both in value (40% less than in 1971) and in volume (approximately 13% less than in 1971). Our problem is that 65 to 70% of our population depend for their livelihood on those traditional agricultural exports commodities.

The government of Indonesia is fully aware of the dangers and vulnerability of such a situation.

Though bilateral contacts are of great importance, we hope slowly and thoughtfully to strengthen ASEAN as the basis for a strong collective approach.

We believe the new Special Committee for the Coordination of ASEAN Affairs (SCCAN) can provide a mechanism for the beginning in establishing a continuing dialogue for multilateral considerations between ASEAN member countries and the European Economic Community. The E.E.C. in turn will establish within its administration a special bureau to function as the counter part of SCCAN. It is Indonesia's hope that this arrangement can prevent further deterioration and may improve the marketability of our traditional export commodities to the E.E.C.

We have particularly welcomed the visit last week of Prof. Mansholt and his group of the E.E.C. with whom we discussed such subjects as tariffs and other obstacles which we hope can be changed to relieve our present pressing situation. We are primarily concerned with the application of a wider coverage of the generalized system of preferences and we need the further reduction of tariffs relative to Indonesia's exports, as expressed by our Minister of Trade Dr. Sumitro during the Pacific Basin Economic Council meeting in Wellington in May this year.

Larger nations of the E.E.C. have shown a very positive and helpful approach in their relationship with developing countries such as Indonesia.

The E.E.C. is one of the three powerful economic centres today in the free enterprise system, along with Japan and the United

States. Indonesia believes she must establish with these three primary trading centers a more productive economic trade relationship than is presently prevailing. This situation in fact reminds me of Japan's position and strife during the first 50 years after the Meiji Restoration in 1868 when steps were taken to rid Japan of the unequal treaties and to arrange new and more equitable agreements. The difference today is that with advanced technology and science, conditions change faster and more frequently. Therefore, close and quicker communication and more thorough understanding between countries of these changes and their results, are essential indeed.

It is within this context that we in Indonesia and undoubtedly also other ASEAN member countries are vitally interested in tripartite meetings of the three economic centres of the world namely the E.E.C., Japan and the Untied States. In my personal opinion the ASEAN should be invited at least as observers. Such meetings with government and business leaders is in fact desirable to keep open a continuous contact and dialogue in trying to solve not only the present monetary and other economic problems but also and importantly, to define future objectives.

If we wish to sustain a lasting political and economic stability in the world at large we must move thoughtfully, but positively, in organized fashion without undue delay to improve the present situation where 25% of the world population enjoys 75% of the world's prosperity and the remaining 25% of the world's good is being shared by the last 75% of the world's population.

The export of labor-intensive industries by the United States, Japan and the E.E.C. would help the unemployment and underemployment problem in Indonesia. We are searching for technology that will create the highest employment without unduly sacrificing productivity. I was told that the streamlining of procedures by the Japanese government for the utilization of the yen credit would accelerate investment to Indonesia.

Allow me now to make some observations on the role foreign and multinational companies operating in Indonesia and other developing countries. Companies whether foreign or national owned should meet their environmental responsibilities if they wish to continue favorable return on their investment over a long period. No longer is it enough to be imaginative and intensive in our technological research, but we have to be competitively creative in meeting the challenge of how to keep our environment fully productive. It is vital that in this respect the local management of these companies can count on the guidance and support of the parent companies and that the local managers be kept up to date with new and changing philosophies in this respect. Only in this way can these companies substantially and tangibly contribute to the growth of private enterprise and the free economic system, patricularly in developing countries where the people are not always convinced that private enterprise can offer them the best opportunities to improve their living standard. I must admit that these efforts take time, tolerance and perseverance on the part of the local management.

The ecological problem is another subject which should have the constant attention of the business and industrial managers in the developing countries. Already some of the new investors in Indonesia have been negligent in this respect with the result of certain frictions. The population in the developing countries does expect that companies from developed nations are much more aware and able to prevent pollution and assist us in conserving some of our natural resources for the future.

The matter of Human investment through training of nationals of the host country is imperative. It should be carried out according to a well developed plan in order to reap the maximum benefit from the investment made. Technical and business knowledge and experiences are just as important if not even more important than material and financial gain. This additional experience and expertise can only further a deeper mutual understanding between nations.

My appeal to you in this meeting of decision makers of major and multinational companies, is based on hard and sometimes bitter experience during the last 20 years in trying to guide a foreign company through some of the difficult times after Indonesia's independence. The benefit our company is reaping today is a result of seeds carefully cultivated to meet our present and future environmental and social responsibilities, which are today, most vital business responsibilities as also expressed by Mr. Edgar Kaisar a few days ago in Tokyo.

Indonesia belies in a cooperative approach. However, Indonesia will also always look independently at each decision and stand for what we judge to be wise and fair. In this respect the adversities we experienced during the pre-Soeharto period may prove to be a blassing in disguise in that now we do appreciate what we are gaining and become more and more aware as to how many opportunities we have lost in the past. Guided by a deep spiritual and cultural heritage that has given us a certain understanding and a sensitive to appreciate real values we hope soon to be able to contribute more positively and tangibly to the stability in this part of the world. Indonesia needs the expertise and monetary assistance from Japan and the United States now, you need our vitality and stability in the future.

We believe that this is the least Indonesia can do to show our appreciation to the donor nations in the IGGI who have been most instrumental to put us back on the road of economic recovery. Thank you for inviting us to be with you and share with you your experience.

THE NATIONAL HEMOPHILIA FOUNDATION'S AWARD TO THE UNITED PILOTS AIRLIFT

HON. WILLIAM R. ROY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, the disease of hemophilia afflicts many thousands of our citizens, many of them children. It is a disease which lasts from birth until death. It is frequently extremely painful, and is always a factor to be dealt with in the life of the person who has it. As a physician, I know the toll of pain hemophilia takes—as an obstetrician-gynecologist, I am more aware than many doctors of the deep concern of parents of newly born and young children who have the disease.

Recently, a very humanitarian program regarding hemophilia has come to my attention. At its annual board of directors meeting in Denver on October 21, 1972, the National Hemophilia Foundation presented its Humanitarian Award to the pilots of United Airlines. The award was accepted on their behalf by Capt. Thomas E. Cornell, chairman, United Air Lines Master Executive Council, Air Line Pilots Association, in appreciation for their program of a special kind of aid to hemophilic children.

The "United Pilots Airlift" as the childrens' travel program is known, makes contributions available to the National Hemophilia Foundation for the purchase of air transportation to provide specialized care at medical centers not available in certain parts of our country. Additionally, upon recommendation of a physician, the fund will pay the air fare for one parent. Children are selected by the foundation on the basis of need.

I am informed that often a pilot, on a nonwork day, will accompany the youngster selected, will explain aeronautics to the child, accompany the child to the cockpit, and, in general assist the youngster in any way he can to enjoy the flight.

A number of these flights have been made, and I understand more are pledged for the future.

Mr. Al Dubin, of California, a leader in the development of hemophilia programs and clinics, whose son has hemophilia, commented, when making the award:

One of the highlights of the past year for us was the beginning of "mercy flights" for hemophilic children in need of special health care or special consultation with medical specialists. Too often, perhaps, undue emphasis is given to the costs of medical care, though often this may exceed $15,000 a year, and no attention is paid to other expenses of the family with a hemophilic child. By other expenses, of course, I mean transporting a child long distance for examination, diagnosis and recommendation of treatment. The family that has to pay the bills is aware of those "extra" costs. And so, happily, are the pilots of United Airlines who, as members of the Air Line Pilots Association, International have created a travel fund for the use of hemophilic children. With deep gratitude, therefore, we acknowledge and honor the good instincts of those who set up the fund by presenting the Humanitarian Award to the United Airlines Pilots Association.

The plaque inscription states:

National Hemophilia Foundation's 1972 Humanitarian Award is presented gratefully to the United Airlines Pilots Association in recognition of its generosity and effort in providing transportation for Hemophilic Children to Medical Centers throughout the Country.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this is an excellent example of humanitarianism, and of the spirit of voluntary assistance so needed today. I hope that all of my colleagues will take note of this excellent project.

SYMPOSIUM ON NATIONAL POLICY TRENDS IN EAST-WEST TRADE, OCTOBER 5, 1972, WASHINGTON, D.C.

HON. FRED R. HARRIS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on October 5, the East-West Trade Council sponsored a symposium on "National Policy Trends in East-West Trade." The symposium was attended by over 200 persons representing business, agriculture, State governments, academics and private individuals concerned with broadened East-West trade. The 1-day symposium featured major speeches by

Cyrus Eaton, Averell Harriman, Samuel Pisar, Senators WALTER MONDALE and JACOB JAVITS and Secretary of Commerce Peter G. Peterson. The transcript of the symposium will be of interest and use to Members of the Senate as major trade legislation affecting East-West trade will be before the Congress in 1973. As a member of the advisory board of the East-West Trade Council, I am pleased to include the proceedings of the symposium in the RECORD.

Mr. President, in compliance with the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing, I have obtained from the Government Printing Office an estimate of the cost and length of this insert. They have informed me that the article will take up approximately 13¾ pages at a cost of $2,337.50. Notwithstanding the 2-page rule of the Joint Committee on Printing, I request that the materials be inserted into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SYMPOSIUM ON NATIONAL POLICY TRENDS IN EAST-WEST TRADE, OCTOBER 5, 1972, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. CHRISTENSON. Senator Harris is a member of the Advisory Board of this Council. After eight years in the United States Senate, he is retiring at the end of this year. He is a member of the Senate Finance Committee which has jurisdiction over foreign trade, and under the auspices of that Committee he traveled in the Soviet Union in 1971 and other Eastern European countries. He has been instrumental in bringing to you this Symposium. We are pleased to hear from him at this time, Senator Harris. [Applause.]

Senator HARRIS. This year is the first year we have had microphones in the Senate, so I'm really use to speaking without them. In some ways it was not improvement. We use to wonder what some of the Senators were saying, and now that we know, we're not sure we weren't better off before. [Applause.]

I want to tell you about the two men who will be chairing these sessions. The afternoon session will be chaired by Dean Adrian Fisher of the Georgetown University Law Center, where he has been the Dean since 1969. Dean Fisher's distinguished law career extends over three decades. He served as Law Clerk for both Justices Brandeis and Frankfurter, as Assistant to Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and, later, as Legal Adviser to the Department of State and in various other posts of importance in the government since that time. He has served as a Consultant to the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency since 1969.

The man who just called us to order will chair the morning session. He is Gordon Christenson, Dean of American University Washington College of Law. He has had a distinguished career in the field of international law. He served under three Administrations in both the Department of Commerce and the Department of State as Counselor on matters of public international law and national law concerning science and technology.

We are very pleased that these men are here and will be participating in this program. And I want to welcome each of you here.

Most of us have not been engaged in this subject matter for nearly as long as Mr. Cyrus Eaton has. He has been showing us the way for a long time, and I think the fact that his ideas have attained a great deal more currency is testified to by this overflow attendance. We are very pleased that he's here. He will be followed by former Ambassador to the Soviet Union Averell Harriman. We hope to put present and future trends in the proper context, and both of these men are quite able to discuss in detail, too, the present and future situation in regard to East-West trade.

Sam Pisar is particularly expert in the field of international trade. I know he and others were cheered yesterday by reports that were published in the *Washington Star* and in the *Post* this morning that there has been a relaxation of Soviet policy in regard to exit visa fees. That is a matter of serious concern for an overwhelming number of members of the Senate, as well as others who would like to see the free movement of both goods and people. I think sometime during the day we will want to address ourselves to that subject in questions and discussion. Mr. Pisar, as a lawyer, does a great deal of commerce with the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and other countries. He is, himself, a refugee from the Nazi holocaust in Poland, leaving there when he was sixteen, all of his family having been killed. He is an expert in both aspects of the exit fee problem, which, as I said, is of central concern to a great many people, and rightly so.

We are pleased that they are all here. We have an excellent program in the afternoon, as well, which will be concluded by Secretary of Commerce Peterson. Then, we hope all of you will be able to stay over for the reception which will occur at 3:30 this afternoon. We think that some informal and private exchanges among ourselves can be an important part of the usefulness of this Symposium. We have with us representatives from Eastern countries who will be introduced later on.

At the end of each formal presentation we want to have about thirty minutes or so of questions and answers. Our program is somewhat deficient, of necessity, in the field of trade with the People's Republic of China. But there are knowledgeable people on the program as well as in the audience who can discuss the various aspects of China trade, and I hope each of you will feel free to comment if you have some particular feeling about any of the issues involved in that or other subjects, as well as to ask questions.

We think, those of us who have been involved in forming the East-West Trade Council, that 1973 will be a very crucial year. Not only in the directions that we decide to take insofar as striking down the artificial barriers, governmental and private, which exist to broadened East-West trade, but also to do what we can to resist the generally protectionist pressures which have been growing alarmingly in the Congress and in the country in recent years. Probably, our first barrier is the protectionism that exists toward broadened trade in general. Of course, East-West trade falls heir to that problem as well as to other kinds of problems which we will be discussing here today.

Before the day is over, I hope that you will have an opportunity to give some thought to how the East-West Trade Council might be most helpful to you. In the brochure you will see a listing of intended purposes of the Council, and I hope you may want to comment in writing to us about those purposes and how they might best be furthered and how the services of the Council can be useful in a very specific way to you, your companies, your associations and otherwise, insofar as your interest in trade is concerned.

Again, I want to say we're glad you're here. I hope we may yet get the microphones working. In any event, please bear with us as well as you can. We should have met in the Engineers Club. [Laughter.]

There is a slight error in the brochure. Governor Harriman will actually speak at 10:30, and Mr. Pisar at 11:30. Then, we have a complimentary luncheon. It's not overly lavish, but we think it is good to stay here, rather than try to go out all over town. We hope to get back promptly at 1:30. Senator Walter Mondale will speak at 1:30. He is Chairman of the Subcommittee in the Banking and Currency Committee which has jurisdiction, among other things, over export-import bank credit legislation. Then, at 2:00 o'clock, Senator Javits will be here. He has, as you know, a very long and experienced record in the field of foreign trade. Then, at 2:30 Secretary Peterson will be here. In all of these sessions we do intend questions and answers.

DEAN CHRISTENSON. Our first speaker for this morning is a man who has a distinguished reputation and long contact with the countries of Eastern Europe. Cyrus Eaton has been a pioneer in attempts to bring East and West together. He is founder and sponsor of the Pugwash Thinkers Conferences to promote international understanding. He has traveled extensively through the Eastern European countries and the U.S.S.R., speaking on the theme of increased contact between the communist and non-cvommunism countries of the world. He has been a leader in business a well as in intellectual circles and presently holds positions on some of the most influential corporations in the country. Mr. Eaton's principal business associations have been with iron ore, steel, coal, railroads, paint, chemicals, rubber and lake shipping, as well as public utilities. He received the Lenin peace prize in 1960, was elected to the Royal Norwegian Academy of Sciences, a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and has received many civic awards. His many years of effort in this country and abroad to bring together the countries of the world through commerce and culture make him a truly outstanding individual who deserves our appreciation and deep respect. Mr. Eaton, we are pleased to have you with us this morning to speak on "Doing Business in the East."

CYRUS EATON. I have prepared no formal speech. I'm going to rely on your questions to give me an opportunity to maybe supply what you would be most interested in. All my life. I have been concerned with international trade. My ancestors were ship builders and shippers on all the oceans. Many built the clipper ships and the sailing ships of the world and they engaged in China trade as well as in communications between Boston and San Francisco in the early days.

My ancestors were very interesting in international trade and in my childhood I heard many stories about China trade. My first job was with John D. Rockefeller, Senior, who created a great world-wide empire. America was hardly prepared for an institution as big and powerful as the Standard Oil Company was seventy years ago. But that contact enlivened my interest in world affairs, and I think you will agree with me that there has been no greater economic genius in the history of the world than John D. Rockefeller, Senior.

The next contact I had with international affairs was World War I. Russia purchased most of its supplies in America from Cleveland, my hometown. They bought their trucks and automobiles and cannons and shells, and all of the things they needed in the war. I participated in that very actively during the early period of that great war. And, speaking of World War I, one cannot mention it without pointing out what a tragedy it was. Here were great countries—Germany, Austria, France, Italy, England, Russia—hurling themselves at each other, with the terrible loss of life. And the one that suffered most economically was, of course, England. At that time England's investments were everywhere in the world. For instance in South America, British capital had built all the railroads, created practically all the public utilities—electric lights, gas, telephones—created the ports, and every

dollar of that was dissipated in World War I and left England impoverished and occupying, now, a very small place in world affairs.

My next active participation, maybe on a big scale in international trade, was about fifteen years ago. The Soviet Union asked me if I would put their representatives in touch with the steel manufacturers and rubber manufacturers of America. Mr. Mikoyan, later the President, came to Cleveland and addressed the steel manufacturers and other manufacturers, and he said, "Our steel works are only in their infancy. We need steel in immense tonnages to build pipelines for gas and oil. We need sheets for trucks and automobiles and refrigerators, and I'm prepared to place a mammoth order and while you want to extend us credit, we will pay cash." All of these famous American industrialists who were there were up to see him at the close of the luncheon with their order sheets to supply him all of the steel that he needed for every purpose. When they went, Mikoyan said to me, "This is the happiest day of my life. I've been so graciously received by these outstanding American industrialists who are prepared to do business with me. It's marvelous."

He went immediately to Washington to get export permits, and he first went to the Department of Commerce and ran into Louis Strauss, who then was Acting Secretary. And Strauss said, "We will not permit you to buy steel or rubber from America." Mikoyan was deeply shocked and said, "Surely, that couldn't be the attitude of the State Department," and he went over there. On that occasion, Douglas Dillon was Acting Secretary, in the absence of Mr. Dulles, and Dillon said, "No, we will not sell you anything." And Mikoyan said, "Why? None of the things I want could in any way add to our military equipment." Dillon said, "I know, but we will not do anything that will in any way benefit the Soviet Union."

At that time, I was closely in touch with a number of big German firms supplying them coal and iron ore and they said, "We would be delighted to have that business." The result was that those stupendous orders were placed with West Germany, with France, with Holland, with England, and for three years the steel mills of those countries were running full on those mammoth Soviet orders. And they were using their gold supply to pay for it.

I mention this to emphasize what I think have been mistaken policies on the part of the United States that need changing. One of the obvious things in promoting trade is, of course, courtesy. The customer is always right, supplying them with good material. And we are well-equipped in America to do that, but we can't do business with these countries if we treat them as enemies. The old saying that the customer is always right is one that applies to international trade as well as to domestic trade. A merchant selling his goods doesn't ask a man whether he is a Democrat or a Republican, a Christian or an atheist. He has to do business with anyone who will do business with him. And I think we've got to have that same attitude in our relations with these countries with whose system of government and philosophy we totally disagree.

There are one or two fundamental things that I think the Nation must take account of in order to trade in a big way. That is the extending of credit to these countries. Banks in America are too small. I have been through all the panics since 1907, and most of them have been because of shortage of credit. Our greatest tragedy in the history of American business is the bankruptcy of the Penn Central Railroad—one of the greatest properties of the world. What was the fundamental cause of that? Absence of money. At the time they were trying to do a hundred million dollar piece of financing, some good high-grade bonds were yielding as high as fifteen percent. You can't carry on international trade under that kind of a financial system. We need bigger banks. We need banks in every state in the Union, and they must be able to extend credit on a vast scale. Now, you take an institution that's borrowing a couple of hundred million dollars currently, and it will be borrowing from a hundred or a hundred and fifty banks. If one of those banks becomes unhappy and wants the loan called, the whole institution is in trouble. I want to urge very strongly that our statement consider ways and means of big banks so that we'll have institutions that can loan money in any quantity. I think we ought to invite these foreign countries to establish banks in America. The Soviets have a good bank in London, a good one in Paris, a good bank in Switzerland; why shouldn't they have a good bank in New York?

So, on the fundamental side, we not only have got to treat these people courteously even though we disagree with their philosophy, but we've got to be in a position to extend credit in a very big way.

Now I hope you have some questions to ask me, and to which I will try to reply.

QUESTION. Mr. Eaton, I notice that this conference is called a conference on East-West trade. I am sure that this does not include investments. Now, my corporation is very much interested in investing in Eastern Europe, but don't you think that this is equally as important as trade or of some importance—the importance of American investments in Eastern Europe?

Mr. EATON. Is investment as important as trade? Investment is important and I think there is great opportunity for investment in probably all of these countries. Take the Soviet Union, for instance, twice as large in geographic extent as the United States and with fabulous natural resources—iron ore, coal, oil, gas, diamonds, nickel, copper—there are vast opportunities there. I am confident that the Soviet Union very shortly is going to come to the point, assuming that they regard America as friendly to them, where they will welcome American investment in partnership with them. And I'm sure that goes for most of the Communist nations of Eastern Europe, and no telling what will happen in China. Don't forget that there is a population about three times the size of the United States and their people need urgently all the good things of life that we have provided here in such great abundance. They will be wanting us in as partners, provided they become persuaded that we are not trying to destroy them.

You see, those nations are conscious of the fact that the United States has been the leader of the world in the production of nuclear weapons. Of course those weapons, if we ever use them, could destroy civilization. We are spending $70 billions a year in direct armaments, countless billions for institutions like the CIA and other parasites, none of which return a dollar to America. Let us abandon that and these countries will welcome us as partners in their enterprises.

QUESTON. Mr. Eaton, you're an industrialist who has worked in the private sector on industry all your career. How would you propose to interface investment or capital equipment in the Soviet Union with their type of government structure? How do you see the mechanics working?

Mr. EATON. Once they get persuaded that we are not dedicated to destroying them, there will be no difficulty in having a partnership between a Soviet agency and an American corporation. The proportions might have to be fifty-fifty, or might even have to be fifty-one percent in their favor, but I'm sure we can have joint enterprises that will be highly profitable to us, and when they are kept going on a big scale we can forget military outlays.

QUESTION. Mr. Dean, there are no banking facilities available in America to do business with the Soviet Union or Communist China. They simply do not exist. There is no bank available today to extend a six or an eight billion-dollar credit to the Soviet Union for the movement of goods which we need. Moreover, our system of banking ought not to be based on "you send me a letter of credit and I'll send you the goods." Here in our country—and I was brought up overseas, I'm an American brought up overseas—we do not have the facilities for such banking. We do not have the facilities of switches, of trade, of barter.

A few days ago I called the Senior Vice President of a sixteen billion dollar bank and I said Mr. so-and-so, I have $40 million worth of barter business for you. He said, "We haven't got such a bank." I looked in his list of banks and there tucked away in Vienna he owns a little merchant bank and he doesn't even know it. *He doesn't even know it!*

So, when we talk of extending business to the Soviet Union or China, I think a lot of it is poppycock. Because the first thing we have to do is to start educating our banking community. Number two, we have to convince our own government that we are heading towards a course of peace. Because if we are heading towards a course of peace, we can find the money to extend credit. But until we join up our economics, our banking community, with the government, East-West trade will remain a dream.

DEAN CHRISTENSON. Thank you for your comments. I had thought Mr. Eaton had addressed himself precisely to that point. I'm also reminded of the history of our relations with the Soviet Union, that at least on paper, in 1934 the Export-Import Bank of Washington was organized precisely for that purpose. Why it fell into disuse is another matter. But, at least on paper, they have the mechanism if the decisions are reached to extend the credits.

Mr. EATON. I'm an optimist—maybe a little young and enthusiastic—but I think the time is coming in America when not only our governmental agencies but the private ones will want to join in developing these projects with the chance of mutual profit. Now, that wasn't true forty years ago when the Soviets felt that they had discovered a new solution to human affairs, but I think time has proven to them that the rain falls on both the capitalists and the communists alike, and that they haven't created a paradise where their people can be happy and rich without work. I think enormous changes have taken place in their attitude. I think they are prepared to go a long way. Mr. Kosygin visited me in Canada about three years ago and I wanted to give him a good time, so I proposed taking in the best salmon fishing in Canada. He said, "I would like to go salmon fishing, but I'd like to see one of your industries that would be typical of what we could do in the Soviet Union." So, I took him to one of the big newsprint companies where they were making a million tons of newsprint a year. I never saw a man so fascinated as he was with every operation, from the log coming in. He was right down with the workmen. He was an industrialist at heart, but he was fascinated with the whole undertaking. It was something new to him. He didn't believe the world could use a million tons of newsprint a year, and he compared the requirements of Pravda and Isvestia, but his interest was so absolutely keen and terrific, and his approval of American and Canadian technology, that all over him was written a desire to play ball with us, if we would.

DEAN CHRISTENSON. We have time for one more question, I think.

QUESTION. I would just like to elaborate. When I mentioned investment in Eastern Europe, I should have made it more specific. I think the principle of equity is a good one, as it is happening in Yugoslavia, but I was

thinking of the bulding of plants in Eastern Europe on a turnkey basis for the Eastern European countries, for them to use under their own system. Now, there have been a number of examples where European firms and American firms have built planes in Eastern Europe. You can call this investment in the broadest sense, but I think there is a great potential in that area also.

DEAN CHRISTENSON. Mr. Pisar said that he is going to spend some time on investments, and perhaps we can get into it a little more during the course of his remarks.

Did you have a precise question that you wanted to direct to Mr. Eaton?

QUESTION. I just wanted to elaborate. I don't think it is only a question of equity. It's also the possibility of building plants on a turnkey basis for them to use under their own systems.

QUESTION. I would like to know what Mr. Eaton's suggestion is about the bombing, the investments in the bombing of Vietnam?

Mr. EATON. In my judgment, and I realize there are differences of opinion on the subject, but I feel it is very unwise. Mr. Harriman, representing brilliantly the United States in Paris, I'm sure, if he had been given full authority, he would have settled that war and there would have been no occasion to bomb. But the use of force to change people's minds is not effective. We are going broke trying to subdue that little nation. If you've been there, you'll agree with me that there never was greater devotion to the cause than the people of Vietnam. And I think we have made a colossal blunder. I hope we're going to quit it. I hope the voice of America-the conscience of America, will protest against this mighty nation sending our troops, Navy, Air Force, ten thousand miles to subdue that little nation. It's a mistake. [Applause.]

DEAN CHRISTENSON. We are now moving to the next speaker, please.

No one is better qualified to speak on the long-term policy implications of expanding East-West trade than is the Honorable Averell Harriman. He first traveled to the U.S.S.R. on family business in the '20s, and years later he returned to the Soviet Union as our Ambassador from the United States. His life and government service are intertwined with the great men and events that have dominated the world scene for the past thirty years. He served as Governor of the State of New York and as United States Secretary of Commerce. He negotiated the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty for President Kennedy and represented President Johnson at the Paris Peace Talks. Ambassador Harriman is a great American, with unique experience and understanding in the field of world affairs, and we are honored to have him with us today—Ambassador Harriman. [Applause.]

Ambassador HARRIMAN. Thank you very much for that kind introduction. This question of long-range East-West trade, I suppose, if you are looking to the future, one ought to look back. It is true that I was in the Soviet Union, as our Chairman indicated, in the middle Twenties. I was interested very much in what my good friend, Mr. Eaton, was saying about the opportunities of investment. We had substantial investments in a concession in the Soviet Union in the mid-Twenties. I and a group of steel men and other businessmen had a very large operation in the Caucasus in the extraction of manganese. It was, I think, the large concession under Lenin's new economic policy. I know something about dealings of a private operation within the Soviet Union. It can be done, but it's difficult. The government has to be very much in favor of what you're doing, and the contract has to be written in such a way that it is favorable to the local conditions. If anybody wants to talk about the Twenties, I will be very glad to discuss it. I went to the Soviet Union in late 1926 and made up my mind that the new economic policy was out, and I negotiated the cancellation of our Treaty. Fortunately, we got our money out with a small profit. Those who remained lost it all because, later on, they closed down more tightly. What their policy will be in regard to private investment in the future is very hard to tell. Yugoslavia is, of course, opening up for private investment, and there are some opportunities, perhaps, in Rumania.

But I would like to deal with the trade aspect, first, and then the question of investment possibilities or this question of a turnkey building of a plant. I'd like to discuss that because I saw what the Russians did with opening up steel works in India. And we had a turnkey operation that is somewhat different, and it works a lot better. But the present-day trade relations, really, I think, started with Lend-Lease during the War, the UNRRA, and then we began trade. The Lend-Lease operations ended in an unfortunate disagreement. The cancellation of Lend-Lease on an overnight basis was a tragic blunder, but it didn't last very long. A great deal has been made of it, as one of the issues of the Cold War. It wasn't true. It was a mistake, and it was rectified and we came to an agreement with the Russians by which shipments were continued for those things that were underway. And then we made arrangements for the filling of the contracts for those postwar plants which were to have been financed under Lend-Lease on a rather favorable basis. We had difficulty in settling Lend-Lease and that's still open today. It is really, perhaps, the biggest stumbling block which I think the present Administration has. Mr. Peterson will tell you later about it. I don't know the exact status, but I remember when I had something to do with it, we were demanding about $800 million which has nothing to do with repayment for any of the war materials we had sent. They would only pay two or three hundred million, and we didn't get together. We're still apart. The Johnson Act, as you remember, makes it impossible for the government to grant Most Favored Nation treatment to any nation that has not settled its debts, and this is a settlement of debt which must be arranged unless the Johnson Act is amended. Certainly it is high time that this settlement be made. I thought we made a very generous offer at the time. I imagine if we took the $300 million twenty-five years ago—thirty years ago, nearly—it would have been better for us than to have waited this long. But in any event it is still a stumbling block.

There are all kinds of laws, as most of you know, and amendments which have gotten through Congress under some excitement which affect our economic relations. Before we get to those, I want to carry forward a bit further on the UNRRA. The UNRRA was generous to the Soviet Union, and rather more generous to the Soviet Union than to some of our European allies. Under the UNRRA formerly no country could get gifts of UNRRA. They had to repay it if they had adequate resources to repay it. And I remember we demanded return from Norway, because Norway had made some profits during the war in their shipping. They did have some gold, and we did some exchange, and we did insist they repay.

The Russians had a lot of gold and it was quite obvious that we could not give them aid unless there was some way around it. So we recognized the UNRRA with our approval, the approval of the United States Government, and recognized Ukraine and Byelorussia as an independent political unit. And they, of course, didn't have any foreign exchange and, therefore, I think some $270 million, or shipments of around $300 million, of UNRRA was given to the Soviet Union. That was a generous act, and I'm not resenting it in any way. I'm only explaining it. As a matter of fact, most of our UNRRA shipments went to what are now the big communist countries, the Eastern European countries. They got more than half of it.

The political situation began to deteriorate very rapidly. I don't know how many of you read the modern revisionist historians who say that if we had only shown more kindness to Dear Old Uncle Joe Stalin and more affection that there would never have been a Cold War, and it was all our fault. I can assure that that isn't true. There was a disposition on the part of all concerned to carry forward the spirit of our cooperation during the war. In fact, I would have told you that even the Marshall Plan was offered to the Soviet Union. Molotov came to Paris, as you will probably recall in July of 1947, and joined with Bevin and Bedell in considering the Marshall Plan. He didn't like the terms of the Marshall Plan, so he quit and took Poland and Czechoslovakia with him.

But there was already a good many incidents which were creating difficulties. The first was the demand on Turkey for the Eastern provinces and for the base in the Dardenelles. There was an agreement netween the British and the Russians that each country would take their troops out of Iran. The Russians had troops in the North, the British the South. The British took their troops out and the Russians refused to take theirs out, but finally did. And then, as you know, the problem about Poland, the problem about Czechoslovakia, then the Berlin Airlift—all of them—the blockade of Berlin, all of them moved rather rapidly.

So, began new and other events which rather disturbed me and others. For instance, the Russians were not demobilizing as rapidly as we were. We did probably the most rapid demobilization and the destruction of perhaps the strongest fighting forces that any nation had developed in the world up to that time, in a very short time. The Russians demobilized somewhat—but they maintained substantial forces and they also maintained industrial production. So, we began to wonder, with these events developing, whether we shouldn't control our shipments to the Soviet Union. There wasn't any thought of stopping trade, except to check what was called strategic materials. In 1947, I think, we did impose the first licensing system, which was, we thought, rather well developed. It developed rather easy to work under, and was not as tight as it is today, but was to prevent those items from going through which would contribute to the Soviet war machine and war production.

The Marshall Plan came and, as I've said, Molotov refused to join on the basis of Marshall's offer, which was that Europe should get together and develop a program. Molotov took the position that the Americans tell us how much they are ready to contribute to the recovery of Europe and we'll divide it on the basis of that those who suffered the most get the most, which means the Soviet Union. And he walked out. Bevin and Bedell said no, this is the way we're going to work it and the Russians refused to cooperate. They walked out—they weren't forced out. Poland and Czechoslovakia wanted to stay, but Stalin refused to listen. I think that record is an important one for those who are thinking about who really was responsible for the increase of tensions which developed between us.

I was then in charge of the Marshall Plan operations in Europe and was the United States Representative on the United Nations Economic Committee for Europe which met in Switzerland in Geneva. And we did everything that we could at that time to encourage European East-West trade, everything except the strategic lists which were relatively short, as I recall it. We felt it was going to help Western Europe, and also we had no objection to recovery in Eastern Europe.

Trade between them—normal trade, which had existed—as a matter of fact, bridged more or less Western Europe against Cold War materials from the East. And I can assure you we did everything we could at that time to encourage that trade. We were not blocking it.

In more recent times, we have had continued cooperation with the Europeans, as under the OECD, a European organization of which Japan is a member. A committee, it's called COCON, has a list of strategic items which all hands agree should not be shipped to the Soviet Union or their satellities. That list is agreed to from time to time between the different countries, including ourselves. Now our list is very much longer. I wish I had brought the two lists together, but I didn't think of it until it was too late to get them. Bu we've had a very unrealistic, in my opinion, list which has led to very little trade in recent years between ourselves and the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries. The last time I saw it a couple of years ago there was about $10 billion in trade between Europe and Japan, and Russia and Eastern Europe—that's two-way trade—and it has increased since that time. I don't want to give you a figure, but it has substantially increased since then. And ours is a trifle. We have a little business with Poland, but well within a few hundred million dollars. It just doesn't make any sense for us to try to think that we are interfering with the operations of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe because we are trying to restrict it. The idiotic people who talk about our preventing the economic development, preventing the military development of the Soviet Union because we are restricting business is a lot of nonsense. And we ought to get it out of our systems. They can buy practically everything they want from Europe and Japan in the areas, except for those restricted items, and it's nonsense that we don't join in that trade. It's ridiculous. It's not only that it creates an atmosphere which is not in our interest but also a mutual atmosphere of suspicion. With the result, we are losing trade which we ought to be getting.

There are some of these laws which are rather stupid, which restrict some of our operations. Yugoslavia was mentioned. Even with Yugoslavia, they are not allowed to get credits. In Yugoslavia, even, they are restricting trade on the Findley Amendment, I think it is, which doesn't permit the P.L. 480 transactions with a country which does business with Cuba. Yugoslavia buys sugar from Cuba and isn't going to be stopped because some Congressmen think they gain some kudos at home, stopping Communists. To Yugoslavia it is nobody's business and they're not going to be interfered with. There is a certain pride of sovereignty which we cannot go against.

Now, let me say that I am still for certain restrictions of strategic lists until we come to a sensible agreement about SALT. It's very important, I think, to continue to restrict certain things like computers, as well as direct war materials. But we carry it too far. Things that they can get from Europe just as well, or practically as well, it's foolish for us to interfere with.

The length of time, as most of you businessmen know, that it is now taking to get licenses is prohibitive. I know in recent years many cases where an American company was ready, a bid was ready to be accepted by one of the other countries, and it took so long for the licenses to be approved for the shipments that the business was lost. The machinery of approval must be very much speeded up, as well as, of course, the machinery for credits, which I'll be glad to go into if any of you wish to do so.

There are some real reasons for us to be a little bit suspicious of the Soviet Union and what they did with Lend-Lease. I know the time that Henry Wallace went to Siberia. He was accompanied by a man who was familir with these operations. He discovered that they were using dredges, which we had sent them to keep their ports open in the Pacific at a good deal of difficulty and expense to ourselves during the war, and were using them to mine gold in their gold fields. That sort of thing, we didn't make a fuss about, but it didn't encourage us to have complete confidence in the manner in which some of the Lend-Lease that we sent them was being used. In other words, they were probably using what we sent them to some extent. They used most of it, of course, very well in defeating Hitler. And the items which they misused were relatively small, but that tended to make us want to have more information about what they were doing with their Lend-Lease shipments. It was, of course, always very difficult to get them to give us that information.

Before I close, I think we should make it a little plainer to the American people that the Most Favored Nation clause is not a favor, it's simply treating the nations in a normal manner. You ought to call it the re-establishment of normal relations. As you well know, it's a discrimination not to give a nation Most Favored Nation treatment. Every time the question of giving Most Favored Nation to a Communist country comes up, the public generally thinks we are doing them a great favor. We're not. We're simply putting them on a normal trade basis and not inflicting them with the high tariffs of the Hawley-Smoot period which, as you remember, resulted in making many items almost prohibitively high. Today, we have Most Favored Nation treatment only with Yugoslavia and Poland. I think it's not being given to Rumania, although it should be and, of course, you know it's one of the subjects that's being considered today with the Soviet Union and that it's tied up in the Johnson Act procedures.

I want to quote you what Mr. Khrushchev said to me about trade. Although I know Mr. Khrushchev was a little explosive and somewhat exaggerated when he said it—I knew him pretty well and knew just how far to discount him. He said, "We don't care whether the United States sells us anything; what we want is for the United States to abolish its discriminatory laws or else there can be no confidence. Trade is the first sign of neighborly relations. He who does not want trade, wants war." As I say, that's a little too colorful. He was a bit of an exaggerator. But it does indicate that this has been one of the annoying aspects in our relations and it hasn't done us any good. We haven't gained anything by it, although they do need to buy some of our most sophisticated equipment. We are better, as many of you know, and are a year ahead of some of the European equipment and they would rather have ours in certain areas. At the same time, they can get practically everything they want elsewhere.

If anybody is interested in this turnkey operation, I'll be glad to describe what the Russians did with the Indians, and why it worked somewhat better than a turnkey operation, but that is a detail. I fully agree with what Mr. Eaton said about the war. As long as the war is going on in Vietnam, it's going to be very hard to relax and to get on a normal basis because, as you well know, they are supporting and going to continue to support North Vietnam, whether we like it or whether we don't, as Mr. Kosygin told me in 1965. It is a difficulty which will continue to lead to mutual suspicions. The Cold War has done real damage in our influence all over the world, and I can't find very many heads of governments who will support our position. People all over the world would like to see the war stopped, and I think that relations not only with Eastern Europe but the world would be vastly improved. I very strongly second Mr. Eaton's comments on that affair, and I do hope that something very real is happening today. I hope at least we'll be ending the war before election day so that, no matter who wins, we can go into the new Administration feeling that that tragedy is behind us. And that has a real bearing on our relations with the Soviet Union and with the other Communist countries that contribute to Vietnam.

After we are through with that, we ought to get out of our system the insistence that nobody trade with Cuba. We probably ought to readjust our relations. We are trying to impose our will on other people, and we've got to get that out of our system. We can do things that we think are in our interest, but we've got to remember they are sovereign and people will starve rather than give up their sovereignty. I know one day I talked to Mr. Bevin—he was then Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom—and I was trying to get him to be more cooperative with the unification of Europe, which we were promoting at that time as much as we could. The British were rather loth to do it, because of their Commonwealth commitments. He said, "Well, they are getting a billion dollars from us under loans under the Marshall Plan. It will be hard for us to do it, but we'll pull in our belts rather than have you dictate what our political policies should be around the world." We've got to get that through our systems. No, Americans are the most generous people in the world, but also we can be among the most arrogant people in the world. And I think we ought to keep many of those arrogant people at home. [Laughter.] We can take care of them here.

But this idea that because we are trading with them, we are doing them a favor is ridiculous. We are doing ourselves a favor. We need that trade. God knows, our trade position is in a ghastly state. And, as you well know, for the first time in this century we have an imbalance in trade. We need that trade, and let's go about getting it in a business-like way and in honorable trade. Now, it is true that we can, in addition to trade, explore with investment. Investments in Yugoslavia and others is not going to be easy. It's going to be difficult and we are going to have to have imagination to carry it through.

But I do believe Khrushchev was right in what he was thinking, if not in his total words. If we can get trade going it will help relieve the tensions throughout the world and move towards peace, which is what all mankind wants.

If you have any questions, I'll be glad to answer. I was told to talk a half hour and I've talked a little less. [Applause.]

We are open to questions.

QUESTION. Mr. Harriman, perhaps this question would have been a little bit better directed to Mr. Eaton, but with your background I think you are eminently qualified to comment on it. First, of all, let me say the fact that I'm here representing our company is a positive approach, and secondly, this is not a hostile question at all. Rather a forward sort of a question. Which comes first, the chicken or the egg? Political or trade improvement?

HARRIMAN. The two have got to go together and we've got to recognize we're the mature nation. The others are younger and are more self-conscious. I'm not defending them, but this is a reality. I'm talking about SALT. We are going about it in just the wrong way. Kennedy did it the right way; we got the first agreement. He said in the American University speech in June 1963: "To make our good faith and solemn convictions on the matter, I now declare that the United States will not propose to conduct nuclear tests in the atmosphere as long as other states do not do so. We will not be the first to resume." Such a declaration is no substitute for a binding agreement, but I hope it will help us achieve one. We ought to do the same thing today. We ought to indicate that

we are ready to show restraint if the other side does. This business of trading counters, or whatever it's called—trading chips or whatever it is—is a lot of hooey, a lot of nonsense. I'm not saying this politically, because if the Democrats were doing it, I'd be just as condemning of them, and many of them are of that mood. But I want to explain to you that they are still very much concerned over our behaviour. We have to take the lead. It's very rare that they will take the lead. They are beginning to get mature enough to do that. Whenever they make a gesture in our behalf, someone in the United States says: "All right, you see they are giving in." And then that helps their hawks. You've got to recognize that they have the same spectrum of opinion in the Soviet Union as we have. This is not one brain. Perhaps some people are apt to think of the Soviet Union and Communist countries as one brain. This is a collective leadership which goes really down into the public opinion to some extent, at least—a fraction of what it is in this country. When our hawks say rough things, it tends to reduce the credibility of those who want to be more reasonable. Now, let me say that those who are more reasonable aren't being more reasonable because they love us, but they believe that the time has come when they should do a better job, after fifty years of Communism, for their people in order to prove that Communism is a success, which, of course, it hasn't been.

On the other hand, statements that we have to have these bargaining chips give the hawks in the Soviet Union the upper hand. Those that believe that we have the intentions of first strikes are those who believe that they have to have a very large defense. Now, we ought to have some understanding of their psychology. Trade is one of the things which isn't going to cost us anything. We can be generous and decent about it. We've got a demand. I've shown you in some of the things I've said, some of the things they did to us which I thought were utterly outrageous. And I sent through Congress and was the first man to recommend to Mr. Truman that he impose these trade restrictions and he accepted it. But they were handled in a sensible manner.

I can assure you, we ought to be the first. Now if any of you want me to go further than that, I've got to be a little more political, which I don't want to be. [Laughter.]

QUESTION. Mr. Ambassador, I personally agree that failure to grant Most Favored Nation status to the Soviet Union or the Eastern countries is essentially of no benefit to the United States. I cannot personally see where it is of particular harm to those countries, although . . .

Mr. HARRIMAN. In what particular?

QUESTION. Particularly harmful to our trade with those countries. I know that they speak of this, and in my own travels throughout the Communist countries, this has come up a number of times. But it does seem to me that it's a bit of a straw man in that it has certainly not stopped the Soviets from buying grain or from selling diamonds or from trading nickel for phosophate fertilizer or talking about LNG or crude oil. It seems to me the Russians don't have that much we want, except in the basic raw materials of natural gas, oil, metallic ores and things like that. I don't think Most Favored Nation would change that.

Mr. HARRIMAN. You are right. There's very little. There is a very real problem in our being able to buy from them. But this is an insult to them and is psychologically a barrier. There is more that can move than you think, because it would begin to move if there weren't some of these restrictions.

The reality is that Europe and Japan are doing about $10 or $11 billion a year and we're doing just a fraction of it. So, it's partly our fault, and American subsidiaries in Europe are selling to them. But, anyway, this is a block and it is a block also on credits, which is in some ways more difficult and cause greater difficulty than the Most Favored Nation. But it is psychologically a very substantial block in developing trade relations.

QUESTION. Mr. Harriman, you mentioned computers as something you think should remain on the restricted list. Yet isn't that contradictory with something you earlier said. If we don't trade with Russia in some of these areas, other countries will.

Mr. HARRIMAN. There are certain restrictions. I'm not up-to-date on it, so I don't know. But the COCOM list does include computers of a certain type. I think there's been an easing lately, but in some ways we are ahead in computers. The computers are of importance in connection with nuclear weapons and until we get a real SALT agreement, I think we ought to be very careful not to help them in that. I think we could make more progress in SALT. We're not here to talk about that, but until we do I would keep computers under a very close eye. Of course, I would not myself go beyond the COCOM list. I'd battle it out with the Europeans. We've always been urging somewhat more restrictions than most of the Europeans want, but they have lived up to the agreements that we have made. But you are quite right. Certain types of computers we haven't been selling wouldn't make any real difficulty. It is really the most sophisticated ones that affffect us—some of the more sophisticated weapons.

QUESTION. Mr. Harriman, in the light of your earlier comment, where you said the United States often is rather heavy-handed in trying to urge other nations to follow policies that the United States desires, do you feel that the Jewish emigration visa payment should be tied to trade restrictions?

Mr. HARRIMAN. I thnk we ought to discuss it together. I've been very strongly in favor of frank discussions with the Soviet Union. Senator Muskie was there. I went with him a year ago last January. We talked about it with Kosygin. The words were rather calm, but they were filled with emotion. Senator Muskie did a very good job. But we were talking about the desirability from the Soviet Union's standpoint of letting the Jews out. The effect of that talk may have been useful, anyway. Maybe it had some influence because after that talk they let out more Jews, per month at least, and about thirteen thousand in '71, and this year it will be somewhere approaching double that amount if not up to thirty thousand. Of course, the trouble today is the ransom they are putting on the heads of educated people. I doubt very much whether sanctions will achieve much—I'm just talking about generality—I don't want to get into this individual subject. It's filled with emotion, and I am too. I have that emotion. But, by and large, trade sanctions don't achieve very much in political subjects. It isn't only the Jews that are being discriminated against or refused the privilege of leaving that country, but it's all the minorities and it hits at the whole Soviet system which I dislike intensely, but at the same time we are not going to make Christians out of the present Communists—Christians or Jews. [Laughter.]

QUESTION. Gov. Harriman, I gather from your remarks that you recognize the trade aversion on both sides—our side and the Eastern side. Now, assume that we should repeal the Johnson Act, the Battle (?) Act, the Export Control Act, removing our trade aversion, do you believe that a relief from the Eastern side would come from the Soviet Union and the other Eastern countries, or would it drift Eastward, beginning in Poland and Yugoslavia or East Germany, and, then, the Soviet Union would have to follow suit?

Mr. HARRIMAN. It's pretty hard to say. I think you can ask that of Mr. Peterson who has just been over there. I've got a great deal of respect for him, and I think he can tell you about it. I think a lot depends on the manner in which we handle these negotiations. You know, a few years ago we refused to sell grain to the Soviet Union. At least we have been sensible enough this year to sell them grain. But it isn't only the United States Government. You remember it was our Long Shoremen who refused to load ships going to the Soviet Union. So, it is not only the government, it's also other agencies of our American life. But as to which comes first, Eastern Europe or the Soviet Union, that's a matter of how we handle it and how they handle it. It's rather hard to say. I would think, by and large, the Eastern Europeans and certainly Yugoslavia tend to want to do more business with the West, so they won't be so dependent upon the Soviet Union, and that is a factor which would work toward your idea of, perhaps, doing more business with Eastern Europe. On the other hand, however, as I've said, these countries can get mostly everything they want from Europe or Japan, and we have to make an effort to sell our stuff, to prove it's better and also prove they can get it as rapidly, these deliveries are as good and the credit terms are as good.

QUESTION. First, a comment on the other side of this question of the straw man of Most Favored Nation. I have been for four years trying to buy some things in East Europe for my own company, United Fruit Company, and I find this is a deterrent. There are things we can buy there, but they cannot compete.

Mr. HARRIMAN. I'm glad to hear you say that because so many people think the reverse. I'm glad to hear you say that. I've been conscious that it is true. I'm pleased to know that you had that specific experience.

QUESTION. I may be the only exception in the room, but I do want to say that there is something on the other side that is restrictive to people who are trying to buy in East Europe. I do have a question. It's obvious from the talks that we have had so far that trade is so closely tied up with personal emotion, biases, beliefs and political ethics. My question is, despite this, what can we who are trying to get this trade going, both ways, do to encourage us until these political decisions are made?

Mr. HARRIMAN. I'm not sure that I can answer that. It's to encourage certain of the Congressmen not to think they get political kudos by being tough on trade. I think all citizens and majorities can have some influence—and I'm sure some of you can have a little more than a little bit of influence. I think the general attitude of business and business organizations will very much affect the political scene in this country. I think your visits to the Soviet Union and to other European countries are all very helpful in allaying suspicions. We have got to recognize that a very few of these men that are dealing with these matters in different countries have ever been abroad, and, certainly, few of them have come to the United States. When they do come, show them everything that you've got. I know that I've had trouble when I've got Russians to come over here. Certain industries, thinking they were being very patriotic, refused to show them everything that they show. I know this was true of coal mines, even. These seem small, but I think they are very important.

I want to go back a little bit to the question about releasing the Jews so that you don't misunderstand me. I feel very, very strongly—perhaps as strongly as anybody—about this failure of the Soviet Union—this putting a price on the educated Soviet Jews. And I certainly think this question of Most Favored Nation treatment that we have should be considered. But I would like to have our government deal with the Soviets

in the most vigorous manner to try to get changes made—the elimination of this price tag. And whether we get further announcing in advance we are not going to have Most Favored Nation, or whether we talk about it privately, are matters which I am not sufficiently close to have an opinion. Sometimes we injure ourselves by trying to knock the other fellow in the head. We get nothing for it. It's a question of astute negotiations and diplomacy, and I think the President has made great progress in the field of improved relations with the Soviet Union, and I wish him well in this particular aspect. I think there is a clear need to get a change. I'm only saying this so that I won't give any impression that I'm opposed to the fullest pressure. For anybody who thinks that automatically withholding Most Favored Nation will get it changed, I'm not very optimistic about that heavy-handed method.

QUESTION. Mr. Ambassador, I can't agree with you more that the lack of Most Favored Nation clause is the main stumbling block for total understanding with the Soviet Union as far as trade is concerned. Until we have it, we cannot barter, we cannot switch, we cannot exchange our goods or commodities for theirs.

Mr. HARRIMAN. I want to say that these are human beings you are dealing with. Unless you've dealt with the Soviet Union . . . I've dealt with them, as I say, since the middle '20s. I saw Trotsky and I've seen all the leaders since. They're human beings; they are affected as we are, as you are, as the people you deal with in business. If we think about them more in that way and less as some strange kind of mechanical brain or beast, we'll get further with them. We ought to be able to adjust ourselves somewhat better. We do it as individuals when we are dealing with them, but not as a nation, so far.

QUESTION. Governor, what can you do about your friend George Meany and the Labor movement in this country? They seem to be moving in the wrong direction.

Mr. HARRISON. You had better talk to George Meany about that. [Laughter.]

QUESTION. Ambassador, I'm a little concerned about some of the things coming out of this discussion. We seem to take the attitude that we can sell to the Russians and then tell them what they may or may not do with it.

Mr. HARRIMAN. I don't know why you suggest, I've never said what they may or may not do with it. To the war we gave them dredges at a great sacrifice to ourselves in war in order to open up ports. And when we found those dredges being used in gold fields, it didn't encourage certain people who saw it to feel that they were making good use of our Lend-lease. I can assure you that, on balance, they made extraordinarily good use of our Lend-lease—the food as well as the military equipment.

QUESTION. Over the years our commercial thinking has been characterized by on and off thinking, the Spirit of Glassboro, the spirit of this, the spirit of that; in the meantime we get to Berlin, Czechoslavakia. Do you feel we're in an historical place where there is a really neutral meeting of minds? One which will last for a while.

Mr. HARRIMAN. That's a lot of guessing.

I know one of the things that I learned first when I went to Russia, one fellow was a Texan who'd been to the Soviet Union—there'd been very few businessmen—I asked him what was going to happen. He said, "Well, I think about the Soviet Union and the way we do about people that come down to Texas and predict the weather. We've learned in Texas that you can't predict the weather and therefore, I'm very careful about predicting what's going to happen in the Soviet Union." I think that part of the on and off business has been changes in personalities on the American scene. They are apt to be more consistent than we are. But there was a change between Khrushchev and Stalin, which it took us some time to take advantage of. The Test Ban agreement was the first one of importance, in June of 1963. But then there has been somewhat of a tightening up since that time. I judge external affairs somewhat by what's happening internally; this is a tightening up of controls internally and therefore they may be appearing as somewhat tightening in their relations with foreigners. The problem is on and off which you speak of. The actual trade has been very little, if any. The on and off has been rather more in political terms than in trade terms. I would hope that President Nixon's initiative, his visit to the Soviet Union this time and the other negotiations that have been going on, including Mr. Peterson's visit, will contribute to a stabilizing of our trade relations. If we could get our trade relations out of the political scene and get it more on an economic plane, I think it would be better for us all around. The end to the war in Vietnam will vastly contribute to the improvement of mutual feeling between our two countries; that includes all the communist countries.

QUESTION. I would like to refer once more to these fees for leaving the Soviet Union by the Jews. Why don't we look more at the motives behind the Soviet Union. I would think it is a brain drain they are trying to prevent. I certainly don't think they are doing it in order to complicate their relations with the rest of the world, and the United States in particular. I've seen countries, England, for example, that were very concerned about the brain drain of doctors or the nurse drain. In a country like Singapore, if you hire a young Singaporian who received his education at the expense of the Singapore Government, he had to buy his way out if he wanted to come into private industry.

Mr. HARRIMAN. There is a friend of mine who was in the Soviet Union and did get a chance to talk to different people privately and, you have to be rather skillful in finding a place to do it. But there is some indication that a brain drain was involved in this and they didn't realize the uproar that would happen. I'm not sure whether that's true or not, but, as you well know, there is a substantially greater percentage of the Jews who are in high scientific positions than the percentage of Jews in the population.

And it may be that doesn't sound very consistent in some ways, because when a man, a Jew scientist in Russia, applies for a visa, he's taken off his job. I was told that was done in order to stop other people from applying. I was told also that this was because they were afraid that if they wanted to go to Israel, they were no longer trustworthy. Well, if any of these are true, I don't know. It is conceivable that this is to protect against a brain drain. It's a very heavy-handed and stupid way to do it. And I think quietly they should be told, quietly you can say all sorts of very blunt and frank things. It's not that they want to protect the brain drain, they're not going to let all the Soviet Union Jews leave the Soviet Union all at once, and they could handle it in some other way. But I don't think that just stopping trade in itself, although I think the talk about it may have some value, it may impress upon them the damage they're doing to their international image. So I don't condemn it.

Well, thank you all very much and I do want to congratulate all of you for joining, for the first place the organizers of this meeting, and continued work you're going to do. I think it is very important that the business community, as well as the intellectual community should get a good, solid, sensible nonchangeable attitude towards East-West trade, and that will help our political scene which has been rather mercurial. I thank you very much for what you're doing and good luck to you. [Applause.]

DEAN CHRISTENSON. Governor Harriman, we're deeply grateful for your insights and personal experience and your judgment as we move into the deliberations on extending this Council.

Our next speaker is Samuel Pisar, whose background and experience make him a valuable and appropriate speaker on the developments in the East. Mr. Pisar is a prominent international lawyer and counsel to multinational corporations and banks. He is the author of a widely-acclaimed book entitled, "Coexistence in Commerce: Guidelines for Transactions Between East and West." Mr. Pisar. [Applause.]

Mr. PISAR. Mr. Christenson, it takes a great deal of humility to try to speak after two such distinguished historical figures as Mr. Eaton and Mr. Harriman. And I have that humility. I will not at all try to speak at ther level, but to shift gears to the practical plane. I believe that this is what is expected of me, to give you a few insights into what is going on today and what will be happening in the near future in East-West business relations. As a matter of fact, I come here directly from Moscow, except that I stopped in Paris briefly to say hello to my family. I've been to Moscow three times in the last month. I have participated in discussions about LNG, about fertilizers, about metals, about construction of trade centers, about turn-key plants and also about the problems that exist before any such huge deals can be consummated.

It's particularly interesting to hear Governor Harriman's comments about the problem of what is strategic and what is not strategic and what should be sold and what shouldn't be sold. One of the best insights on this subject was provided, again, by Mr. Khrushchev. He not only said, "Those who don't want to trade want war," and obviously exaggerated. He also said that the United States is far too liberal in its strategic policy as far as trade is concerned.

"One of the most important items the United States should promptly embargo," he said, "were normal buttons, because if the United States sold buttons to Russia and if the Red Army had buttons in its pants, it would be able to aim its rifle with two hands instead of one." [Laughter.]

As a practitioner, I see a real revolution taking place in East-West economic relations. Somehow, for businessmen on both sides, it has become instant "Love Story." And let us pray that this time, there will not be a quick and unhappy ending, because there are still many political problems that remain to be resolved and some emotional problems as well. Now, I would have not alluded to the link between East-West trade and the Jewish problem in Russia were it not for Senator Harris' comments this morning, comments in which he tried to qualify me as having unusual credentials on both issues. That I have spoken out in favor of East-West trade is known. Another subject about which I hardly ever talk at all is my own past during the war in Germany, as a child and in a context of racial persecution.

The question is not a new one. It has been effervescing in Russia for a long time and it is an oversimplification to call it Anti-semitism. During the time of Stalin it bubbled even more than it bubbles today.

I have travelled with Senator Javits to the Soviet Union for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress; and everything that he did in my presence or said was designed to promote East-West trade and peaceful coexistence. Recently, I was chairman of the East-West Industrial Corporation Conference in Budapest. I invited my friend Abe Ribicoff to give the keynote address. Senator Ribicoff came to Budapest and, again, everything he said privately or publicly was designed to further East-West trade. Now, these two men and many others, are torn by another dilemma. Yesterday, the Senate has

spoken on the subject. The Soviets have not completely defined their attitude on it. The lines are not clearly drawn and I don't think anyone has dug in yet. From my personal observations, I believe that the present leaders of Soviet Russia are reasonable men, and they are beginning to apply increasingly reasonable policies. Let us hope that East-West trade and the Jews will not be casualties of this new controversy that is shaping up and that is so mixed up with emotional overtones.

Now, I would like to go to constructive matters. My immediate concern is with the great opportunities and the great problems that exist in East-West trade at the practical level. At the level of those that have to do business on both sides—and here there is a strange thing happening. Now that both sides have started to clear away the thick underbrush of discriminations, restrictions, and prohibitions, we suddenly wake up to a new fact of life. We were so preoccupied with Cold War tensions, that we forgot to focus on the very basic and important problem of how a state enterprise society, such as the Soviet Union, China and Eastern Europe, can conduct stable, mutually advantageous trade with a private enterprise society such as the United States, Japan and Western Europe. For decades those who were trying to do that trade were doing it on a catch-as-catch-can basis. They were improvising. And here our allies in Western Europe and in Japan, through experience, have far outdistanced their American competitors.

But if we're really talking about a major increase in East-West trade, we're talking about joint ventures and turn-key plants. It becomes very urgent to develop institutions, to develop procedures that could enable businessmen to operate effectively in an improving political climate, given the problems that exist and that will permanently exist, because of the two different economic systems. Because they will no more dismantle their economic system than we will dismantle ours. We are condemned to coexistence with these different types of institutions, procedures and business habits, and there are no ground rules to guide us as we're beginning to shape the new ventures that I have recently seen negotiated in Moscow, and Budapest and Warsaw and so on.

Now, that interest in trade today is genuine and mutual, is obvious. For the first time since the Bolshevik Revolution, 55 years ago, the Soviet Union is not only talking about more trade, but about a new variety of sophisticated transactions which include licenses, sales of know-how, various forms of corporate ventures, as well as cooperation for mutual profit in third countries. In Eastern Europe, Communist state enterprises, and in Western Europe, capitalist private enterprises are forming joint companies in Switzerland, in Luxembourg and in the Bahamas with jointly constituted Boards of Directors, and jointly selected management. And the purpose of these companies is to establish an efficient production line, an efficient distribution system, and, most of all, to make a profit.

Now, when you start building this type of a web, industry to industry, company to company, businessman to businessman, you are not only building roots for greater prosperity, but you're also building roots for peace. Most surprising of all, even Communist China, which ten years ago had eighty percent of its trade with the communist camp, today has eighty percent of its trade already with the capitalist world. It has literally reversed the entire course of its foreign commerce, and we can get into the reasons for it and the opportunities for it in the question period if you wish.

Now, for the West, the problems are similar. The Western economy is becoming a little bit congested. It is being overwrought by competition, over-saturated in many sectors. The Communist World offers a new frontier, populated with the kind of human needs that existed in Western Europe after the Second World War at the time of the Marshall Plan that Governor Harriman has been talking about. Here you have an equation on both sides, and what we are really witnessing is a dramatic reversal of policy on each side.

For the United States, this has very important implications. What it means is that after twenty-five years of embargo, which really prevented any form of meaningful trade with Russia, China and their respective allies, we are now adding to our market one-third of mankind. It's a very startling and very potent fact. The European Economic Community, the Common Market, today enjoys $10 billion worth of trade with the East, twenty-five times as much as the United States, and the United States economy is approximately twice as large as the economy of the European Common Market.

There is really no reason in the world today—and obviously we must remain vigilant and strong, and worry about security—but for the reasons that have been explained with such extraordinary authority and experience by Mr. Eaton and Mr. Harriman, it seems to me there is no reason in the world why the United States cannot look forward to having at least half that amount of trade, $5 billion per annum, in a few years from now. And this would be more than twenty times more than what we have been enjoying in the last few decades.

To go back to the main theme that I'm asking you to consider, we've got to build new procedures and new institutions for East-West commerce, because with all the problems that have prevented trade have come from political hostility. And it is also a myth that the Communist countries don't observe contracts or don't respect commercial custom or the rule of law. The best commercial paper, the best banking paper you can find today in the capital markets of Europe, are promissory notes and letters of credit issued by Communist banks. They have accumulated an impressive record of honest and reliable dealings, and this is true of Eastern Europe, of Russia, and even of China.

But the kind of problems that I would like to talk to you about now are not the banal problems that we have re-hashed over and over again in the last few years, such as should we give them Most Favored Nation, should we give them credits, should we lower our strategic criteria. These problems exist. There are also problems of this type on the other side. How do you do business in a Communist economy that is so typically secretive?

You really have no way of going in and estimating your market. You cannot open an office. You cannot easily attend to the maintenance of your product. You can not protect your industrial property. You can register a patent. But you cannot expect that you are going to do business in the very near future in the Soviet Union, in China and in Eastern Europe in the same way that you have been doing business in Western Europe. You are entering a strange economy that has its own way of doing things even though it is reforming and to some extent decentralizing. And while it is no longer necessary in all cases to deal through a central government-operated purchasing or selling monopoly that stands in front of that market like a watchdog, things are gradually changing. The fact is that for many, many years, maybe even for a century, you as capitalists will have to deal with the other side as Communists and you will have to learn new habits and new ways of doing things, and that is going to come as something of a shock and, I believe, a healthy shock.

To be a little more practical and specific, there's a great deal of interest here in industrial projects and joint ventures, and we read about it every day. There are not going to be, in the foreseeable future, in my opinion, joint ventures between American and Soviet companies, the way you understand joint ventures. Yugoslavia already allows a capitalist company to buy into the equity of a Yugoslav company. Rumania has changed their law last year and is also beginning to allow the same thing. And I think Hungary will probably be next. These are very limited things. These smaller countries are testing their way. They are looking over the shoulder to see how Russia is reacting.

The Soviet Union is also willing to go in this direction, but very slowly and very conservatively. I was in the Soviet Union last year with several Americans, including David Rockefeller of Chase Manhattan Bank. And at a meeting with Mr. Kosygin, the word "joint venture" was pronounced for the first time. And Mr. Rockefeller asked him, "Mr. Prime Minister, if we are to recommend to American companies to enter into joint ventures, we would have to show them how they can make a profit. We couldn't expect them to risk the shareholders' money for nothing." And Kosygin replied, "Of course they have to make a profit; who's ever heard of doing business without the expectation of profit." Now, the question, therefore, is how to do it, because Marx and Lenin said that you cannot have capitalist exploitation in a Communist society. And no matter how reasonable the Russians become, they are still a long way away from sacrificing this principle.

What is needed is to develop new devices, euphemistic devices that enable each side to accomplish the purpose that each side has, because the Soviet businessman who has to fulfill a certain job, who has to run a plant or who has to satisfy the economic plan, is not a Party hack or a demagogue. He has to get a job done, and he worries about practical things—"If I can't do it this way, maybe I can do it that way." So, the art, here, is how to develop ways of doing things without offending the Communist scriptures. I'd like to give you a few examples.

Let us assume that you will not have a right to buy equity in a Soviet corporation that builds a plant, that builds a hotel or that operates a farm. But if you think about it, there is no reason why such a plant cannot be built jointly. There is no reason why a company cannot be established in Switzerland, maybe even on a 50–50 equity basis—and the Russians have done this with the French and the Germans and the British, the Ethiopians and many others—whereby that company has a contract with the plant in the Soviet Union that is owned by the Soviet state, but, instead of giving you your shares of profit from the plant, you get it under a price structure that is agreed by contract between that Swiss company and the Soviet plant. And, depending on how that price structure is, you can make a profit in Switzerland for both partners. And there is nothing in Marxist-Leninist scriptures that prevents this type of activity.

Second example. There is absolutely no way to own socialist means of production in the name of a blood-thirsty capitalist company. But there is a way, perhaps, of getting around it. Suppose you send in heavy equipment and you transfer the title to a Soviet state corporation. Now it is the owner, and Marx and Lenin can sleep peacefully wherever they are. But there is nothing to prevent you, possibly, from taking a leaseback for ten years and maybe for twenty years. And under the terms of the lease, you are not the owner, but you have the control of the equipment and you can manufacture with the Russians and perhaps sell locally and sell in export.

There is no way in which you can control a Board of Directors in a Communist country, because that is against the law, and against the philosophy. But whatever goes for a Board of Directors in a Communist country, doesn't really have that much authority and those on it don't really know how to run a modern business in a compet-

itive world economy. It may just be that there is nothing to prevent you in the years to come from writing a careful management contract and establishing under the management contract an executive committee, an advisory committee, a technical committee—call it what you like.

And I don't remember Marx and Lenin saying anything about such a committee or that foreigners cannot have a majority of it. Because it has no constitutional power. But on a day-to-day basis, while the plant is being put into operation, while it is built and even while it is operating, the real power can be held by that committee while the ostensible, or formal power, is held by some Board of Directors that doesn't have much to say and isn't much interested anyway. Because, ultimately, the state itself controls everything. If it ever became state policy to stop this type of business, it could be stopped. And I'm not saying this to trouble, I believe the Communist countries are probably among the safest to do business in. If you look at what is happening in all these less developed countries, you really take your life in your hands if you decide to invest. But in Russia and in Rumania and Poland and China, no one is going to nationalize you. It's already been done and you know exactly where you stand and you start on a very, very healthy basis. Maybe one more example.

You cannot have dividends. You can see the logic. It would mean exploiting Communist labor. Nor can you have a profit participation. And there is a gentleman in the back of this room who is smiling as I say these words, Mr. Cyrus Eaton, Jr., who has gone through these exercises with me on a few occasions, particularly when we negotiated. I might as well reveal it because it's been written about—the Pan-American-Intercontinental Hotels in Hungary and in Rumania and in other countries. You cannot have dividends because they won't let you have equity. You cannot have a profit participation, but there is nothing to prevent you from obtaining a royalty payment. There is nothing to prevent you from obtaining engineering fees. There is nothing to prevent you from earning interest, because these things have not been ruled taboo by Marx and Lenin.

As a matter of fact, I remember a closing where those who were with me would have been satisfied with an equity participation, or with a profit participation—twenty-five percent of the Communist company and that would have done it. But that was not possible. So, in the end, they refused us profit participation, they refused us equity and they gave us a royalty, a percentage of the gross. Now, who needs equity and who needs profits if you can have a percentage of the gross, which is the cream off the top? You couldn't care less if they are making a profit or a loss in operating whatever it is that you helped them build.

They've paid the penalty, because the system is so organized that they couldn't give you the thing that would be more advantageous to them. They have to give you something that was much more valuable because the dogma didn't allow any other solution. As a matter of fact, I remember the evening of one closing where a minister turned around and proposed one of those interminable toasts in our direction and said, "You know, you got away with murder. I wish Marx and Lenin had kept their mouths shut."

We are in a stage today, when you watch at the negotiating level where it all happens and not by reading about it or by looking at it in the intensely political and emotional terms to which we've been used in the last twenty-five years. When you look at it in low key, you see that there are pragmatic people on each side, that they are trying to do the job. And that the Communist negotiator really goes half-way to meet the capitalist negotiator. And often he doesn't know how, because he hasn't been exposed to the outside market. He's been in a rigid bureaucratic system. So, you have to show him how he should do it, so as not only to accomplish your purpose and his, but so as to protect his skin and not create any problems and not violate any laws or any Communist Party directives. And as this process goes on, almost invariably, pragmatism triumphs over dogma.

Now, I'll repeat, it would be unrealistic to expect these countries to change their system, change their institutions as a condition of increased trade.—They won't do it. And, obviously, we're not going to change ours. So, these new ways of doing things, these ground rules I'm talking about, become a very urgent matter. And the only way in which those ground rules can be developed, is through negotiation. In my opinion, the best place to negotiate such ground rules is in the Joint Commercial Commission that President Nixon and Secretary Brezhnev established in Moscow last May. This Commission is now getting down to work in Washington. I believe it is a "sleeper." You will see a lot of hullabaloo about commercial agreements. Lend-lease settlements, maritime agreements and all of these state-to-state negotiations that are difficult, that are loaded politically and they may not be quite as important as we all think because all we do is change the climate a little bit.

The real action will be when the business people on both sides . . . all the officials who have been concerned with giving the business people the rules and the framework in which to work, when they buckle down and start meeting these problems that I am talking about. And it is logical that the best body for building ground rules between state enterprise and private enterprise societies should be a Soviet-American Commission. Because here you have the two poles of the two systems—America is the pole of private enterprise and Russia is the pole of state enterprise.

I am very optimistic about the prospect of East-West trade. I have made the analogy with "Love Story"; and while there are dangers, while there are doubts, while there are legitimate concerns, I think we are moving toward a form of reasonableness on each side. And in this dialogue about trade and technology and agriculture, we will develop habits for solving even more important problems as well. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Pisar. We have some time for questions. I was going to say that as a representative from the academic community and as a Dean, I'm supposed to be slightly philosophical, quite aloof, and offer some perspective. Well, I only have one to offer and that came out of my talk with, when I was a special assistant in the Secretary's office in Commerce—we had a trade delegation here from Czechoslavakia and this was in the early days when we were also trying to get East-West trade moving and we had endless task forces to put it together.

But this delegation couldn't understand how to deal with the profit system of private enterprise. And in the course of conversation, it struck me that the state trading agencies in the Communist countries are really very much capitalists.

So, that if I could get across to this guy that dealing with private enterprise was like dealing with a state system like his neighbor Rumania or Bulgaria or Yugoslavia, that would be a very appropriate thing to do. And what I've learned from that is that if in dealing with the Soviet Union or an Eastern European country, you imagine yourself dealing with General Electric you'll be very successful indeed. Now we'll entertain questions.

QUESTION. Dr Pisar, you mention a case of lease-back; has there been one? Has the precedent been created of a lease-back of American machinery sold to the Soviet state enterprise and leased back by an American firm? . . . In the field of heavy industry?

Mr. PISAR. No such arrangement has been closed to my knowledge. It has been negotiated and is being negotiated. But there are a few precedents, not in the field of entire plants, but in the field of certain types of equipment. There are precedents already, in the here and now, in some of the smaller East European countries. In the Soviet Union there are such transactions being negotiated now. Of course the difficulty is that, in the whole field of leasing, it may just so happen that you have to repossess, and then, it's very difficult to send in the Marines. But the way it usually works is that you have other compensations. For example, you can have, when the Communist side is the lessee, a guarantee from the Foreign Trade Bank, that the rent will be paid regularly, so that you don't have to worry about repossessing. But my example was more in terms of the Western party supplying the equipment, and being the lessee.

QUESTION. But we're the Western party, and releasing the equipment. Are we allowed to operate it?

Mr. PISAR. The deal would be, the whole purpose of the lease would be, for the Western side to be the lessee, and to either operate, or to help operate the equipment. Otherwise there wouldn't be any reason for the transaction. And once the term of the operation is over, the residue of the lease would revert to the Soviet government. This is the logic of all of these transactions, even the LNG, which is still being negotiated. But there was a precedent, which has been signed, the Japanese have signed, in 1968, for the development of the Siberian timber industry. There you have transactions where the Japanese are sending in equipment, sending in engineers and know-how, and jointly, with the Russians, exploiting the timber of Siberia, first to pay off the investment, and then, to make a joint profit. And of course, after a number of years, maybe as long as thirty years, Siberia reverts back to the Soviet Union.

DEAN FISHER. Because of roll-call votes in the Senate, Mondale and Javits will be delayed a few minutes. We thought that while we await their arrival we would call upon Dr. William W. Whitson, President of Cathay Corporation and editor of "American Opportunities for Doing Business in China in the 1970's" to discuss briefly some aspects of the problems and prospects of trade with China.

Dr. WHITSON. Before a group with the international trading experience represented by the several hundred corporate executives assembled here today, I need not dwell on the significance of East-West trade, nor its departure from premises and routines of the past. Indeed, in the fifteen minutes available, such an emphasis would steal too much time from a more important question; namely, the immediate role of China trade in this new era.

I would like to make three points which I will label "How Fast?", "The Name of the Game" and "Who Sells to China?". How fast will China trade grow? Answers to this question abound and range from the very pessimistic to the very optimistic. The pessimists tell us that trade controls, foreign exchange shortages, politics and especially the politics of the two Chinas and a revival of the fear of "cheap Oriental labor" will keep China trade to a very low volume over the next decade, a turnaround Sino-American trade volume of $100 million by 1980 being very optimistic. Conversely, others argue that a turnaround trade of $400 million should not be surprising by then. If we recall that total trade (through third countries) in 1971 did not exceed $1 million, the growth in the first six months of 1972 to more than $11 million (not including the Boeing deal) sets a pace which cannot possibly be sustained indefinitely.

Certainly many problems must surround the revival of a set of commercial relationships which have been dormant for more than twenty years. But it is my conviction that the greatest problem of all, more important than tariff barriers, foreign exchange problems, MFN, shipping restrictions, credit guarantees, and a maze of legal and commercial procedures, is the shortage of reliable information about the market. The name of the game in Sino-American trade today is Information. Aside from a few special deals such as the RCA and Boeing sales, most manufacturers in the United States will remain justifiably cautious about investing in China trade until they have learned a great deal more about that market and the men with whom they must deal. Whether or not American companies should ever attempt to trade with the People's Republic is a corporate strategic decision that deserves a small but very important investment.

In the early days of the opening to China, some corporate executives flew to Hong Kong, expecting a red-carpet welcome. With rare exception, they found that there was no welcome at all. For the Chinese also needed—and still need—to assess this new era from the very pragmatic viewpoint of their own needs. Thus, a second ingredient in the current situation is the mutual Sino-American need for confidence. In a context of slowly developing trade volume, what is happening today is the creation of a new structure of human relations, as much at the individual and personal as at the institutional level. China has had considerable experience in trading with Europeans, who have taught them that the western businessman is capable of cheating. Almost puritanical in their own approach to agreements and their implementation, the Chinese do not intend to be cheated by fast-talking, super-selling American entrepreneurs. Therefore, in addition to a demand for precise specifications on product-line, the Chinese desire human specifications; that is, they wish to know and trust the men with whom they will be dealing. It is the process of building a structure of trust that we are now engaged in—a process which must frequently draw on noncommercial relationships for sustenance.

Indeed, the combination of the two questions of pace and the name of the current game underscores their mutual dependence. The rate of growth of Sino-American trade is very deeply dependent on the gestation period of this information phase. Our earliest experiments in actual trade contracts must be perceived as important primarily as tests of trust. If a Chinese contract to deliver a small amount of porcelains or shrimp or processed foods repeatedly goes astray, there will be a natural American reluctance to enter into much more complex and costly arrangements. The real game today—and for the next two to three years—will therefore be one of structuring a flow of reliable information about the two markets. Chinese and American, and identifying the key people who can bridge the differing procedures and perspectives of those markets.

My last point concerns selling to China. No amount of high pressure salesmanship is likely to impress the Chinese as much as the virtue of patience. On balance, Americans will not sell to China. China will buy from Americans. The decision to buy specific American products in such important fields as agri-industry, high technology electronics, pharmaceuticals, petrochemicals and management technology will demand lengthy analysis in the relevant Chinese ministry. Price will often be the deciding factor; but sometimes politics or quality may take priority over price. American businessmen must be prepared for surprises, therefore. And they must be prepared for long delays, occasioned by *both* American as well as Chinese governmental bureaucratic inertia.

While all this waiting is consuming time, the corporate executive might continue to address the question, "Should we deal directly with the Chinese or use an agent?" Sooner or later, direct negotiating will be possible. But the answer to that question, even after direct relations become "normal," must be guided by costs. For a long time, relatively small companies will find it much more inexpensive to employ an experienced consultant initially to help in deciding whether and how to approach the China market. Then, if trade seems probable, if the product-line promises Chinese interest, an agent will probably be cheaper than hiring a full-time China hand or spending the executive time in travel back and forth between the United States and China for negotiations. Therefore, this phase of Sino-American trade would appear to be the heyday of the middleman. The Chinese understand the middleman and are quite prepared to use his services. Indeed, in many instances, they prefer to use the middleman simply because he can minimize delays and misunderstandings. But China trade today has already spawned so many middlemen, all self-styled experts on the Chinese and China, that some rationality is needed in searching for accurate information.

It is to that purpose that I hope the East-West Trade Council will dedicate its energies, insofar as China trade is concerned. Members of the Council will have every right to demand help in finding good advisors and good advice through the good offices of the Council. If this assemblage is any measure of managerial sophistication, I am confident that, with your support, the Council will meet that challenge. Thank you.

DEAN FISHER. Our next speakers need little introduction to those persons interested in broadened East-West trade.

Senator Mondale is Chairman of the Subcommittee on International Finance of the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee. Major legislation such as the export administration act and legislation affecting the EX–IM bank passes through his committee. He has been instrumental in loosening rigid U.S. export control policies and increasing opportunities for U.S. exports to the countries of Eastern Europe. He has a distinguished reputation in his Committee and on the Senate floor as a man who knows inside and out the problems of U.S. trade relations. He is dedicated to the principle that the U.S. can only gain from an increased volume of trade with the Eastern countries. It is our great pleasure to have him with us today to discuss legislative trends in East-West trade. Senator Mondale—

Senator MONDALE. As some of you may know, I have been interested for some years in a far more rational and modern U.S. policy on East-West trade. When I came to the Senate in 1964, we were still locked in the old Joe Stalin-Cold War philosophy and we were hemmed in by a host of laws that closed any hope for progress even when companies wished to seek meaningful business opportunities in Eastern Europe on a non-strategic, peaceful basis.

A trip to Eastern Europe early in 1968 convinced me that the policies of our country were self-defeating. The practice of foreclosing trade with Eastern Europe in non-strategic peaceful matters did not in any way affect the public policies or directions of the Soviet Union or of any of the countries of Eastern Europe.

As a matter of fact, I came to the conclusions that our policies were really making us the laughing stock of intelligent businessmen around the world. I was particularly impressed by one top French Government trade official, who pleaded with me to make certain that our country pursued restrictionist policies for at least five more years—until the French managed to secure a bigger share of the market.

There has been a substantial change, since that time, in the underlying laws which govern trade into Eastern Europe by U.S. companies and I have been privileged to be part of that change. Just as important, there has been a fundamental, indeed radical, change in the public environment in this country. Three or four years ago, the barriers to the U.S. businesses in Eastern Europe consisted of a series of very restrictive laws conservatively administered. And there was also a psychological environment that seriously inhibited trade potential by raising substantial doubts about the patriotism of any company with the audacity to participate in East-West trade.

In the last few years, these factors have changed dramatically. And I would hope that the trade statistics, which are now starting to move upward, will continue to reflect that change.

The first series of changes dealt with the export control act. The old export control system—and the word *control* had critical significance—loaded the dice legally against any trade into Eastern Europe. If that trade had any economic potential to the purchasing nation, it was supposed to be denied, although one wonders why any nation would engage in trade that did not have some economic potential.

The Act was administered in almost the same spirit. The amount of trade into Eastern Europe was nothing more than a meaningless trickle, even though trade from other free world sources was beginning to rise dramatically.

Over the objections of the Administration, which wanted to make certain we kept the Communists on their knees, we passed an Act in 1969 that changed the philosophy from one of trade restriction to one of trade expansion.

We dropped the control language and talked instead about export *administration*. Furthermore, this 1969 Act contained very strong Congressional endorsement of the principle of peaceful trade with Eastern European countries. The Act declared that trade with Eastern Europe was valuable, was to be supported, and was in the national interest. The Act was intended to deal with both the legal problems of East-West Trade and the inhibiting psychological environment surrounding East-West Trade.

The Act also sought to deal with the absurd situation which required U.S. unilateral controls on items that were freely available at that time from other sources—Great Britain, France, Western Germany, Italy, Japan and elsewhere. It sought to require the Export Administration Office to achieve a realistic reconciliation of our control policies with the trade environment of 1969, and of the past 3 years.

The Act passed, as you know, and there has been important, yet very cautious, movement in the administration of that Act since 1969.

One of the problems has been, and in my opinion continues to be, that the Export Administration Office is really governed by a series of departmental representatives from the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the State, Commerce, Agriculture and other Departments. It is a floating committee determined by the kind of item for which export licensing is being sought. When decisions are made, the incentives are always conservative. The safest action on any controversial item is either to refuse the license; or if it is a hot item, to keep studying it until the prospective deal has soured. Then no one has to decide anything.

We have tried to develop new standards for a more balanced treatment of export control applications. The forward-looking mood of the Congress is now clearly reflected in the latest extension of the Export Administration Act.

This Act goes beyond the 1969 legislation,

requiring a careful accounting from the Secretary of Commerce on the export items that remain subject to unilateral control. The new Equal Export Opportunity Act states, far more explicitly than the 1969 Act, that the Congress expects the Commerce Department to move swiftly toward an export control policy which no longer places our businessmen at a competitive disadvantage compared to the businessmen from other countries.

For the first time, we have also established technical advisory committees, which we think and hope will better advise the Commerce Department in the establishment of more liberal programs.

These Committees will enable the Commerce Department to understand better the technical problems that businessmen face; lack of communication is sometimes a problem. The Committees should also provide some kind of a counter-force to the conservative tendencies which, as I mentioned before, we often find in many of the departments involved in export administration.

We have also hoped that the whole export administration process would become a little more public than it is.

I appreciate the fact that much of this information is classified. But it often happens that a businessman applies for an export license and the application is stalled somewhere. The applicant has no way of knowing whether it is stuck in the Defense Department or the Council or Arts and Humanities; and he simply does not know where to look if somebody, somewhere has raised serious objections to his request. We think it would be productive if businessmen were permitted swiftly and expeditiously to be heard by the Department and the personnel objecting to or delaying the applications.

It is my impression that the Commerce Department is moving. Whether the movement is as fast as it should be, I am not prepared to say. But it is clear that they are moving in the direction of de-controlling items. In the third quarter of 1972, metal-cutting and metal-working machines, machine tools, certain mass spectographs and spectrometers, certain electronic systems, certain grain and sorghum seeds were all de-controlled. And I am hopeful that we will see more dramatic movement in this decision.

In addition to the export administrating procedures, we had to deal with the problem of non-availability of credits into Eastern Europe.

As you know, for many years we had the so-called Fino Amendment, which prevented any country in Eastern Europe from receiving the benefit of U.S. credits or guarantees if that country in turn was in any way supplying North Vietnam. Many of the countries in Eastern Europe had only marginal, nominal involvement in that war. Yet under the strict terms of the Fino Amendment, there was no possibility of extending credits to any of these countries except Yugoslavia.

Here again we came up against the same dilemma that the unilateral export controls created. The refusal of the U.S. to participate in credit extension meant that other countries with exim type banks were able to extend credits. Consequently, businessmen in these countries were in a position to compete far more successfully in East European markets than American businessmen.

The Export Expansion Finance Act of 1971, enacted last year, came out of the International Finance Subcommittee which I am privileged to chair. It repealed the Fino Amendment and authorized the President, when he determines it to be in the national interest, to extend exim credits to Communist countries.

It also established the principle, which has not yet been fully realized, that the exim bank should be administered on a truly competitive basis. We should not sit back in the administration of our bank and adhere to certain credit standards, terms and regulations that keep U.S. businessmen from competing successfully against businessmen from other countries who enjoy solid support from their own banks. I am hopeful that Presidential action, in accordance with the competitive principle recognized by the law, will enable us to make substantial progress in improving the competitive position of our businessmen.

And finally, the Act provided that the Exim bank make special efforts to see that small businessmen as well as large are able to make efficient use of exim facilities.

We're beginning to see the use of this new tool. We've clearly seen a significant expansion of trade with Rumania. We hope to see even more trade here as exim credits are approved. We have also seen other discussions of extension of U.S. credit into other countries, which I think have come about as a result of the measure.

Another problem, of course, was the old administrative regulation requiring 50–50 bottoms. This was a serious barrier to expanded East-West Trade—requiring, for example, that half of any U.S. grain shipped to Eastern Europe had to travel on U.S. flagships. This had the effect of driving the cost of U.S. grain up over what was then the world market price. At the same time, it did not provide a single U.S. ship or a single U.S. maritime union member with a single job. Now the 50–50 barrier no longer exists.

That, in summary, is the present situation in the laws dealing with export control and exim credits. If we are successful in achieving our goals, I think we will be able to reverse some of our serious balance of trade problems and also to provide employment opportunities for our people.

Perhaps, too, we will make real progress in lessening world tensions. By doing so, we will build a stronger foundation for real understanding and peace.

DEAN FISHER. Senator Mondale regrets that his estimate of the duration of Senator Kennedy's filibuster will not permit him to say. We'd like to express our appreciation to him for coming during a period when his own bill was under consideration. Thank you very much.

It's with a great deal of pleasure that we present to speak to us Senator Jacob Javits. He is undoubtedly one of the most knowledgeable men in the Senate on the topic of East-West trade, and so is particularly suited to discuss with us upcoming legislative efforts in that area. We are most pleased to have him with us—particularly since the Senate is on a tight schedule and votes are being taken all day today. Senator Javits—

Senator JAVITS. Thank you very much, Dean Fisher, Sam Pisar, and all the guests, whom I haven't met. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Secretary of Commerce is imminently due here. He, like myself, has left a negotiation—I have left the floor where we're voting every five minutes on the welfare bill. So, if you will forgive me, I'll let everything I've written stand, and I'll just say a few words about what the central thoughts are that I have in mind.

First, you've had a thorough briefing, I understand, on the effort on the Senate floor in which I have joined with Senator Jackson, Senator Ribicoff, Senator Humphrey and some almost seventy other Senators. And in discussing this subject, one must necessarily assume that a way will be found out of that situation, that it will not represent an impasse, and that we deal here in this context with the economic elements which are involved. And I shall do that. I will simply leave that question aside on the theory that we will find some way out of the impasse. It may be an impasse that will be insurmountable. If so, all talk is academic. But for this discussion, to make it meaningful, I will simply lay that aside. Secondly, I would like to thank very much my colleague, Fred Harris. I talked with the Majority Leader at lunch, for example—to give you some idea of what we thing of Fred—and he said, "Jack, I want you to go, tell me what you want held up and I'll hold it until you come back." So, I just want you to know that about Fred.

Now, any agreement, any trade agreement with the Soviet Union, will, as you know, involve very considerable restructuring of our trade legislation, not only Most Favored Nation, not only probably considerably more money for the Export-Import Bank, but probably new types of authority for the OPIC, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

Also, we will have to amend the Johnson Act and this is, again, a very real problem.

Now, the major point that I would like to make is that the one message that this teaches is that if the United States goes protectionist, if we're going the Hartke-Burke route, in our national economic system, then forget about East-West trade. It will be the first victim of a protectionist drift by the United States. If, on the other hand, the United States is going to continue to maintain its generally present policy—get tougher on anti-dumping and on seeing that others do for us what we do for them—and I'm all for that—and I'm including Japan, and we have a rather stiff backbone on an international monetary agreement, nothing that I've said compromises that situation. But if we go the protectionist route, then the first casualty is going to be East-West trade.

As next year will be the watershed year, I urge all those who believe as I do that East-West trade is critically important, not only to the economy of the world but to the peace of the world, to work toward better trade relations. And I go all the way, I'd love to see the Russians members of the World Bank, the Fund, every credit mechanism, full partners in international aid, I say let them have it—that's fine. If they want to give aid, good, there's nothing wrong with them. But if you want all of that in this new outlook for the world in the next three decades, so intimately tied to peace and nuclear arms reduction and the hope of reducing these overwhelming defense budgets, then you've got to fight diligently for the continuance of the outgoing trade policy of the United States. All the caveat, all the safeguards, all the get-tough you wish, but within the basic principles and rules that our country has laid down. If we go the protectionist route, it isn't anything you can do a little bit—you're going to go all the way—because the weight will be glacial and the first casualty, in my opinion, will be any hope for opening East-West trade. Thank you all very much.

DEAN FISHER. Thank you, Senator Javits, for taking time out of an obviously harassed and heavy schedule to come down here. We all appreciate it very much.

Ladies and Gentlemen, without any further ado, and here again on their theory that introductions are totally unnecessary, it's with a great deal of pleasure that I present the Secretary of Commerce of the United States. Mr. Secretary:

Secretary PETERSON. One question we are often asked is which comes first, foreign trade or foreign policy. There is the view, very widely held, that if the United States were to grant the Soviet Union most favored nations treatment more or less unilaterally, and also grant EXIM credit, we could then develop a more constructive set of accommodations in the foreign policy arena and those trade concessions would be the major cause of that accommodation.

All sorts of groups have recommended to the President that he trade first, as it were. The President's view, as must be obvious to all of you, is quite different from that. He has felt that he would like first to see evidence of political accommodation—we try to

avoid using the word linkage—but he would at least like first to see some evidence of accommodation.

Commerce can lead to further peace, but the decisive steps in the President's view should be as they have been, on the political and security front.

So it was no accident that it was only in the context of the political accommodations embodied in the SALT agreement that the President decided in May of this year to set up his Commercial Commission to negotiate and obviously in setting it up, he was acknowledging that the time had a trade agreement with the Soviet Union.

Having decided that the time had come, we then had the question of what kind of an agreement we should get, what we should be striving for. Many argued that what we should strive for was a rather straightforward, simple agreement. People suggested that we simply grant MFN, grant credit, and get down to business. If we had decided to do that, my life would have been a great deal simpler over the last few months, I'm sure.

Our view has been that if our commercial relationships are going to be satisfactory, and if we are to avoid important political problems later, our main task should be to build a comprehensive structure—and I would emphasize the word *comprehensive*—so that commercial disturbances that aren't anticipated don't end up sabotaging the political relationship, instead of making it better.

The President's instructions to me from the beginning have been to search for what we call a comprehensive understanding and not an understanding that simply says we're going to grant most favored nations treatment, grant credit, and then start doing business.

The President, better than anybody, knew that this kind of agreement would take more time and be much more difficult to negotiate. We have the question of lend-lease. Some ask what is the relationship between lend-lease and trade, and why should they be linked. Well if you are looking for a conceptual rationale, I think there is one. If what we are talking about here is new credits, there's a certain logic, I think, to the notion that countries should take care of their old credits, before they extended new ones. This is a very difficult, emotional, in many ways personal issue. I don't know how many of you have been to the Soviet Union. Anybody who has been to the Leningrad Cemetery, anybody who's reminded of the story of Tanya, anybody who remembers that they lost 20 million people in the war, can appreciate why it's an emotional issue. Also there's a lot of circularity in the cause and effects as there is always when we retrospectively try to understand the past. For example, one could argue that the reason they had not paid lend-lease was that most favored nations had not been offered, others could argue just the other way around. So there's a complex history here that's obviously deeply tied to the political relationship that our two countries have had post-World War II.

The second reason why we think this is an appropriate time to solve the lend-lease problem is a highly pragmatic one. If we can't settle this problem now, at a time when you are ready to consider making some constructive moves, what reason is there to believe we could solve it two, five, ten years from now. So the lend-lease issue has obviously been, and we're still negotiating this issue, a kind of an important foundation point.

Now we then get to what the specific issues are we're trying to work out. Most favored nations, of course, one.

The difficulties one has with most favored nations are in several areas.

In the first place, the reciprocal granting of most favored nations treatment by the Soviet Union and the United States is hardly a symmetrical act. Most favored nations in the context of a market system is obviously a different thing than most favored nations in the context of a country that is a state-trading monopoly. So to the extent that one views this as a concession, the reciprocal concession is not an equivalent one. You have that to consider as you negotiate.

Secondly, it is important to remember that the Soviet Union is not a member of any international trading organization, or monetary organization, as Senator Javits just reminded us, and that some of the forums we have for adjudicating problems do not include them. In fact, a lot of the legal structure we have for negotiating with other countries does not exist between our two countries. So that one must anticipate what he will do in the event of various kinds of problems.

Third, there is the important problem of what to do about potential dumping and potential market disruption. We've been very much interested in getting this problem satisfactorily resolved in advance for a variety of reasons. In the first place, those of you who've been to the Soviet Union know that costs have a very different meaning in their economy than they do in ours. Price as a mechanism has a very different meaning. I'll give you only one example—a young man that we were riding with one day was terribly exhilarated about something, and I asked him why he was so happy. "Well," he said, "I've just learned I'm going to get a car." Because of my American vantage point I had an image of a lot of different brands and a lot of different options and accessories and features and so forth. So I said, "what kind of a new car are you getting?" This young man said, "I'm not getting a new car, I'm getting a used car." And I said, "I see." And we got into the whole discussion of pricing.

I asked him what the price of this car was, and he indicated that the price of this car, which, as best I could understand, was what you might call a standard Fiat, of a few years vintage, was about $5,000. I said that seemed like a rather substantial amount for a car of that nature and asked him what they exported that car for. He said he thought the number was about $1,200.

Now clearly in their system, price can be seen as a way of reallocating resources. In that sense, it's not a profit mechanism as it is in the United States, but a social mechanism. So I think it's quite important that we anticipate now how we handle these potential market disruption problems—both because philosophically we are different economies and because with the Soviet Union we just don't have any of the conventional mechanisms we rely on in dealing with other countries. So a great deal of time has gone and is going into the question of what we mean by most favored nations and what are we going to do about this potential market disruption problem.

Now quite frankly, another reason why we want to get this problem solved now is the allusion of Senator Javits to potential protectionist legislation. It seems to us that if this problem is not satisfactorily handled, what was done sincerely is a way of moving toward a more open economic world, could be seen as a carrier device, as it were, for an infectious kind of protectionism that went way beyond the Soviet Union. And we think the time therefore to solve those problems is now, not after this legislation is presented to the Congress.

A second issue that we spent a lot of time on is the credit issue. The Soviet Union has an interesting view of credit, as some of you probably know. I discovered after a few months of negotiation that their favorite numbers were ten years and 2 percent. I've reminded them that I could understand that, but that it was very important for us to understand that, as a fundamental principle, the United States could, under no circumstances, engage in anything that could be called concessionary credit rates of any kind; and that, if credit was going to be made available, it would have to be on a completely non-discriminatory basis.

A second issue that we are negotiating still is the issue of reciprocal credit. Once again, we think it is important that we try to get these problems solved now, before we've made concessions rather than later when they may be much more difficult to solve. We're trying to get reciprocal credit so that American importers who want to have credit will know what the terms are, how they go about it and so forth.

Now we've had problems on something called business facilities. Some of my associates probably feel that I am putting too much emphasis on the need to do something in a substantial way about business facilities. Perhaps one of the reasons is that we are all victims or prisoners of our own environment, our own upbringing. As an American businessman, I recall the rather affluent way that most of us at high levels traveled, and the freedom we enjoyed. We want to be careful that the euphoria of a quickie deal does not cloud the fact that six months from now, or two years from now, or five years from now, you gentlemen, who are trading with the Soviet Union, will be less concerned about whether the agreement was signed last week or three months from now than about physical problems such as where you are going to stay, where you are going to have offices, how you are going to get telephones, and how you are going to handle communication.

These are problems that can be extraordinarily frustrating and have been extraordinarily frustrating to American businessmen in the Soviet Union. So we are now trying to negotiate an arrangement that will give us a substantial expansion of facilities and in addition to that, a clear idea notion of what the guidelines are by which business facilities and living facilities and communication facilities are granted.

At the governmental level, quite frankly, our resources on both sides have been inadequate. The Soviet Union, for 40 years, has been trying to get a commercial representation office in this country. I can tell you with feeling that that quest has not ended and we are now involved in some reciprocal negotiations that deal with what kind of expanded commercial representation for our government, we in turn may get in the Soviet Union.

The whole question of business disputes and how do you solve them—we think is an important issue to get resolved now. We think it would be unfortunate if American businessmen and/or the federal government were involved in a multi-million dollar transaction and then six months, a year or two years from now, find themselves in a dispute with no established procedures for handling the problem. The only mechanisms available now are Soviet arbitration courts. The Soviet Union understandably feels that their arbitration courts are very good. But I wonder whether you would feel comfortable with an arrangement in which your only recourse was Soviet arbitration courts if millions of dollars were involved. So there is that whole issue that is important. We've also had questions that are continuing to be negotiated in the field of taxes and patents and licenses and that whole part of what you could call a foundation for broadened commerce.

Now, it is amazing to me to talk to people across the country, who, when I ask them what they are concerned about with the Soviet Union, say the Soviets are going to flood our markets with all kinds of products, just the way the Japanese did. As a curious businessman, when I was in Moscow, I spent about three or four hours looking at the products. I started my business life in mar-

ket research, and I guess I couldn't get it out of my system. I went through six or seven stores just to look at prices, values and things of that sort.

As a refugee from the photographic business, I had for example, a particular interest in looking at the motion picture camera, and I can tell you that the products I saw in that field were characterized by being about four times heavier and four times larger, about five times as expensive, with about one/fifth the features that American products have. In short, distinctively uncompetitive in almost every dimension, and I could spend the rest of the afternoon, which I assure you I won't, giving anecdotes of that sort.

I think oddly enough the problem that we must face, and I use the word problem advisedly, is not a flood of imports but a dearth of imports. And the question that we are going to face is how we make this a viable business relationship in the sense that the Soviets can earn enough to buy the many things they want to buy from America. There isn't any question that with their meat objectives—increasing meat consumption—they are going to need more grain. You may not know something which I find quite a testimony to our system. In spite of many, many years of huge investments, the agricultural productivity of the Soviet Union still stands at only 11 percent of the United States', the same percentage as in 1955. Also, their industrial productivity was only 40 percent of ours in spite of capital investments that are greater than we are making in absolute terms, and much greater in relative terms. There are many, many things in the fields of agriculture, machine tools, capital equipment, all kinds of products that the Soviet Union wants. A more difficult question is what do we want? What is it that we can buy to make the relationship a viable one?

I had the interesting opportunity to spend about three hours with Mr. Brezhnev reviewing this whole relationship. You might be interested in what he thinks we can use. He probably spent about half his time talking about what he called the Soviet Union's vast treasure, their natural resources, which he said could last for generations to come and how at the highest level of the Soviet Union they had made a fundamental policy decision to make those resources available to the United States. But I think that it is in this whole area of raw materials, energy, where the important volume of trade is likely to take place in terms of from them to us—at least that would be my prognosis.

Now there will be some exceptions. The Soviet Union like any highly centralized economy, does very well when it focuses it resources, whether it be space, or military or steel or cement or power equipment. Their economy has an uneven quality to it, it seems to me, and there are certain sectors, a few, that they do very well in. But by and large, I think this raw material-energy area is where the big action is going to be.

Mr. Brezhnev, for example, mentioned a whole variety of such fields he would like to cooperate with us, but the field of gas was one that was obviously first in his mind. Now for those of you who are not gas experts, that includes your speaker, incidentally, in case any of you are being unnecessarily humble, let me give you a panorama of what we are talking about here.

The projects being discused are in Siberia, in western and eastern Siberia. These projects are going to have to be installed in permafrost conditions, which is a euphemism for 50/60 degrees below zero a good deal of the year. We are talking about pipelines that are three and four thousand miles long—in other words, more than the length of the United States. We are talking about 56-inch pipes, and that's a fair sized pipe. It will take an enormous amount of the other kinds of equipment that go with it for drilling, liquification, and so forth. Then this energy has to be transported—and what we're talking about here are supertankers, LNG supertankers, since it has to be transported in liquid forms; perhaps 125,000 or so cubic meters, which I understand is the range people are talking about. And it has to be carried 8,000 or 9,000 miles at about 250 degrees below zero. These ships already cost something like 80 to 90 million dollars apiece and one of these projects could take from 15 to 20 of such ships.

What I'm talking about is just in terms of the external investment of materials, and ships and products of various kinds. These projects could require capital input of $4 to $5 billion each and this doesn't even include the direct labor input from within the Soviet Union. Now when you look at projects of that magnitude and look at the EXIM bank whose largest outstanding credit to any single country is now about 1.2 billion, you see that when people talk about a new era, they know where they speak.

What we are talking about here are projects of the magnitude that the world has never really contemplated before and it is going to require innovative thinking, in my view, to solve those problems. But we're prepared to look at them very thoughtfully and at the same time we have to understand that this is part of a larger problem for the United States, the energy problem, about which we have to do a great deal of thinking. What are our alternatives on energy? What is the cost of energy going to be five to 10 years from now? What are the true national security aspects of getting what portions of our energy from what countries? Is it or is it not to our benefit to diversify our sources of energy. This whole question of energy will be intimately involved, I think, with the Soviet Union.

I think what I better do, Mr. Chairman, is kind of stop there, and take questions.

QUESTION. What is the status of the Maritime negotiations?

Mr. PETERSON. The Maritime negotiations, as we have felt, and I think it is still our view—are likely to be the first negotiations to be signed. I'm very amused to read editorials, particularly the one that appeared shortly after we got back, which alleged that I was in the Soviet Union negotiating the end of the Vietnamese War and that the basis for this was that I had with me one of Dr. Kissinger's senior aides. In the course of that article, the view was advanced that that had to be the reason we didn't sign the agreement in the Soviet Union; because these more or less minor trade issues and commercial issues, certainly wouldn't have taken much time to negotiate. [Laughter.]

This is symptomatic of a view that many people interested in foreign policy have. I'm an enormous admirer of Dr. Kissinger but I remember, at least in my early months in the White House. Henry had a way of looking at me and saying: "Peterson, that's just a minor commercial matter." [Laughter.] I responded in a variety of ways. Some of which wouldn't be appropriate here, I'm sure, but one of them was, "Henry, that's a redundancy, because you think all commercial matters are minor, and the time may come before long when you'll be spending a good deal of your time on these minor commercial matters that you've been referring to."

We had a lot of minor commercial issues here. Like which ports are we talking about? Keep in mind that large numbers of ports have not been opened to either country. On what precise basis are those ports going to be left open to each other? Remember, this isn't exactly a relationship between the United States and Canada. This is a different kind of relationship we are talking about here.

Now, when we talk about access to ports, what kind of ships are we talking about? Not on a high level of generality, but quite specifically. When a certain kind of ship comes, is it or is it not acceptable and how do you know? You've got very important questions here, as the press has widely reported, dealing with the fact that the labor unions that are identified in this field had indicated in times past some rather strong views on this subject of loading these ships. Therefore, it is important to have an arrangement that gets people loading ships. Although I'm not a Maritime expert, I know enough about the subject to know that it does you very little good to solve all these other esoteric problems only to find out that nobody will load or unload what we have negotiated. (Laughter) So we've got a negotiating agreement that is somehow satisfactory to them.

This gets us into an interesting set of discussions about how much trade going to American ships is sufficient to achieve that purpose, and at the same time leave trade for the third countries of the world. And that's taking some time.

You have a question of freight rates, what kind of rates you're talking about and for how long, and for what kind of ships. Those are some of the kind of negotiations that are taking place right now. Now, obviously, you don't want me to carry out the negotiations right here, except to indicate we're making progress. We still think this will be the first agreement, probably, to be signed. But anybody that has negotiated with the Soviet Union, or any other formidable bargainer, appreciates the point. Until you have something you can see in writing, you just don't have an arrangement. It's terribly important that some of these minor commercial matters be negotiated in very precise language. I would say that on nearly all the issues we're at that stage now, where we're looking at prescise drafts and precise formulations. Because you are at that stage, one doesn't like to assume he's got all the problems solved. But I still think that's going to be the first agreement that we'll probably announce.

QUESTION. Many of us are very interested in the work you were doing prior to your coming to the Commerce Department. What happened to the joint inter-departmental activity? Is that going on?

Mr. PETERSON. Do you have any other questions? Fine, that will give me time to think of an answer. (Laughter)

The question was, some of you were interested in the work I was doing before taking this job in the inter-department effort on inter-national economic policy and you would like to know how it's going. I suppose the modest answer is to say that it's going a great deal better than it did before. I think a group like this, incidentally, could benefit from having Peter Flanagan come over and tell you about what he's doing. Nothing has happened either before or since I left to change my mind that, as you enter a world in which international economic policy is becoming very important to domestic politics and domestic economics, and at the same time to foreign politics and foreign policy, you need some kind of mechanism to bring these points of view together. On nearly all issues of policy, I think the Council is working well. I know of very few decisions that are being made in this field that are not being coordinated at that level, and my impression is that it continues to be a useful forum.

QUESTION. Would you say overall agreement is a year away?

Mr. PETERSON. No. No. The question is, "Is the overall agreement a year away? No, I wouldn't say that. The President has a way of setting goals in all sorts of intriguing ways. When he returned from Moscow he said that he expected to have terms of a trade agreement in the hands of the Congress before the end of the year. I was sitting there listening to that, so when somebody asks me when we are going to have a trade agreement,

there's only one answer—"Before the end of the year." (Laughter.)

Through the efforts of a lot of people—the President, himself, has been very much involved, Dr. Kissinger has been involved, and many Departments have been involved—I still think we're going to beat the end of the year. It could be a matter of weeks, depending on how some of these problems develop. It could take longer, but I certainly expect to see it this year. I'll be disappointed if it's not done by the end of the year.

QUESTION. How much trade would you expect us to do with the Soviet Union if an agreement is signed?

Mr. PETERSON. Well, in '71, we were doing about $200 million. There have been a variety of people who have suggested billions of dollars in the next three years. I've seen people talk in terms of that sort. I'll have to tell you that I find that a little difficult to foresee, because when you look at their foreign exchange producing capacity, and you look at how long some of these projects take, I think I'd be surprised to see that happen by '75. What I think could happen is a substantial amount of grains of all kinds, particularly feed grains, a substantial amount of machine tools, capital equipment of various kinds, I think by '75, if I had to guess with one large caveat—which I'll come to—I would still expect trade to be measured in the hundreds of millions, rather than the billions. But still and all, that gives us an opportunity for seeing trade increase several times during that period.

The big caveat is that it's very hard to predict until we get into these very, very large projects, because they will affect trade both ways. They will affect it in a way that could make any estimate highly conjectural. In the first place, they will require great exports. And in the second place, the imports from the Soviet Union, from these very large projects, will also be very, very large. I think it is very hard to give an accurate prediction on orders of magnitude until one sees how the huge energy projects work out. If you ask me about '75, I would expect it to be several times more than we are doing now, but still in the hundred millions range, I would think.

QUESTION. Mr. Secretary, European trade with the Soviet Union has increased considerably in the last decade.

Mr. PETERSON. Right.

QUESTION. Have they had a comparable apparatus and negotiations with the Soviet Union that we are now undertaking?

Mr. PETERSON. The Soviets have set up commercial arrangements, commercial commissions, trade agreements with some countries—France, for example, and with England, I believe. They have not had a mechanism that is going to do as many of these subjects in quite as specific a way as we. We have taken a position, rightly or wrongly, that when you are talking about the two largest superpowers in the world that have been in a position of confrontation for many, many years—where the stakes are extremely high—we believe that we should exercise, perhaps, more care and more prudence. You might say that we are delaying—in trying to get some of these exasperating problems taken care of now rather than later. But I think you're right. I think other countries have been less concerned than we about the business facilities, about market disruption and some of these other things. I think when the history of these negotiations is written, the injection of those elements may have added—Oh, I don't know—60 or 90 days, perhaps, to the negotiations. They seem sometimes like they have added 60 to 90 years, but I still believe—as I guess you would expect me to believe—that we are right in taking the extra 60 to 90 days to work out something that doesn't create political problems. If we get into situations in which the United States and the Soviet Union—because, for example, they don't know how to arbitrate a multimillion dollar dispute—end up in a position of confrontation, I think it's a somewhat different problem than when almost any two other countries are engaged with similar confrontation with the Soviet Union. But you're right. They have viewed these problems as less important than we have.

QUESTION. How far off are we from trade with China?

Mr. PETERSON. With China? I've got to call Henry and ask him. (Laughter.)

In the first place, I think it's safe to say that I'm far from a China watcher. But trade in general has meant substantially less to the People's Republic of China than it has to other countries. When I last looked at the number—I can probably be proved wrong—but it seems to me last year they did a total of about two and a half billion dollars worth of trade both ways. Is that about right? That is imports and exports. You've got to remember that you are dealing with an economy with a gross national product that has to be estimated, but the estimates run from $90 billion to $120 billion GNP. When you take an economy of a GNP of only that magnitude, which is highly self-sufficient, to whom trade has been very unimportant as a matter of policy, then you add to that the fact that China has traditionally had very strong views about credit, as I guess many of you must know.

I think there has been a kind of euphoria here about the levels of trade that I find hard to substantiate by an in-depth look at the problem. Now, I would think as time goes on you're going to see some trade expansion there. I know of no immediate plans, if that's what you're asking, to have a Commission of the type we have with the Soviet Union and to move aggressively ahead. There is nothing of that nature. They have recently bought, as you know, some large aircraft. They have bought some communication equipment, and they have invited 25 or 30 companies over there to fairs in very precise fields. But I have not indicated as of the moment that you're about to see a large explosion in trade with the People's Republic.

Whatever you do, be careful that in any time frame like what's going to happen by 1975, you don't get yourself confused as some people have, I think, by saying with 800 million people there, it must be an enormous market. It isn't quite that simple. It is not an economy of anything like the size in GNP that many other economies are. For example, just look at Japan. Here's a country with one-eighth of the people—am I right, about 100 million versus 800 million people?—that has something like two and a half times the gross national product that China does, and whose trade is even many times more than that larger than the People's Republic of China. That isn't to say that long-term it may not be very important, and very politically important, but in a two- to three-year deal, I would worry a bit about getting too euphoric about that.

Senator HARRIS. Mr. Secretary, you've been both generous with your time and candid with your answers. [Applause.]

My thanks to Secretary Peterson.

AGNES DISASTER

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, at the close of each session of Congress it has been my custom to present my constituents with a year-end report in which I make an effort to detail the most important actions taken here in the U.S. Congress and to describe how some of those actions affect the daily lives of my constituents. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith for insertion in the RECORD a copy of my most recent year-end report:

JOE MCDADE—YOUR CONGRESSMAN REPORTS

DEAR FRIENDS: Each year, at the end of the session of Congress, I have sent you a report on actions taken in Congress which are significant for all of us. This year I am also including the results of my 10th Annual Questionnaire. Ordinarily this would have been sent you toward the end of the summer, but the enormous demands created by the Agnes Hurricane disaster made it impossible for me to send it at that time. It is included in this report, therefore, so that you may be well informed on the work being done here in Washington and also on the thinking of the people in our Congressional District.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
Member of Congress.

AGNES DISASTER

Pennsylvania was struck during this year with what the Army Corps of Engineers called "the greatest natural disaster in the history of the nation." The greatest natural disaster was met by the most massive Federal assistance program in the history of the nation. I co-authored much of this legislation, and worked in my Appropriations Committee to make certain the money to fund this program was available. For the first time since coming to Congress, I felt it was more necessary for me to put my Congressional work in Washington aside, to come to the District and to make certain that all that could be done. No words could describe the cooperation of all the people of our District to help the victims of the flood. I have proposed additional legislation to give further assistance. An enormous amount of help has been given; but what is important now and in the future is that all of us remember that the job is not yet finished, and we must work until the last trace of Hurricane Agnes is erased.

MINING RESTORATION

I testified before the Interior and Insular Affair Committee in favor of new, stricter, federal strip mine legislation, more in conformity with our Pennsylvania strip mine laws, as well as for comprehensive legislation attacking the problems of coal refuse banks, burning banks, acid mine water, and all the other problems left as a residue of old mining. I secured funding for massive mine flushing projects aimed at preventing subsidence of people's homes and businesses over abandoned mines. One of these projects in Green Ridge will pioneer the use of coal refuse to fill abandoned mine voids, using a brand new method. It is a project that every coal mining section of the nation will watch with interest. In this year alone, we are moving forward on mine-flushing programs which will cost nearly $15,000,000. This is the most extensive mine-flushing program in any community in the history of the nation.

NEW ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS

This year I wrote a new law which will bring a new industry to our District, with the creation of the Northeast Pennsylvania Fishery and Research Development Center. This facility, to be run by the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries, will cost between $3.5 and $4 million, and will employ about 20 people at an estimated annual payroll of $500,000.00 funded entirely by the federal government. The purpose of the Center will be to develop optimum ways of culturing fish and transporting them to receiving water. There are only four other such facilities of this kind in the nation.

In addition to providing a new industry for our District, the Center will draw on the local colleges of Northeastern Pennsylvania for

their expertise in the fields of natural science, physics, chemistry, etc. The Center will benefit fishermen and sportsmen both locally and nationally. Fish raised in the center will be released in public streams. Increased efficiency and the production of better quality fish will result from the work performed at the new Center.

A second law I wrote funded the building of the headquarters of the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area in our Congressional District. This construction will cost $1.1 million. There will be 33 permanent positions with additional temporary positions with an annual payroll of $655 thousand. We also doubled the budget for the Recreation Area and added new Park Rangers. A special summer project, under the direction of three of our institutions of higher learning, established a Youth Conservation Camp near Sky's Edge in our District, to educate young adults in conservation measures; and a year-round conservation-education program is presently under development in our Congressional District as a joint venture between the Department of Interior and Keystone Junior College. In addition to these, two demonstration projects were initiated in our District, to prove the feasibility of growing vegetation on sites covered with the refuse of deep mining; and their success could mean a significant step in our ongoing program of improving the appearance of our area.

A third law I wrote funded a strip-mine reclamation project on the Taylor-Scranton line, to convert an unsightly abandoned strip-mine pit into a model recreation area.

Of special significance is a new law I wrote to provide $28 million to purchase the remaining properties needed to create the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. Forty percent of those properties still remain to be purchased, with many of our people suffering extreme hardship because there was no money for the purchase. Now this $28 million will open the door for the purchase of all the properties, so that we may see the creation of the National Recreation Area. This new law will preserve the natural beauty of one of the most magnificent scenic areas of the nation for all times.

VETERANS AND RETIRED SERVICEMEN

Congress voted into law with my enthusiastic support, increased compensation and increased pensions. A 10% across-the-board increase in servicemen's compensation was voted.

Congress also took a long overdue step in extending to the widows of servicemen the same benefits which are presently extended the widows of Civil Service employees. I supported also the increased payments under the Vietnam Veterans G.I. Bill of Rights.

JOBS

We have been working vigorously in our continuing program to attract new industries to our area and to preserve the strength of those industries which are located among us, and which are so significant in our employment picture.

The year opened with a notable victory in one of the more difficult fights we have had to save employment in our area, when the General Accounting Office rejected a protest by Golden Industries against the award of a contract of nearly $5 million to Chamberlain Corporation.

When the protest was lodged by Golden Industries, I pointed out to the Comptroller General that basically Golden was trying to change the rules of bidding after their own unsuccessful bid was rejected. The Comptroller General agreed with me, and awarded the contract which was so significant in the employment at Chamberlain.

The J. P. Ward Foundries in Tioga County faced an equally serious problem, when plans for the construction of the Tioga-Hammond Dam revealed that a rail spur, which had supplied Ward for 50 years, would be eliminated. There was no way Ward could absorb the enormous cost of realigning its supply and delivery system; and this major industry, with some 450 jobs and an annual payroll of $3.5 million was threatened with extinction. I was able to persuade my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to provide $1.1 million to finance the construction of a new loading system, to keep Ward Foundries open with employment assured.

Our continuing fight to preserve Tobyhanna Depot as a vibrant and significant force in our community was successful during this year. Tobyhanna's Electronics Mission is outstanding. Employment at Tobyhanna is important for all of us, and we will be fighting for additional missions which our fine workers could perform with the same degree of excellence.

SOCIAL SECURITY—RAILROAD RETIREMENT—BLACK LUNG PAYMENTS

In a major effort to combat the problems of inflation faced by our Senior Citizens, Congress passed a law which I vigorously supported to grant a 20% increase in Social Security benefits, and an equal increase in Railroad Retirement Benefits. Included in that law is an amendment which I authored to tie the payment of these benefits to the cost of living index, so that our senior citizens will not have to await new Congressional action in the face of any future rise in the cost of living. Presently under consideration is a new law which I have also sponsored to increase sharply the amount of money which those receiving Social Security and Railroad Retirement Benefits, might earn, while still receiving their full federal payments.

New revisions of the Black Lung Law, for which I testified and fought on the floor of Congress, were passed, with two provisions of immense significance to those applying for benefits under this legislation. Under the first provision, the act extended for two years the period during which applications would be received, because it was obvious that the States were unprepared to take over the financial burden of this program. Under the second provision, the X-ray reports are no longer to be the sole determinant in deciding the presence of Black Lung. Other medical tests will be administered and their evidence will be accepted. Because of this provision, a complete review of all cases formerly rejected on the basis of X-rays was ordered.

RESULTS OF McDADE'S 10TH ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

	Percentage	
	Yes	No
DO YOU FAVOR:		
1. The President's efforts to normalize relations with China?	95	5
2. A similar effort to normalize relations with Cuba?	55	45
3. New efforts in arms limitation and in space between U.S. and U.S.S.R?	90	10
4. In Vietnam, immediate withdrawal, then negotiate for POW's?	12	
Withdrawal only with simultaneous release of all POW's?	24	
Withdrawal after cease fire and firm agreement releasing POW's?	64	
5. For young men who evaded the draft or left military service:		
Unconditional amnesty and pardon?	16	
No amnesty or pardon?	33	
Amnesty or pardon with alternative service for specific time?	51	
6. Making GI benefits available for family of man killed in action?	63	37
7. Higher military pay and benefits to create all-volunteer services?	77	23
8. Strict Federal regulation of strip mining and surface reclamation?	96	4
9. Federal revenue sharing; communities deciding where to spend money?	75	25
10. Prohibition of busing to achieve racial balance in schools?	73	27
11. Federal tax substitute for property taxes to fund schools?	75	25
12. In the area of health insurance:		
Expansion of Federal health care for working poor or unemployed?	6	
Tax credits to purchase private insurance protection?	19	
Federal program to help pay catastrophic medical costs?	24	
Government financed health care for everybody?	33	
No new Federal legislation in this area?	18	
13. A stated national policy to preserve the small family farm?	72	8
14. Moving the level of parity with the movement of cost of living?	68	32
15. Removing Congressmen or Senators for excessive absence?	92	8
16. In presidential primary elections:		
Present system of many primaries on many dates?	4	
National presidential primary on same day in all States?	91	
Many primaries, but on a restricted number of dates?	5	

17. Priorities (percentage of times ranked in top 5):	Percent
1. Education	89
2. Anticrime	79
3. Health	77
4. Environment	72
5. Housing	60
6. Space exploration	55
7. Defense	46
8. Urban Affairs	41
9. Rural Development	20

STATION KTUL–TV, TULSA

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, for the second year in a row, I would like to commend television station KTUL of Tulsa, Okla., for its work in the Jerry Lewis Labor Day Telethon to benefit the Muscular Dystrophy Association of America, Inc. KTUL–TV made a remarkable effort to raise funds for this important cause.

Certainly, Tulsans can be proud of the fact that, during the 1972 telethon, $68,000 was collected from donors in their city. This great success would not have been possible if the management and staff of KTUL–TV had not undertaken to do a tremendous job and do it well.

James Leake, the president of KTUL, has done a great deal for Tulsa and for Oklahoma. This work on the telethon is one more instance of his concern for people. Jimmy Leake and his staff deserve a real vote of thanks for contributing time and hard work to raise money for the Muscular Dystrophy Association.

GEN. WILLIAM C. WESTMORELAND

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, former Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, Gen. William C. Westmoreland was the guest speaker at the annual banquet of the Oak Cliff, Tex. Chamber of Commerce on Thursday, October 26, 1972. I am indebted to General Westmoreland

for making this appearance, and I am deeply honored by the fact that he accepted as I consider him one of my closest friends. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of the press interview held prior to his appearance at the aforementioned banquet:

GENERAL WESTMORELAND: CAREER IN RETROSPECT

(By Doris Harris Seivert)

He hopes the history books will record him simply as a man who performed a difficult job to the best of his ability.

General William C. Westmoreland wants no special laurels for his job as commander of the U.S. military assistance forces in Vietnam and, more recently, as U.S. Army chief of staff.

But he wants posterity to know that he was loyal to his men and sensitive to the life and death situations of war.

Westy Westmoreland's friends call him "a soldier's general." Time Magazine more eloquently referred to him as "the sinewy personification of the American fighting man."

He sees himself as a not-too-gregarious fellow whose life is bound to the performance of duty.

Since his retirement from the Army staff last July, Westmoreland has talked with civic and service organizations throughout the United States. He will be in Dallas October 26 to keynote the Oak Cliff Chamber annual banquet in the Statler Hilton Hotel.

"I have no qualms of conscience about my career," he admitted in an hour-long telephone interview from his temporary home in the North Carolina mountains.

"Most professional military men realize they do not formulate policy but that they are merely instruments of that policy," the general explained. "The decisions are made by civil authority, by the President and by Congress. One can't argue right or wrong. He can only accept the fact that it is his duty to carry out those policies."

The first uniform Westy Westmoreland ever wore was as a youth for the Boy Scouts of America at a World Jamboree in England. "I took great pride in wearing our uniform abroad," the general remembered. "I suppose that's how I first acquired the desire to wear the uniform of my country as a career."

Born and reared in the foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains of South Carolina, Westy Westmoreland was the son of a civilian banker and a religious mother, both of whom possessed a great reverence for their country and for the fundamentals of hard work, honesty and patriotism.

When the late Congressman Jimmy Burns appointed young Westmoreland to West Point, his father proudly agreed that he should go.

Westmoreland was to become a brigadier general at the age of 38, and four years later, the youngest major general in the Army.

He saw action in Tunisia and Sicily during World War II as commander of an artillery battalion, and in Korea, as commander of the 187th Airborne Regimental Combat Team.

He came home from a war to marry the girl he promised to wait for until she grew up. They met on a fox hunt when she was nine years old and he was a young lieutenant about to be shipped overseas. Eleven years later they were married. She was 20 and he 33.

"She's a real soldier," said Westy. "She's put up with me for 25 years and through many long separations." They are the parents of four children, two daughters and two sons, through whom he relates to youth at large.

"I much admire the young people of today," he said. "They are better educated, they are dedicated and they are not easily duped by propaganda.

"And our young soldiers in Vietnam are the best we've ever had in any war. Their job has been a most difficult one because the issues weren't as clearly defined as in other wars."

As for present-day foreign policies, he believes the recent Strategic Arms Limitations Treaty "is a step forward in bringing peace. Contrary to the feelings of many, I believe the treaty will make it more difficult for the arms race to continue," said Westmoreland. "Nobody welcomes peace more than a soldier, for he is the first to go into battle when there is a war. I applaud the treaty because it is enabling the two greatest powers in the history of the world to reach a detente. This single fact far outweighs any disadvantages the treaty may have."

The most gratifying moment of his career has been "to see the U.S. Army make a successful transition to a small peacetime army under the stresses of the longest war in history."

His own recent transition from military life to retirement has been comfortable. "I've rather enjoyed being able to write my own ticket for a change," he said. "But if I had it to do all over again, I'd choose the same career.

"I suppose the performance of one's duty is a principle which is ground into me. A soldier must be sustained by some higher ideal. In the United States that ideal is the preservation of freedom. We have the greatest country in the world. Not only has America been an example, but it has been the hope of many countries. It is important that the soldier realize he is fighting for this higher ideal.

"We have been a party to stopping aggression in Vietnam. This is compatible with our country's image as the champion for freedom throughout the world," he observed.

William C. Westmoreland now will move back to his native South Carolina, but he will find himself ever returning to the familiar halls of the nation's capitol. This time, however, his job will be as a member of a task force for progressive development of the State of South Carolina.

"It will be good to get home," said the general. "I haven't been there in 40 years."

SENATOR CLINTON P. ANDERSON

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, those of us who served in the House of Representatives in the 1940's had a special opportunity to know firsthand why President Harry Truman selected CLINTON P. ANDERSON from the Congress to serve as his Secretary of Agriculture.

CLINTON ANDERSON'S reputation, built on integrity and knowledge was unquestioned among his colleagues.

The wider circle of associates with whom he worked as Secretary of Agriculture simply increased the broad esteem in which he was held.

But CLINTON ANDERSON—having served in the House, having headed one of our most important Federal departments, and having subsequently been chosen by his constituents to represent them in the U.S. Senate—never lost his sincere personal touch, and I shall never forget the sage advice on agricultural matters which I as a freshman Senator received from this statesman from the other side of the aisle and the other side of the Nation.

The Nation, the State he served so well, the Congress as a whole, and I personally, will miss him deeply.

CONSUMERISM—YOU BETTER BELIEVE IT

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the thought-provoking speech delivered by Mr. James Lutz, executive vice president of Montgomery Ward & Co. at the annual conference of the Direct Mail Advertising Association held in Chicago on October 9.

The speech is entitled "Consumerism—You Better Believe It." I commend it to your careful reading.

What commends the speech to me is not simply that it was delivered by an executive of a great merchandising firm based in my home State of Illinois. It is that Mr. Lutz admonishes business "to become a true partner in consumerism," and not resist it, by improving the quality of their products—making them safe and durable—and by insuring that the prospective buyer is told the truth about the products and not be misled in any way with respect to it.

In other words, Mr. Lutz tells it like it is, and his speech clearly indicates that there are forward-looking businessmen who recognize that businessmen have more than the responsibility of making a profit to be distributed to stockholders. Montgomery Ward is to be congratulated on its progressive attitude so essential if our free competitive enterprise system is to survive.

CONSUMERISM—YOU BETTER BELIEVE IT

Thank you. Now, I wonder if you realize that you have just started your conference with a precedent by applauding a businessman. This is entirely contrary to all of the recent polls.

The other day, while at home, fighting a cold, I received a phone call from one of our younger, aggressive and highly promotable vice presidents, who inquired about my state of health. After listening to my complaints, he merely said, "well, I hope it isn't anything trivial."

As your keynoter, I hope my comments will be challenging and not trivial.

It gives me extreme pleasure to welcome you to our great commercial hub of the world—Chicago. It has a long and distinguished record as a convention city where, in 1860, Abraham Lincoln was nominated for President—an event that changed the course of history.

I am confident that this 55th annual conference of the direct mail advertising association will uphold this tradition.

The most familiar description of your host city is Carl Sandburg's—

"Hog butcher for the world,
Tool maker, stacker of wheat,
Player with railroads and the Nation's freight handler,
Stormy, husky, brawling,
City of the big shoulders."

And it is all of that. Mr. Sandburg's famous description did not include one of Chicago's

greatest claims to distinction—birthplace of mail order business—although I suppose we might be included under the category "stormy, husky, brawling."

When 100 years ago Aaron Montgomery Ward issued his first catalog—a single-sheet price list—it marked the beginning of a whole new industry and is certainly a landmark in the history of direct mail merchandising.

After a shaky beginning, the idea caught on and the catalog business grew. Mr. Ward gave it another push in his 1875 catalog with this statement, his now famous policy of "satisfaction guaranteed or your money back." A policy which has been adopted by most of the Nation's business.

Although some of his friends seriously recommended that Mr. Ward have his head examined, the suspicious country people of the day accepted this policy at its face value and Mr. Ward had another landmark to his credit—this time a landmark in consumerism—which brings us around to the title of my remarks: "Consumerism—you better believe it."—But let me quickly add—businessmen, like me, speaking positively about consumerism are like statues that bleed—highly suspect—I have to chance that image.

As I was thumbing through Bartlett's "familiar quotations," I noted the prairie philosopher's wise remarks—"the past is a barrel of dust."

And how true.

We know that in this day and age nostalgia is popular—but business cannot live on past glories and accomplishments no matter how significant. We are judged by what transpires *today* and by what we can guarantee *tomorrow*.

In this election year, politicians can outline great dreams, they can wave banners, ring bells and blow horns for America to come home—but businessmen have no such luxury. They must be prepared to be judged by immediate action, today's performance, today's headlines, today's dissent or assent—not by tomorrow's promises.

Our prime purpose is not masterful rhetoric and ringing slogans. Rather, we present—or should present unless one wants to incur the wrath of governmental regulatory agencies—workable proposals, accurately supported by facts and figures related to past, present and guaranteed future performance.

As businessmen, we are responsible for profits and losses and many of us must be responsive to stockholders. Each of us carries, at least to some degree, the responsibility for the legislative, executive and judicial processes of business. And our accountability is every day and every hour—not just during election years. And it is here, I believe, that many businessmen part ways with the idealistic programmers of new worlds.

The American businessman has continually strived to forge new economic and technological frontiers and unchartered horizons. We should do no less in confronting new attitudes and new changes, and we should by now clearly realize that the real challenge is not from new ideas and changes themselves, as from *how they will be implemented*. This is *our* responsibility. And herein lies a great opportunity—an opportunity to become a full-fledged partner with the various governmental regulatory bodies, the bonafide public and political consumer activists.

Today, the consumer is making himself heard. We must make ourselves listen—but unfortunately too many of us have an amazingly fertile talent to make a difficult problem immediately worse.

Louis Harris & Associates have asked people about the degree of their confidence in various major institutions. During the period from 1966 to 1971, the confidence in big companies declined 28%; in advertising 8%—never very high on the scale, but now at a new *low* level of confidence.

To the question "Do you think we can depend on competition to keep prices at fair levels this year, or is some sort of government control needed to keep prices fair?" 62% opted for government controls. Only 27% felt they could rely on business to hold price lines.

"How much profit do manufacturers make on the dollar?" the estimate was 28¢. The actual 1970 manufacturing profits, after taxes, averaged 4¢ on the dollar.

Can companies raise wages 10¢ per hour without raising prices? In the most recent survey, 66% agreed against 55% during the last survey.

And what do teenagers—our future customers—think of business. In 1951, *one in 25* felt that the bad in the system outweighed the good. Today, that same proportion has gone up by five times. Today, *one in five* thinks the system is so bad that it needs to be completely overhauled.

In general, two out of three adults are dissatisfied with current standards of repair, service, quality and safety and think the Government could help to some extent.

Seven out of every ten people consider product quality an important factor in their day-to-day living.

So what do these surveys tell us?

Perception of product quality has continued to decline.

The image of industry continues to deteriorate.

The public continues to believe that the work of the consumer advocates will benefit them.

Consumers desire increased supervision by industry and/or Government to improve product quality and service.

Consumers recognize the need for better and more relevant product information.

The most critical consumer segments of the population are:

College graduates;

Upper income adults ($15,000 plus); and

Young adults (18–29 years).

Are we listening? Are we going to act? Are we going to communicate? Are we prepared to update our thinking? Are we prepared to live up to the promises we are making? We must!

We must offer programs to satisfy the new affluent, sophisticated, alert, restless, articulate, typical American citizen.

If we are to become a true partner in consumerism, we will herald the consumer's bill of rights:

The right to be safe;

The right to choose;

The right to be fully informed; and

The right to be heard.

How can we argue these points? If we view it objectively and not with alarm, consumerism is no longer a dirty word. It should not be a skeleton in our closet. It should be a motivator for better products, better services, better advertising, a better dialogue between business and the public and between business and the Government. It should promote a realistic view of regulatory decisions and proposals and, ultimately, *foster broader consumer protection measures*.

We must orient ourselves regarding each government regulatory agency so that we can cooperate, assist and persuade in their endeavors. We must be prepared and willing to hang our hats in the offices of agencies and legislators—not to seek special privileges, but to listen, respond, inform and advise.

We must sensitize our legal, advertising and product development departments to new consumer attitudes and new and pending governmental demands.

Chemists, physicists, engineers, product designers and home economists have become an integral working part of retailing organizations. I now suggest that we add sociologists—a staff of experts who can look at our business from the consumer's point of view and be frank about what they see.

We must be certain that warranties and guarantees not only make sense, but are written in good faith—not that the big print giveth and the small print taketh away.

No segment of society is better qualified nor has greater responsibility to provide assistance and guidance to the consumer than ours. We must establish—and now—more effective communication channels through which our expert advice and counsel can be extended to the consumer with full credibility.

We must call more such conferences as this, which give us an opportunity to hear the views and the objectives of government and civic leaders. And we should become working partners with the Peter Petersons, the Roger Mortons and the Gloria Steinems. I firmly believe that we would discover, to the surprise of all parties, that our greatest difference in opinion in the realm of semantics and not in feasibility.

As good businessmen, it is time to wake up and realize that we are no longer seeking the better mouse trap. *Our survival as an economic system depends upon sound consumer relations in its broadest scope.* The businessman—no matter how deeply involved in capital expansion—who fails to cope with the consumerist movement—to detect the quickened pulse beat of this new society—will inevitably lose the right to stay in business.

If business operators, large and small, had not been guilty of misleading and overpromising to consumers, I doubt that the consumer advocacy movement of the late sixties and today would ever have begun. But it did and with good cause.

All of us were in such a rush to sell more merchandise—to grow and expand—to successfully compete in the face of ever rising costs—and were so infatuated with a throwaway economy that we did not keep pace in the improvement of quality and services which direct mail pieces and retail organizations were promising to customers.

Today, we have 283 Government agencies looking over our shoulders. What is more, we now must anticipate new moods and interpretations since on almost a daily basis the rules are changing with new Federal regulations, legislation and court rulings, which may effect directly mail and retail operations. It is high time we clean house and rid ourselves of those who make illegitimate profits and mislead the consumer.

Let's face it ladies and gentlemen, we're going to have more regulations than in the past. There will be a new consumer protection agency, and there will be an even greater emphasis on performance, safety and truth-in-everything.

And let's not overlook the fact that in the face of these new regulations and changing consumer attitudes, there is a competitive advantage for those businesses which give the best goods and services. The profiteer who misrepresents has short-term profits only, and the new consumer movement and sophistication will make that term even shorter.

What's more, the new movement is raising the standards that business must meet in order to survive and prosper. Nothing that we have done in the past will ever be good enough again. And we cannot step away from it and let "Charley" do it. Dante tells us that the hottest places in hell are reserved for those who in time of crisis maintain neutrality. Today we have a crisis of confidence in business. Today we cannot remain neutral. We must act now and put our money where our mouth is.

A recent article in Business Week maga-

zine forcefully emphasized the growing consensus of top management that press releases and public relations alone cannot reverse this erosion of public confidence. Only with significant changes in corporate policies affecting the consumer can we stem the tide running strong against us.

There's a new dimension to this corporate responsibility which we commend to all of you for consideration. Today, consumers are calling for passage of certain new legislation which is clearly good for them. The new dimension of corporate responsibility is to stop fighting every new proposal and to start supporting those sound proposals that consumers want and need, providing of course they are basically fair and effective for all concerned, including business. Without that crucial element of fairness the consumer himself will only lose, but fairness can be achieved in many instances if business will work for improving a bill rather than killing it. How *can* the consumer ever believe business is really on his side if virtually every time consumers *propose* legislation most businessmen *oppose* that legislation? It's time we begin to fight *for* the consumer, not against him in the legislative arena. This is the new dimension of corporate responsibility.

But even this is not enough. We must also fight harder for the consumer's interests *as he sees* them in the market place, or better said, for her interests as *she* sees them, since most of our customers are women. For example, a number of women earlier this year testified in congressional hearings that they wanted the right to have credit accounts in their own names. Single women with their own incomes, have always had credit accounts with Ward's in their own names—based on their ability and willingness to pay. Ward's has always granted credit to these women, but in response, we re-emphasized this credit posture to all of our field credit personnel. Married women with their own incomes can have in fact separate credit accounts in their own name, on the same basis as single women.

There is another segment of our society that merits more reasoned attention from all of us. Young people not only have a right to be heard, business has a need to listen. From amongst their voices, if we listen carefully, we can hear the currents of the future.

Finally, we must develop our future practices with the realization that this is a multifaceted society and, in fact, everything that is good for business is not necessarily always good for all of the people. At the same time, and of equal importance, we have a responsibility to continue to defend those practices and principles which generate mass affluence and are basic to the perpetuation of our unique business system.

Let us remember, ladies and gentlemen, mistakes or violations by any one of you, reflect on all of us. So, you can see that I am going to be a consumer advocate and activist in insisting upon compliance with laws and regulations for consumer interests. Insisting that you not only become involved—but committed—and there is a difference. It is like ham and eggs: the hen is involved—the pig committed.

Our business is founded on a sound principle of satisfaction guaranteed to the customer. We have found this to be a successful principle for 100 years and we intend to be in business for many other 100 years. Therefore, my company and I are going to continue to be aggressive consumer advocates to protect the rights of the consumer. I sincerely hope that the membership of the direct mail advertising association will join with us to serve our consumers better. Your challenge is to live up to the promises you make. Consumers expect no less—and you better believe it.

HON. PRES BUSH

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, all of us who served in the Senate with Pres Bush remember him with affection and respect.

Mrs. Case and I shall never forget his and Mrs. Bush's kindness and hospitality to us as freshmen Members of the Senate community.

In his public and his private life alike Pres was the soul of honesty and thoughtful consideration for human beings and for the public good. His service here will long be remembered with gratitude and admiration as he himself will be.

Our affectionate sympathy goes out to Mrs. Bush and all of their wonderful family.

HISTORY OF THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the history of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, which follows:

THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART—40 YEARS OF SERVICE

Those who have been awarded the Purple Heart have earned the nation's oldest military decoration. When it was created by General George Washington on August 7, 1782, it was also the nation's sole decoration and the highest military award of the land. The Purple Heart was revitalized as a military decoration on the 200th anniversary of Washington's birth, February 22, 1932, by Executive Order of President Herbert Hoover. The medal as we know it was designed to replace Washington's original Badge of Military Merit—the "figure of a heart in purple cloth or silk, edged with narrow lace or binding".

In the years since its creation in 1782, the Purple Heart has been supplanted by other decorations that now rank higher, but it remains exclusive in a very special way. A man may be awarded even the Medal of Honor and yet not be eligible for the award of the Purple Heart. The Purple Heart, said General Douglas MacArthur, "is unique; . . . it is the only decoration which is completely intrinsic in that it does not depend upon approval or favor by anyone. Enemy action alone determines it. It is a true badge of courage, and every breast that wears it can beat with pride."

CHARTERED BY CONGRESS

The Military Order of the Purple Heart was founded in 1932 as a national organization of veterans who have been awarded the Purple Heart by the U.S. Government. Only those persons who earned the medal during active service in the Armed Forces and who are persons of good moral character qualify for membership. The Congress of the United States unanimously approved H.R. 13558, authored by Texas Congressman Olin E. Teague, which granted the Military Order of the Purple Heart its Congressional Charter and which subsequently became Public Law 85–761 upon the signatures on August 26, 1958, of the then President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Vice President Richard M. Nixon and the Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn.

The Military Order of the Purple Heart does not differentiate between sexes or among races or ethnic origins, religious beliefs, political affiliations or educational or economic levels. Having the Purple Heart is the sole criterion for membership.

After more than 40 years of striving, with many ups and downs, this relatively small but elite organization is on a sound footing, with a built-in system of checks and balances to protect its membership and its funds, and it has a most enviable record in service work, rehabilitation, employment guidance, VA hospital voluntary services and welfare work for veterans and their dependents or survivors. In volume and significance, its work has outdistanced wealthier and numerically larger organizations.

Almost from the inception of the President's Committee for Employment of the Handicapped in 1947, the Order has been an active, contributing participant in the Committee's work. From the time of the founding of the World Veterans Federation, encompassing the veterans' organizations of more than 50 countries throughout the free world, the Order has been an active member of and has provided leadership to the international body, whose periodic assemblies enable veterans' leaders to keep abreast of scientific and technological breakthroughs beneficial to disabled or ailing veterans everywhere. The Order has long been an active participant in the work of Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pennsylvania.

COMBAT-WOUNDED VETERANS

The single bond uniting one member with another is that each has sustained an enemy-inflicted wound in combat. Veterans of all American wars are eligible to belong; so there is no exclusion by any specific war. The organization does not recognize the much-touted generation gap because its own bridges connect several generations. Long experience has proved that the relentless march of time can transform the zero-percent disability of youth to the 100 percent disability of middle age and later. Thus, the Order's service officers are always ready to cope with such eventualities. A single-generation group is deprived of this experience. What is more, the organization cherishes the 90-year-old member of its Ladies' Auxiliary who still dedicates an 8-hour day weekly as a VA hospital volunteer and who has well over 10,000 hours of such volunteering on record. To no lesser degree does it cherish the unhackneyed viewpoints and imagination of its unfettered and optimistic Vietnam veterans with their fresh approaches to problems as old as war itself.

SERVICES AVAILABLE TO ALL VETERANS

What, besides good fellowship with veterans who have a single common bond, does the Military Order of the Purple Heart have to offer a person eligible to join? Among other things, the Order:

(1) has a full-time National Service Director in Washington, D.C. with over 150 National Service Officers accredited by the Veterans Administration in more than 40 States, and is seeking others to train. These officers advise and aid veterans and their dependents in the technical preparation and prosecution of claims for any governmental benefits due them and in securing suitable employment. The Director keeps advised of pertinent developments and feeds the information to the officers in the field; he is responsible for the handling of appeals before the Appeals Board of the Veterans Administration in Washington, D.C.

(2) has a full-time Legislative Director who keeps abreast of legislation in the Con-

gress of the United States to improve the status of the nation's veterans and promotes Congressional action on service and legislative resolutions adopted by the annual National Conventions of the organization.

(3) has 125 Veterans Administration Voluntary Service representatives and deputies in many of the VA hospitals throughout the land as well as countless additional volunteers contributing thousands of hours in VA hospitals, out-patient clinics and domiciliaries under the guidance of the professional staffs to aid, comfort and entertain the veterans and their families.

(4) offers a comprehensive, seven-faceted group insurance program to members and their dependents, providing coverage of types not generally available either to veterans or non-veterans.

SPECIALIZED AND SPECIFIC REHABILITATION PROGRAMS

The involvement of the Military Order of the Purple Heart in the functioning of the VA Hospitals and Regional Offices has broader range and greater depth than is generally realized. The Order's sights have been aimed at constant personal and group involvement in restoring maimed and ailing veterans to a full role in community life as human beings and citizens. Examples of some of the Order's projects follow:

The VA has three Rehabilitation Centers for blinded veterans—in the East, Mideast and West. For more than 20 years, the Order's volunteers have devoted untold hours to help restore self-sufficiency to the trainees. These Centers now have programs to rehabilitate the families of blinded veterans as well, since experience has proved that families often unwittingly undo the results of the Centers' work. The family rehabilitation program at present is financially underwritten by the organization in two Centers with similar programming for the third.

One California VA Hospital has a highly successful Office Machine Repair Training Program to which the Military Order of the Purple Heart donated $15,000 for machinery and tools in a single year. Each graduate receives a complete tool kit on graduation, donated by the Order. Attesting to the excellence of the program is the fact that job offers far outnumber the graduates from this continuing program. Another California VA Hospital with many wheel-chair patients having spinal cord injuries was granted $38,000 this year to develop a sophisticated athletic field for patients' use.

Another VA hospital with an outstanding Physical Medicine and Rehabilitative Services Job Training Program, having paid-trainee patients working on commercial contracts, received a $25,000 donation from the Order this past year. Another VA hospital with a special Audio-Visual Program received $5,500 from the Order for the purchase of needed sophisticated equipment.

In cooperation with the National Organization, various Chapters and State Departments sponsor and finance a program—variously called Operation Santa Claus, Operation Reindeer, Operation Holiday, Operation Homebound and Operation Reunion—to enable veterans under prolonged hospital care and treatment to visit their families when and as deemed salutary by the hospital's professional staff. Should the veteran's condition preclude leaving the hospital, his entire family is often times brought to the hospital with all expenses paid by the organization. So significant have many of these reunions proved to be that they have spelled the difference beteween the veteran's recovery and his failure to improve. So popular has this program become that entire communities have adopted the project and donated toward its realization even to children contributing them meager allowances to express their gratitude to the men who fought for them.

Some local and State groups of the Order organize Christmas parties and other special events providing refreshments, bingo parties and variety shows in the hospitals for veterans and their families. Some provide nurseries in VA hospitals to allow care free visits for wives with their husbands. Others redecorate and refurnish hospital Day Rooms; some purchase a paraffin bath to benefit arthritic patients. Others purchase large kitchen appliances for Day Care Centers or hospital recreation rooms; other purchase automatic book page turners for use by paraplegic and disabled patients. Some groups buy stereo consoles for enjoyment by blind patients while others finance skiing, skeet shooting, sailing and fishing week-ends for hospitalized veteran amputees; and others help purchase buses to transport hospitalized veterans.

OPERATION ARMED FORCES

The National Service Foundation underwrites the Social Service Emergency Fund of a large VA hospital in a city which does not have a local Purple Heart organization. The Foundation has also expended great effort toward building better relations between the civilians at home and the servicemen in Vietnam, mobilizing support from students, veterans, housewives, workers, business men and women and the armed services. Operation Easter Bunny provided a filled basket for each patient in a 400-bed naval hospital. Operation Holiday arranged for airlifting 52,700 individual gift-wrapped presents, Christmas trees and ornaments to GI's in 27 military hospitals in Southeast Asia. Operation Citrus airlifted thirty tons of fresh oranges and grapefruit from Florida to Vietnam for the sick and wounded in military hospitals. For Operation Valentine, thousands of students throughout this country and several foreign lands hand-made 150,000 valentines that were shipped to men in 27 service hospitals, the front lines and contiguous waters of Southeast Asia. Operation Pledge of Allegiance sent thousands of posters with the imprinted Pledge on one side to all major American cities, where citizens attested their support of the fighting men by signing their names on the reverse. The signed posters were then mailed and distributed to units in Southeast Asia.

PEACE WITH FREEDOM

The organization necessarily involves itself with the situations inherent in the continuing conflict of the Southeast Asian area. It seeks actively to exert its influence for release of all prisoners of war in Vietnam. The Order believes they must be accorded the treatment dictated by the Geneva Convention and that all facts about POW/MIA should promptly be made public.

The Order strives assiduously to foster justice and law enforcement. In short, it is a patriotic organization which works hand and glove with other community organizations and agencies to preserve life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness for all of our people. The Military Order of the Purple Heart believes that peace is Man's second most urgent goal; the first is freedom.

SENATOR B. EVERETT JORDAN

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, a man usually gets to know his fellow man fairly well when he works with him in the same office, so to speak, and it has been my privilege to work in this type of a relationship with B. EVERETT JORDAN since the 1950's, when we both came to the U.S. Senate.

However, I once had a short period of especially rare good fortune.

Working together on problems connected with the textile industry, EVERETT JORDAN and I toured his native North Carolina and it was then that I saw EVERETT JORDAN at work, not "in the office," but "at home," in the area he knew, loved, and served so well.

If, as is the case, his work in Washington was consistently exemplary, the understanding and dedication he displayed on that tour in behalf of his constituents and their problems showed even more vividly the reasons he was held in such high esteem.

He served his State well; he served the Congress well; he served the Nation well. His efforts and accomplishments will not be forgotten.

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bid farewell to our distinguished colleague from the Ninth District of North Carolina, the Honorable CHARLES RAPER JONAS, who is retiring after 20 years of service to the Nation.

It has been my privilege to serve with CHARLEY JONAS on the House Committee on Appropriations. As a matter of fact, when I first came to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1964 as a new Republican from the South, CHARLEY made himself available to me and was very helpful in my getting assimilated for the tasks which lay ahead.

As the second ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee, CHARLEY JONAS has provided inspiration to other committee members including myself and has been a driving force for fiscal responsibility. During his 18 years on the committee, there were some $90 billion worth of cuts from the budget request of five Presidents. CHARLEY JONAS played no small part in trimming these budgets down to size.

Mr. Speaker, CHARLES RAPER JONAS will be missed in the U.S. House of Representatives. He will be missed in the Committee on Appropriations in particular. I am pleased to have enjoyed CHARLEY's friendship, and I wish him the best of health and happiness in the years ahead. I am confident that his service to the Nation, like our friendship, will not end with the adjournment of the 92d Congress.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JORDAN OF NORTH CAROLINA

HON. WILLIAM B. SAXBE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. SAXBE. Mr. President, today I would like to pay tribute to my good friend and colleague, B. EVERETT JORDAN of North Carolina, for his more than 14 years of service to the Senate. It has been my pleasure to have served with

him for the last 4 years, during the 91st and 92d Congresses.

The list of legislative accomplishments which bear his imprint is long and impressive. His amendments resulted in a needed tightening of the Wholesale Meat Act. His support was vital to legislation amending the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1970. More recently he was instrumental in strengthening the National Air Quality Standards Act so that it has become one of the strongest pieces of legislation dealing with this problem ever proposed by Congress.

The environment has not been his sole concern. Problems in our educational delivery system and in our flood control, navigation, and beach protection projects have also received his attention and concern. It was with these and a host of other legislative matters that EVERETT JORDAN concerned himself during his term of office in the Senate. I only hope that these measures will still receive the attention they deserve in future sessions of Congress.

EVERETT JORDAN possesses those qualities that each of us wish all men possessed. He is firm yet fair, friendly yet reserved, proud but not pompous, firm in his views, but understanding of the views of others. I have been proud to serve with him as I know others have. He is one of North Carolina's most distinguished sons, and he has been a credit to the Senate in which he has served so ably.

UNION CARBIDE UNVEILS NEW MULTINATIONAL STUDY

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in light of the congressional interest in the effect which multinational corporations have on the U.S. economy, I was interested to see that Union Carbide Corp. has just completed a detailed new study on the benefits to the U.S. economy of its international investments.

According to Union Carbide's study, the corporation's foreign investments have resulted in more U.S. jobs and more exports from the United States than would have been the case if the foreign investments had not been made.

Specific studies such as this one by Union Carbide will be helpful to the entire Congress and I ask unanimous consent that Union Carbide's report on its international investments be included in the RECORD.

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

UNION CARBIDE UNVEILS NEW MULTINATIONAL STUDY

An exhaustive new study by Union Carbide Corporation shows that its foreign investments have resulted in more exports from the U.S. and more U.S. jobs than would have been the case had the investments not been made. These and other findings, detailed in a comprehensive report released today, are in direct conflict with recent charges by critics of the so-called "multinational" corporation that overseas investments by U.S. corporations are weakening the domestic economy and contributing to the nation's unemployment problem.

The survey reveals, for example, that rather than falling off, Union Carbide's U.S. exports actualy increase as its overseas investments expand. In fact, from 1951–70, the dollar growth of the corporation's exports from the U.S. significantly outpaced that of its affiliated foreign manufacturing operations, increasing from $38 million to $250 million a year or nearly 7-fold over the 20 year time span. This is attributed largely to the "pull" effect which affiliated overseas manufacture exerts on U.S. exports.

Union Carbide's vice-president for international affairs, George C. Wells, who spearheaded the landmark study, describes the "pull" phenomenon this way: "While the establishment of a plant within a particular foreign market obviously reduces U.S. exports of the specific product manufactured by the new plant, this loss of exports is far more than offset by the resultant increase in U.S. exports of allied, intermediate or accessory products. This 'pull' effect stems from the fact that a company can do a much more aggressive and effective marketing job when it has a strong manufacturing and sales organization actually on the scene than it can through the usual export sales arrangement."

The report credits the "pull" effect with more than a half billion dollars in U.S. export sales from 1951–70 over and above what the corporation would have realized if it had not invested abroad during this period. In terms of domestic employment, this translates into nearly 2,000 additional export-related U.S. jobs within Union Carbide alone, which otherwise would not have existed.

The report cites as further evidence of the export "pulling" power of Union Carbide's foreign investment the fact that fully 57 per cent of the corporation's total U.S. exports are to or through foreign affiliated companies, and that its exports to foreign markets where it has affiliated manufacturing facilities tend to be at a higher level and show at least the equivalent and sometimes a greater rate of growth than exports to areas where Union Carbide has no manufacturing investment.

The "pull" effect of its affiliated foreign manufacture on its U.S. exports is primarily responsible for Union Carbide's continuing highly-favorable trade balance. Between 1963–70, for example, Union Carbide recorded a combined trade surplus (exports over imports) of more than a billion dollars. The corporation's imports consist primarily of raw materials not available in the U.S.

Further highlighted in the report is the vital contribution of Union Carbide's overseas investments to the overall U.S. balance of payments. The survey shows that from 1951–70, the inflow of funds to the U.S. from the corporation's foreign investments outweighed its investment outflow by nearly a quarter of a billion dollars. Additionally, for the period 1966–70 alone, total U.S. inflow (exports, foreign dividends, etc.) to the corporation from its foreign operations exceeded U.S. outflow (imports plus direct foreign investment) by an impressive $805 million.

The report also explodes another popular multinational "myth"—that U.S. corporations invest abroad to escape or evade taxes. According to the report, between 1966–70, Union Carbide's share of total income and withholding taxes paid to foreign governments by international affiliates totaled $196 million. This came out to an average tax rate of 52.5 per cent.

"Although we cannot speak for other companies or industries," Mr. Wells stated, "as far as Union Carbide is concerned, current proposals to penalize U.S. corporations for having invested abroad cannot help but adversely affect our nation's economy, its balance of payments and domestic employment. Our study clearly proves that."

Union Carbide would "much prefer to build all of its plants at home and try to compete for overseas markets through export, solely," Mr. Wells said. This, he explains, would avoid much of the risk involved in investing abroad. He adds, however, that this is becoming increasingly difficult, and, as in many cases, impossible to do because "in today's world, U.S. corporate objectives have to mesh with those of the nations in which and with which we do business."

Union Carbide is a major, worldwide producer of chemicals and plastics, industrial gases, metals, carbon products, and consumer products. The corporation has production facilities in 44 states and 30 foreign countries and, together with its foreign affiliated companies, employs nearly 100,000 persons.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 748

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recently Congress passed House Joint Resolution 748. This is landmark legislation which will enable the Veterans' Administration to help solve the massive health manpower crisis which exists in this country today. For the benefit of my colleagues, there follows a summary of the provisions of this legislation:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE OLIN E. TEAGUE, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL SCHOOL ASSISTANCE AND HEALTH MANPOWER TRAINING ACT OF 1972, HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 748

I think that everybody who is knowledgeable on the subject agrees that for many years we have had in this country a health care crisis due to the tremendous shortage of physicians and allied health personnel. It is now estimated that there is a shortage of approximately 48,000 doctors and 250,000 medical support personnel. Because of that shortage, the rising costs of health care, and the increasing demand by the people of this country for quality health care, it has appeared to me for several years that the VA hospital system—the largest single hospital system in the world—could make a real contribution in alleviating these shortages in a minimum of time and at the lowest possible cost. The VA hospital system maintains active affiliation with over 80 medical schools, and hundreds of other schools involved in other phases of health personnel training. For many years VA has assisted in training thousands of medical and health care manpower for this country.

On March 11, 1971, I introduced legislation which would authorize a 7-year pilot program whereby VA grants could be made to states to assist them in establishing new medical schools in conjunction with VA hospitals. It also authorized grants to currently VA affiliated medical schools and other schools training health personnel. That legislation was later co-sponsored by almost every member of my Committee. It passed the House on July 19, 1971, and went to the Senate where it was amended and returned to the House on April 27, 1972. The House and Senate agreed on a modified version and sent it to the President on October 13. The President approved the measure on October 24.

The new Act provides for a pilot program of

assistance to states in the establishment of eight new state medical schools if such schools are located in proximity to, and operated in conjunction with, VA medical facilities. Under this provision, $25 million would be authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and a like sum for each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years. These sums will remain available until the end of the sixth fiscal year following the fiscal year for which they are appropriated.

Under this program, the Administrator of VA may enter into agreements with colleges or universities which are primarily state supported, to enable such institutions to establish new medical schools. He is prohibited from entering into such agreements unless he finds that (1) there will be adequate state or other financial support for the proposed school; (2) overall plans meet professional and other standards which VA prescribes; (3) the school will maintain arrangements which are mutually beneficial in carrying out the mission of the school and the VA medical facility with which it is affiliated; and (4) he receives reasonable assurance from the appropriate accreditation body or bodies that the school will meet accreditation standards within a reasonable time.

If these conditions are met, the Administrator may use the funds authorized for the extension, alteration, remodeling, or repair of buildings and structures under his control, so as to make them suitable for use as medical school facilities, and lease such land, buildings, or structures (including equipment) to the institution. Further, such funds may be utilized for payment of grants to reimburse states for the cost of faculty salaries over a 7-year period on a declining formula.

The Act also authorizes an additional $50 million a year for 7 years for grants to VA affiliated medical schools; to universities, colleges and schools for training professional and technical allied health services personnel; and to expand VA hospital education and training capacity.

The VA is now in the process of drafting regulations for the implementation of this new program. Although the Act provides authorization for the appropriations I mentioned earlier, unfortunately it was approved after the adjournment of Congress, and there was no opportunity for the Congress to act on a supplemental appropriation. However, I am sure that the Administrator will from now until a supplemental appropriation can be obtained in the first session of the 93rd Congress, continue to plan for the wise implementation of this new program. I assure you that I will seek the funds for this program early in that session of Congress.

I must remind you that this is a very limited pilot program. It only provides for the establishment of eight new medical schools. I am sure the competition for these grants will be great. I am confident that the Administrator will thoroughly examine all applications for grants under this new program and make a wise decision as to the establishment of new schools with the greatest potential for the production of new doctors and health care personnel in the shortest possible time at the lowest cost to provide the best possible medical care for the nation's veterans.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JORDAN OF IDAHO

HON. WILLIAM B. SAXBE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. SAXBE. Mr. President, Senator LEN B. JORDAN of Idaho has been an able and dedicated public servant for more than 20 years. I wish to join with my colleagues in the Senate in paying tribute to LEN JORDAN for his outstanding record of service to his great State of Idaho and to this country.

His service to the U.S. Senate nas covered a span of 10 years. He has been an active member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Senate Finance Committee, the Joint Economic Committee, and the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct. Prior to this he served as a member of the Idaho House of Representatives and as Governor of Idaho.

I have served with Senator JORDAN for the past 4 years in the Congress of the United States and he has gained my respect as a leader, legislator, and a man. I have had the opportunity to publicly observe his participation on the Senate floor and to privately observe his participation in the breakfast meetings of the Senate prayer group.

Certainly he has contributed much and it has been my privilege to serve him. I wish to add my good wishes to LEN and his family for much continued happiness.

HON. PATRICK T. CAFFERY

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, PAT CAFFERY has rendered splendid service to the Nation and to the great State of Louisiana. He has chosen to leave this body at the very prime of his career of public service even though such is his popularity and effectiveness that he could have served in this body for many years to come.

PAT CAFFERY is a young man of great dedication and ability and we predict for him many years of public service and success in his beloved Acadia Parish of Louisiana. It has been a special pleasure for us to serve on the Public Works Committee with PAT and we will miss his splendid contributions and wise counsel. Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for PAT CAFFERY and his lovely family continued success and every happiness in the years to come.

SENATOR ELAINE S. EDWARDS

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Senator ELAINE EDWARDS came to the Senate in the later days of the 92d Congress, to represent her great State of Louisiana while it mourned the death of our great colleague Senator Allen J. Ellender.

Senator EDWARDS came to the Senate at its most difficult time, in its last rush of activity before the close of the Congress. Many complex and important bills required her immediate attention and decision. Every Senator will agree it was no small task to take on this burden—without the months and years of preparation enjoyed by her colleagues. I would like to congratulate Senator EDWARDS for the determination and zest she applied to her task, and for her informed and diligent representation of the people of Louisiana and the Nation.

I had the particular pleasure to cosponsor Mrs. EDWARDS' bill to establish the Ellender scholarship program and to work with her to secure its enactment. This law will be a lasting tribute to Senator Ellender by providing fellowships to disadvantaged secondary school students and their teachers to participate in a grassroots public affairs program in Washington.

All Senators will remember that Mrs. EDWARDS presided in the Senate with the same forcefulness and intelligence that characterized her other Senate work. When she pounded the gavel for order in the Senate, she got it.

I admire our colleague and do not want the session to end without congratulating her for the fine job she has done. The people of Louisiana and her colleagues in the Senate all owe her our gratitude and admiration.

HON. EVERETT B. JORDAN

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the adjournment of the 92d Congress approaches on a note of sadness, for the end of the session also marks the departure of a close friend and outstanding legislator, Senator EVERETT JORDAN.

Few Senators have worked harder and more effectively in the service of their State and Nation. EVERETT JORDAN is a man of kindness and courage, and the two attributes have blended to make him an outstanding person as well as a legislative leader.

Senator JORDAN has been a valued member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, and his background in the extensive farming economy of North Carolina gave him a broad range of expertise and understanding.

He also served on the Public Works Committee, where the welfare of his Nation as well as his own beloved State greatly benefited from his contributions.

But Senator JORDAN also held the important and largely thankless responsibility of heading up the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. His leadership of this key panel during a difficult period when it handled sensitive Senate ethics issues and the thorny problem of modernizing Senate rules was in itself a tribute to his dedication and ability.

We will miss EVERETT JORDAN, but we wish him continued happiness and achievement.

A TRIBUTE TO FORMER SENATOR PRESCOTT BUSH

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the recent death of former Senator Prescott S. Bush of Connecticut brings sadness to all who had the privilege and pleasure of knowing this fine, distinguished gentleman.

I value the memory of my service with Pres Bush in the Senate, where he represented his State with distinction from 1952 to 1963. We were both members of the Armed Services Committee and for a part of the time the Public Works Committee. Although we were from different parties, and from different regions of the country, with corresponding differences in our constituencies, we had similar views in many matters. He was quick to see the dangers in what came to be referred to as "Joe McCarthyism." His experience in the field of banking made him acutely aware of the need for a strong sense of fiscal responsibility in government, and he had a broad understanding of the dangers that inflation could hold for the country. He was effective in committee, and courteous and gentlemanly in debate on the floor.

This word "gentleman" fits Prescott Bush in every respect. He had dignity integrity, compassion, and an inherent empathy which led him always to understand and respect another's point of view. Though he might disagree and feel obliged to voice an opposing view, he did so kindly, and with charm and good humor. His fine personality, keen wit, and instinctive consideration for others made it a pleasure to be around him, and he will be greatly missed by all his friends and associates.

Mrs. Stennis joins with me in extending to his wife, Dorothy, their four sons and their daughter, our deepest sympathy in their great loss.

THE WHEAT SALE TO RUSSIA

HON. FRED R. HARRIS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on October 8, the Agribusiness Accountability Project, under the direction of Ms. Martha M. Hamilton, published an excellent study of events surrounding the recent wheat sale to Russia. I ask unanimous consent to include the first half of the summary of that study "The Great American Grain Robbery and Other Stories" in the RECORD.

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

A SUMMARY OF THE GREAT AMERICAN GRAIN ROBBERY AND OTHER STORIES

(By Martha M. Hamilton)

INTRODUCTION

Preoccupied with protecting the economic well-being of agribusiness middlemen—major food processors and grain exporting corporations—the United States Department of Agriculture fails to promote or protect the interests of family farmers or tax-paying consumers.

Agribusiness has installed itself as USDA's chief client, and the department created to be the farmers' agency—isn't.

The questionable multi-million dollar wheat sale a few weeks ago to the Soviet Union by a small, private group of Agriculture Department-favored exporters provided one example of USDA favoritism. THE GREAT AMERICAN GRAIN ROBBERY AND OTHER STORIES, a forthcoming, book-length report by the Agribusiness Accountability Project, shows that the summer wheat sale giveaway was just business as usual at USDA. The AAP report is by Martha M. Hamilton.

THE GREAT AMERICAN GRAIN ROBBERY examines in detail USDA's policies on the International Wheat Agreement and wheat exports, USDA's 1971 sale of feed grains to Russia and USDA's handling of procurement under two surplus commodities removal programs.

These actions are examined in the light of three questions:

Did they improve farm income?

Was this their primary intent?

Whom did they benefit?

The year-long study by the Agribusiness Accountability Project contains a profile, assembled for the first time, of the major corporations involved in the grain trade and how they largely determine grain policies. A similar look at the 56 major processors that each sold USDA over $1 million in surplus food in fiscal 1971 is included in the report.

The report also focuses on the interchange of executives between the Department of Agriculture and agribusiness. This back-and-forth movement promotes a policy within the Agriculture Department that declares: what's good for agribusiness is good for America's farmers and consumers.

THE INTERNATIONAL GRAINS ARGUMENT

Gutting the International Grains Arrangement was one of the first tasks the Department of Agriculture performed for the grain trade after President Nixon took office. The IGA attempted to provide fair returns to wheat growers through a stabilized market, to multilateralize food aid and to insure exporting nations of a market in time of surplus and importing nations of a reasonably priced wheat supply in times of shortage.

IGA had barely sprung to life before it was shot down. The Johnson administration, which helped create the IGA, was replaced by the Nixon administration, and right away the United States and other countries seemed to have difficulty recalling why IGA existed. The grain trade began to cut prices and thus helped fulfill its own prophecy that IGA would fail.

The IGA limped through three years before it expired officially. Its successor—the International Wheat Agreement (IWA)—was more to the grain trade's and the Nixon administration's liking, a not-very-strong gentlemen's agreement. Attempts by Congress, wheat growers and other exporting nations to strengthen the International Wheat Agreement met a wall of administration resistance.

Prior to 1969, the idea behind IWA was to provide price stability in world wheat trade. The agreements included minimum prices to serve as protection against price-cutting wars among exporters trying to claim each other's markets. The current International Wheat Agreement has no minimum or maximum. If the commodity is sold at a lower price on the export market, the government makes up the difference. Because of this, price-cutting has taken a heavy toll on national treasuries and the taxpayer's dollars.

The world in which wheat is traded is hardly a world of free trade. It reeks of price protection, conflicting national interests, political considerations, finite markets and trade blocks. USDA officials and grain trade representatives seem to come from another world when they argue against putting a minimum floor under world wheat prices. Wheat farmers, meanwhile, endure the real world pressures of the cost-price squeeze. The grain trade predicted that IGA wouldn't work, and it didn't. It never had a chance. The world wheat crop harvested just after ratification of the IGA was huge. By the middle of the crop year, United States grain exporters were cutting prices—perhaps in self-defense or perhaps to sabotage the agreement. U.S. exporters began selling different types of wheat below the minimum prices. IGA contained mechanisms for dealing with pressure on prices as they approached minimum levels, but the U.S. ignored the mechanisms.

In 1971, the administration that presided over the demise of the IGA was back with their version of an International Wheat Agreement. The new IGA did not provide minimum and maximum prices. It was simply an agreement, as one spokesman for farmers described it, "of grain trade, by the grain trade, and for the grain trade."

Among the strongest arguments that advocates of minimum pricing provisions make are arguments on behalf of U.S. taxpayers and the balance of payments. The U.S. now pays export payments to companies which handle wheat exports to make up the difference between the higher domestic price the exporters pay for wheat and the lower price for which they sell it. There are two ways to minimize this expenditure. One way would be to lower the U.S. market price of wheat to a level approaching the so-called "world" price of of wheat. USDA has expressed its desire to do so, telling growers that they will be able to export more wheat at lower prices and increase income that way. The Department sells this theory on the basis that increased markets will boost the U.S. balance of payments. The idea makes sense in a vacuum, but not in the real world of international trade. In the real world, there is no "world" price reflecting supply and demand.

If the United States, as the dominant wheat exporter, moves prices down, other developed countries follow to keep their shares of the market. The percentage of world wheat trade that the United States handles each year goes up and down, but it does so on considerations other than price. Factors that influence how much the United States can expand its share of world wheat trade include the weather, politics, national interest, wheat quality, and transportation. The latter two factors influence how much wheat the U.S. and other exporters handle, but politics, national interest, and world wheat production are probably stronger restaints.

In 1971, after hearings on the weakened International Wheat Agreement, the Senate passed a "sense of the Senate resolution" directing the U.S. negotiators to go back to the International Wheat Council to seek agreement with other nations on minimum prices, reference wheats (wheats used as a basis for figuring relative minimum prices of other types of wheat) and basing points (various export and import shipping points).

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Clarence Palmy, now vice president of Continental Grain Company, served as head of the U.S. delegation to the Council. He testified that the U.S. was "not in favor of this resolution" because member countries could at any time "negotiate a pricing provision if such seems desirable and timely."

In spite of the urgings of American growers and the expressed desire of the U.S. Senate, the USDA remains intransigent. Its officials and other trade representatives of the Nixon administration obviously believe that the best trade agreement is no trade

agreement at all. The next best thing is one that means nothing.

THE GREAT AMERICAN GRAIN ROBBERY

The Great American Grain Robbery included the USDA-arranged sale of feed grains to Russia in November 1971—"the great feed grain sale," as the Agriculture Department called it. The sale may have opened the way for further Soviet purchases from the grain trade, but it could have been less expensive from the taxpayers' point of view. And though the higher cost helped improve farm income, there was no indication that USDA planned it that way.

As a result of the grain sale, USDA brought grain at inflated prices with taxpayers' money so they could deliver it cheap to two multi-billion dollar grain trading corporations.

USDA promised to sell government-owned oats and barley to Cargill and Continental Grain at below-market prices and for less than USDA paid for them. USDA buys grains and stores them when prices are low, and as a result it had oats and barley on hand. The moderate loss was viewed as acceptable because it would help the United States sell surplus corn to Russia. The Soviet Union would take corn only if oats and barley were included in the sale, USDA officials said.

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Palmby defended the loss, citing as one benefit the creation of a new market for U.S. grain. Besides, he told a House Agriculture Subcommitte, it saved storage costs on the barley and oats. Palmby discussed the sale in detail with the subcommittee, but no questions were raised about Cargill's and Continental's profits. The congressmen stifled that line of questioning at USDA's request.

The cost of subsidizing the private sale to Russia through the oats and barley concessions got higher when USDA, caught short on barley, turned to the open market to buy enough to fulfill its cut-rate commitment. Market prices were surprisingly strong, bolstered by USDA's sale to the grain trade corporations. Farmers, upon whom USDA had been counting on to turn over barley cheaply to USDA rather than leave it on the market or under loan, didn't deliver—even when USDA offered a 3 cents per bushel storage bonus to turn in barley under loan from 1968, 1969 and 1970 crops ahead of time.

USDA had expected a loss of about 2.5 cents per bushel on 39 million bushels of barley. When the barley failed to materialize, the cost ran higher. Cargill and Continental paid USDA from 83 cents to 91 cents per bushel to the government for barley in the Fall of 1971. But USDA paid $1.18 per bushel and more when it found itself nearly eight million bushels short.

The National Farmers Organization (NFO), a collective bargaining agent for farmers, was the successful bidder on much of the barley purchased. The increased price of barley translated into higher farmer income, in spite of USDA's poor planning.

USDA's concessions on the sale of oats and barley was only one example of its bending over backwards to help Cargill and Continental make the sale. The Nixon administration helped with shipping arrangements, too, extracting from the maritime unions a deal to ignore a requirement that 50 percent of all grain shipments to Communist countries be moved in American flag ships. Commodities move more cheaply in foreign vessels. Cargill, with foreign flag vessels of its own, and Continental, with an interest in Overseas Shipholding Group, were pleased with the outcome.

During hearings on the grain sale, congressmen focused attention on red-baiting and missed another development. Aside from the loss involved in the sale of oats and barley to the corporations, the hearings disclosed that USDA had only a guarantee that half of the corn sold would be U.S. corn, not corn from competing nations—incredible, since getting rid of U.S. corn during the price-depressing surplus of 1971 was a major justification for the oats and barley giveaway.

The sale provided for the purchase of "*up to* 80 million bushels of U.S. corn for which no market was otherwise in sight," Palmby said at the hearing (emphasis added). Questioned by Congressman Graham Purcell (D-Texas), Palmby admitted that as much as 43.3 million bushels of the corn being sold to Russia could come from outside the United States. There was a guarantee for sale of only about half as much U.S. corn as the 80 million bushel figure USDA bandied around.

USDA originally argued for a better deal for U.S. farmers. Palmby told the subcommittee, "In the earlier conversations with the grain exporters we had tentatively agreed on terms . . . whereby we would insist that for every ton of barley and oats purchased from CCC for export, the firm would agree to export at least two tons of corn or grain sorghum. We were then subsequently faced with dock strikes and threatened dock strikes. For this reason we, at the last moment, changed our announcement to read one-for-one. But the exporters continued to tell us—and really we are talking about Continental in this case—that it was their intention to deliver most all of this corn from the United States." Continental Grain—where Clarence Palmby now is a vice president—was the major beneficiary of the sale.

Another USDA gesture affected only Cargill. Cargill did not have a contract with Russia for all of the corn it promised to sell when it bought oats and barley from the government. But the company promised to present USDA with a contract for purchase of 12 million bushels of corn—an amount matching the figure for the oats and barley purchased from USDA by Cargill—by the end of 1971.

When Cargill failed to do so, the Department granted the company a month's extension. Finally, half the corn was shipped to Russia, the other half to East Germany.

USDA's generosity knew few bonds in its assistance to Cargill and Continental in making the sales—generosity that may not have been necessary. Another exporter, Louis Dreyfus, later sold the USSR 50,000 metric tons of corn without cheap oats and barley.

WHEAT: WHO CARES?

Wheat and what happens to it is big business. It is a source of income for more than a million farmers, a source of international and domestic political machinations, and a significant element in the huge enterprises of a handful of unknown but powerful companies—the grain trade.

Wheat is a major U.S. crop and a major export product. Some 1.3 million farmers make their living directly from growing wheat; millions of other jobs depend on it indirectly.

What generates income, which is why there are those who care. The question is, who gets the money? USDA is usually the arbiter. The contenders are grain trade corporations and the farmers who grow wheat.

THE INTERNATIONAL GRAIN TRADE: HIDING THEIR LIGHT UNDER A BUSHEL

"The big rich men that buys your crops have organized. They organized and agreed that they wouldn't give you a fair price for nothing you raise. Or nothing you work at. They got them a Union. . . ."—Woodie Guthrie

Grain trade companies are large, diversified corporations that handle and export wheat and other grains. Most are privately held corporations with so few stockholders that they don't have to file reports with the Federal Securities and Exchange Commission, a process that would subject their operations to public scrutiny.

The leaders of the grain trade are Archer Daniels Midland (ADM), Bunge, Cargill, Continental Grain, Cook Industries, Louis Dreyfus and Peavey. They dominate a concentrated industry. Continental and Cargill together handle about half of the world's grain shipments. Six exporters handle about 90 per cent of U.S. wheat exports, according to one authority.

The companies dominate more than sales. Six grain exporting firms owned 44 per cent of the port grain elevators and 56 per cent of the storage capacity in major U.S. grain shipping ports in 1967.

Controlling this storage capacity allows the giant grain firms to collect substantial fees from USDA for storing and handling government-owned grain (see figure 1).

There are a number of reasons offered for why so few outsized corporations dominate the grain industry, including the argument that they offer economies of size. The USDA rationale is, generally, that giant corporations are most effective in capturing a substantial share of world markets for U.S. trade.

The leading members of the grain trade look alike at first glance, but under close inspection there are differences of size, strength, interests and style.

Cargill: At the top is Cargill, a firm that for the past century quietly has become perhaps the nation's largest privately held corporation.

Cargill's sales hit $3 billion in fiscal 1972, according to some reports, and at least $2 billion for the last four years. A multinational company, Cargill operates in 36 foreign countries and sends more than a fourth of its invested capital abroad. By its own account, Cargill contributes as much as $1 billion in a single year to the U.S. balance of payments—the second largest corporate contributor.

Cargill runs a restaurant; owns ships; mines rock salt; catches fish; manufactures chemicals; raises turkeys; processes chickens; runs barges, towboats, trucks and trains; and sells insurance. But Cargill's reign in grain is mainly in conveying; Cargill is primarily a handler and trader. Its storage capacity is estimated at over 180 million bushels.

The Cargill and the MacMillan families control more than 80 per cent of the company's stock. Two Cargill officers have received presidential appointments since Richard Nixon became President. Erwin Kelm, chairman of the board and chief executive officer, is a member of the National Industrial Pollution Council. Former Cargill vice president William Pearce was named deputy special representative for trade by President Nixon.

Continental: By selling nearly 200 million bushels of wheat to the Soviet Union in July, 1972, Continental Grain has become the most visible of the grain firms.

A conservative estimate puts Continental's sales at $2.5 billion. Continental is large and diversifying, moving from the shadows of the grain trade world into consumer products. Continental's structure is autocratic under Michel Fribourg, who owns more than 90 per cent of the stock.

In 1966, Continental gained control of Allied Mills, a manufacturer of livestock feed. Allied Mills carried Continental outside its traditional lines of business into pet food, leather goods, frozen food and vertical integration of broiler and hog production.

In early 1970, Continental formed Continental Commodity Services, a brokerage headquartered in Chicago.

Continental's latest splurge took it into the baking business. In December, 1971, it acquired Oroweat Bakeries, a West Coast Operation dealing in specialty breads and "natural foods", flour and cereal products.

Cook Industries: Cook Industries is the grain trade's conglomerate, a far-reaching amalgamation of businesses with little in common. Cook is in termite control, grain and cotton merchandising, flooring, chemicals, insurance and apartment building. Sales in fiscal 1971 reached $152 million, up

25 per cent from the year before and almost double 1969's sales.

Cook is essentially a Southern operation. Cook and Co. began in 1919 as a cotton merchandising partnership, but grain is increasingly important to it. Since 1962 it has become one of the world's largest grain exporters. Cook's deals go beyond grain and cotton merchandising to agricultural chemicals, fertilizers, and mixed feed distribution, and soybean and cottonseed processing. Cook is a public corporation, traded on the American Stock Exchange as CKI.

The company has ties to Conservative Southern Democrats. Board member John Murchison is part of a rich, powerful Texas family—supporters of John Connally, Senator Lloyd Bentsen and Senator John G. Tower. He was among the rich conservatives at former Treasury Secretary Connally's first barbeque for President Nixon.

Bunge: Bunge Corporation, with U.S. headquarters in New York, is one of the most privately held grain trade corporations. It is, by one account, the third largest grain shipper in the world. Bunge has drawn the cloak of secrecy more tightly around its operations than the others. A study of the grain export industry in the U.S. lists Bunge among four top exporters of U.S. grain—with Cargill, Continental and Louis Dreyfus.

Bunge's storage capacity is around 100 million bushels. The corporation maintains offices and agents in 80 foreign countries. Bunge has sales of at least $800 million and has 1,200 employees.

Louis Dreyfus: Dreyfus's U.S. operation in New York is a member of the worldwide Louis Dreyfus Group, headquartered in Paris. Dreyfus has been doing business for 117 years. It is the fourth or fifth largest grain trading firm in the world. Louis Dreyfus's activities in the United States have been limited to traditional grain trade business for the most part, though the firm seems to be gearing up for diversification. In Europe, Dreyfus owns a shipping fleet of more than a million tons under French and British flags, operates ships on a time charger basis, and charters ships for its own activities and for clients. In 1971 Dreyfus's U.S. sales volume was $300 million.

Archer Daniels Midland (ADM): Archer Daniels Midland ranks sixth or seventh in its volume of grain exported from the United States. It ranks 192 among the 500 largest industrial corporations in the nation, according to 1972 rankings. Sales for the years on which the rating is based jumped from $443,383,662 in fiscal year 1970 to $659,799,515 in fiscal 1971.

ADM is the nation's largest soybean processor with a crushing capacity of 150 million pounds and an oil refining capacity of one billion pounds. It is the largest processor of bulk finished oil in the U.S. It is the nation's third largest flour miller and the largest barge shipper on the Mississippi River, shipping over 15 million tons of raw and procesed commodities in an average year and storing more than 70 million bushels of grain.

In 1965, Dwayne and Lowell Andreas, brothers, gained controlling interest in ADM. Dwayne Andreas, who is chairman of ADM's board, plays both sides of the political fence. He supported his friend Hubert Humphrey for president in 1972, but also contributed to the Republican presidential campaign. Even before Humphrey's defeat at the Democratic National Convention in Miami, Andreas was contributing to the Nixon campaign. A $25,000 contribution made before the new disclosure act law on April 7, 1972, became public when it ended up in the bank account of one of the men indicted by a Federal Grand Jury in the burglary of the Democratic Party headquarters.

Peavey: Peavey Co., along with ADM and four other industry leaders, account for nearly 80 per cent of the world's grain sales, according to one study. Peavey also is a privately held firm, and thus able to avoid public notice. It is increasingly vertically integrated, moving into consumer products, and operating transportation facilities. Like most other big grain corporations, Peavey is in the futures brokerage business.

Peavey's annual sales approach $200 million. It both buys from and sells to farmers operating elevators and farm service centers in over 300 locations.

MARKET MUSCLE

The size and structure of these seven corporations suggest market power, not unlike political power. "Structural monopoly is essentially a matter of probabilities," economist William Shepherd has said. The grain trade has the elements—including a high degree of concentration—that make it possible to exert market muscle.

Control of Information.—Grain trade leadership is a close-mouthed bunch. Five of seven of the top companies are privately-held corporations. Those in government who deal with the trade respect its privacy, even the bits of information considered "public."

Information is a tool traders use to make sales. They gather it energetically and guard it jealously, operating communications networks of a size and expertise hard even for the government to match. "Gathering intelligence on the daily goings-on around the world is a key to successful grain trading," said a story on Continental Grain. "And Continental is plugged into virtually every major foreign government. Its listening network is like a vast news agency that never publishes a word. It is so good, in fact, that members of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency often wine and dine the company's traders to pick their brains." Cargill has a similar operation.

Leading grain corporations spend a lot to learn what they know. It is hard for a newcomer to break into the business unless it has the resources and the connections to play catch-up in the international intelligence market.

Directorships.—Officers and directors of major grain trade corporations meet face-to-face in a set of relationships built over the years. Most join trade associations to promote mutual interests. There are corporate relationships as well. For example, the chief executive officer or ADM once was a vice president of Cargill, as was a former board member of ADM's bank. Philip H. McCaull, executive vice president of Louis Dreyfus Corporation, held the same post with Cook Industries. Prior to joining Cook, he worked for Cargill in Kansas City and New York.

Grain trade officials from ADM, Peavey and Cargill all serve on the board of Soo Line Railroad Company.

Access to Capital.—The grain trade companies have friends who are bankers. Peavey's former board chairman was a director of the First National Bank of Minneapolis. Cook's directors interlock with the boards of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, Union Planters National Bank of Memphis, Puget Sound National Bank, First National Bank of Dallas and the First National Bank of Memphis. Cargill shares directors with First National Bank of Minneapolis and Northwest National Bank of Minneapolis. ADM has people on the boards of five banks.

A concentrated market, lack of information outside the industry about what goes on inside the industry, diversification, interlocking directorates and easy access to capital—it adds up to market power. In the grain trade, the largest corporations determine where the money goes.

IT'S AN HONORABLE THING

The other claim on the fruits of wheat farming comes from the wheat grower, about a million of them in 43 states.

Ray Goldberg, a Harvard professor of agribusiness, summarized the problem. Production is up, but "the increasing yield does not offset the increase in production costs; therefore, the farmer is dependent upon government subsidies, acreage set-aside incentives and warehouse income from on-farm storage to make a profit from wheat production." Caught in the cost-price squeeze, wheat growers rely on farm program payments for the difference between loss and profit.

Wheat prices are an index of the grower's market and political power.

Growers from all parts of the country are concerned. Their preoccupation is income—but they also worry about their children, their communities, the cost of machinery, land values, whether the public appreciates their work and the futility of expansion to keep up with increasing costs. But money is the real issue.

Six wheat growers talked to the Agribusiness Accountability Project. This is what they said about their lives, jobs and futures.

"I've been farming there since 1950 or 1951. And I did buy a combine[1]—a new combine—right after I started. I bought a 14-foot Minneapolis self-propelled combine for $5,600 brand new. And I was getting $2.00 a bushel for my wheat. Last year, 20 years later, in 1971, I bought my second new combine. This happens to be a John Deere 770, 24-foot cut for $24,000. And my market price, including certificates[2] was a dollar and a half a bushel, roughly. So I did some mathematics and I said—$5,600 for a 14 foot cut is $400 per foot (putting this in perspective). OK, now that seemed all-right. So then I took a $24,000 combine, 24 foot. $1,000 a foot $1.50 per bushel. And now I wonder why this happens. Is it steel? Is it labor? And where do I fit into the picture? This is part of our problem when we talk about equity, parity and survival on the land."

"I'm in the process of reducing my operations and let someone else buy the $20,000 combines and this and that. Because we just can't keep up with it. We just spend more than we take in. If we have a drought . . . you spend two or three thousand or more than that farming it, and then there's nothing in it. You just have the pleasure of working it and buying some high-powered machinery. So I'm just in the process of eliminating that."

"There are three types of farmers: The fellow that's gone; the fellow that's making up his mind to go; and the fellow that's expanding" . . . "Price basically is the problem. They say down here, if you will produce more and take less, you are going to make more money. It don't work."

"When I went to grade school in the late 20's and the early 30's, we had five grade schools here with a total of over 150 kids in the schools. Now they're all consolidated into one school district and they have 11 kids in these six families." . . . "There is just one fellow farming there who was there in 1938, when I began. There are empty houses all around. There are farm sales, fellows going out of business because they're foreclosing, auction sales. And, I wonder, what's gonna happen to the town? And we just built a new church" . . . "We are losing a way of life." "The nearest implement dealer to me was 80 miles away. But he went broke last month, I saw about the sale in the paper. Now it's going to be 220 miles to the nearest dealer."

"They talk about rural development. It's putting the cart before the horse. Unless something is done soon, there won't be anyone left to take advantage of these programs" . . . "If farmers can receive a fair price, we'll put people to work." . . . "We're going to come to town. And we're not scared to work.

---

[1] A wheat harvesting machine.

[2] Price support payment.

We're going to be competing with these people in town for their jobs. Either somebody's going to have to pay enough money to get them on relief that we've knocked out of a job, or if we can't get a job, somebody's going to feed us. Because, me-myself, I pride myself in my honesty. But if somebody don't bring some soup for me and my family, or if somebody don't furnish me a job that I can go out and earn an honest living at, I'm going to steal. I will not see my family go hungry."

"The United States has, and is now, helping other countries with land reform, to get the land back into the hands of ordinary people. Here, we're going the other way, to where, pretty soon, maybe through large farm corporations or non-farm corporations, our land will be controlled by maybe one per cent of the people. And then when that one per cent comes, you can see that there won't be too long til there will be a revolution. And then we'll have land reform."

"I love farming. I love producing food and fiber. I love living out there. I love driving a tractor. I love the whole theory of the thing, if we can just make some money."

"I think we're doing an honorable thing."

SENATOR LEN B. JORDAN

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I hold in the highest esteem my friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Idaho, LEN B. JORDAN.

Senator JORDAN's voluntary retirement from the Senate at the end of this Congress is deeply regretted in the Senate and by the people of Idaho. I join with his colleagues from both sides of the aisle in wishing him a fond farewell.

I know that when he returns to the great State of Idaho, he will continue to play an important role as a political leader and as an effective advocate for the people of his State. We will be hearing from him and welcoming his counsel.

Throughout his political career—as a member of the Idaho Legislature, as Governor and as Senator—LEN JORDAN has served his people well. They can be proud of his efforts on their behalf.

Senator JORDAN served in the Senate in a manner of which both he and this body can be proud. He is known widely for his diligence and selfless work as a senior member of the Committee on Appropriations, and for his leadership in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, both committees being of highest importance to Idaho.

Senator JORDAN will be remembered here for many accomplishments. But I wish to refer in particular to his key role in defeating the effort to undermine the authority of the Congress through a so-called "spending ceiling" during consideration of the debt limit bill. I worked closely with Senator JORDAN on this matter and I can relate to my colleagues the Senator's very deep feelings that no President—Republican or Democrat—should ever have the power of an item veto over congressional appropriations.

Senator JORDAN had the determination and the courage to work with Senators from both parties to insure that Congress authority in the name of the people was not eroded.

After his compromise amendment was deleted in conference, Senator JORDAN came back from Idaho in the closing days of the session to make sure that the Senate would not give in to the House and unwisely give the executive branch an item veto. Despite strong pressures for Senator JORDAN to change his vote, he stood his ground.

All Americans can be grateful for his independence of mind and his courage—on the debt limit legislation and in so many of his activities in the Senate.

Senator JORDAN has served in the best traditions of the Senate. He has brought honor to himself, his family, his State, and our country.

JOHN W. BYRNES

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Honorable JOHN W. BYRNES who is retiring at the close of the 92d Congress after 28 years of distinguished service in the U.S. House of Representatives.

JOHN BYRNES' gift of leadership has accompanied him throughout his long and outstanding career. While a practicing attorney, he was elected to the Wisconsin State Senate and in less than 4 years was named chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee and majority floor leader.

In the U.S. House of Representatives, JOHN W. BYRNES has served as the ranking Republican on the important Ways and Means Committee. In this position, JOHN has applied his great expertise in revenue matters to some of the most vital pieces of legislation of our time. His hard work and his leadership in this vital position has benefited all Americans.

For many Members, membership on the Ways and Means Committee would be enough. But JOHN BYRNES has shared his abilities through service on the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

His leadership has also been made available to his party by serving as chairman of the Republican Policy Committee for several years and in many other capacities.

I join my colleagues in saluting this great American and outstanding public servant. I wish him good health and much happiness in the years ahead.

YELLEN AGAINST HICKEL

HON. FRED R. HARRIS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the Senate a recent decision filed on October 2, 1972, in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California. The decision of the court as set forth in the opinion by Judge Murray reaffirms the decision made in November of 1971 in the case of Yellen against Hickel. This is indeed an historic ruling which goes to the heart of the controversy surrounding the Federal Reclamation Act of 1902 and its application to the Imperial Valley. I ask consent that Judge Murray's decision be printed in the RECORD.

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

[In the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California]

OPINION: CIVIL NO. 69-124—MURRAY

Ben Yellen, et al., Plaintiffs, vs. Walter J. Hickel, individually and as Secretary of the Interior, et al., Defendants. W. E. Jacobs, et al., Intervening Landowners.

Plaintiffs brought this suit seeking a writ of mandamus requiring the Secretary of the Interior to enforce Section 5 of the Reclamation Law of 1902.[1] On November 23, 1971, a partial summary judgment was issued against the federal government,[2] the initial defendants in the suit. The landowners of Imperial Valley, believing that their interests were not sufficiently protected by the government, requested and were granted permission to intervene on their own behalf. A full trial on the merits was then held. All parties have submitted post-trial briefs and the court has reconsidered its partial summary judgment. Now, in light of the testimony and evidence produced at trial, the court reaffirms its partial summary judgment and makes its final determination.

The issues being reconsidered are: (1) the issues of standing and res judicata, (2) the scope of Section 5 of the 1902 Reclamation Act (the residency requirement), (3) the effect of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (hereinafter referred to as the B.C.P.A.) on the Imperial Valley, (4) the rule of Udall v. Tallman, 380 U.S. 1 (1965) which requires deference to longstanding administrative constructions, and (5) the equal protection argument.

STANDING AND RES JUDICATA

The plaintiffs in this suit do have an interest in having Section 5 residency requirement enforced. Section 5 is directed specifically to the provision of water for settlement of individuals upon the land. The plaintiffs, residents of Imperial Valley, are clearly within the general zone of interest that is sought to be protected by this legislation.[3] Landowner defendants would have the court believe that only those "directly" affected have standing and that, conveniently, they are the only ones who will be "directly" affected. Obviously the landowners, the beneficiaries of the present state of affairs, are not going to press for enforcement of Section 5. If the plaintiffs are not granted standing to bring this suit, the Department of Interior will in effect be given a license to disregard the law, as well as an immunity from challenges by the intended beneficiaries of the legislation in question.[4]

The decision of *Hewes v. All Persons*[5] decided by the Superior Court for Imperial County is not res judicata as to this cause of action. The case was originally commenced to confirm the proceedings on the part of the Imperial Valley Irrigation District for the authorization of the execution of the contract with the United States. At the same time, a landowner in the District, Charles Malan, filed an action in the same court to enjoin the District from expending any more money in furtherance of the con-

Footnotes at end of article.

tract. Malan alleged the invalidity of the contract, in part, because of Malan's contention that Section 5 of the Reclamation Law of 1902 would apply under the contract and control over its terms, thus taking, without compensation, his water rights for all of his land in excess of 160 acres.

The Malan action was consolidated with the District's confirmation action. On July 1, 1933, judgment was entered confirming the validity of the contract. In its opinion the court held that Section 5 of the Reclamation Law did not apply to the contract.

43 U.S.C. § 511 [6] gives the state courts the power to confirm "proceedings on the part of the district for the authorization of the execution of the contract with the United States." The jurisdiction of the state court is delineated by this statute. The statute confers no jurisdiction upon the state court to decide, as was done in *Hewes v. All Persons*, whether Section 14 of the B.C.P.A. ("reclamation law shall govern the construction, operation and maintenance") incorporates Section 5's acre and residency limitations. The precise question of whether the term "construction, operation and maintenance" includes the delivery provisions of Section 5 has been decided by the United States Supreme Court in *Ivanhoe Irrigation District v. McCracken*, 357 U.S. 275 (1957), and the decision is contrary to the dicta in *Hewes, supra.*

Plaintiffs are not estopped by a decision rendered at a time when plaintiffs surely would not have been granted standing to contest the issue. Nor are they estopped by a state court decision which is contrary to a subsequent Supreme Court determination of the question.

The question of whether or not Section 5 applies to the Imperial Valley involves interpretation of a federal statute and is therefore a federal question. Federal courts are not bound by a state court precedent on federal questions.

"It was upon a determination of a federal question, therefore, that the Supreme Court of California rested its conclusion that by Sec. 10, sales to post exchanges were not exempted from the tax. Since this determination of a federal question was by a state court, we are not bound by it." Standard Oil Co. v. Johnson, 316 U.S. 481, 483 (1941). See also 20 Am. Jur. Courts § 222.

THE SCOPE OF SECTION 5

Landowner defendants along with the government contend that Section 5 does not apply in a situation in which there has been no "sale", nor does it apply in a situation where an "irrigation district" is involved in lieu of "individual landowners"—the term used in Section 5. Also, they contend that Section 5 imposes only a threshold requirement; not a durational requirement. A "threshold" requirement would, in effect, be an initial prerequisite to the receipt of a water right as herein defined. The requirement would terminate upon granting of a water right rather than continuing on in duration. The suggested threshold periods are either five years or the period of time needed for the irrigation district to repay the government for its capital investment in the irrigation project (the year 2002 in the case of the Imperial Valley Irrigation District).

What is a "Sale"

The United States Supreme Court has answered both of the questions posed by landowners in its decision of *Ivanhoe v. McCracken, supra.* The question before the court in *Ivanhoe* involved the application of the 160 acre limitation of Section 5 to individual landowners in Central Valley. The *Ivanhoe* case differs from this case only in that it involves the 160 acre limitation of Section 5 rather than the residency requirement. The case is analogous in that it involves a "district" and in that the "no sale" prohibition pertains to both the acreage and the residency requirements.

The landowners are quick to point out that Congress has reenacted the acreage limitation many times while failing to mention the residency requirement.[7] Landowners would have the court believe that this history of reenactment of the acreage limitation explains the Supreme Court's holding in *Ivanhoe.* In support of their specious reasoning, the landowners quote Mr. Justice Clark when he alludes to "Sec. 5 of the Reclamation Act of 1902, as reenacted in Sec. 46 of the Omnibus Adjustments Act of 1926." [8] Were the landowners' attorneys to read the substance of Justice Clark's opinion rather than his mere paraphrasing of counsel's argument, they would find that the decision turned on the 1902 Act alone, thus vitiating the import landowners attach to the Acts of 1912 and 1926.[9] The Supreme Court in *Ivanhoe* held the 160 acre limitation applicable to the Central Valley even though the only "sale" involved consisted of a contract [10] between the irrigation company and the government by which the irrigation district agreed to repay the construction costs of the project. The Imperial Valley has a contract with the federal government essentially the same as the one in *Ivanhoe.* The "sale" to the Imperial Valley Irrigation District is the same as the "sale" to the Ivanhoe Irrigation District. Section 5 was found applicable to the Ivanhoe Irrigation District and should be equally applicable to the Imperial Valley contract.

"Districts" as against "Individual Landowners"

The Supreme Court in *Ivanhoe* held that "where a particular project has been exempted (from reclamation law) because of its peculiar circumstances, the Congress has always made such exemptions by express enactment".[11] Finding no specific exemption, the court applied Section 5 to the Central Valley landowners regardless of the fact that the landowners had formed a "district" and Section 5 makes no mention of "districts". This holding is completely compatible with the policy of Section 5 as seen by the court:

"The policy as declared by the Congress has been one requiring that the benefits therefrom be made available to the largest number of people, consistent, of course, with the public good. This policy has been accomplished by limiting the quantity of land in a single ownership to which project water might be applied." [12]

Residency, the companion requirement of the 160 acre limitation, will also further the policy of making the benefits from the act available to the largest number of people. The formation of "districts" is merely for administrative expediency. It is not meant to thwart the policy of Section 5.

"Durational or threshold"

Section 5 does not limit residency to a threshold requirement as defined *supra,* pages 4–5. To so limit it, would be contrary to the whole tenor of Reclamation Law. No conceivable purpose would be served by freeing the landowners from this requirement after they have acquired the immense benefits of the federal subsidy. The law was not intended to provide supplemental income to former residents who have returned to San Diego, Burbank and other locations far removed from the Reclamation project. Accordingly, the residency requirement should not be waived upon final payment of construction costs of the project. Such a practice would reduce the statutory limitations to a mere sham. Section 5 would then be nothing more than a financial test tailored to suit the more affluent who can afford to accelerate their payments, move off the project and reap the benefits of a federal subsidy.[13] The policy of the Reclamation Law will best be advanced by imposing a durational residency requirement upon recipients of water from federal projects, even after the construction costs have been paid.

A durational residency requirement to the receipt of water does not fly in the face of the "water right" concept. A water right is not as inviolable as a fee simple in hand. The holder of a water right does not own any water, he merely holds a right to the "use" of that water. The use of the water, can be, and most always is, subject to state and federally imposed conditions. For example, most state water rights are conditioned on their being put to a "beneficial use." If they are not put to a beneficial use, they can be forefeited.

An appropriative water right is a usufructuary right.[14] The holder of the right has the privilege of enjoying a thing (water) the property of which is vested in another (the state). Holders of land patents, on the other hand, have fee simple titles vested in them. State imposed conditions present a much greater constitutional problem in the context of land holdings than in the context of water rights because of the situs of the title. This is basically why water rights lend themselves to the continued implementation of reclamation policy. A water right, which is in the nature of a privilege,[15] can be made conditional upon continued residence. Such a durational requirement would not be possible with land, however. It would be contrary to the vesting of a fee simple title. This explains the use of "threshold" requirements with land patents. Once the threshold requirement is met, the conditions cease and the title vests in the entryman. The landowners fail to make this distinction between land and water rights when they cite the Small Tract Act of 1950 and the Farm Unit Exchange Act of 1953 as being examples of Congress' intent that residency be only a threshold requirement to receipt of water. These two Acts deal with land, not water, Consequently, they are not persuasive as to Section 5 being durational or threshold. They are, however, indicative of Congress' intent to benefit only "residents" of the land.[16] They reaffirm the basic policy of the Reclamation Law.[17]

THE BOULDER CANYON PROJECT ACT

The landowners claim that the B.C.P.A. precludes any application of Section 5 to the Imperial Valley. For support they rely essentially on Section 14 of the B.C.P.A. which states: "general reclamation law shall govern the construction, operation and management except as otherwise provided." and Sections 6, 8 and 13 which incorporate the Colorado River Compact which in turn recognizes "present perfected rights." [18] It is the position of the government that reclamation projects constructed pursuant to the B.C.P.A. are governed by Section 46 of the Omnibus Adjustments Act of 1926, 43 U.S.C. 423(e). The Omnibus Adjustments Act carries forth the acreage limitation but makes no mention of the residency requirement.

Landowners point out that Section 14 refers to "construction, operation and management." No reference is made to "delivery." Section 5, however, is aimed at "delivery." The landowners reason that Section 5 is, therefore, not incorporated by Section 14 of the B.C.P.A. In light of the *Ivanhoe case, supra,* their argument must fail.

The *Ivanhoe* case dealt with the Central Valley Project in California. The language of the Central Valley Project Act [19] is essentially the same as Section 14 of the B.C.P.A., *i.e.* except as herein otherwise provided, the reclamation law shall govern the "construction, operation and management". In finding that the 160 acre limitation applied to Central Valley contracts, the Supreme Court in *Ivanhoe* found that the water delivery provisions of Section 5 were included within the ambit of "construction, operation and management" as used in the Central Valley Project Act. The same must hold true for the in-

Footnotes at end of article.

corporation statute (Section 14) of the B.C.P.A.

Both defendants (landowners and the government) then contend that Section 1 of the B.C.P.A. falls within the "except as otherwise provided" language of Section 14. Section 1 states that no "charge" shall be made for water. This, defendants claim, runs contra to the "sale" language of Section 5 and thus precludes incorporation of Section 5. Defendants misconstrue the term "sale". Section 5 must be read in conjunction with Section 4. Former Solicitor of the Department of Interior, Frank Barry, suggested that a reading of the two sections together reveals that the "sale" is not a commercial transaction. Rather, "Sections 4 and 5 disclose a scheme by which all participants in a project share its cost" [20] by contracting to repay, over an extended period of time, the government expense of constructing the project, *i.e.* the capital outlay. There is no inherent inconsistency between Section 5 of the 1902 Act and Section 1 of the B.C.P.A. which would prevent Section 14 of the B.C.P.A. from incorporating the residency requirement.

THE COLORADO RIVER COMPACT

Landowners next contention is that the B.C.P.A. states in §§ 6, 8 and 13 that the "storage, delivery and use" of irrigation water shall be subject to and controlled by the Colorado River Compact.[21] Article VIII of the Colorado River Compact says:

"Present Perfected Rights to the beneficial use of water of the Colorado River System are unimpaired by this Compact. Whenever storage capacity of 5,000,000 acre feet shall have been provided . . . such rights . . . shall attach to and be satisfied from water that may be stored."

Landowners reason that they were owners of perfected water rights and that mandatory satisfaction of those rights is incompatible with denial of water because of a landowner's place of residence. This argument fails for any one and all of four reasons.

To begin with, there is no evidence that the landowners were owners of perfected water rights as of 1929, the effective date of the Compact. The stipulation of facts and the landowners' Exhibit #1 reveal that the landowners filed water right claims to the Colorado River prior to 1900. In 1903, the Hanlon heading intake in California became clogged with silt.[22] The landowners, at this time, were also having trouble with the newly formed Bureau of Reclamation whose engineers had attacked the California Development Company's right to take water from the Colorado,[23] a navigable river. There is no evidence that Congress, prior to the B.C.P.A., ever authorized the Imperial Valley landowners to use the navigable waters of the Colorado. The landowners then attempted to skirt the problem by requesting Congress to declare the Colorado to be non-navigable and thus beyond federal jurisdiction. Congress rejected this request.[24]

As a result of the silt problem and Reclamation's challenge, the California Development Company apparently turned to Mexico for its diversions.[25] Tnere is no evidence that the landowners, the California Development Company, or the Imperial Valley Irrigation District ever diverted water from the Colorado in the United States after 1903. Although we make no factual finding in this regard, it appears that at the time of the authorizing of the All-American Canal, the landowners were still relying on Mexican water rights—not perfected American rights.[26]

Secondly, assuming the landowners do have perfected United States water rights, they are free to make use of *those* water rights, *i.e.*, they are free to make use of their original diversions in lieu of using B.C.P.A. water. However, if the landowners opt to use B.C.P.A. water, they must satisfy the conditions of delivery. The B.C.P.A. recognition given to "present perfected rights" is a limited recognition. Holders of perfected rights, choosing to use B.C.P.A. water must, like everyone else, comply with the acreage and residence requirements of the Reclamation Law.

The superior navigation easement of the United States precludes private ownership of the water or its flow in a navigable stream.[27] Non-recognition of private usufructuary rights is limited to the relationship between the owner and the national government in the exercise of the navigation power. Within that relationship, whatever rights exist, exist by the grace of Congress.[28] The federal government is at liberty to acknowledge private usufructuary rights; likewise it can impose whatever conditions it wishes. Accordingly, the United States Supreme Court told the members of the Ivanhoe Irrigation District that if they chose not to comply with the acreage limitation, they would have to turn to existing water supplies since the excess land law applies to private land within a federal reclamation project without regard to whether those lands are covered by valid water rights prior to the formation of the project.[29] Similarly, if the Imperial Valley landowners wish to evade the strictures of the reclamation law, they are free to turn to their water rights which allegedly existed prior to the B.C.P.A.,[30] regardless of whether those rights are at Hanlon heading in California or below the border, in Mexico.

Thirdly, there is no evidence before the court that the landowners ever complied with the decree in *Arizona v. Calif.*, 376 U.S. 340 (1964). The decree requires the landowners, through the state of California, to submit their water claims to Colorado River Water and have them acknowledged by the Secretary of the Interior.[31] The Supreme Court has preempted the question of perfected rights in the Colorado. The lower courts should not attempt a determination of this issue.

Finally, and the government is in total agreement with this reason, pre-project water rights are irrelevant because it need only be shown that the Imperial Irrigation District is deriving a benefit from the use of a government facility for reclamation law to be applicable. Therefore, even if landowners comply with the *Arizona v. California* decree and have their rights acknowledged, they will still have to comply with the reclamation law.

EQUAL PROTECTION

The landowners raise a Fourteenth Amendment Equal Protection argument claiming that a durational residency requirement would penalize their constitutionally protected right to travel. Landowners cite *Shapiro v. Thompson*, 394 U.S. 618 (1969), and *Dunn v. Blumstein*, 405 U.S. 330 (1972), to support their contention. This court finds that the landowners do not fall within the scope of the *Shapiron* and *Dunn's* holdings.

The Shapiro and Dunn cases both involve situations wherein a person has moved *into* a jurisdiction and has been denied the rights and/or privileges enjoyed by the established residents of that jurisdiction. Neither case deals with persons who move *out* of a jurisdiction and who are then denied the rights or privileges of that jurisdiction. Shapiro and Dunn involved laws which discriminate between *old* and *new* residents.[32] The two cases say nothing about laws which discriminate between *residents* and *non-residents* as Section 5 does. This is a permissible classification. The logical extreme of landowners' position would allow a person who once resided in Imperial Valley to change his address to New York, for example, and yet still enjoy the benefits of the Imperial Valley's voting and welfare laws. Such a proposition is untenable.

THE RULE OF TALLMAN AGAINST UDALL

It was stated in this court's pre-trial summary judgment, 335 F. Supp. 200, 208 (1971): "We cannot accept the contention that administrative rulings, such as those here relied on, can thwart the plain purpose of a valid law. As to estoppel, it is enough to repeat that the United States is neither bound nor estopped by acts of its officers or agents in entering into an arrangement or agreement to do or cause to be done what the law does not sanction or permit." *United States v. San Francisco*, 310 U.S. 16, 31–32 (1939), citing *Utah Power and Light Co. v. United States*, 243 U.S. 389, 409. Although landowners claim that they have not made an estoppel argument, they persistently raise the issues of "economic injury" and "reliance" which are, in essence, estoppel arguments. The principles of equitable estoppel, however, cannot be applied to deprive the public of the protection of a statute because of the non-feasance of public officials. The rule of *Tallman, supra*, requiring deference to longstanding administrative interpretation, does not apply to the facts of this case. *Tallman* dealt with the construction of an administrative regulation. Section 5, far from being an administrative regulation, is an expression of national policy. "Sec. 5, the provisions of which, as we shall see, have been national policy for over half a century." *Ivanhoe, supra*, at 292. In *Tallman*, the underlying statute behind the regulation left discretion in the Secretary to refuse to issue leases.[33] There is no such leeway in Section 5. Its language is mandatory, not discretionary.

There is no one consistent administrative interpretation of Section 5 which would warrant application of the *Tallman* rule. Over the years, the interpretations of Section 5 have been very much in conflict. The landowners rely upon the Wilbur letter; [34] *Hewes v. All Persons, supra*; and the President's Commission on Water Resources.[35] The plaintiffs rely on Solitictor Barry's opinion [36] as well as Solicitor Harper's opinion.[37] As a consequence of these conflicts, this court must look at the law itself and interpret it consistently with the Supreme Court's holdings in *Arizona v. California* and *Ivanhoe Irrigation District v. McCracken, supra.*

Plaintiffs are hereby ordered to prepare an order and mandate in compliance with the court's findings herein.

Done and dated this 27th day of September, 1972.

W. D. MURRAY,*
Senior U.S. District Judge.

FOOTNOTES

[1] 43 U.S.C. § 431. No right to the use of water for land in private ownership shall be sold for a tract exceeding one hundred and sixty acres to any one landowner, and no such sale shall be made to any landowner unless he be an actual bona fide resident on such land, or occupant thereof residing in the neighborhood of said land, and no such right shall permanently attach until all payments therefor are made. June 17, 1902. § 5, 32 Stat. 389.

[2] Yellen v. Hickel, 335 F. Supp. 200 (1971).

[3] Judge Schwartz, who originally was sitting on this case, denied the government-defendant's motion to dismiss for lack of standing. A written order was signed June 30, 1970. In ruling that the plaintiffs have standing, Judge Schwartz said: "Without prejudging the results of the lawsuit, it does appear to me that the Plaintiffs in this case do have an interest of some kind in having the law enforced—that is, the residency requirement enforced. It may be that in the end their interest will not be served by the result that they hope for. Nevertheless, they do have an interest. They seem to come within the general zone of the interest that is sought to be protected by the legislation. The legislation seems directed specifically to the provision of water for settlement of individuals directly upon the land. So it will be the ruling of the court that the Plaintiffs do have standing to prosecute this action, and, accordingly, the Motion to Dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction will be denied." (Tran-

script of Proceedings, June 12, 1970, pp. 27–28).

[4] See Ivanhoe Irrigation District v. McCracken, 357 U.S. 275, 292 (1957). "From the beginning of the federal reclamation program in 1902, the policy as declared by Congress has been one requiring that the benefits therefrom be made available to the largest number of people, consistent, of course, with the public good."

[5] Hewes v. All Persons, No. 15460 Dept. 2, Superior Court of the State of California in and for the County of Imperial. May 24, 1933.

[6] 43 U.S.C. § 511. In carrying out the purpose of the Act of June 17, 1902 and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, and known as and called the reclamation law, the Secretary of the Interior may enter into contract with any legally organized irrigation district whereby such irrigation district shall agree to pay the moneys required to be paid to the United States . . .: Provided, That no contract with an irrigation district under this section and sections 512 and 513 of this title shall be binding on the United States until the proceedings on the part of the district for the authorization of the execution of the contract with the United States shall have been confirmed by decree of a court of competent jurisdiction, or pending appellate action if ground for appeal be laid.

[7] *See* 43 U.S.C. §§ 543, 544, Aug. 9, 1912 and 43 U.S.C. § 423e, 1925, *e.g.*

[8] *Ivanhoe, supra,* note 6 at 289.

[9] *Id.* at 291–294.

[10] *Id.* at 277 and footnote #1.

[11] *Id.* at 292.

[12] *Id.*

[13] *But see,* Solicitor Bennett's Opinion on the Kings River Contract, July 10, 1957: "You have requested my opinion concerning your (the Dept. of Interior) authority under Federal reclamation law to agree to provisions in the proposed contract with the Kings River Conservation District whereby *individual holders* of excess lands will be permitted to pay the reimbursable costs allocable to their excess lands and the consequences of the antispeculation features of the recordable contracts required by law . . . My opinion is that Congress has not granted to you such authority. Further, fiscal desirability, no matter how impelling, does not suffice as a substitute for that statutory power." (emphasis added) Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 28.

Secretary Seaton's letter concerning the Kings River Contract, July 12, 1957. "The Department continues to recognize and support the basic concept of reclamation law that full and final payment of the obligation of a *district* to the Federal Government ends the applicability of the acreage limitations . . . In the Kings River situation, the proposed options of repayment, extended to each water user, would reduce the statutory limitation to a mere shadow. This would make the test, not one of public policy, but solely one of the financial capability of each landowner to purchase immunity from the statutory restrictions." (emphasis added) Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 27.

Secretary Seaton fails to recognize that termination of the acreage limitation upon full payment, regardless of whether payment is by individuals or district, "reduces the statutory limitation to a mere shadow" making the test one of financial capability of the individual or the district. If anything, it becomes more of a shadow when *districts* are involved because of the greater financial resources and ability to raise money.

[14] Amador County v. State Bd. of Equalization, 49 Cal. Rptr. 448, 457, 240 C.A. 2nd 205.

[15] United States v. Willow River Company, 324 U.S. 499, 509 (1945).

[16] See Under Secretary Oscar Chapman's letter to Senator O'Mahoney: "The purpose of S. 1543 is to allow the disposal to *resident* landowners and entryman on reclamation projects of small tracts of lands which are not suitable for disposal under the homestead or reclamation laws. . . . The sale of such tracts to *those farmers located on the project* would be in the interest of the project and would place the lands on the county tax polls." U.S. Code Congressional Service, Vol. #2, 1950, pp. 1997–8. (emphasis added)

[17] *Ivanhoe, supra* note 6 at 292.

[18] The Colorado River Compact, provides in Article VIII that: "Present Perfected Rights to the beneficial use of water of the Colorado River System are unimpaired by this Compact. Whenever storage capacity of 5,000,000 acre feet shall have been provided . . . such rights . . . shall attach to and be satisfied from water that may be stored. . . ."

[19] 50 Stat. 850.

[20] M–36675, 71 I.D. 496, at 501 (1964).

[21] Boulder Canyon Project Act § 6 (43 U.S.C. § 617e) The dam and reservoir provided for by section 617 of this title shall be used: First, for river regulation, improvement and navigation, and flood control; second, for irrigation and domestic uses and *satisfaction of present perfected rights* in pursuance of Article VIII of said Colorado River Compact;" (emphasis added)

[22] Stipulation of Facts, p. 7, paragraph 7. "Hanlon's heading, the first intake cut by the California Development Company, became clogged with silt by 1903. In or about 1903, the Mexican company was granted a concession by the Republic of Mexico which permitted it to divert water from the River in Mexico and deliver half of that water at an inland point on the international border for use in Imperial Valley. Second and third heading, situated *south of the border,* were built in 1904. (emphasis added)

[23] "The diversion of water from the Colorado River was made through three intakes, one in California, and the other two in Lower California or Mexico. Intake No. 1 was commenced in October, 1900. The first water distributed or used for irrigation was drawn through this intake and carried by canal and the channel of the Alamo river through Mexican territory back to the international boundary line in the neighborhood of Calexico, where the first water was delivered to the water companies in California about June 15, 1901. Intake No. 2 was constructed in 1904, and was located just *below the boundry line* in Lower California or Mexico. Intake No. 3 was completed October 6, 1904, and was located about four miles *below the boundary line,* and, like Intake No. 2 was in Lower California and Mexico.

"The witness C. R. Rockwood testified that the reason for cutting intake No. 2 was purely political; *that the right to take water from the Colorado river in the United States had been attacked* by the reclamation engineers. The witness says: We then obtained concessions from Mexico which gave us the right to take water on Mexican soil from the river." The Salton Sea Cases, 172 Fed. 792, 810 (1909). (emphasis added)

[24] "If this legislation should be enacted, you will have granted away forever the entire magnificent Colorado River." William H. Smythe, Hearing on H.R. 13627, 60; *see* fn. 8. "If the policy of the Government is to be sustained and carried out, the Reclamation Bureau will have to take up this enterprise, because the small enterprises will get just enough land in frequent spots and just enough water to make it impossible for the Government to carry out on proper lines what would be absolutely impossible for the individual or corporation here to carry out." Congressman Clarence Van Duzer of Nevada, *Ibid.,* 59.

[25] Salton Sea Cases, *supra* note 26. "It is my earnest desire to worship at our own altar and to receive the blessing from the shrine of our own Government, but if such permission is not granted, of necessity I will be compelled to worship elsewhere." Anthony Heber, Hearing on H.R. 13627, 87.

[26] The Colorado River Compact, in acknowledging present perfected rights, was obviously ensuring recognition of presently existing rights in the contracting states. The Compact was not concerned with acknowledging Mexican rights although Article III provides for any future recognition of Mexican water rights by the United States: "If as a matter of international comity, the United States of America shall hereafter recognize in the United States of Mexico any right to the use of any water of the Colorado River system, such water shall be supplied first from the waters which are surplus . . ."

[27] United States v. Chandler-Dunbar Co., 229 U.S. 53, 69 (1913).

[28] Clark, Water and Water Rights, Vol. 2, p. 24 (1967).

[29] *Ivanhoe,* supra note 6 at 286.

[30] See the preceding discussion of the dubious nature of the landowners claim to perfected United States water rights in the Colorado as of 1929.

[31] 376 U.S. 340, 351–352 (1964).

[32] Dunn v. Blumstein, 405 U.S. 330, 334 (1972).

[33] Tallman, 380 U.S. 1, 4 (1965).

[34] 71 I.D. 529–530.

[35] President's Water Resources Policy Commission, *Water Resources Law,* Vol. 3 (1950).

[36] 71 I.D. 496 at 501 (1964).

[37] *Id.* at 533 Appendix H.

THE IRISH-AMERICAN CULTURAL INSTITUTE

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on previous occasions I have remarked in the Senate on the outstanding achievements of the Irish-American Cultural Institute, the only international Irish cultural organization of its kind. The headquarters for this distinguished institute, I am pleased to observe, are in my own State of Minnesota, in St. Paul.

In recognition of the vision and work of the IACI, His Excellency, Eamon de Valera, President of the Republic of Ireland, has now extended to it his official patronage. This is a deserved tribute to the International Cochairmen of the IACI, HSH Princess Grace of Monaco; my longtime friend, Mr. I. A. O'Shaughnessey of St. Paul; and to Dr. Eoin McKiernan, the Institute's founder-president.

It may seem unusual that St. Paul may be outpacing much of the United States in its contribution to cultural understanding between Ireland and America. It is nonetheless quite true to state that the Irish-American Cultural Institute is this country's only active, international, successful organization promoting an understanding and interpretation of Irish culture. It has been cited as the "premiere Irish-American organization" by Ireland's Prime Minister. Its national council inculdes scholars, writers, and artists like Pat O'Brien, Mike Douglas, and Bob Considine.

The Irish-American Cultural Institute publishes a 160-page quarterly journal, Eire-Ireland, that is found in every major American university library and has sev-

eral thousand subscribers all over the world. A monthly newsletter, DUCAS, written in popular style, covers current and historical events in Ireland. Both publications are in English. The institute has produced a 53-week television series, awards $10,000 annually to writers writing in Irish and in English, brings famous Irish artists and scholars to lecture in America, arranges graduate education for Irish students, and provides low-cost tours to Ireland for members. I draw particular attention to the Butler Literary Awards, made available through the institute by a great Minnesotan, Mr. Patrick Butler, awards which now total $80,000.

During the period between October 16, 1972, and November 20, 1972, the institute is presenting to the Nation's Capital its full festival program called the Irish Imagination: The Poetry of Vision, Song and Words. Mrs. Humphrey and I are pleased to be honorary sponsors of this program. A main feature of the festival is the Irish Imagination Art Exhibit of the Corcoran Gallery of Art. This exhibit was orignially a part of ROSC 1971, the internation arts festival put together by the Irish Arts Council and its presentation in the United States was made possible through the initiative of the directors of this council, including Mrs. Dorothy Walker and Mr. Michael Scott, and an imaginative American response on the part of groups and individuals including Gulf Oil, the Massachusetts Fine Arts Council, Mrs. Elizabeth Van Buren and Mrs. Dorothea Weldon, of Boston, Mass., the Philadelphia Civic Center Museum, the Corcoran Gallery of Art in Washington, and the Irish-American Cultural Institute.

A second feature of this fall festival are performances by Comhaltas Ceoltoiri Eireann, the Irish Traditional Music Society, which is helping to create a new era for authentic Irish music.

Mr. President, I congratulate the Irish-American Cultural Institute for once more uplifting our minds and spirits through its cultural leadership. I ask consent to have printed the text of the fall festival program, an editorial from the Washington Post (October 16, 1972) and tributes from the honorary sponsors, our First Lady, Mrs. Richard M. Nixon, and Ireland's Finance Minister, Mr. George Colley.

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

THE IRISH IMAGINATION—THE POETRY OF VISION, SONG AND WORDS

(Under the patronage of His Excellency Eamon de Valera, President of Ireland, presented by the Irish American Cultural Institute)

PROGRAM

General Chairman: Francis X. Gannon, Member, Board of Directors, The Irish American Cultural Institute.

The Poetry of Vision: October 21, 1972 Through November 20, 1972.

The Irish Imagination, 1959–1971: Contemporary Irish Artists in Exhibition, representing all thirty-two counties.

Sponsors: The IACI and the Corcoran Gallery of Art; Corcoran Gallery, 17th and New York Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. Daily 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. (Closed Mondays). Irish Books are on sale and on Sundays from 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. film shorts on Irish cultural themes will be shown. Admission free.

Honorary Sponsors: Mrs. Richard M. Nixon; The Honorable George Colley, Finance Minister, Republic of Ireland.

Patrons: Senator Hubert H. Humphrey and Mrs. Humphrey; Mr. Charles T. Carey; Mr. and Mrs. Joseph M. Fitzgerald, Coral Gables, Florida; Mr. and Mrs. Eugene I. Kane; Mr. and Mrs. Walter F. McArdle.

Chairman: Mrs. Rose Saul Zalles.

Art Consultant: Mrs. Elizabeth Curran Solterer.

Corcoran Director: Mr. Gene Baro.

Preview-Reception: Friday, October 20, 1972, 8:00–9:00 p.m., The Corcoran Gallery of Art, Admission by Invitation only.

GUESTS OF HONOR

His Excellency, The Ambassador of Ireland to the United States and Mme. William Warnock.

Mr. Michael Scott, Architect and Vice Chairman, The Arts Council of Ireland.

Mr. Charles Merrill, Editor, *The Arts in Ireland.*

Dr. Eoin McKiernan, President, Irish American Cultural Institute.

Mrs. Eugene J. McCarthy, Member, National Council, Irish American Cultural Institute.

Introductions: Mr. Thomas J. Murphy, Founding President, Dublin Branch, Institute of Costs and Works Accountants.

SPECIAL EXHIBITS

The Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, Maryland honors The Irish Imagination by placing Irish jewelry on display, October 21, 1972 through November 20, 1972. The exhibition will be composed of six Irish pieces, some from the 7th century and a unique Viking silver armlet. Gallery Director, Mr. Richard H. Randall, Jr.

The Library of the Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. salutes the Corcoran show through an exhibition of Irish books, including the facsimile edition of the Book of Kells, the Lindisfarne Gospels and also a handwritten manuscript of the 19th century from the Ludley Bequest. Catholic University's Chair of Celtic Studies, endowed by the Ancient Order of Hibernians in 1896, is the oldest Celtic program in America. President: Dr. Clarence Walton.

To honor the Irish Imagination show at the Corcoran Gallery of Art, October 21-November 20, 1972, the National Capital Parks will display the papers and writings of Frederick Douglass, which refer to Ireland. Frederick Douglass Home, 1411 W Street, S.E. Admission Free.

Special Exhibits Chairman: Mr. Frank Kelleher, Member, Washington Council, Irish American Cultural Institute.

The Poetry of Song: October 16, 20 and 22, 1972.

A Performance by Comhaltas Ceoltoiri Eireann (Association of Irish Traditional Musicians). Company of 30 award-winning All-Ireland musicians, dancers, singers and performers.

Sponsors: The IACI and National Capital Parks. The President's Park (South of the White House) 17th and New York Avenue, NW. at 12:00 p.m. Noon, Oct. 16, 1972.

Monday, October 16, 1972, 8:00 p.m. Comhaltas Ceoltoiri Eireann. A repeat performance, Caldwell Hall, Catholic University Campus. Admission free. Sponsors: The IACI and University Student Government, Catholic University.

Friday, October 20, 1972, 8:00–9:00 p.m. Preview-Reception at the Corcoran Gallery of Art. Thomas Standeven, Irish Piper (Philadelphia, Pa.); John Curry, Irish Piper; Mrs. Lois Velsey, Harpist; Sean and Eamon Culkin, Irish Step-Dancers.

Sponsors: The Irish American Cultural Institute.

Sunday, October 22, 1972, 3:00 p.m., a program of Irish entertainment featuring Mrs. Lois Velsey, Irish harpist, at Arlington House. Introduction by Dr. Eain McKiernan, IACI founder and President.

Sponsors: The IACI and National Capital Parks.

Chairman: Barbara Murphy, IACI Washington Music Coordinator.

President, Comhaltas Ceoltoiri Eireann, Seamus de Brun.

National Director, Comhaltas Ceoltoiri Eireann, Labhras O'Murchu.

Director, National Capital Parks, George Hartzog.

Visual Arts Coordinator, National Capital Parks, Berenice Reed.

President, University Student Government, Catholic University, Joseph Hurley.

The Poetry of Words: An illustrated slide-lecture by Michael Scott: Irish Art and Architecture.

Sponsors: The IACI and the Banshees, A Washington Cultural Society. Sunday, October 22, 1972 at Heurich House, 1307 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W. Admission: $2.00 for non-members.

Introduction: Mrs. Elizabeth Curran Solterer, Irish Art critic and IACI consultant; Banshee President, Joseph Foley.

A lecture by John Mulcahy, Editor of Hibernia, the distinguished Irish review of the arts, culture and politics: The Future of Ireland.

Sponsors: The IACI and Georgetown University, Gaston Hall, Tuesday, November 14, 1972. Admission Free.

Chairman: Dr. Riley Hughes, Founder and Director, Georgetown Writers Conference.

President, Georgetown University, Robert Henle, S.J.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

History (The Irish in Washington): Edward Fitzgerald, National Capital Parks Historian.

Printing: McArdle Publishing Co. Merkle Press, Robert Melendez.

Reception for Dr. Eoin McKiernan: AOH, Emerald Isle Division, Wash., D.C. Dinner-Dance, 8:00 p.m. Saturday, Oct. 22, 1972. Open to Non-Members but tickets limited.

The Ancient Order of Hibernians, Washington, D.C. and Ladies Auxiliary.

The Ancient Order of Hibernians, State of Maryland and Ladies Auxiliary.

The Ancient Order of Hibernians, Northern Virginia and Ladies Auxiliary.

Irish-American Club and *Amergael.*

Irish Imports, Baltimore, Edgar Brady.

Irish Cultural Society of Northern Virginia.

Eugent I. Kane, Baltimore (Transportation).

The American Trucking Associations.

The International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs and Warehousemen of America.

United Steelworkers of America.

Films: Yeats Country, International Film Bureau, Inc. Faithful Departed (A Film on James Joyce), McGraw-Hill New Grange (Megalithic Culture) Manchester Community College, Manchester, Connecticut.

Aer Lingus—Irish.

Irish Tourist Board, New York., Images of Ireland.

Austin Nichols & Company—Importers, Paddy Irish Whiskey.

Heublein Incorporated—Importers, Tullamore Dew Irish Whiskey.

W. A. Taylor & Company—Importers, Jameson Irish Whiskey.

The Public House, Georgetown.

The Wine and Cheese Shop, Georgetown.

Special Thanks are due to The Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation, Washington, D.C., The Sheraton-Carlton Hotel.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 16, 1972]

"THE IRISH IMAGINATION"

. . . an exhibition of contemporary Irish paintings, will be shown at the Corcoran

Gallery of Art from Oct. 20 to Nov. 20. The show, which was presented in Boston and Philadelphia earlier this year, includes work by the best artists working in Ireland today as well as a small selection of paintings by Jack B. Yeats, Ireland's national painter, who died in 1957. It was assembled by Brian O'Doherty, editor of "Art in America" and director of the visual arts program of the National Endowment for the Arts, for a major exhibition in Dublin, where it will return when it closes in Washington.

The 68 paintings—some by internationally known artists, some mythically Irish and some breaching this atmospheric mode—clearly demonstrate, according to critic Robert Taylor, that modern Ireland has "a flourishing, inventive and well-established avant-garde." The show affords an opportunity, Taylor says, "to confront the range and energy of the country's visual art—an art that is fully as articulate as its verbal accomplishment. Irish letters had a Gaelic tradition to draw on, a spoken language, when the Irish state came into existence; present-day Irish painters, aloof from the Anglo-Irish tradition, have been making their own language from scratch, and it is rich and expressive."

STATEMENT FROM MRS. RICHARD M. NIXON

It is truly a pleasure to serve as Honorary Sponsor of the Irish-American Cultural Institute's exhibition of "The Irish Imagination 1959–71" and to welcome this outstanding collection of contemporary paintings to the Nation's capital. This fine cultural exchange is indeed a delightful opportunity not only to enjoy but also to pay tribute to an artistic tradition so important to our own. Through our ancestral ties and long time friendship the Irish imagination has left a cultural legacy which lends richness and diversity to our country's art work. This exhibit of recent Irish Art is therefore a truly enlightening and enjoyable experience for all Americans.

I am happy also to commend the Irish-American Cultural Institute and Dr. Eoin McKiernan, its founder and President, for their consistent efforts to broaden avenues of communication and understanding between our lands. The deep appreciation and lasting friendship between the Irish and our people is a most significant contribution to world peace.

Sincerely,

PAT NIXON.

STATEMENT FROM MR. GEORGE COLLEY

The Irish American Cultural Institute is to be commended for its original contributions to the advancement of Irish culture. Through its sponsorship of the distinguished quarterly EIRE-Ireland, the Butler Literary Awards for Gaelic authors, cultural tours, summer music and history institutes, the Annual Irish Fortnight in America and other programs, the Institute has gained acclaim not only in the United States but throughout Ireland for its visionary endeavors.

Among the Irish, the sustained cultivation of the arts has been the hallmark of our culture, even during the most trying days of our long history as a people. To enrich and enlarge this tradition Ireland has in recent years enacted special legislation which provides tax benefits to writers, composers and artists. By honoring artistic creativity in practical ways, we believe that we are demonstrating our profound belief in the great truth that man does not live by bread alone.

I am pleased to commend the Irish American Cultural Institute and its Honorary International Chairman, Her Serene Highness, Princess Grace of Monaco and Mr. I. A. O'Shaughnessy for bringing "The Irish Imagination" to an international audience in the capital of the United States. By arranging this event the Institute is helping to forge a greater bond of understanding and sympathy between Ireland and America.

GEORGE COLLEY,
Minister for Finance of Ireland.

SENATOR DAVID H. GAMBRELL

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a uniformly respected Senator, truly dedicated to the people of Georgia, is retiring from the Senate. I will miss Senator DAVID H. GAMBRELL. It was my privilege to know him as a public official and as a friend.

Senator GAMBRELL was appointed in February 1971, to fill the unexpired term of Senator Richard B. Russell. It was a challenge to fill the Senate seat of such a legislative giant as Richard Russell. But, DAVID GAMBRELL served Senator Russell's memory well. He exercised his senatorial duties with great responsibility. And, as a freshman Senator, he won the respect of his colleagues for his thoughtful approach to legislation and his willingness to work unceasingly for the people he represented.

Before coming to the Senate, Senator GAMBRELL served as the State Democratic Party chairman of Georgia.

Upon appointment to the Senate, Senator GAMBRELL was assigned to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, and the Committee on Small Business. He was appointed chairman of the Subcommittee on Science and Technology of the Small Business Committee.

Senator GAMBRELL has represented the people of Georgia with distinction. He served as assistant floor manager of the legislation to guarantee a $250 million loan to the Lockheed Co., one of Georgia's largest industries. And, he consistently advocated and fought for more and better jobs for the working people of his State. Senator GAMBRELL spoke out early on the need for property tax reform, going before the Senate Finance Committee with a well-thought-out and imaginative tax relief plan for citizens in the lower income brackets and on pensions.

Senator GAMBRELL exercised a strong and active interest in rural development. In August 1971, he joined with the senior Senator from Georgia, HERMAN TALMADGE, and me to conduct a series of rural development hearings in rural Georgia. The Senate was impressed by his understanding of the problems of rural America. Senator GAMBRELL was so correct, as he told the rural development hearings in Alma, Ga., that the problems of urban America could not be solved without attention to the problems of rural America.

But perhaps more important than any single legislative achievement, Senator GAMBRELL had a strong sense of responsibility to the people of Georgia. He conducted "listening tours" of his State, going into the small towns and communities—talking with and listening to the people. He knew of their aspirations and he represented them in his work here in Washington. He knew of their needs, and he tried to help meet them.

DAVID GAMBRELL cares about the people of Georgia. He is a fine Senator. His voice of moderation, his interest in people, and his love for his country will be missed in the next session of Congress. My wife, Muriel, and I join in wishing DAVID and Luck many more years of happiness and service to the people of Georgia and the United States.

JEWISH CEMETERIES DESECRATED BY NAZIS

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, once again there has been brought to our deserved strict attention the matter of the more than 2,000 Jewish cemeteries descrated by the Nazis during World War II. Most were located in Poland, but others were in the U.S.S.R., Hungary, and Czechoslovakia. The gravestones from these sites were consequently desecrated and used as construction material and paving stones for streets and roads.

The "Geder Avot" section of the World Center of European Rabbis, with offices in New York City, has for some time been endeavoring to obtain reparations for the destruction of these cemeteries. Unfortunately, these efforts have not met with success.

Since most of these cemeteries have been completely destroyed and cannot be reconstructed, Geder Avot plans to build memorial houses in Israel for the martyrs, for those who no longer have gravestones, and for the cemeteries which were demolished.

The current situation, I am informed, hardly promises to be much of an improvement from the past. The Government of Poland has already confiscated the cemetery of Lvov and built a park on its site. Among the Polish cities where Jewish cemeteries have been confiscated are Stanislaw, Regzazov, and Belz. Many Jewish graveyards endangered are over a thousand years old, and with their destruction the last historical traces of the Jews of Poland will be effaced. Similarly, Babi-Yar in Kiev, U.S.S.R., a mass grave of Jews and Ukranians murdered by the Nazis, is in danger of being converted into an amusement park if no action is taken.

Geder Avot is devoted to preventing the further confiscation of Jewish cemeteries and to the erecting of fences around the remaining ones to prevent vandalism and the destruction of graves, both of which have frequently occurred.

Rabbi M. J. Rubin, the distinguished president of Geder Avot, has explained that from the point of view of Talmudic law, the commandment to see that the dead are properly buried is being transgressed. So unequivocal is this obligation that even the high priest, an office mentioned frequently in the Bible, who was under ordinary circumstances forbidden to come in contact with the dead, may busy himself with the burial of the dead.

I am hopeful that this matter of desecrated cemeteries may soon be resolved. Already a petition of a million signatures has been presented to the United Nations.

Now, more than a quarter century after the conclusion of World War II and the demise of nazism, this issue, too, should be brought to its "final resting place."

THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on September 20, 1972, the Committee on Government Operations issued a report entitled "The Administration of the Freedom of Information Act" (H. Rept. 92–1419). This investigative report was based on some 14 days of hearings held this spring by the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee which I chair.

I am pleased to note that this report has received wide attention by the bar, the public and the press—all of whom are concerned with improving and strengthening of the act.

On the basis of the testimony taken from Government and private witnesses, I have introduced H.R. 17142 to strengthen the Freedom of Information Act and further protect the peoples' "right to know." (See RECORD, October 16, 1972, page 36735.)

While the present administration has developed secrecy techniques on an unprecedented level, it is gratifying to see that this country's newspapers and others still consider the public's right to know to be paramount.

I include at this point a selection of articles and editorials commenting on this committee report and the subcommittee hearings:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 22, 1972]

HILL REPORT SCORES PERSISTENT SECRECY

A congressional committee says foot-dragging by secrecy-minded bureaucrats has kept Americans from fully enjoying the freedom of information intended under a five-year-old right-to-know law.

While some agencies have tried to implement the Freedom of Information Act, "the over-all picture which emerges was encrusted with bureaucratic dust and grime which need to be vigorously scrubbed away," says the House Government Operations Committee. The law, which went into effect July 4, 1967, provides that any citizen may see a government document in the files but lists specific categories of material that are exempt.

In a 46,800-word report released yesterday, the committee said the efficient operation of the law "has been hindered by five years of foot-dragging by the federal bureaucracy."

Specific legal language to carry out the objectives of the report will be drafted, including:

Putting time limits in the law, so that an agency would have to grant or deny access to information within 10 working days after getting the request, and limiting an appeal study period to 20 days.

Awarding court costs and attorneys' fees to a complaining party if a court decides the information was improperly withheld.

Providing that trade secrets and commercial or financial data can be withheld only if they actually are confidential.

Prohibiting a government agency from mixing non-exempt and exempt records into a single file with the claim that all the records in it are thereby kept secret.

Spelling out that scientific tests, inspection reports on health and safety, and records used in public policy statements or rules are not to be considered exempt from disclosure even if contained in a so-called investigative record.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 5, 1972]

SILLY SECRECY

(By Alan L. Otten)

WASHINGTON.—It's not really too hard to see why the government tries to cover up information about possible favoritism to large grain traders, or the bugging of the Democratic National Committee, or an Air Force general who bombs as he pleases.

The Air Force incident arouses fears, best left dormant, that top military brass will some day run off with government policy, if not the government itself. A wide-open investigation of Russian wheat contracts or the Watergate caper might conceivably cut into the President's reelection margin. With so much at stake, the impulse to concealment is understandable, if not defensible.

It's far more difficult, though, to figure out just why the government, in this or any administration, works so hard to keep hidden and buried a wide range of less important or even routine information—information that couldn't possibly help the enemy or violate constitutional rights or do anything except perhaps embarrass a few bumbling bureaucrats.

Documentation of just how hard the government does work at this job comes in a recent report from a House Government Operations Subcommittee headed by Pennsylvania Representative William Moorhead. The report details the progress, or more properly the lack of progress, under the Freedom of Information Act, a law enacted in 1967 to make it easier for citizen organizations, business firms, the press, and other groups to gain access to government rules and records.

In essence, the act changed the burden of proof so as to make the government show why citizens shouldn't have particular pieces of information, rather than making the citizens show why they should. The act said the public ought to be able to find out about government matters pretty freely unless secrecy was essential to protect national security, personal privacy, trade secrets, or a few other specifically-listed items.

Now, five years later, a subcommittee investigation finds that while some gains have been made, "the efficient operations of the . . . act has been hindered by five years of foot-dragging by the federal bureaucracy."

The subcommittee complains that agencies take far too long to respond to public requests for information—33 days on the average, with another 50 days to pass on appeals—often so long that the information loses its value. Many agencies have prescribed inordinately complicated procedures for requesting records, or charge excessively high fees for searching and copying. Court challenges are bitterly contested by government lawyers.

A few of the horrible case histories cited by the lawmakers:

Pesticides: A public interest law group asked for Agriculture Department reports on the safety of handling certain pesticides. The request was refused on grounds that the records sought weren't clearly identified. So the group asked for the department's indexes, so that it could identify properly the specific reports it wanted—and was told that these indexes were private, intra-agency memoranda. "It was a Catch-22 situation," one of the group's lawyers testified to the subcommittee.

"The final straw," the lawyer related, "was when USDA stated that if the information were made available, it would cost $91,840 to prepare the registration files for public viewing. At that point we decided to try to find other means to get the information."

FHA Appraisals: The Nashville Tennesseean suspected that a blind homeowner was being swindled on the basis of an FHA appraisal of his property. First the homeowner, and then the paper, asked the Department of Housing and Urban Development for a copy of the appraisal, but both were turned down. The paper sued and won, but the copy turned over by the department was completely illegible, so the paper had to go back to court.

The judge then ordered the government to produce a legible copy—but he also okayed the government's request that the appraiser's name be deleted. The Tennesseean appealed that part of the decision, won, and finally received a legible copy including the identity of the appraiser.

Discrimination: A presidential order requires each major federal contractor to file a report spelling out plans for correcting any discrimination existing in his work force against women or minorities. Groups trying to get copies of these plans—to check whether the compantea are promising enough change, or are really doing what they promised—were told the plans were confidential because they contained trade secrets.

"To deny disclosure of the plans is to destroy what appears to be the only method by which the Executive Order can be enforced," one women's group spokesman protested. "The compliance agencies lack the resources to do adequate reviews and investigations" of their own.

Truth-in-Lending: A Washington attorney wanted a copy of the Civil Aeronautics Board's response to a Federal Reserve Board questionnaire on CAB policy under the Truth-in-Lending Act. The CAB told him the Federal Reserve would have to make this public, while the Federal Reserve told him the statement must come from the CAB. After six months of "an absolute runaround," the lawyer filed suit. Three days later, he received a copy from the CAB.

Rep. Moorhead's subcommittee suggests a number of ways to improve the present act; tighter time limits on agency responses to requests for information; less burdensome service charges for searching and copying; government cooperation in speeding court cases; some opportunity for plaintiffs to recover legal costs when they win the court tests; and annual agency progress reports to Congress.

Freedom of information, the subcommittee remarks, is not a partisan matter, for "each new administration develops its own special secrecy techniques which, as time passes, become more and more sophisticated." Relatively open information policies, it argues, are vital to rebuilding citizen trust in government statements and government policies.

"We believe," the lawmakers conclude, "it is better to have too much freedom than too little."

[From the New York Times, Sept. 22, 1972]

PUBLIC HELD THWARTED ON DATA ACCESS

(By Marjorie Hunter)

WASHINGTON, September 21.—A House subcommittee reported today that "foot-dragging by the Federal bureaucracy" had impeded the effective operation of the Freedom of Information Act.

The findings of the Government Operations Subcommittee were based on 41 days of hearings into the administration of the freedom of information law that went into effect five years ago.

The subcommittee reported that the law had opened access to some previously denied

* * * * *

Government information. But the panel accused Federal departments and agencies of delays in providing requested data, of charging excessive fees for copies of documents and of other intentional or unintentional thwarting of the public's right to know.

The report on Administration of the Freedom of Information Act was compiled by another House subcommittee headed by William M. Moorhead, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

The law is designed to provide public access to most types of Government information, with certain exceptions, such as trade secrets, law enforcement investigations and various financial and commercial data.

Furthermore, the law exempts information that the President specifically orders be kept secret in the interest of national defense or foreign policy.

The subcommittee was highly critical of bureaucratic delays of weeks and months in providing requested data. The panel also noted what it called "a relative lack of utilization of the act by the news media," which had pushed for the legislation.

The subcommittee also was critical of what it called the tendency of some government agencies to confuse "public information" with "image-making."

The report cited a case in which the Interior Department had hired a former Nixon campaign aide, Harry Treleaven, to recommend improvements in the department's public information programs.

The department subsequently refused to make public the Treleaven report, even when asked to do so under the Freedom of Information Act, the subcommittee reported. Finally, the report continues, the department did make public the report but it had censored one paragraph.

The subcommittee said it had later learned that the censored paragraph stated that Interior Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton "is the most photogenic member of the Administration" and the department's communications program should give him "maximum exposure" in order to build "valuable goodwill for the department and the Administration."

[From the Federal Times, Oct. 11, 1972]

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

This week we begin a two-part special report dealing with the failure of the "Freedom of Information Act" to live up to its early promises.

The House Subcommittee on Government Operations says the blame must be shared both by the government and the management of the media. The government is rapped for its failure to enforce the act and the newspapers are blasted for failing to report violations of the act when they are refused access to information. It's not quite that simple. Let's look at both sides of the argument.

As was to be expected, federal agencies proved reluctant to loosen up the flow of information—even though the law obligated them to do so. Either through force of habit or lethargy they continued to deny information which the act said should be made available.

It will take a long time—possibly even another generation of public information people—before some agencies realize the long range benefits to our form of government of making public information public.

On the other side of the coin is the almost total lack of initiative on the part of the news media to pursue the release of information under the act. This is both disappointing and somewhat unexpected.

It is difficult to understand behavior of this type. Perhaps it is due to the wording of the act and the general lack of knowledge about it.

In order to request information the news media must know that the information exists. This is not always possible because of the vastness of the federal government and the inherent secrecy of the bureaucracy. It is going to take diligent newsmen and women to become aware of the existence of the information and to ferret it out.

It also is going to take a change in the attitude of the government toward the release of information.

Some agencies insist that information be released only through the public information office. They then act to insure that the "information" office has no "information."

Thus, the people who are supposed to be able to answer questions from reporters and comment intelligently on a situation are put in the position of being least able to do so. This is not only unfair, it is unfortunate.

The difficulty in prying news loose under the act is compounded by the requirement that a reporter be fully aware of the information before he can request the release of it.

Private industry often is in a much better position than the media representative in this respect. A "too-close" relationship exists between the regulatory agencies and the industries they are supposed to regulate. This makes for a strong desire for secrecy on the part of the groups and the agencies involved. It also makes it difficult for the media to be aware of "inside" transactions.

Can the Freedom of Information Act be made to work? We believe it can. However, it is going to take a concerted effort to make it work.

This involves groups like associations of newspapers and the various journalism societies acting to make the provisions of the act more generally known. It involves a strong desire on the part of the government to be "open" with and to the public. It involves reporters with enough public concern to pursue the news through all obstacles.

Without all three, the act will be nothing more than another ineffective piece of legislation.

[From the Seattle Times, Sept. 22, 1972]

SECRECY LAW RESISTANCE CITED

WASHINGTON.—Saying an "entrenched bureaucracy is stubbornly resisting" the anti-secrecy commands of a right-to-know law, a House panel has urged reforming the law and renewing the spirit of the Freedom of Information Act.

Federal officials "actually testified under oath that they had to balance the government's rights against the people's rights. The government, however, has no rights. It has only limited power delegated to it from "We the people," the House Government Operations Committee said yesterday.

A 46,000-word report on the impact and administration of the five-year-old Freedom of Information Act was made public by the committee which took sworn testimony from 142 witnesses in 41 days of public hearings.

While some agencies have sought to follow the open-government mandates of the law, the commiteee said, "the overall picture which emerges was encrusted with bureaucratic dust and grime which need to be vigorously scrubbed away."

Efficient operation of the law, the committee added, "has been hindered by five years of foot-dragging by the federal bureaucracy. The widespread reluctance of the bureaucracy to honor the public's legal right to know has been obvious in parts of two administrations."

The panel concluded there is a need "to strengthen and clarify the law to make it more effective and responsive to an open society."

The law, which took effect July 4, 1967, provides that any citizen may see a government document in the files, but lists specific categories of material which can be exempt from disclosure.

The committee said the provisions allowing withholding of information, intended to safeguard vital defense secrets, personal privacy, trade secrets and the like, "have been misused" by federal agencies.

[From the Des Moines Register, Oct. 7, 1972]

STRUGGLE TO LET THE PEOPLE KNOW

The House Committee on Government Operations has reviewed the first five years of the Freedom of Information Act and finds it hasn't accomplished all that was expected of it. The act proclaimed that government information was to be available to the American people, with exceptions only to protect defense and state secrets, personal privacy and trade secrets.

The committee found that much information previously denied the public is now available. But it reported that in many federal agencies the purpose of the act is being defeated by delays, evasions, and other ruses. Federal agencies took an average of 33 days to respond to requests for information.

A "catch-22" evasion was practiced by the Agriculture Department when the Center for the Study of Responsive Law tried to obtain research reports on the safety of handling certain pesticides. The request was refused, because it did not clearly identify the records.

The center asked for the indexes the department maintained so the files could be identified. The department said the indexes were interagency memoranda and would not be available.

The center took the case to court, won access to the indexes and identified the files it wanted. The department then said the files also contained confidential company information. To pull the confidential matter from the files so they could be made public would cost the center $91,840, the department said.

The Interior Department paid $121 a day to a political publicity man to prepare a report on how to improve its public relations and then decided the report should not be made public. After a newsman appealed the ruling, the department agreed to make public all but one paragraph of the report, which it said would be embarrassing to an individual.

When the University of Missouri's Freedom of Information Center took the case to court, it learned the individual involved was Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton. The paragraph said:

"Secretary Morton is not only the most photogenic member of the administration—but he's also able to participate physically in all kinds of outdoor situations and look natural. It's important that the communications program make full use of this, because it's a way of making sure that the secretary's statements get maximum exposure, as well as building valuable good will for the department and the administration. . . ."

The committee recommends an amendment to the act giving an agency 10 working days to respond to a request for information and 20 days to act on an appeal. It also proposes that federal agencies be required to file annual reports detailing their administration of the public information law.

Bureaucrats can find ingenious ways of hiding the public's business from the public, despite legislative enactments, but the committee's proposals would help pry a little more information loose.

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 22, 1972]

BUREAUCRACY SCOLDED FOR HIDING INFORMATION

(By Marjorie Hunter)

A House subcommittee says "foot-dragging by the federal bureaucracy" has impeded the effective operation of the Freedom of Information Act.

The findings of the House Government Operations subcommittee were based on 41

days of hearings into the administration of the freedom of information law that went into effect five years ago.

The subcommittee reported that the law has opened access to some government information that had previously been denied. But the panel accused federal departments and agencies of delays in providing data upon request by newsmen and other persons, of charging excessive fees for copies of documents and of other intentional or unintentional thwarting of the intent of the act.

SOME EXCEPTIONS

The report was compiled by a subcommittee headed by William S. Moorhead, D-Pa.

The law is designed to provide public access to most types of government information, with certain exceptions such as trade secrets, law enforcement investigations and various financial and commercial data.

The law also exempts information that the President specifically orders to be kept secret in the interest of national defense or foreign policy.

The subcommittee was highly critical of bureaucratic delays of weeks and months in providing requested data. It also noted what it called "a relative lack of utilization of the act by the news media," which had pushed for the legislation.

The subcommittee also was critical of what it called the tendency of some government agencies to confuse "public information" with "image-making."

TO AVOID EMBARRASSMENT

"A more positive attitude in support of 'open access' from the top administrative officials is needed throughout the executive branch," the report said. "In too many cases, information is withheld, over-classified, or otherwise hidden from the public to avoid administrative mistakes, waste of funds, or political embarrassment."

In general, the committee said, it "finds that the Freedom of Information Act has helped thousands of citizens gain access to information when they have been able to overcome government roadblocks."

But it said agencies have been able particularly to misuse the nine exemptions in the law permitting withholding of information in limited cases—provisions intended to safeguard vital defense and state secrets, personal privacy, trade secrets and the like.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 18, 1972]

MEDIA SAID TO IGNORE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

WASHINGTON, March 17.—Although reporters and broadcasters were in the forefront of those pushing for the Freedom of Information Act, the media have made little use of it during its first four years of operation, a Congressional report said today.

For the most part, according to statistics, it has been commercial interests that have taken advantage of the law, enacted on July 4, 1967, as a means of opening up to public inspection most records of the Government.

Representative William E Moorhead, Democrat of Pennsylvania, who is chairman of the House Government Information Subcommittee, released the results of a Library of Congress study as his panel resumed hearings on its review of the law.

In analyzing implementation of the act, the Library of Congress concentrated on formal requests for information made of 29 Federal departments and agencies between July 4, 1967, the day the law took effect, and July 4, 1971.

The identification of requests for data were refused by the agency. The total numbered 1,413. Of that figure, only 90 requests, or 6 per cent of the total, were filed by representatives of the media.

On the other hand, corporations and private law firms were initially refused information under the act 640 times, representing nearly 46 percent of the usage.

Mr. Moorhead said he was not surprised that businesses were making most use of the act. "Those who can afford the expensive and time-consuming process of fighting for their right to know will do so," he said, adding that he hoped Congress would provide some help for the average citizen.

"I am surprised, however, that the reporters, editors and broadcasters whose job it is to inform the American people have made so little use of the Information Act," Mr. Moorhead said. "They were the major supporters of those in Congress who created the law."

Under the law, nine categories of information are exempt from required disclosure. They include such areas as national security data, trade secrets and internal Government memorandums. When a citizen disagrees with an agency's contention that a record is exempt he may sue for it in Federal court. The burden is on the Government to prove that it does not have to be made public.

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 30, 1972]

INFORMATION IMPEDED

A great hooray went up from the press five years ago when the Freedom of Information Act was passed. Journalists and others interested in eliciting the hidden facts about government saw the law as a signal breakthrough against official secrecy. And it was, but obviously it needs more teeth.

For in too many cases the federal bureaucracy has shown itself adept at running around the law and foot-dragging on a marathon scale. Defensive systems have been contrived so as to impede or jam the flow of facts the administration would rather keep secret. Though much useful information emanates from the agencies, they excel at cranking out blurbs reflecting credit upon themselves, and the pricklier realities often are hard to pry out. All this was reviewed in a report issued last week by a House Government Operations subcommittee that held 41 days of hearings on how the information act is being administered.

Clearly, the law has brought about improvements here and there in the availability of facts. Some agencies and departments are implementing it rather well, but the panel found that others have thwarted it, intentionally or unintentionally. What the act provides is that any citizen may see government documents (except those relating to national security and a few other sensitive matters) that are in the fields. But in practice, sometimes there are delays of weeks or months in making documents available, or high fees are charged for copies, or official papers that aren't exempt from public scrutiny are kept in files with those that are exempt, or something is censored out. Even innocuous documents, it seems have been kept from public view for the most whimsical and trivial of reasons.

So the subcommittee is preparing some potent remedies. It will offer several recommendations to strengthen the law, including time limits for the release (or denial) of documents, clearer definitions of what can and cannot be withheld, and a better system of appeal for people who are denied access. These renovations are essential if the public's right to know is to be upheld.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Oct. 5, 1972]

THE WAR AGAINST SECRECY

The fight to prevent undue governmental secrecy is a never ending one. There are Freedom of Information Acts (FOI) at both the federal and Virginia state levels, but neither has proved 100 per cent effective in assuring the public's right to know all it should know concerning the public's business.

"The efficient operation of the Freedom of Information Act has been hindered by five years of foot-dragging by the federal bureaucracy," declares the House Committee on Government Operations in a report to the House of Representatives. "The widespread reluctance of the bureaucracy to honor the public's legal right to know has been obvious in parts of two administrations."

The committee suggests certain amendments to strengthen the act, but it concedes that "no changes in law and no directives from agency heads will necessarily convince any secrecy-minded bureaucrat that public records are public property."

The committee does make specific recommendations, however, as to how federal departments should make public records more readily available to people who want to see them and as to how the Department of Justice should ride herd on other agencies in the enforcement of the FOI act.

Here in Virginia, some local governing bodies and other governmental agencies are finding ways to thwart the intent of the state FOI law. Atty. Gen. Andrew P. Miller has suggested certain amendments to strengthen the law, and the Richmond Chapter of Sigma Delta Chi journalism society is studying the law and the experience under it in preparation for urging changes.

It has been suggested for example, that before going into a closed session, a governmental body be required to state specifically the subject that will be discussed. The law lists the topics that can be discussed secretly—personnel, land acquisition, court litigation, and so on—but the governmental body is not required to reveal which of these will be the topic of the closed session. Still another proposal is that if the governmental body is relying on the authority to discuss privately a subject that later will be given a public hearing a firm date for the hearing be set and announced before the closed session is permitted. This last suggestion is aimed at preventing a governmental body from saying that it is taking advantage of this exemption in the FOI act without really intending to hold a public hearing.

There is one final thought on this whole matter of governmental secrecy. Both the Congress and the Virginia General Assembly could improve their own showings by opening up some committee sessions that are now held behind closed doors. Of course there are times when closed sessions are justified, but legislators, like members of other public bodies and like bureaucrats, need to constantly resist the natural tendency to take the easier way of dealing with problems, which is without the people seeing and hearing all that goes on.

[From the Federal Times, Oct. 11, 1972]

PRESS, GOVERNMENT SEEN SHARING BLAME FOR INFORMATION LAG

(By Bill Andronicos)

WASHINGTON.—Laxity in enforcement of the Freedom of Information Act has been blamed both on the federal government and newspaper management.

Leveling the charges is the foreign operations and government information subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, headed by Rep. William S. Moorhead, D-Pa.

The government, says the subcommittee, is dragging its feet on enforcing provisions of the Freedom of Information Act—and the newspapers are failing to report violations of the Act in instances where they are denied access to certain information

In an interview, one subcommittee spokesman commented that part of the problem lies with reluctance on the part of newspaper management to spend money to start court litigation in instances where they run into a stumbling block while trying to obtain information.

"Publishers simply refuse to use money to order their lawyers, to take court action," the spokesman said. "Moreover, they hesitate to beef up their staffs to include investigative reporters and researchers who can spend months, if necessary, in uncovering violations."

Moorhead himself indicated that legislative action is not enough—and urged the assistance of editors and newsmen in helping make the Freedom of Information Act a success.

Signed into law by President Johnson on July 4, 1966, the Act specifies that "any person" should have clear access to identifiable agency records without having to state a reason for wanting the information. It adds that the burden of proving withholding to be necessary lies solely on the federal agency.

Withholding of information by government under the Act is permissive, not mandatory, and must be justified on the basis of one of specific nine exemptions permitted in the Act.

These relate to such matters as: Secrecy in the interest of national defense or foreign policy; internal personnel rules and practices of an agency; trade secrets and commercial or financial information; personnel and medical files whose disclosure would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy; investigatory files compiled for law enforcement purposes; geological and geophysical information; and the like.

Creation of the Freedom of Information Act followed more than a decade of effort by the foreign operations and government information subcommittee and its predecessor, the special subcommittee on government information, established on June 9, 1955 under the chairmanship of Rep. John E. Moss, D-Calif., who was instrumental in bringing about the Freedom of Information Act.

Similar efforts were focused in the Senate subcommittee on administrative practice and procedure, under the chairmanship of Sen. Edward V. Long, D-Mo., and its parent Committee on the Judiciary.

Despite all these efforts in both the House and Senate to assure the public's access to information from the federal government, there now has erupted considerable grumbling about laxity, apathy and refusal to disclose information.

For example, hearings held by the House subcommittee on foreign operations and government information this year indicate that some agencies "are still relying on the original 1789 'housekeeping' statute as authority to withhold certain types of information from the public."

This charge was leveled by the subcommittee in a report just issued by the House Committee on Government Operations. The report is the first in a series designed to cover virtually all major aspects of freedom of information as it relates to the federal government.

The ultimate objective of the reports, says the subcommittee, is to strengthen and clarify the Freedom of Information Act so as to make it "more effective and responsive to an open society."

In preparing its present report, the subcommittee received sworn testimony from 142 witnesses during 41 days of public hearings.

According to the subcommittee, the results of these hearings on government information policies and practices leaves much to be desired. Government roadblocks, the subcommittee notes, are preventing the effective use of the Freedom of Information Act.

In addition to singling out delays by federal agencies in response to an individual's request for information, the report also notes that there has been a lack of involvement in the decision-making process by public information officials.

Consequently, a number of public information officers themselves are not fully informed on certain agency matters or decisions, according to the subcommittee.

The subcommittee also criticized the relative lack of utilization of the Act by the news media—"which had been among the strongest backers of the freedom of information legislation prior to its enactment."

"The delaying tactics of the federal bureaucrats," said the report, "are a major deterrent to more widespread use of the Act, although the subcommittee did recieve testimony from several reporters and editors who have taken the cases to court and eventually won out over the secrecy-minded government bureaucracy."

The subcommittee added that "no changes in law and no directives from agency heads will necessarily convince any secrecy-minded bureaucrat that public records are public property."

"Only day-to-day watchfulness by the Congress and the Administration leaders can guarantee the freedom of government information which is the keystone of a democratic society," the report added.

In fact, the subcommittee noted that its hearings on the administration of the Freedom of Information Act actually directly influenced the revision of regulations within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's Food and Drug Administration.

PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICERS OFTEN SUFFER FROM AGENCY INDIFFERENCE

(By Bill Andronicos)

WASHINGTON.—An uninformed public information officer is of little use to an information seeker.

And the reason the public information officer is uninformed is because a federal agency—either deliberately or through apathy or neglect—does not bother to keep the officer abreast of agency policies and procedures.

One of the major gripes of the House subcommittee on foreign operations and government information is that many information officers are excluded from the decision-making process.

Consequently, the subcommittee feels that the information-seeking press or public encounters an information officer who truly knows little or nothing about a particular query.

Extensive hearings held this year by the subcommittee disclosed that there seems to be a pattern throughout the government that many matters—that should be in the domain of the public information officer—are handled by the general counsel, sometimes in consultation with a policymaking official whose primary interest may be protecting the agency from critcism.

In a report based on its hearings, the subcommittee notes that refusals often raise the question, justified or not, "what is the government trying to hide?"

Consequently, the report recommends that "the preference always should be toward public disclosure unless solid defensible and compelling reasons exist otherwise."

Among other things, the report notes that "one indication of the importance of the Freedom of Information Act in terms of agency priorities is the record keeping of the agency."

In response to a subcommittee's questionnaire in the summer of 1971, regarding the administration of the Freedom of Information Act, the departments of the Army, Navy, Labor, the Civil Service Commission and units of the Transportation Department all indicated they could not provide certain requested statistics because they failed to keep any records on these matters.

During its hearings, the subcommittee learned that some large government departments and agencies are set up under a system of decentralized operations which, by their organizational nature, impede the chief public information officers in providing the type of advice that should be immediately available.

This is true, said the subcommittee report, of the departments of Agriculture, Interior and Labor.

For example, under questioning by subcommittee chairman Rep. William S. Moorhead, D-Pa., one Agriculture Department witness acknowledged that during the five years of the act's existence, the agency had no record of the number of times that the advice of a public information expert was sought prior to a decision to withhold information. He added that such matters generally were left up to the department's general counsel.

The issue was brought up again in testimony by the Labor Department. According to the subcommittee report, although the Labor Department has an extensive public information office—and the Secretary of Labor has a special assistant who reportedly is an expert in the field—none of the public information people apparently are consulted at any time in the public information process.

The Interior Department also has been taken to task for keeping no records of requests under the Freedom of Information Act—and for not consulting with the public information officer in handling such requests. Moreover, decisions on refusals were made at low administrative levels. Access to requested information was granted in only 40 per cent of the cases.

The subcommittee also noted that some regulatory agencies, such as the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), ignore the public information officers.

Initial decisions on whether to accept or refuse a request for information were made by the FCC executive director with the advice of the general counsel's office, according to the subcommittee report. The public information officer was never consulted, neither in response to an initial request for information nor when an appeal was acted upon.

In fact, the FCC general counsel, in reply to a written question submitted by the subcommittee, said blunty: "The executive director is not required to seek the advice of, nor does he in practice consult with the public information officer before acting upon a request which raises a question of interpretation under the Freedom of Information Act."

Another criticism leveled against the federal government involves its tendency to confuse public information with publicity.

Where does one draw the line between the two?

The subcommittee acknowledges that the line between public information, publicity or public relations—and propaganda—"is fine indeed and, like beauty, is often in the eye of the beholder."

Cautioning that the use of press-agentry or image making by federal agencies apply equally to new and old agencies alike, the subcommittee singled out the Interior Department and the newly created Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as oftentimes confusing public information with publicity.

The subcommittee seemed pleased that in its testimony, EPA testified that final authority on refusals of access to public records rests with the agency's public affairs officers—but was critical of the agency's publicity-seeking devices.

Shortly after testifying to EPA's steadfast commitment to a proper government information program, the agency selected two New York City agencies to develop plans to advertise the work of EPA.

The price EPA paid the advertising agencies to find out EPA's mission and develop an advertising program to sell EPA to the public amounted to $101,535.

The Department of the Interior, the subcommittee added, confuses "image-making"

with "public information" on a slightly smaller scale than EPA.

For example, Interior paid $121 a day to a political publicity man to recommend improvements in the department's public information practices—and then decided that the public information report was not a public record under the Freedom of Information Act.

Harry Treleaven, who worked in President Nixon's successful 1968 campaign and was a leading character in the book "The Selling of the President, 1968," prepared a report to then Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton on the information and public relations activities of Interior. The 85-page report was presented in April, 1971—and included 18 pages of general observations and recommendations.

A reporter for the Louisville Courier-Journal was refused copies of the report on grounds that it was an "internal document."

Pressure from the Congress and the University of Missouri Freedom of Information Center finally prompted the department to release 18 pages of the report—but a hassle developed over a single paragraph which had been omitted because the department felt it contained "references" to named individuals, the disclosure of which could prove an unwarranted embarrassment to those individuals."

Noting that the Department of Justice is the agency responsible for preparing guidelines for the administration of the Freedom of Information Act, the subcommittee commented that the department's office of legal counsel needs to exercise a greater leadership function.

The subcommittee suggested that the office of legal counsel can do so by advising other federal agencies of significant court interpretations of the act—and by preparing a pamphlet for the general public to explain the rights of individual citizens to obtain public records from federal agencies.

Actually, the Justice Department serves three roles under the Freedom of Information Act.

First, as an executive department, it is regarded as an "agency" under the act—and hence, subject to all of the same administrative procedures in making information available as are other federal agencies.

Second, the Justice Department serves as legal counsel to the federal government. The civil division handles the litigation for most government agencies when a suit is filed under the act.

The third, and most vital role played by the department, involves its advisory or consulting capacity exercised by its office of legal counsel through the department's freedom of information committee.

However, the department is not without its limitations in assuring full and effective enforcement of the Freedom of Information Act.

For example, departmental witnesses told the subcommittee that its functions often are limited by the decentralized administration of the act, as prescribed by Congress, in requiring each agency to act on requests for its own records.

Justice spokesmen indicated that the department generally has no authority to compel another agency to comply with a request for its records.

In reviewing its overall findings on the progress—or lack of it—in assuring effective use by the public of the Freedom of Information Act, the subcommittee decided that "a more clearly defined role for public information personnel in the federal government and a general uplifting of their status within the bureaucracy are long overdue."

"Not only could such steps have significant impact on more conscientious administration of the Freedom of Information Act—both in the letter and spirit of the law—but it would also give proper recognition to the legitimate and increasingly necessary role of public information officers as 'the bridge' between faceless government and its citizens," the subcommittee report added.

However, the subcommittee acknowledged that the task would not be an easy one, noting that neither the legislative history of the act nor the act itself is "clear and simple."

In fact, the subcommittee report observed that the act "contains general phraseology, undefined terms and loosely drawn provisions that have bothered the courts, as well as government officials seeking to interpret the Act."

SENATOR B. EVERETT JORDAN

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in paying tribute to Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN. His retirement at the close of this Congress marks the end of a 14-year Senate career which has been characterized by a special brand of diligence and quiet attention to duty that is much admired by his colleagues.

EVERETT JORDAN came to the Senate equipped with a sound background in the business world and a distinguished record of service to the Democratic Party. He set about his work in the Senate with sound judgment, commonsense and a firm awareness that our most significant progress is to be made in the nuts-and-bolts work of committees.

A good part of his effort has been devoted to insuring the smooth operation of the Senate itself. Each of us in this body can be grateful to EVERETT JORDAN for his persevering and effective work as chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration and the services he has rendered in the sometimes thankless posts which contribute so significantly to the on-going work of Congress.

EVERETT JORDAN has my personal gratitude on many counts, Mr. President. When I returned to the Senate 2 years ago, he was most cooperative in arranging the staffing and funding of the Subcommittee on Rural Development, which it is my privilege to chair. To a great extent, his efforts contributed to the work of this subcommittee, which was able to produce the landmark Rural Development Act of 1972.

It is of special importance to me that Senator Jordan has thrice served as chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies. I would have preferred, of course, to have been the direct beneficiary of his good efforts for the 1969 inauguration, but I was able to make a firsthand evaluation of his accomplishments, as an interested spectator.

Mrs. Humphrey and I have been enriched by our friendship with EVERETT and Katherine. We have visited them in their home and have met many of their wonderful friends. One of the rewards of our public life has been our association with the Jordans.

Mr. President, we will miss EVERETT JORDAN. He has given us the benefit of his wisdom and humor, and he leaves us with the knowledge that a fine gentleman has performed admirably in this body.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS DEVELOPED MAJOR LEGISLATION IN 1972

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Committee on Public Works developed major legislation in each of its areas of responsibility during 1972. This level of activity resulted in heavy demands on the time and energies of members of the committee and the staff. It was essential, however, that we legislate in each of these areas because of the needs of a dynamic society that expects more from its government than ever before.

During 1972, the five subcommittees of the Committee on Public Works conducted a total of 42 days of legislative and oversight hearings. In addition, the full committee conducted three hearings on nominations to important positions which were submitted by the executive branch.

Although the committee approved major bills in areas of great importance, I regret to report that in several instances the results of our efforts were not enacted into law. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, which required nearly 2 years to bring to final form, was enacted only after the Congress overrode the Presidential veto of this crucial measure. Two other bills, the omnibus rivers and harbors bill and the Public Works and Economic Development Amendments of 1972, were vetoed by the President following adjournment of the 92d Congress. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1972 also failed to become law because of the inability of the House of Representatives to secure a quorum on the final day of the legislative session. All of these will require our renewed attention early in 1973.

Throughout the rigorous schedule of the past year, members of the committee were diligent in their attendance at committee meetings and in their attention to matters before us. All were conscientious in giving the careful and deliberate consideration required of these important measures.

Mr. President, I now will discuss in detail the 1972 activities of the Committee on Public Works by subcommittee:

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL—RIVERS AND HARBORS

The major legislative activity of the Subcommittee on Flood Control—Rivers and Harbors, chaired by Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN of North Carolina, was the development of an omnibus rivers and harbors bill, S. 4018, which was passed by the Congress but vetoed by the President on October 27.

S. 4018, authorized approximately

$593 million for the initiation and construction of navigational, flood control, and other related multipurpose projects and programs. Particular emphasis was placed upon the correction and prevention of shoreline and streambank erosion problems throughout the country, in an effort to prevent the further loss of valuable adjacent properties, and provision was made for continuation of this essential work on a procedural basis. Emergency repair projects, necessitated by floods and wind damage during recent severe storms throughout the country, were also included in the bill. In addition, it authorized numerous modifications and additions to existing laws affecting navigational waterways and tributaries, considered necessary to improve and modernize them for the purpose of fulfilling current and anticipated needs.

Hearings were conducted before the subcommittee for 12 days during June and September of 1972, at which times testimony pertaining to various projects was submitted for consideration. In addition to the hearings, staff members participated in a series of briefings with officials of the Corps of Engineers and others having a responsible interest in the proposed projects.

In other action during 1972, the subcommittee approved 13 water resource projects having a total estimated Federal cost of $38.4 million, for construction by the Corps of Engineers, under the provisions of section 201 of the 1965 Flood Control Act. Three watershed projects, having a total estimated Federal cost of $6.4 million, were approved for construction by the Soil Conservation Service under the provisions of Public Law 83–566.

A total of 44 resolutions, requested by Members of the Senate, were adopted during the year, directing the Chief of Engineers to investigate and report his findings with report to various flood control, navigation, streambank, and beach erosion problems.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

The Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, chaired by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, is responsible for legislation and oversight in the Committee on Public Works relating to air and water pollution, solid waste management and resource recovery, control of noise, and other matters affecting the environment. During 1972, the subcommittee held 24 days of public hearings and participated in 10 executive sessions relating to subcommittee matters.

Final enactment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 was one of the committees' most important achievements. During 1972, 39 conference sessions were held by conferees on the part of the House and Senate. This was preceded in 1971 by 33 days of public hearings and 45 executive sessions of the subcommittee and the committee on the water bill. Thus, a total of 117 meetings were required in developing the most comprehensive water pollution legislation ever enacted.

On September 14, 1972, the conferees reached agreement. Both Houses of Congress agreed to the conference report on October 5—the Senate by a margin of 74 to 0.

The water pollution bill was vetoed by the President on October 17, but the veto was overridden by a 52-to-12 margin in the Senate and a 247-to-23 margin in the House, and the water pollution bill was enacted into law as Public Law 92–500.

The key provisions of this landmark legislation establish a regulatory system which provides that by July 1, 1977, all point sources of pollution must apply best practicable effluent control technology, and by July 1, 1983, all point sources must apply the best effluent control technology available.

These controls will be administered through a permit-issuing process. Violations of a permit condition will be enforceable through a penalty provision.

The act authorizes expenditures of $24.6 billion in Federal money, $18 billion of which will be allocated to the States on a needs basis for grants to pay the Federal share of the cost of constructing sewage treatment facilities. The Federal share is 75 percent. The definition of construction has been expanded to handle the problems of collection sewers and combined sewers.

The act also expanded the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act to include some water pollution programs managed by the Environmental Protection Agency.

In 1972 the subcommittee also developed the first comprehensive legislation for the control of noise. The subcommittee held public hearings on noise control legislation on March 24 in San Francisco, Calif., and on April 12 and 13 in Washington, D.C. Following the public hearings, there were two executive sessions of the subcommittee and six executive sessions of the full committee on this measure, culminating in committee's reporting the Environmental Noise Control Act of 1972 on September 19. The noise pollution control bill passed the Senate on October 13 and was finally approved by both Houses of Congress on October 18 when the House passed the Senate bill with amendments to which the Senate subsequently agreed.

This legislation requires the Environmental Protection Agency to establish noise regulations for products which are adequate to protect the public health and welfare. State and local governments may establish stricter controls on environmental noise from one or more sources. Aircraft are subject to emission and operational controls as proposed by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and approved by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. All regulations prescribed pursuant to the act are subject to judicial review. Additionally, any person may bring suit against the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency or the Federal Aviation Agency for failure to protect the public health and welfare. The act authorizes $21 million for fiscal years 1972 through 1975 to implement this legislation.

On January 24 the subcommittee held a hearing on a bill to permit establishment of interstate environmental compacts. An executive session was held on this bill on February 15 at which time it was referred back with amendments to the Committee on the Judiciary where it originated.

The subcommittee, in 1972, initiated a greatly expanded effort to examine the implementation of enacted legislation within its area of responsibility. On February 16 the subcommittee began hearings on implementation of the Clean Air Amendments of 1970. The oversight activity included 12 days of hearings in Washington, one hearing in Los Angeles, Calif., on March 25, and an executive session on June 2 at which representatives of the Environmental Protection Agency discussed potential criminal violations by the auto companies in implementing the Clean Air Act.

The subcommittee staff during April and May monitored the public hearings and other activities of the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the request by the auto companies to delay implementation of the emission control standards scheduled under the Clean Air Act to take effect in 1975.

New developments in reducing automobile exhausts, including alternatives to the internal combustion engine, and their potential impact in meeting standards prescribed by the Clean Air Act were examined at a hearing held by the subcommittee's Panel on Environmental Science and Technology in Washington, D.C., on March 14.

The subcommittee, in conjunction with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, held 4 days of oversight hearings on the impact of the National Environmental Policy Act beginning on March 1, 1972.

Oversight hearings were also held on the environmental problems of the Lake Tahoe Basin and Federal policies affecting those problems on August 21 at Lake Tahoe and on implementation of the Resource Recovery Act of 1970 in San Diego, Calif., on August 23.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS

The Subcommittee on Roads during 1972 devoted most of its efforts to the analysis of data and preparation of legislation necessary to continue biennial authorizations for the various Federal-aid highway and traffic safety programs. Many bills introduced by Members of the Senate and numerous suggestions made by the administration and other groups for extension and revision of these programs were considered and acted upon by the subcommittee. In addition, further examination was made of proposals for modifying present width limitations for buses operating on Interstate Highways.

The subcommittee held 9 days of hearings during the year, during which 84 witnesses testified. Additional statements, comments, and communications for the record were received from more than 130 other sources.

Hearings begun previously in December 1971 on H.R. 4354 were concluded on February 14. This bill, which had passed the House of Representatives, would have authorized States to permit buses not more than 102 inches wide to operate on segments of the Interstate System within their borders. On the recommenda-

tion of the Secretary of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administrator, action on this measure was postponed until results are available from extensive research being conducted under departmental sponsorship on possible traffic hazards caused by wider vehicles.

Twenty bills, one concurrent resolution, and two amendments were the subject of a series of hearings on the basic Federal-aid highway program conducted by the subcommittee from May 10 through June 15. Two measures introduced by Senator COOPER, S. 3590, to authorize appropriations for the construction of highways and mass transportation; and S. 3589, to amend the Highway Safety Act of 1960, incorporated many recommendations made by the administration. Several other bills proposed major program changes including S. 2440, to authorize the construction of exclusive or preferential bicycle lanes; S. 2719, to improve highway safety programs with respect to the prevention of accidents resulting from the excessive use of alcohol; S. 3037, to authorize funds for urban public transportation; S. 3266, to authorize reimbursement for future construction of toll roads; S. 3405, to establish a national scenic and recreational highway program; and S. 3701, to extend and improve the Federal highway safety program. Bills more limited in scope or applicable only to particular areas or projects included S. 1634, S. 1959, S. 2119, S. 2360, S. 2633, S. 2733, S. 2852, S. 3052, S. 3242, S. 3581, S. 3582, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 28.

All of these bills, along with testimony of witnesses and other evidence, were reviewed by the subcommittee in executive sessions and a clean bill was recommended to the Committee on Public Works. After carefully analyzing all proposals in a series of meetings, the committee modified several provisions and added a number of new sections.

On August 18 the committee ordered reported S. 3939, the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1972. As noted in its report—No. 91-1081—this bill represented a significant broadening of the basic 50-year-old Federal assistance program and proposed innovations designed to provide greater flexbility, more public participation, and less delay in the administration and supervision of highway planning and construction.

It would have authorized for the first time such new features as the purchase of buses from urban and secondary system funds, a small urban highway system, the privilege of transferring urban interstate segments elsewhere on a dollar rather than a mileage basis, reimbursement from future primary apportionments for new toll roads, funds for the construction of bicycle paths, pedestrian walkways, and equestrian trails, a "pass-through" of urban system funds to urbanized areas in which metropolitanwide transportation agencies had been established, a special urban high density traffic program, and an optional alternative Federal-aid highway procedure for reducing redtape. Other significant features of S. 3939 would have required a realinement of Federal-aid highway systems, revised the control of outdoor advertising and junkyard provisions of the Highway Beautification Act, extended the economic growth center highway program, directed feasibility studies for several proposed interstate routes, ordered a study of laws and regulations governing toll bridges, and extended the life of the Highway Beautification Commission for 1 year.

In recognition of changing needs, the annual authorization level for the Interstate System would have been reduced $750 million, but funds, for primary, secondary and urban system roads would have been greatly increased. Moreover, total authorizations for highway safety purposes, including the improvement and removal of railroad grade crossings, elimination of high hazard road locations, and replacement of deficient bridges, would have been more than trebled to a total of approximately $1 billion. Additional traffic safety sections would have required more effective penalties for driving while intoxicated, mandated compliance with alcohol safety standards, authorized sizable incentive grants to States achieving either above average or significant improvement in carrying out highway safety programs, made Indian reservations eligible for highway safety funds, provided grants for emergency medical care of accident victims, and established a pavement-marking research and demonstration program.

On September 7, the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, because of its primary jurisdiction over urban mass transportation, held a hearing on S. 3939, which had been referred to it for review and comment. In accordance with testimony received at that hearing, that committee recommended that Federal-aid urban system highway funds should be made available for rail and subway transit capital expenditures as well as for the purchase of buses. It also proposed a new title III to the bill which would have authorized $3 billion in contract authority and $800 million for operating expenses from general funds to be administered by the Urban Mass Transportation Administration.

The Senate approved adding title III to the bill on September 13, and an amendment — Cooper-Muskie—permitting the optional use of urban system funds for the construction of fixed rail facilities and the purchase of rail passenger equipment for public mass transportation was adopted on September 19. Aside from minor technical changes, the only other significant amendments made to S. 3939 by the Senate provided for access highways to public recreation areas on Federal lakes, required Federal-aid highway projects to be integrated with overall State transportation plans, and authorized an additional railroad relocation demonstration project. Final passage of the bill on September 19 was by a vote of 77–0.

After the House of Representatives passed its version of the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1972—H.R. 16656—on October 5 and substituted the text of this bill for that of S. 3939, conferees for the Senate and the House met for about 40 hours during five lengthy sessions before agreeing on a conference report. While merging many provisions of both bills, the report authorized a 1-year extension of funding for the Federal-aid highways systems, expanded many aspects of the highway safety program, and included the proposed title III financing for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration with somewhat lower authorizations for operating subsidies. Although the conference report was agreed to by the Senate on October 18, adoption could not be secured in the House of Representatives before sine die adjournment that same day, and the bill did not become law.

Until his resignation from the committee in August to accept membership on the Committee on Appropriations, the Subcommittee on Roads was chaired by Senator BIRCH BAYH. At that time, the chairman of the Committee on Public Works resumed leadership of the subcommittee and directed its work for the remainder of the 92d Congress.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Since the introduction of the Appalachian Regional Development Act and the Public Works and Economic Development Act in 1965, the subcommittee has provided the legislative basis for the national effort to strengthen the economic foundation of the less fortunate areas of our country. The experiences, both successes and failures, of the programs initiated by this legislation, plus the need to meet the challenges of changing times, makes it evident to the subcommittee that new legislation in this field is required, legislation that recognizes more fully the interdependencies of social institutions and economic activities and of interrelationships within our physical environment. The need is for a more rational and coordinated approach to public investments, of which public works is a major element.

With the objective of new development legislation in mind, the subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator JOSEPH MONTOYA held 15 days of public hearings in the field in 1971. As a result of these hearings, a bill—S. 3381—was introduced on March 21, 1972, to establish a national development program through planned public works investment. The basic structure of the program would be a working partnership of Federal, State, and local governments, organized in multi-State commissions.

Program initiative would be placed at the local level while the administration structure would help State and local governments adopt the resources of diverse national programs to local requirements. Such a program of coordinated public decisionmaking should result in reasoned patterns of development and greater opportunity for all Americans.

Hearings on S. 3381 were held in Washington, D.C., on April 18, 19, 20, 25, 26, and 27, 1972, with testimony from 38 witnesses. These hearings were held to examine the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed legislation and to review the programs administered by the Economic Development Administration, the Appalachian Regional Commission, and the title V regional action planning commissions. The hearings demonstrated a need for additional investigation and

study of this important subject. Work has continued, and new legislation will be proposed to the 93d Congress.

The subcommittee believes that current Federal efforts to assist economically distressed areas should not be abandoned in the interim. Legislation that would continue the economic programs of EDA and the title V commissions for an additional fiscal year was considered, therefore, and recommended to the Congress. This legislation — H.R. 16071 — passed both Houses of Congress on October 14, but was subsequently vetoed by following congressional adjournment.

In addition to the 1-year extension, major provisions in the bill separate short-term emergency assistance and funding from long-term economic development programs through the establishment of a separate public works impact program; authorize additional funding to title V regional commissions with completed long-range development plans; allow the Secretary of Commerce to make grants to economic development districts to help pay for administrative and planning expenses; and provide assistance to persons and firms that have suffered or will suffer economic hardship as the result of Federal environmental legislation. The Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution held hearings on the question of economic dislocation as related to environmental control orders on May 17, 18, and June 28, 1971.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Among the major legislative activities of the Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds during 1972 was the development under the direction of its chairman, Senator MIKE GRAVEL, of a bill to further amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, providing for the financing, acquisition, construction, alteration, maintenance, operation, and protection of public buildings, and for other purposes. One provision is for implementation of a unique and innovative lease purchase procedure, enabling the General Services Administration to promptly expedite construction of buildings previously authorized, but not funded. This act also incorporates S. 2900, authorizing funds for the operation and maintenance of nonperforming arts functions of the Kennedy Center. In accordance with Senate and House agreement during conference, S. 1736 was passed and became Public Law 92–313 on June 16.

Further important legislation included S. 3943, a bill authorizing purchase-contract construction of a convention center in downtown Washington, D.C., to be named in honor of the late President Eisenhower. The bill also designated names for several Federal office buildings throughout the country, becoming Public Law 92–520 on October 21.

Another bill, S. 3917, authorized completion of the New Senate Office Building and acquisition of land and planning, for a proposed parking structure. Designated the U.S. Senate Office Building, Land Acquisition, and Parking Facilities Planning Act of 1972, was passed by the Senate on September 13.

During 1972 the subcommittee reviewed and approved five prospectuses for new buildings estimated at $112,117,000, 16 amended prospectuses increasing estimates for previously authorized projects in the amount of $96,081,405, and three prospectuses for purchase contracts estimated at $18,677,250, for a total of $226,875,655.

Joint hearings were conducted with the House Buildings and Grounds Subcommittee on August 9, during which testimony pertaining to the Eisenhower Convention Center was received. In addition, staff members participated in a series of briefings with officials of the District government and others having interest in this matter. Numerous meetings with officials of the General Services Administration were also conducted in conjunction with other proposed projects.

Legislation designating names for public buildings in five cities also was expedited by the subcommittee during 1972. S. 3568, authorizing designation of the FBI Building in Washington, D.C., as the J. Edgar Hoover Building, passed the Senate on May 25. S. 861, authorizing that a proposed Federal building in Atlanta, Ga., be named the Richard B. Russell Federal Building, was subsequently incorporated into S. 3943. S. 3924, the Philip J. Philbin Federal Office Building, was also incorporated into S. 3943. S. 4005 authorized that a proposed Federal building in Albany, N.Y., be named the Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building. S. 4025 designated the proposed Federal building in Honolulu, Hawaii, as the Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalànianaloe Federal Building.

COMMITTEE FILM PROGRAM

The two films on air and water pollution which the committee makes available for public showing continue to be extremely popular.

During 1971, requests for the films—"Ill Winds on a Sunny Day" and "Troubled Waters"—was greater than our ability to meet them. Through October 25, the two films were shown a total of 1,050 times and were seen by 26,187 people. The committee was unable to fill 644 requests for the films.

During the year 21 new prints of the films were purchased and we now have a total of 45 in circulation throughout the country.

SENATOR CLINTON P. ANDERSON

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to take special note prior to the adjournment of the 92d Congress of the retirement of our distinguished colleague and senior Senator from New Mexico, CLINTON ANDERSON.

It is my privilege to have been a member with CLINT ANDERSON of the "class of 1948." It was and is a great group of Senators, if I may say so, Mr. President. CLINT ANDERSON and I were privileged to be elected and enter the Senate at the same time as Lyndon Baines Johnson of Texas, RUSSELL B. LONG of Louisiana, Paul Douglas of Illinois, Estes Kefauver of Tennessee, and Robert S. Kerr of Oklahoma, to name only a few of the Democratic Senators elected that year. And may I add to this reminiscence of our class our present colleague on the other side of the aisle, Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH of Maine.

Mr. President, I do not hazard the judgment whether the "class of 1948" has fulfilled the expectations made of it by the press of the time, but I do say of CLINT ANDERSON that he is one of the great leaders of his class, of this Senate, and of this country, and I am very proud to serve with him and to be his friend.

CLINT ANDERSON'S diligence and total commitment to public service over 24 years in this body have been well recognized in his appointment to the chairmanship of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, his vital work as a member of the Committee on Finance and the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and in his expertise as a member of four joint committees—Atomic Energy, Internal Revenue Taxation, Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration, and Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

Prior to entering the Senate, however, he had already compiled an outstanding record of service in State administration, as a three-term Member of Congress, and as U.S. Secretary of Agriculture.

Having dealt at first hand with the economic crisis of the Depression and later with a critical era in agricultural production, CLINT ANDERSON has a deeply rooted concern for the needs of people. As a member of the Finance Committee he was the great leader for expanded social security benefits and in the extended effort to secure enactment of medicare.

It was this same dedication that resulted in his identification with innovative legislation in such areas as atomic energy, the space program, reclamation, wilderness protection, and statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

For his accomplishments and for his humanity, CLINT ANDERSON has earned warm affection of his colleagues in the Senate. I have been honored by his friendship, and enlightened by his counsel. I hope to enjoy many more years of both.

TRIBUTE TO PRESCOTT BUSH

HON. GORDON ALLOTT

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I was saddened to learn of the death of an old friend and colleague earlier this month. I was privileged to serve with Senator Prescott Bush in the U.S. Senate. I knew Senator Bush and respected him highly. I had great admiration for him as a man, as a Senator, and as a leader in the Senate labors.

Prescott Bush was an outstanding member of the Senate and a great and good servant of the people of Connecti-

cut. He brought to the Senate a native ability and a great deal of that noted Yankee shrewdness. He was always able to leaven any discussion with a great deal of commonsense. Senator Bush was truly a fine man, a man of great integrity, and also a man who placed a high value on hard work. He insisted on performance always to the maximum himself and expected the same degree of performance from others. By his own example, Prescott Bush achieved just that.

Mr. President, in closing this brief tribute to an old and well-loved friend, I wish to extend to his family my sympathy and my hope that they will be comforted by the knowledge to the extent of the affection and esteem in which he was held by all who knew him.

A TRIBUTE TO SENATOR LEN B. JORDAN

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, with the close of the 92d Congress, Senator LEN JORDAN, of Idaho, will end his Senate career, which began a decade ago. During his full tenure in the Senate, Senator JORDAN served on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which I have the honor to chair as a Senator from a neighboring northwestern State with many common interests. As well as serving with him on my committee, I have had an opportunity to observe him in action as a representative of his people and State and as a man. Senator JORDAN is respected by all those who have had the opportunity to serve with him. He is a dedicated public servant and a gentleman in every sense of the word. If we differed from time to time on any issues, it was never in bitterness or narrow partisanship. His attitude was one of seeking to find a way to accomplish an objective rather than enumerating reasons why something could not be done.

His colleagues on the Interior Committee will miss him as will the other Members of the Senate. He has one of the finest attendance records at the committee and his broad interests and "grassroots" western background has been of great help. I am grateful for this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation for the privilege I have had of working and serving with LEN JORDAN in the U.S. Senate.

SENATOR FRED R. HARRIS

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to express my admiration for our colleague, Senator FRED HARRIS, who is retiring from the Senate. We will miss this man of compassion and champion of human rights.

I worked closely with FRED HARRIS at the time when he served as chairman of the Democratic National Committee in 1969, instituting reforms which will evolve to greatly broaden the base of our party. I have also been fortunate to be associated with him in the Senate in connection with a number of his many battles for justice and human dignity.

He played an important role in the movement to bring about much needed congressional reform, in particular as chairman of the ad hoc committee on reform appointed by the Democratic Conference.

He was among the prime movers in Senate efforts to improve and expand health care, child care development, welfare reform, environmental protection, and conservation of our natural resources.

FRED HARRIS has been in the forefront of the continuing fight for social and economic reform. He has always been willing to move forward when others were all too often holding back. He sensed the needs of the future and particularly the growing danger of massive concentrated power. He had the courage to warn of these dangers, however unpopular his warning was with some.

And no mention could be made of our distinguished colleague without including his courageous and innovative wife, LaDonna. Together they have awakened our national consciousness to the plight of the long-ignored American Indian, and to the deprivations suffered by so many others in our society.

Senator FRED HARRIS will be missed in this body and I personaly will feel the loss. It is rare that friendships like those many of us feel for FRED HARRIS and his wonderful wife are formed in the turbulent and tense climate of politics. Those friendships remain as important as the rewards of fighting the "battles" with FRED HARRIS on issues in which we firmly believe.

And there are battles which remain to be fought. I know that LaDonna and FRED HARRIS will be in there at the forefront and I am counting on their continued counsel and inspiration.

ST. LOUIS LAUNCHES PROGRAM TO FIGHT LEAD-BASED PAINT POISONING

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, lead-based paint poisoning is a disease that hits the urban ghetto dweller hardest. Children between the ages of 1 and 3 years are most often affected. The poisoning results from eating chips of paint that have fallen from walls, windows, and ceilings of deteriorated apartments and homes.

Heavy lead concentrations of the paint in the blood system can cause cerebral palsy, kidney disease, blindness, and death, and it is estimated that half of the 14,000 children treated for lead-based paint poisoning this year will be left mentally retarded.

The administration requested no funds for fiscal year 1971 to prevent lead-based paint poisoning and only $2 million for fiscal year 1972, although Congress had authorized $30 million for those fiscal years. The Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Act which authorized these funds is the first Federal law to combat this disease.

Two articles from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch reflect the serious problem of lead-based paint poisoning in only one of our major cities.

The Alliance for Regional Community Health—ARCH—decided to make lead paint elimination its primary health objective in the St. Louis area and took action to establish a task force on childhood lead paint poisoning.

The alliance will work with the St. Louis Legal Aid Society and the People's Coalition Against Lead Poisoning.

The estimated cost of the project initiated by ARCH to deal with lead paint elimination is $2.5 million annually for St. Louis City alone—approximately the total amount requested by the administration for the entire United States.

With that in mind, I ask consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the articles from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch which express the concern of St. Louisans over this disease of epidemic proportions:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat]

ARCH ACTS TO CURB LEAD POISONING

(By Edward L. Cook)

A proposal to establish a permanent task force on childhood lead poisoning was adopted in a policy statement by the Alliance for Regional Community Health (ARCH) board at a meeting in St. Louis University's Busch Memorial Center Wednesday.

The board voted to accept a recommendation of its Environmental Health Committee to consider elimination of lead poisoning the primary health objective in the region.

"Treatment of children may lessen the severity of illness and prevent the death of children already poisoned, but only inspection and treatment of the housing can prevent additional children from being poisoned," the committee said.

ARCH will work with the People's Coalition Against Lead Poisoning and Legal Aid Society in drawing plans to eliminate the hazard, a project estimated to cost $2.5 million annually in the city alone.

The People's Coalition has estimated it costs $1,000 per case to treat a hospitalized child for lead poisoning and some 30,000 children are in high risk lead areas of St. Louis, the environmental committee said.

"For more than a decade, St. Louis has recognized the problem of lead poisoning. . . . Yet, the problem still exists in almost epidemic proportions. Recent statistics indicate that in the first five months of 1972, some 393 children were found to have elevated blood levels," the report noted.

The ARCH board gave its endorsement of an expansion and construction application of St. Mary's Health Center, 6420 Clayton Rd., Richmond Heights.

Total cost of the two-phase project, which includes relocation of the emergency and outpatient departments is estimated to be $4,757,200 over a period ending in March, 1976.

Construction will include an Ambulatory Care Center, comprising emergency rooms,

employee health department outpatient clinic and medi-surgicenter. Phase I construction will begin March 1, 1973.

A final report on the feasibility of extending ARCH functions to four more Illinois counties—Bond, Clinton, Washington and Randolph—was referred to the body's executive committee for consideration.

The report, prepared by Community Health, Inc. (CHI), a nonprofit consulting group, recommended two separate councils be formed, one representing all Missouri counties, and one all Illinois counties involved in the health service program.

Mary Robinson, deputy executive director of CHI, said the study showed expansion of ARCH functions is feasible only if it is reorganized.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

ENDING LEAD POISONING GETS ARCH PRIORITY

Eliminating lead poisoning should be the primary health objective in the St. Louis area, the Alliance for Regional Community Health said in a policy statement adopted yesterday.

"For more than a decade, St. Louis has recognized the problem of lead poisoning," the statement said. "Yet, the problem still exists in almost epidemic proportions.

"Recent statistics indicate that in the first five months of 1972, some 393 children (in St. Louis) were found to have elevated levels of lead in their blood."

Lead poisoning is usually the result of children's eating cracked or peeling lead-based paints or putty.

Area-wide plans to counter lead poisoning will be drawn by ARCH in co-operation with the People's Coalition Against Lead Poisoning and the St. Louis Legal Aid Society.

An ARCH staff member estimated that a campaign to eliminate the old lead-based paints or putty in dilapidated housing would cost more than $2,500,000 in St. Louis alone.

ARCH's environmental health committee quoted the People's Coalition Against Lead Poisoning as estimating that it costs $1,000 to treat a child who has been hospitalized as a result of lead poisoning.

"Treatment of children may lessen the severity of illness and prevent the death of children already poisoned," the statement said. "But only inspection and treatment of the housing can prevent additional children from being poisoned.

CAB CONSUMER CHIEF'S VIEWS PRESENTED TO AIRLINE OFFICIALS

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, once again the Civil Aeronautics Board's office of Consumer Affairs has forcefully outlined its role in the field of consumer relations.

In a presentation prepared for the World Conference of Airline Relations Directors, Mr. Jack Yohe, the CAB's Consumer Affairs Director, told airline representatives:

The one thing we should bear in mind is that every consumer is first and foremost a human being. As such he should be dealt with on the basis of equity and honor.

Mr. Yohe spelled out the CAB's role in handling consumer problems and told what the Board and its staff expects of carrier representatives in their dealings with airline passenger complaints. I believe my colleagues will find his remarks of interest:

REMARKS BY JACK YOHE

Perhaps the most sensible, and I confess the easiest way to begin a presentation to an audience as diverse as this, is to explain the whys and wherefores of my being asked to speak to you.

No doubt most of you are—at least in some form—aware of the existence of my Office. And, there can be no doubt that an equal number are confused as to its scope and purpose.

I hope that by providing you with some background information as to my function in the scheme of things, we might achieve a certain information transfer which could facilitate our future dealings.

At the same time I hope I will be able to share with you some meaningful insights into your own operations which come to mind through the thousands of letters we receive each year.

The Civil Aeronautics Board was the first Federal regulatory agency to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs.

Since then, other American regulatory agencies have followed the Board's lead. I am told that several foreign governments have initiated consumer oriented programs in the field of air transport, and others may follow.

Each such office has, it would seem, some specific function.

We certainly do. But, I am afraid that our function cannot be simply stated in 25 words or less.

It is safe to say that our basic function is facilitation.

Our basic task is to assist an individual who perceives a problem in the resolution of his problem.

Thus, when we receive a letter which cites alleged abuse on the part of an air carrier, the correspondence is brought to the attention of the air carrier involved for its review and corrective action.

May I repeat what I have said in the past months. I believe that if consumer complaints arise at all, the consumer has a right to expect them to be handled with the kind of speed befitting the pace of travel to which the air age has accustomed us; or perhaps a bit more bluntly, with the same alacrity with which his check or credit card was accepted when he bought his ticket.

With that kind of expedition in mind I have found a surprising amount of success on the telephone.

Your time and motion study people can probably tell you, to the penny, that it costs somewhere around $9, or $11 or $15, or whatever, to write a letter these days. I suppose I should add a fine-print footnote here; something to the effect, "not including postage." But that is only part of the cost. To it we can add the cost of the time while the incoming letter percolates up through the corporate strata to the appropriate level, and more time while the strategically and legally hedged $15 reply filters down through the same layers to the now frustrated recipient who must now reply again, if he has not already thrown in the towel.

The telephone, on the other hand, has enabled me to talk directly to top management of most of the airlines as well as to the complainants. In many instances a telephone call to a consumer can resolve his problems. As for the airlines' top management people—presidents and vice presidents, etc.—they are remarkably cooperative and wanting to understand and help the consumer. They are in the position they hold because they know what makes good business. And they recognize that satisfied customers are good business. For the very few entities in the industry that may have shown some past inertia in prompt handling of complaints, the telephone has been an effective instrument for moral suasion, the next best thing to discussing cases face-to-face.

By monitoring the correspondence between a complainant and a carrier, the staff is able to assure that there is equity with respect to existing rules, tariffs and regulations.

Of particular note to an audience like this may be the fact that the CAB's Office of Consumer Affairs attempts to assist passengers of all countries who encounter difficulty with air carriers while they are traveling to or from the United States.

Each month we receive several requests for assistance from foreign nationals who have visited the United States and have encountered some difficulties, either in transit or during their stay.

Requests for assistance from points as diverse as Odessa, Calcutta, Winnipeg and Lima are received and treated on the same basis as a letter from Chicago, Brooklyn or Los Angeles, so long as the person's complaint deals with air transportation under the jurisdiction of the CAB.

Our function is not to adjudicate claims. We have no court authority. We do publish a monthly report of the complaints which we receive, but we do not attempt to assess the validity of the complaints on an individual basis.

We are not a court of appeal. The Office of Consumer Affairs was not intended as such; it does not function that way.

Our task in this phase of our operations is to facilitate the flow of accurate information and speed the resolution of particular complaints which are brought to our attention, within the existing regulatory functions.

The complaints which the consumers of the world send us run the gamut of human experience.

The more than 6,500 letters we received in the last 12 months dealt with every possible aviation-related happening.

Certainly, the routine situations account for the heaviest part of our mail.

We have undoubtedly generated as many letters explaining flight delays and lost baggage rules as each of you have.

But, we often find that people are also willing to share with us the unusual, the traumatic, and the bizarre.

And, they find us responsible and dedicated. Who, after all, could remain unmoved by such things as:

1. The joy of landing in Toronto unannounced on your Mexico City to New York flight.

2. The effect of an airline's release of its reservations for a man and his paramour to his wife's divorce attorney, and

3. The effect on a sleeping man of hot coffee spilled just below his belt knuckle.

The letters which we receive also provide certain perceptions for the staff which may not have been intended by the author.

We have recently heard from a 40-year-old college professor whose youth fare ticket was disallowed in London.

Passengers on charter flights are often confused when they are suddenly enrolled in groups such as the Clayton Rugby Football Club and have no idea what rugby is.

Needless to say, the information in these letters is not normally referred to the air carriers involved.

Instead, it is passed along to the appropriate Board bureau for further analysis, investigation, and sometimes formal proceedings.

Our third function is to provide information to inquiring members of the public concerning Board policy. Often, given the complex nature of air transport regulation, people simply do not know what the "rules and regulations" are which cover a particular instance.

Basically then the Office of Consumer Affairs has three main functions.

We facilitate the handling of individual complaints. We screen mail for trends and

possible regulatory violations. The consumer affairs office is the eyes and ears of the Board as it, like an antenna, picks up messages from the real world and passes them to the Board in summary form. And we provide information to the public.

In essence, we are a service bureau.

In being a service bureau, we are often in an excellent position to convey certain needs or highlight certain trouble areas to an air carrier.

An air carrier can learn a considerable amount about its own operations by being receptive to the comments of a third-party observer.

We have found that those carriers which are the most receptive to the consumers can, and do, substantially benefit. These carriers carefully analyze the remarks which we bring to their attention, and they take necessary action where required to preclude future similar happenings.

If a consumer says that your $20 million airplane is dirty, it may be that your $20 million airplane would benefit more from a good washing than the consumer would benefit from a defensive discourse on the causes of soot accumulation on a certain aircraft type.

If a person says that his seat-back would not recline, I am of the opinion that it is cheaper in the long run to send a mechanic out to fix that plane than to write apologetic letters to the next 20 people who sit in that seat.

As you can easily detect, we try to be of assistance to both the air consumer and air carrier. Nobody benefits from shoddy service. Both you and the consumer benefit from improvements. We have been most heartened by the strengthening of consumer relations staffs by several carriers. These staffs are designed to iron out the bugs in the system, and would appear to have achieved a considerable degree of success.

I would like to share some observations with you on your own functions as they appear to our Office and consumers.

Historically, customer relations officers of air carriers have been traffic managers within the organization.

Today the customer relations manager is no longer just the bureaucrat who sends a man $10 to "get him off our back."

Your function is to be the most acutely aware individual in your organizational structure of the feelings of people in the "real world" outside of airports.

Your function is to perceive a problem area in advance and eliminate it.

You are the person who has the responsibility to inform your corporate structure of trends in consumer thinking, of changes in consumer consciousness, and of the image which your corporation projects to consumers as a class.

If you insist on handing out the Madison Avenue approach in your advertising, you must be prepared to provide it to each and every consumer.

Your function is not simply to deal with the disgruntled, but to eliminate the disgruntled by taking the initiative and removing the sources of passenger discontent.

Practically speaking, this may involve little more than common sense.

Planning with a consciousness of consumer-preferences can avoid disastrous pitfalls.

A ham and egg breakfast on a flight from Tel Aviv will generate many costly letters. A little planning could have eliminated the problem altogether.

You should bear in mind the simple and obvious fact that people complain about what went wrong, not what went right.

If your workload is increasing of late, there may be good reason. If your work is dwindling, your success may be indicated.

Your function is to be the gauge of your company's performance. Unless you inform your company of its own shortcomings, nobody else will in the organization. You are the only person with primary data on consumer opinion.

We are now entering the age of the "airbus," when more people than ever before will be traveling across continents and oceans.

It is a new era in aviation, and I have often thought that this is a most opportune time for governments and air carriers alike to adjust their thoughts to the new conditions of the era.

"Think new" may be a good motto which we both can use in dealing with both old and new problems.

Streamlining procedures at airports and offices is one major step that each carrier and each government can take.

If you accept the basic premise that a simple thing can be simply done, you will see things in a new perspective.

I am very heartened by the boarding and baggage procedures which several carriers have adopted.

A simple idea—color coding boarding passes, seat upholstery and baggage tags. But, it has speeded passenger processing immeasurably.

Any passenger with a red boarding pass can find a red seat and later look for a bag with a red baggage tag.

Many airport operators already recognize the need to transport flight information simply and rapidly to information bulletin boards. And, the familiar silhouettes of lady and gentleman easily identify facilities rooms at airports around the world.

Other streamlining has great potential. Automatic ticket-writing machines are becoming substantial time savers. The "per piece" baggage system has great merit, and its application to international flights should be carefully examined.

Governments should be encouraged to examine ground facilities at airports and make improvements where needed. For openers, governments might make a major contribution in incentives for rapid ground transportation.

Regulatory agencies, such as the CAB, are not immune from reform. We bureaucrats, like those in the industry we regulate, are in need of reform both in the manner in which the regulation is done, and the approaches to regulation. Innovation in regulation has great potential and must be encouraged.

Having said that, I believe I can claim with some pride that the agency I work for under Chairman Secor Browne is indeeed alert and receptive to reform.

An example, I would cite the recent Travel Group Charter Rule which is designed to open the low cost travel market to many more people than ever before. The Board acted to a growing demand on the part of the consuming public for such low cost services.

Several major problem areas which we perceive deserve special attention, at least from the American perspective.

One major problem for almost all of you is the "cartel" image of the International Air Transport Association. Ralph Nader and his associates are not the only persons who consider IATA to be anticonsumer in outlook.

Consumers consider it that way—and I might add, very strongly.

Members of my staff who have flown on illegal charter flights operated by some of you have discovered a very interesting phenomenon. Rather than face the maze of fares offered by regular carriers, people will simply grab at a simple one-price fare which is about the same for everyone on the aircraft. People are convinced that the present fare structure—particularly on the North Atlantic—is unworkable, discriminatory and abusive.

The black market has been provided with an effective incentive because the IATA fare structure is not flexible or simple enough to meet and deal with the new demand for low cost efficiency transportation.

The consumer rebellion against the IATA fare structure has reached a new and disturbing plateau. We have found that people will actually pay more for illicit charter flights than comparable transportation on scheduled flights. It is no secret to you that the black market ticket rate was about $30.00 higher than a comparable IATA rate.

But the black market rate was not followed by an asterisk which limited its use to persons with three ears, traveling in a group of 43, on a Sunday morning, subject to certain unspecified exceptions. A simple $250 fare has infinitely more appeal than a series of fifty questions based on season, date of travel, day of travel, class, zone, stopovers, and the like.

Illicit discounting is a major problem of late. Chairman Browne has ordered an investigation. You would be naive to assume that no action will be taken by the Board's Bureau of Enforcement with respect to your activities in this area.

You would be even more naive to assume that the illegal discounting practices of a few carriers do not reflect poorly on all of you.

Rate cutting practices may afford bargains to a few people, but the long term effect of such practices is obvious to all.

The consumer derives no benefit in the long run. Next year's fares will have to rise to bail out this year's discounting losses. Discounting contributes substantially to the cost of transportation to the average consumer. Don't forget, it is the average consumer who actually forks over the cash to pay for the discounted seat.

The charter flight market is a literal pandora's box of problems. Both government and industry have responsibilities in this area. There is no reasonable reason why persons should be stranded at points around the world. Whether a person is stranded in Singapore, Seattle or London, his stranding reflects on all of you. You are all aware of the operation of illicit charter flights.

Some of you represent companies which own a percentage of charter carriers engaged in this trade. All of you are in a position to curb abuses. All of you should do so. Should any one of you stand up and announce to this group that "all of my company's flights have been totally according to the book," I dare say that the rest of the house will erupt in unrestrained laughter and snickers.

Again, I would caution that abuses will not go unnoticed. The Board is well aware of incidents involving illicit charters, action is forthcoming.

A fourth area of concern to us is your image as projected in advertising. There has been a tendency to promise the world and deliver something less. You should by now be aware that people read and believe your advertising.

If you promise gourmet cuisine, it is expected.

If you promise a certain aircraft type, it is expected.

If you say you will show movies, one is expected.

I am totally in favor of your promising anything you wish, but I am concerned about your ability to deliver. You should share that concern, for you are the people who will have to deal with resultant discontented consumers.

To build repeat business, you must satisfy present consumers. Honesty remains the best policy.

The fifth basic area of concern is reservations security. As you know the United States air carriers are bound by regulations affecting oversales. Currently this regulation does not apply to foreign air carriers operating from the United States. The Office of Consumer Affairs is presently pressing for a modification to this regulation which would encompass the operation of foreign carriers operating here. Abuses by foreign carriers are

growing. Oversales are multiplying, and the consumer is left holding the bag.

Basic to my thought on consumerism is what I call the consumer's right to know.

I feel very strongly that a consumer has a right to know exactly what he is purchasing when he buys air transportation.

He has a basic right to know that his reservations are secure, that his baggage is protected from theft and pilferage, that he will receive what is promised in the way of services, and that he will be dealt with fairly in the event of an irregularity.

If the purchase of a conditional ticket imposes obligations on a passenger he should be apprised of those obligations. He should be told of limitations on liability in advance, and he should be informed as to specific irregularities involving his flight.

Information transfer from carrier to consumer is vitally important. If air carriers insist on hiding behind unknown and nebulous tariff provisions in dealing with passengers, you may find that consumers will revolt.

An essential uniformity in matters of basic customer policy is needed. The tariffs should be clear, concise, and easily available for inspection and reference. If a tariff rule is bad, change it.

The tariff system has afforded a considerable degree of latitude which a direct regulatory system might not afford. However, if tariff provisions are not made more atune to the times, the possibility of governmental regulation becomes more imminent. Evidence which is currently available to the Board indicates that many air carriers are making errors in the construction of fares. Most of these errors flow from either the erroneous application of existing fare provisions or simply the nonapplication of applicable fares for any given travel.

In either event the net result is that the consumer is paying considerably more for transportation than the law requires. In fact, it is the opinion of the Board's Bureau of Economics that erroneous fare computations constitute prima facie evidence of violations of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, and a recommendation to prosecute has been made.

From the consumer point or view, what is needed is not necessarily prosecution, but proper and complete training of persons engaged in the sale of tickets. Ticket agents must be fully informed of fare constructions and must be monitored to assure that proper constructions are made. The "Oh, I'm sorry, that was a misquote" approach to ticket pricing must be eliminated. What is needed is an accurate method to tell a consumer exactly what his trip will cost. I am sure you are well aware that it is your own companies which formulate tariff provisions. If these tariffs are too complex for your own personnel to accurately interpret, then I would suggest that it is your responsibility to either educate your personnel or simplify your tariffs. Chairman Browne has indicated his strong feelings in this matter on several occasions. In fact, it is at his personal suggestion that I am raising this point for your information.

I have not intended to assume the rôle of a parent cautioning his child to behave. Rather, I have hoped to be that "voice crying in the wilderness."

I hope you will accept my comments in the manner of their intent. Today I have tried to show you what concerns consumers and why. I have attempted to share my insights with you. I hope that you will be able to share my concern for consumer welfare, not simply because some government officer has threatened or cajoled you, but because you are all intelligent persons who are entirely capable of dealing with problems of every sort, and who should share a basic concern with the needs of consumers.

We often tend to categorize consumers into blocks and types, but the one thing we should each bear in mind is that every consumer is first and foremost a human being. As such he should be dealt with on the basis of equity and honor.

You and I are the bridge which attempts to close the gap between the impersonal, corporate structure and the flesh and blood passenger. Our success in this endeavor requires that both you and I rethink old concepts, recognize problem areas, and eliminate the root causes of passenger discontent.

KARL E. MUNDT

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, at the close of the 92d Congress, the Senate will be losing one of its most distinguished Members. KARL MUNDT of South Dakota will be retiring after four consecutive terms. During this near quarter century of service, Senator MUNDT has been a leader and a moving force in this body.

I know that many Senators will be recalling their own most memorable impressions of Senator MUNDT. I will remember especially our service together on the Government Operations Committee. KARL MUNDT had a deep interest in the structures of government and in the performance of administrative institutions.

KARL MUNDT was one of the original members of the Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations, first formed in 1959 as the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery. For more than a dozen years this subcommittee—which I have had the privilege to chair—has sought to evaluate national security policymaking at the highest levels and to recommend changes and improvements. KARL MUNDT never failed to take the most constructive and nonpartisan approach to the subcommittee's work. The Senate and the executive branch alike have profited from Senator MUNDT's statesmanship. He never allowed partisan considerations to take precedence over the Nation's security needs.

His interests have been broad and they carried him from an active role in the affairs of the North Atlantic Assembly to a charter membership on the Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations. All of us will remember him as a forceful advocate and an accomplished debater. But perhaps the most impressive aspect of Senator MUNDT's career has been his profound devotion to the Senate as an institution and his deep sense of the historical legacy of the Senate. He never failed to communicate to us all a sense of our responsibilities. He will be sorely missed.

FOREIGN TRADE AND INVESTMENT ACT OF 1972

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Hartke Foreign Trade and Investment Act of 1972 has attracted both attention and criticism. The multinational companies that profit from our outmoded trade policies are in the forefront of the opponents of the Hartke program.

Recently, Reader's Digest published a short article that repeats a number of the charges that have become so familiar—Hartke-Burke means higher prices, a trade war, and unfair taxation of multinational companies.

These charges carry little weight other than the force theoretical liturgy oft repeated. The very groups that express concern that import quotas mean fewer imports and higher costs for imported goods generally favor the devaluation of the dollar. Devaluation, of course, is designed to raise the price of imports and reduce their quantity while encouraging domestic exports.

Much is made of the role multinationals play in creating American exports. No mention is made of the items worth millions of dollars which are made abroad by American-based firms that have come flooding into America in recent years. Nor did the Reader's Digest article explore the potential for exports had American firms not become so heavily involved in manufacturing overseas.

Far from seeking to penalize foreign investment, the Hartke-Burke bill merely seeks to restore tax equity in the field of corporate taxation. The same rules that apply to domestic investments would henceforth be applied to foreign investments.

Mr. President, the Reader's Digest article is far wide of the mark and dangerously erroneous on many accounts. But it does constitute a clear statement of one position on our foreign trade debacle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

WE MUST STOP THIS ISOLATIONIST TRADE BILL

(By Irwin Ross)

It is a safe bet that few Americans would favor a Congressional bill that they knew would limit the choice of goods they could buy. Or that would raise prices, worsen our balance-of-payments position and set off an international trade war. Yet this catalogue of horrors is likely to unroll before our eyes if Congress enacts the Foreign Trade and Investment Act of 1972, popularly known as the Burke-Hartke bill.

Such disastrous consequences are hardly the intent of the bill's Democratic sponsors—Rep. James Burke of Massachusetts and Sen. Vance Hartke of Indiana, nor of its most vigorous supporters, the 13.6-million-member AFL–CIO. They see it as a way to protect the American economy and jobs by restricting imports and hobbling the operations of American-owned companies abroad.

Admittedly, the American economy does have a problem with the rapid build-up of imports in the past decade. Some industries have been hurt, thousands of workers have lost their jobs. By 1970, imports accounted for 12 percent of textile goods and apparel sold in the United States, 15 percent of steel, 30 percent of shoes, 70 percent of radios, 75 percent of calculating machines. A large chunk of the consumer electronic industry, unable to meet import competition, decamped from the United States and set up in lower-wage areas like Japan, Taiwan, Hong Kong and elsewhere, shipping much of its production back to the United States.

It's little wonder that the unions have swung to a protectionist position after decades of favoring free trade. Technically, the Burke-Hartke bill was drafted on Capitol Hill; substantively, it was conceived at AFL-CIO headquarters. In addition to limiting competitive imports through a quota system, it would increase taxation on American corporate subsidiaries abroad, and restrict the flow of capital and technology to foreign countries.

The trouble with Burke-Hartke is that the proposed cure would be worse than the disease. The quota feature of the bill illustrates why. Imports would be rolled back to their average annual volume for the years 1965–69; in future years they could increase only as domestic production increased, with their proportions fixed by the base period. Such a drastic reduction, according to a Commerce Department study, would amount to a staggering $10.4 billion cut—nearly a quarter of our 1971 imports of $45.5 billion.

This would be painful in many ways. First, consumer choice would be severely limited. Last year, for example, 704,000 Japanese cars were sold in the United States. Under the Burke-Hartke quotas, only 116,000 Japanese vehicles could come in. Imports of color-television sets would be reduced from 1.3-million units to 500,000, bicycles from 2.3 million to 1.3 million. If you wanted a Sony TV set, a Peugeot bicycle, a Necchi sewing machine, you might have to put your name on a waiting list.

As a result, prices of many imported goods could be expected to rise. Take Japanese cars: if the supply were drastically reduced, some Americans, prompted by non-monetary considerations, would be willing to pay more to get a scarce Toyota or Datsun.

Restricting imports would also raise the prices of *domestic* products, since American manufacturers would be relieved of competitive pressure and would have less incentive to innovate, to improve efficiency, to hold down costs. In the past, for example, it was the influx of small foreign cars that forced Detroit to produce compact cars at competitive prices, to the great benefit of Americans. Under Burke-Hartke, that incentive would be muted.

Then there is the matter of jobs. Supporters of Burke-Hartke claim that if imports are reduced, hundreds of thousands of U.S. workers would be employed manufacturing an equal volume of domestic goods. There is one glaring fallacy to this thesis. It assumes that foreign countries will not retaliate, thereby reducing employment in our export industries. The import rollback would deprive Canada $3.6 billion worth of sales, Japan of $3.1 billion, the Common Market of $1.8 billion.

Any country sustaining such losses would have to retaliate by curbing imports to avoid a disastrous trading deficit. Many American commodities would be vulnerable. The Common Market, with food surpluses of its own, could dispense with many U.S. agricultural products. Europe and Japan could gradually switch from American aircraft—on which last year we enjoyed a $3.1-billion export surplus— to domestic models. Industries supplying computers and other "technology-intensive" products, which brought us an $8.3-billion trade surplus in 1971, would also lose sales. Hundreds of thousands of U.S. jobs would be lost, more—and higher-paying ones—than the economy would gain through the drop in imports.

The Burke-Hartke bill also aims to curb America's multi-national corporations—large U.S.-based firms with manufacturing subsidiaries in several foreign countries. Since World War II these have grown enormously, because setting up shop in foreign lands enabled American firms to hurdle tariff walls and other trade barriers.

Senator Hartke would reverse this entire process, on the ground that multi-nationals encourage the "export of American jobs, American know-how and American dollars." The bill would frankly "discourage American business investment abroad." Under present law, the profits of American subsidiaries are not taxed at home until they are sent back to the parent company. Under Burke-Hartke, this tax deferral would end and all foreign profits would be taxed immediately; thus companies would have less available cash to expand foreign operations.

More important, the bill would end the present practice of allowing U.S. multi-nationals to credit their foreign taxes against the tax bill owed to Uncle Sam. Instead, the foreign taxes would be deducted from a corporation's taxable income. The result would be to raise taxes on foreign investments so high as to drastically discourage investment.

This would be self-defeating. For the foreign investments of American multi-national companies create jobs in the United States by increasing our exports. The situation may seem paradoxical, but it is easy to understand. A parent company here often exports components to its foreign subsidiaries, foreign sales it might not make otherwise. Moreover, many foreign subsidiaries manufacture only a few products themselves but sell a wide range of finished goods manufactured back home by the parent company.

A recent survey by the Emergency Committee for American Trade of 74 large multinational companies revealed that, between 1960 and 1970, they increased their domestic employment by 529,000 workers—to 2,981,000 (exclusive of employment increases due to acquisitions)—a growth rate more than 50 percent higher than that of all other manufacturing firms. During the same period, these 74 companies showed an increase in exports from the United States from $4.3 to $12.2 billion. Immense gains were also realized in their return on foreign investments—by way of dividends, interest and royalties. Indeed, the "return flow" from American investment abroad injects a huge plus figure into our balance-of-payments equation, which overall has been in deficit for years.* In 1970, for example, income returning to the United States from direct foreign investment, plus royalties and fees, totaled $7.9 billion. Even after deducting the income we paid on foreign investments of the same sort in this country, we still had a net surplus of $7.4 billion from repatriated earnings.

Beyond these purely economic considerations, the whole approach of the Burke-Hartke bill is narrowly nationalistic, inward-looking, fundamentally isolationist. If enacted into law, it would promote a similar isolationism abroad—not of individual countries, for they are too small, but the isolationism of blocs—a self-contained Common Market and perhaps a new Japanese-led "co-prosperity sphere" in Asia. Beyond lies the great risk that these will be not only economic blocs but political and military blocs as well.

Defeat of the Burke-Hartke bill will not solve our international economic problems, of course. One crying need is for an ambitious program of adjustment assistance to provide job retraining and placement, realistic cash supplements to unemployment compensation and relocation assistance, far larger than the present program which has helped no more than 24,000 workers. Indeed, such an effort might be part of an overall manpower program of a scope which the nation has not yet seen. In a dynamic economy, old industries frequently decline as consumer preference shift and new technologies come to the fore. Employment patterns go through a parallel shift, and masses of individuals, left behind in the parade, need help, quite apart from the problem of imports. Such adjustment assistance is obviously linked with the health of the entire economy.

Expansion of our exports, particularly of high-technology products in which we enjoy a competitive advantage, should also generate significant numbers of new jobs. The currency realignment of last December will ultimately increase exports because their prices are lower in world markets, while moderating the flow of imports, for their prices have simultaneously gone up.

In sum, our foreign-trade problems can be attacked on several fronts. Prospects of success are good. The Burke-Hartke bill, however, would weaken the nation in a misguided attempt to preserve its strength.

*See "What's Behind the Balance-of-Payments Problems?" The Reader's Digest, March '72.

SENATOR GAMBRELL

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, when the 93d Congress convenes in January, a number of outstanding individuals who have served in the 92d Congress will, regrettably, not be with us; one such is the junior Senator from Georgia, DAVID GAMBRELL.

Senator GAMBRELL was appointed to the Senate on February 1, 1971, to fill the vacancy created by the untimely death of the late Senator Richard B. Russell. From his first day in the Senate, DAVID GAMBRELL served with ability and dedication. I had the opportunity to work with him on the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, and the Select Committee on Small Business, and I can say that his presence in those committees was most welcome and constructive. In addition, Senator GAMBRELL served with distinction as a member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Before his appointment to the Senate, Senator GAMBRELL practiced law in Atlanta. He has served as president of the State Bar of Georgia; as a trustee of the Metropolitan Atlanta Commission on Crime and Juvenile Delinquency; and as vice president, and a director, of the State YMCA. Senator GAMBRELL also served as chairman of the Georgia Democratic Party.

Mr. President, in the short time he has served here, Senator GAMBRELL has earned the respect of the Members of this body, and made an important contribution to our National Government. He will certainly be missed next year, and I know my colleagues join me in wishing him well in whatever enterprises he now undertakes.

HAMMERSCHMIDT QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I recently sent my sixth annual questionnaire to residents of the Third Con-

gressional District of Arkansas. The response was most heartening, with 14,000 questionnaires returned at the time of computation—reflecting a total number of responses—many have both "his" and "her" views—of over 22,000.

For the RECORD, I submit the questionnaire and the computation of the responses as prepared by an independent firm. Results are expressed in terms of percentage of those answering each question.

They are as follows:

RESULTS

1. Do you believe wage and price controls are working reasonably well in cutting the rate of inflation and stabilizing the economy? Yes. 40 percent; no, 47 percent.

2. Are stronger laws needed to deal with prolonged strikes which harm the public interest? Yes, 83 percent; no, 13 percent.

3. Do you support the all-volunteer army concept for national defense? Yes, 54 percent; no, 38 percent.

4. Should Congress approve a program to establish government-subsidized day care centers and nursery schools? Yes, 24 percent; no, 69 percent.

5. Do you favor an increase in the minimum wage to $2.20 per hour? Yes, 46 percent; no, 50 percent.

6. Do you favor the Family Assistance Plan which subsidizes working lower income earners and provides work incentives to replace the present welfare system? Yes, 69 percent; no, 23 percent.

7. Would you favor a "Value Added" tax, in effect, a national sales tax, as a method to reduce property taxes? Yes, 33 percent; no, 58 percent.

8. Do you favor national health insurance for all, with the federal government underwriting the cost for low-income families? Yes, 34 percent; no, 59 percent.

9. Should food stamps be available to persons on strike? Yes, 10 percent; no, 84 percent.

10. Do you favor federal prohibition on the sale of cheap, short-range handguns (so-called "Saturday Night Specials"), not including longer range pistols and revolvers, rifles and shotguns? Yes, 59 percent; no, 36 percent.

11. Do you approve busing children to meet racial quotas in public schools? Yes, 4 percent; no, 94 percent.

12. Do you generally approve the course taken to end the war in Vietnam? Yes, 70 percent; no, 23 percent.

13. Should the federal government reduce penalties for possession and use of marijuana? Yes, 16 percent; no, 80 percent.

14. On programs agreed to by both the executive and legislative branches, when congressional appropriations bills greatly exceed budget recommendations, which would you support? (Choose One)

A) The full appropriation, 9 percent.

B) The budget recommendation, 82 percent.

15. When Congress considers desirable new or expanded programs, how would you vote? (Choose One)

A) For the programs, financed by tax increase, 27 percent.

B) For the programs, financed by debt increase, 9 percent.

C) Against the programs, 50 percent.

16. Congress meets virtually the entire year. When in session, I must be in Washington for committee meetings, to vote, and to handle problems for constituents. Though I return to work in the District most weekends, I cannot attend all meetings which pertain to federal matters. Should my policy be: (Choose One)

A) To return to Arkansas even while the House is in session and some important votes might be missed, 7 percent.

B) To stay in Washington at all times the House is in session, 83 percent.

SENATOR FRED HARRIS VOLUNTARILY RETIRES

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, when the U.S. Senate opens the 93d session of Congress in January, we will do so without a colleague who has made the decision to voluntarily retire from this body.

Although FRED HARRIS will not be retiring from public service, since he will devote his efforts to his Institute for Populism, his views and thoughts will certainly be missed in this Chamber. FRED HARRIS' career in the U.S. Senate and as chairman of the National Democratic Party has been marked by his total commitment to those who are the less fortunate on our society—the poor, the minorities, and those who have been the victims of inequities and injustices.

His advocacy of these crucial issues of our time will be missed in this body. However, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the significant contributions he has made in this area of public service and to wish him the best in his future endeavors.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS DURING THE SECOND SESSION OF THE 92D CONGRESS

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, during the second session of the 92d Congress the Senate acted favorably on 22 bills which were handled by the committee. Of these, 13 have become public law.

I am listing below information concerning each of the bills handled by the committee in this session:

RÉSUMÉ OF BILLS HANDLED BY THE COMMITTEE

S. 652—Mr. PROXMIRE; passed Senate April 27, 1972; amends the Truth in Lending Act to protect consumers against careless and unfair billing practices, and for other purposes; S. Rept. 92–750, April 17, 1972.

S. 1076—Mr. HARRIS; passed Senate July 18, 1972; provides for the striking of medals in commemoration of Jim Thorpe; S. Rept. 92–965, July 17, 1972.

S. 2013—Mr. THURMOND; passed Senate April 25, 1972; amends chapter 21 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum amount of the grant payable for specially adapted housing for disabled veterans; S. Rept. 92–677, February 29, 1972. Concurrently the bill S. 3343 which was reported by the Veterans' Affairs Committee, which contained the same provisions as S. 2013 was also passed by the Senate and subsequently passed by the House and became Public Law 92–341, approved July 10, 1972.

S. 2499—Mr. BEALL; passed Senate June 30, 1972; Public Law 92–384; provides for the striking of medals commemorating the 175th anniversary of the launching of the U.S. frigate *Constellation*; S. Rept. 92–942, June 29, 1972; passed House August 7, 1972; approved August 14, 1972.

S. 2987—Mr. JAVITS; passed Senate June 28, 1972; authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to make grants to Eisenhower College, Senaca Falls, N.Y., out of the proceeds of the sale of minted proof dollar coins bearing the likeness of the late President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower; S. Rept. 92–837, June 6, 1972.

S. 3001—Mr. SPARKMAN; passed Senate June 22, 1972; establishes a Federal Financing Bank, to provide for coordinated and more efficient financing of Federal and federally assisted borrowing from the public, and for other purposes; S. Rept. 92–853, June 12, 1972.

S. 3160—Mr. SPARKMAN; passed Senate March 1, 1972; Public Law 92–268; provides for a modification in the par value of the dollar, and for other purposes; S. Rept. 92–678, February 29, 1972; passed House March 21, 1972; approved March 31, 1972.

S. 3166—Mr. MCINTYRE; passed Senate March 22, 1972; Public Law 92–320; amends the Small Business Act; S. Rept. 92–693, March 15, 1972; passed House June 12, 1972; approved June 27, 1972.

S. 3197—Mr. SPARKMAN; passed Senate February 22, 1972; increases the dollar limitation on the cost of construction of Federal Reserve Bank branch buildings; S. Rept. 92–633, February 18, 1972.

S. 3248—Mr. SPARKMAN; passed Senate March 2, 1972; consolidates, simplifies and improve laws relative to housing and housing assistance, to provide Federal assistance to local governments in support of community development activities, and for other purposes; S. Rept. 92–647, February 28, 1972.

S. 3337—Mr. TOWER; passed Senate September 13, 1972; Public Law 92–595; amends the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes; S. Rept. 92–1007, August 1, 1972; passed House October 11, 1972; approved October 27, 1972.

S. 3353—Mr. SPARKMAN; passed Senate March 15, 1972; Public Law 92–266; provides for the striking of medals in commemoration of the first U.S. International Transportation Exposition; S. Rept. 92–692, March 15, 1972; passed House March 20, 1972; approved March 30, 1972.

S. 3714—Mr. CRANSTON; passed Senate June 20, 1972; Public Law 92–325; amends and extends the Defense Production Act of 1950; S. Rept. 92–868; June 16, 1972; passed House June 28, 1972; approved June 30, 1972.

S. 3726—Mr. MONDALE; passed Senate Aug. 1, 1972; Public Law 92–412; extends and amends the Export Administration Act of 1969 to afford more equal export opportunity, to establish a Council on International Economic Policy, and for other purposes; S. Rept. 92–890, June 19,

1972; passed House August 3, 1972; approved August 29, 1972.

S. 3876—Mr. WILLIAMS; passed Senate August 4, 1972; amends the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide for the regulation of clearing agencies and transfer agents, to create a National Commission on Uniform Securities Laws, and for other purposes; S. Rept. 92–1009, August 2, 1972; passed House October 13, 1972.

S. 3939—Mr. RANDOLPH; passed Senate September 19, 1972; authorizes appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; S. Rept. 92–1081 and S. Rept. 92–1103, August 18, 1972 and September 8, 1972; passed House October 5, 1972.

H.R. 7987—Mr. PATMAN; passed Senate February 7, 1972; Public Law 92–228; provides for the striking of medals in commemoration of the bicentennial of the American Revolution; S. Rept. 92–603, February 4, 1972; passed House February 2, 1972; approved February 15, 1972.

H.R. 15692—Mr. STEPHENS; passed Senate August 4, 1972; Public Law 92–385; amends the Small Business Act to reduce the interest rate on Small Business Administration disaster loans; S. Rept. 92–1008, August 1, 1972; passed House June 29, 1972; approved August 16, 1972.

S.J. Res. 211—Mr. SPARKMAN; passed Senate May 23, 1972; Public Law 92–321; amends title IV of the Consumer Credit Protection Act establishing the National Commission on Consumer Finance; S. Rept. 92–795, May 18, 1972; passed House June 19, 1972; approved June 30, 1972.

S.J. Res. 218—Mr. MONDALE; passed Senate March 29, 1972; Public Law 92–284; extends the authority conferred by the Export Administration Act of 1969; S. Rept. 92–701, March 20, 1972; passed House April 24, 1972; approved April 29, 1972.

S.J. Res. 250—Mr. SPARKMAN; passed Senate June 28, 1972; Public Law 92–335; extends the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to interest rates on insured mortgages and to extend laws relating to housing and urban development; S. Rept. 92–920, June 23, 1972; passed House June 30, 1972; approved July 1, 1972.

H.J. Res. 1301—Mr. PATMAN; passed Senate October 6, 1972; Public Law 92–503; extends the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to the insurance of loans and mortgages under the National Housing Act; S. Rept. 92–1261, October 3, 1972; passed House October 2, 1972; approved October 18, 1972.

SUPPORT GROWS FOR HARTKE-BURKE

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, America's foreign trade crisis has continued to worsen. Our deficit grows by hundreds of millions of dollars every month—a deficit that means lost jobs, failing businesses, and ruined communities. More and more American communities are recognizing the imminent danger of current foreign trade policies.

The city council of Erie, Pa., is the latest of a growing number of local governments to publicly endorse the Hartke-Burke Foreign Trade and Investment Act of 1972. I can only hope that other American communities open their eyes in time—even America cannot stand the onslaught of low priced foreign goods forever.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the city council of Erie, Pa., be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the City Council of Erie, Pennsylvania does herewith register its positive endorsement of the Burke-Hartke Bill, which would create a Federal Trade and Investment Commission for the proper regulation of foreign imports and the protection of American trade and industry, and

Whereas, it is of vital importance that these activities be vested in a single overall agency for the alleviation of dumping foreign made products at unrealistic prices to the detriment of American manufactured goods made under the aegis of independent trade unions representing American labor, and

Be it further resolved, that the City Clerk be and he is hereby directed to send certified copies of this resolution to the Senators from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and to Congressman Joseph Vigorito, from this district, and to Senator Vance Hartke of Indiana and to Congressman James A. Burke of Massachusetts.

TORRANCE CIVIC CENTER

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Torrance, Calif., has again lived up to its well-earned reputation as a city displaying "growth without strain."

A regional center for business, industry and finance, Torrance ranks seventh in the State in terms of retail sales, and with a resident population of 139,000, is the 12th largest city in California.

To keep pace with the ever expanding private sector of the community, the Torrance government, in 1956, began the planning for the development of a 30-acre civic center site.

Today, with the completion of the new city hall complex—the largest public facility ever to be constructed during the city's 52-year history—Torrance marks another milestone in the future development of the site.

In addition to the construction of the four-story city hall, modernization and aesthetic treatment of two existing facilities were accomplished. This "planned for the future" complex includes general and special offices, as well as new modern facilities for the purpose of expanded public participation in the local government process.

In its relative short history since incorporation in 1921, when Torrance boasted a population of 1,800, the city hall has had four locations. Each move was made to provide larger quarters for the ever-increasing public demand.

Civic center development has matched population increases, and the total complex now emphasized Torrance's role as a major center for governmental agencies.

The complex includes an expanded county court facility, a county probation office building, the public defender's office, city hall complex, a newly constructed main library facility, a modern police station, a civic plunge, and two separate recreational use facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend the citizens of Torrance, and their elected leaders—both past and present—for their wisdom in planning and constructing the Torrance Civic Center to meet the needs of the community. This project shows that Torrance is, indeed, an "All-American City" for its "growth without strain."

AMERICANS TRAIN IN CUBA FOR REVOLUTION

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on March 16, 1970, in a speech before the Senate, I alerted my colleagues and the Nation to a serious danger to the internal security of our country, that was about to result from the return of a group of young Americans who had gone to Cuba for the alleged purpose of cutting sugar cane and thus helping the Communist regime that strangles the freedom of that island Republic.

The group called itself the "Venceremos Brigade." It has grown from an initial membership of 213 to nearly 2,000.

The Communist regime of Cuba was quick to realize that the seeds of subversion sown in Cuba among members of this group would bear handsome fruits in the United States.

What I predicted 2½ years ago has come to pass.

Testimony taken by the Internal Security Subcommittee has established the subtle method of training of the "Venceremos Brigade" members. Copies of Cuban manuals on guerrilla warfare and urban terrorism seized from returning members, dog-eared and with salient points underscored, indicate intensive study of such deadly literature.

Diaries of the brigade members indicate that the Cubans held seminars where Latin American, African, North Vietnamese, and Vietcong guerrilla experts lived, worked, and gave live performances of their skills.

In his address to the second contingent

of the brigade, Fidel Castro was optimistic about the future performance of the brigade members. He said:

I believe with this we are beginning a great movement. I believe that this creates the basis for a tremendous development—which will have a tremendous impact on the whole world . . .

What Fidel Castro was expecting has become manifest in many ways and in many parts of this country. For instance, on the weekend of April 16–18, 1971, a group of Venceremos Brigade organizers held a "working seminar" with a workers' committee of Cesar Chavez' United Farm Workers Organizing Committee. Two of the items on the agenda of the meeting involved the "exchange of information and show of solidarity with UFWO workers."

What actually happened according to the May 1971 bulletin of the brigade was a full-scale indoctrination seminar on organizing along Marxist lines.

Then there was the case of one Van Ba, a Vietcong representative in Cuba who exhorted the Americans of the Venceremos Brigade to disregard the revolutionary who spoke best in favor of the activist who fought the police the hardest. Members of the Venceremos Brigade, according to their diaries, made it possible for Van Ba to cross the border from Canada into Detroit for an on-the-spot inspection of what he considered the "enemy camp."

Brigade members have been arrested in Massachusetts, and in California, and elsewhere, for possession of explosives and manufacturing of bombs. Others have infiltrated computer data centers of oil companies and were found in possession of maps of pipelines with strategic locations marked in red pencil. I could cite more examples, but will not take the time of the Senate.

Mr. President, the danger is by no means past. In my previous address I introduced into the RECORD the names of the first contingent of the Venceremos Brigade. I think it appropriate, in view of the continuing threat which these Venceremos members constitute, to add the names of the members of the four brigades which followed the first, so that anyone who reads the RECORD may know who these activists are.

I ask unanimous consent that these lists of Venceremos Brigade members may be inserted at this point as a part of my remarks.

Mr. President, in compliance with the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing, I have obtained from the Government Printing Office an estimate of the cost and length of this insert. They have informed me that the article will take up approximately 10 pages at a cost of $1,700. Notwithstanding the two-page rule of the Joint Committee on Printing, I request that the materials be inserted into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VENCEREMOS BRIGADE

SECOND VENCEREMOS BRIGADE

California

Alexander, Ronald Keith, 463 61st, Oakland.

Alper, Johanne, 397 Dolores St., San Francisco.

Berman, Edward, 517 Miles Ave., Oakland.

Broullon, Rudolfo Juan, 160 21 Ave., San Francisco.

Collosi, Ernest John, 2646 Dwightway, Apt. 6, Berkeley.

Fincado, John Harding, 1109 High Court, Berkeley.

Freeland, Connie, 8 Oak St., Berkeley.

Fugett, Richmond, Box 24507, Los Angeles.

Goldberg, Ellis Jay, 427 Mississippi St., San Francisco.

Harris, Daniel, 1721 Francisco St., Berkeley.

Infante, Anne Marie, 2212 Derry St., Berkeley.

Lacy, Carl Glenn, 1263 65 Ave., Oakland.

Lorredo Ungaro, Horacio Daniel, 158 21 St. N., San Francisco.

Loudermilk, James Edwin, 2317 La Conte Ave., Berkeley.

Maher or Procter, William Joseph, 1919 Crogon St., Berkeley.

Mayfield, Francis John, 1825 Eddy St., San Francisco.

Mines, Holly Surs, 33 Evergreen La., Berkeley.

Mines, Richard Allan, 33 Evergreen La., Berkeley.

Montanes, Fred R., 741 E. 13th St., Oakland.

Nibbe, Ronald George, 285 N. St., Apt. R, Chula Vista.

Nihlen, Ann, Box 23, San Geronimo.

Ojeda, Raul, 48 Harper, San Francisco.

Olson, Katherine, 180 Bemis St., San Francisco.

Peake, Steven Keith, 1870½ 10th St., Santa Monica.

Pedrin, Steven Bryan, 423½ 21 St., San Francisco.

Price, Anola Diane, 154 Santa Clara Ave., Oakland.

Price, Styles Frederick, 154 Santa Clara Ave., Oakland.

Rosen, Stanley Lawrence, 4216 24th St., San Francisco.

Sahrager, Christopher John, 725 Chesterway, Hillsborough.

Schryver, Ann Britton, 3910 23 St., #2, San Francisco.

Sheldrick, Susanna, 1819 10th St., Berkeley.

Silverman, Mark, 691 Glensido Dr., Lafayette.

Slaughter, Kenneth David, 2231 Carleton St., Berkeley.

Stone, Jennifer, 1635 Josephine St., Berkeley.

Tircuit, John Dewey, Jr., 4839 Webster St., Oakland.

Uriarte, Ronald Paul, 6447 Aldea Ave., Van Nuys.

Varga, John C., 2843 Fulton, Berkeley.

Wishart, Blaine, 29 Guy Pl., San Francisco.

Wasserman, Steve, 14 Bonnie Lane, Berkeley.

Watson, Mary Lou, 990 Casper Dr., Sacramento.

Zabala, Ana Marie, 2374 Bryant, San Francisco.

Connecticut

Bower, Peter M., 439 Springwater, New Canaan, Conn.

Candelman, Abigail, 268 Humphrey St., New Haven, Conn.

Carapetyan, Francelle, 857 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn.

Champion, John H., 47 Monroe St., New Haven, Conn.

Harris, William, 39 Witch Lane, Rowayton, Conn.

Kahn, Evelyn L., 7 Parkstead La., W. Hartford, Conn.

Knight, Deborah, 47 Mome St., Hamden, Conn.

Limbert, Julia, 1145 Chapel St., New Haven, Conn.

Michalowski, Linda Both, 10 Collidge St., New Britain, Conn.

Nowakowski, Janet Claire, 787 Prospect St., New Haven, Conn.

Resnick, Ruth E., 122 Valey St., New Haven, Conn.

Rossiter, David G., 85 Sachem St., New Haven, Conn.

Rothkrug, Barbara Ann, 25 Farthing Ave., Danbury, Conn.

Simon, Esther Pinya, 232 McKinley Ave., New Haven, Conn.

Vaner, Edward J., Lakeview St., Burlington, Conn.

Maryland

Arnall, Thomas Fielding, 502 Bond Mill Rd., Laurel, Md.

Barracca, Robert Richard, 3910 Old York Rd., Baltimore, Md.

Fish, Oliver James, Cheverly, Md.

Fournelle, John Harold, 1634 S. Charles St., Baltimore, Md.

Lerner, Jonathan David, Chevy Chase, Md.

Levi, Richard Hecht, Lystra Meadows, Lutherville, Md.

Nelson, Virginia Anne, 7105 Hawthorne St., Hyattsville, Md.

Pope, Charlene Ann, 862 Benninghaus Rd., Baltimore, Md.

Wagner, Ann, Accoceek, Md.

Wood, Roberta Lynn, Maryland.

Massachusetts

Anderson, John Robert, N. Leverett, Mass.

Beckwith, David Louis, Medford, Mass.

Berney, Barbara, 51 Gorham Ave., Brookline, Mass.

Bouley, Robert E., 159 Green St., Fairhaven, Mass.

Brightman, Carol, 51 Debra Simpson, Sharon, Mass.

Brown, Katherine, Middleton Golf Course, Middleton, Mass.

Clinker, Diane, 490 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, Mass.

Comes, Daniel Gill, 77 Main St., Fairhaven, Mass.

Cormier, Pauline Ann, 157 Taliman St., New Bedford, Mass.

Dworitin, Marilyn Brown, 600 Charles St., Fall River, Mass.

Elyn, Richard M., 325 Colombia St., Cambridge, Mass.

Fahey, John, 39 E. Springfield St., Boston, Mass.

Falil, Elaine Dianne, 18 Mt. Auburn St., Cambridge, Mass.

Felbaz, David Joseph, 901 Ave. T, Brookline, Mass.

Fitch, Stephan David, 344 Putnam Ave., Cambridge, Mass.

Fox, Elizabeth, 51 Gorham Ave., Brookline, Mass.

Frazier, Maureen, 53 Erlinton, Longmeadow, Mass.

Golden, Sarah, 1160 Main Ave., Cambridge, Mass.

Griffith, Joe, 116 Adams St., Newton, Mass.

Hagopian, Veronica, 431 S. Main St., Fall River, Mass.

Harper, Virgiania Davis, Amherst, Mass.

Henton, Rosner Ted, Concord, Mass.

Jenkins, Nancy Lee Wood, 1520 Purchase St., New Bedford, Mass.

Lellydahl, Sandra June, Springfield, Mass.

Losell, John Manning, Ipswich, Mass.

Mark, Lucy Todd, Amherst, Mass.

Millen, Richard Herbert, 16 Gardner Rd., Brookline, Mass.

Noir, Henry Richard, 34 Fairmont Ave., Cambridge, Mass.

O'Brien, Nancy Noreen, Long Meadow, Mass.

Oliveri, Joseph, 93 Princeton St., East Boston, Mass.

Paul, Eileen Frances, 11 Collins St., New Bedford, Mass.

Pullman, Judith, 10 Henry St., East Boston, Mass.

Rice, Barbara, 16A Austen St., Somerville, Mass.

Richard, Randall, 807 High St., Fall River, Mass.

Romano, Ronald, 33 Fairmont St., Lawrence, Mass.
Schirmer, Joseph, 12 Gerry St., Cambridge, Mass.
Sisson, Margaret Wendell, Trapelo Rd., RFD 1, Lincoln, Mass.
Soper, John William, 175 Hemanway St., Boston, Mass.
Streeter, Rhoden, 1 Eldora St., Roxbury, Mass.
Ware, Reuben Milford, 10 Lenox St., Brookline, Mass.
Wells, Michael, 276 Hurley, Cambridge, Mass.
Whitcomb, Linda J., 690 Mass. Ave,, Boston, Mass.

Michigan

Binderman, Bonnie Noreen, Detroit, Mich.
Borowski, Michael Anthony, Mount Clemons, Mich.
Douty, Stuart and Janet, 532 S. First St., Ann Arbor, Mich.
Ellman, Linda S., 945 Dewey, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Frappier, Nancy Barrett, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Goldberg, Jerome Dale, 517 S. Div. No. 2, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Graham, Angua, 340 Evergreen, E. Lansing, Mich.
Lindquist, Gerard, 599 Chandler, Detroit, Mich.
Rice, Jacquiline Diana, Detroit, Mich.
Risidown, Ronald A., 649 Evergreen, E. Lansing, Mich.
Salks, William Kahn, 517 S. Div., Ann Arbor, Mich.
Sanders, Joseph, Detroit, Mich.
Taub, Carol Beth, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Vallei, Allen, 340 Evergreen, E. Lansing, Mich.
Valls, Ana Maria, Detroit, Mich.
Wheeler, David Davenport, 4756 Fourth, Detroit, Mich.

Minnesota

Cove, Sandra, 8201 W. 16th St., St. Louis Pk., Minn.
Gerber, Sandra Gail, 2620 Harriet Ave., Minneapolis, Minn.

Missouri

Brocline, Mare Russell, St. Louis, Mo.

Montana

White, Scott, 921 N. 31, Billings, Mont.

New Hampshire

Alper, Fredericka, C., 12 Howard Ave., N.H.
Gibbs, Perry J., 520 Chapel St., N.H.
Gore, Lawrence Jayle, RFD, No. 1, Exeter, N.H.

New Jersey

Berger, David L., Apt. 401, Hadden View E., Westmont, N.J.
Berron, Marshall Perry, Newark, N.J.
Boyd, John Bradford, 510 Reservoir Dr., Boonton, N.J.
Clements, Linda Joan, Long Beach Island, N.J.
De Remer, Kathleen R., Clarksville Rd., Princeton, N.J.
Diaz, Juana Felicita, 84 Hansbury Ave., Newark, N.J.
Hill, Theodore Wayne III, 43 Hawthorne Le., Willingboro, N.J.
Mulvihill, Katherine Mary, 112 Hoob Ave., Ocean Grove, N.J.
White, Jane Ann, Stratford, N.J.

New Mexico

Contreras, Roberto, 2446 Mervosh SW., Albuquerque, N. Mex.
Small, Janet Kay, 1835 Anderson Dr., Las Curves, N. Nex.

North Carolina

Sompolinsky, Josepha, 12321 14 Mile Rd., Greenville, N.C.

New York State

Acaba, Nilda I., 1307 Edward Grant Hwy., NYC.
Armistrad, Catherine Vanderburg, 146 Henry St., NYC.
Armstrong, Burke, 2015 Shore Blvd., Astoria.
Batista, Adames, 3733 Warren St., Jackson Heights, NYC.
Batson, Ronald, 196 Throop Ave., Brooklyn.
Bell, Richard Evans, 76–32 168 St., Flushing.
Benoid, Ronald Lee, 640 E 6 St., NYC.
Berg, Jorri Lynn, 444 E 82 NYC.
Berg, Randee Elize, 33 Riverside Dr., NYC.
Berenson, Mark Henry, 91 Old Farm, Chappaqua.
Bergard, Barbara.
Berman, Andrew, 173–09 Jewel Ave., Flushing.
Berry, John Alvin, 230 Bundhurst Ave, NYC.
Black, Spencer Jules, 44–65 Kissena Blvd., Flushing.
Blawn, Thomas Anthony, 38 Harrison Ave., Massapequa.
Block, Margaret P., 71 Todd Drive North, Glen Head.
Bluestone, Barry Stuart.
Blumberg, Paul Elmer, Box X, Loch Sheldrake.
Bramble, Bonnie Day, 340 E 64, NYC.
Brennen, Eric William, 669 N. Pkwy, Uniondale.
Brund, Bruce, 870 5th Ave., NYC.
Brushin, Gene Larry, 500 W 190 NYC.
Brushin, Merith M., 500 W 190, NYC.
Buchanan, Lynn Johnson, 178 Edward St., Buffalo.
Buchanan, Thomas R., 178 Edward St., Buffalo.
Burns, Mark Andrew, 787 Prospect Ave. NYC.
Burrows, Raymond J., 391 Rockaway Park, Brooklyn.
Cassetto, Raul, 60 E 1st St, Apt. 1, NYC.
Chabot, Jessica Maher, 3926 Bell Blvd., Bayside.
Chilton, Sharon Lee, 235 E 4 St, NYC.
Cimino, Glenda Dianne, 434 W 120 St, NYC.
Cohen, Hillel Wilfred, 200 W 106th St., NYC.
Cole, Andrew Treguba, 52 Barrow St. NYC.
Colon, Gloria Ester, 709 Park Ave., Apt. 55, NYC.
Conti, John Salvatore, 183 E 2d St. NYC.
Daniels, Susan, 14 Harness Rd, NYC.
Daumont, Lucas, 790 E. 150 St, NYC.
Davis, Joyce, 237 W 135, NYC.
Dewind, John Stone, 37 W 12, NYC.
Engel, James, 10 Argyle Rd., Pt. Washington.
Engelman, Lois Ann, 925 W End Ave, NYC.
Fears, Charles David, 249 Hopkinson Ave, Brooklyn.
Felder, Andrew, 249 Hopkins Ave, Brooklyn.
Feldstein, Wally, 52 Moss Lane, Jericho, Nassau.
Figoeroa, Jose Enrique, 1262 Webster Ave, NYC.
Figueledo, Gricel, 643 Middleneck Pl, Great Neck.
Fink, Lynn, 9 Renco Pl, Passapequa Park.
Finkelstein, Stuart, Brooklyn.
Flaherty, Michael Henry, 3170 Broadway, NYC.
Franklin, Theodore, 160 Claremont Ave, NYC.
Freeman, Joshua, 765 Amsterdam Ave, NYC.
Friedman, Alexandra Caron, 204 W 92 St, NYC.
Geistein, Marsha M., 104 40 St, Forest Hills.
Gilpin, Margaret, 240 10th Ave., NYC.
Goodway, Arleen Frieda, 426 E 22 St, Brooklyn.
Goodwyn, Herbert Calvin, 16–20 Redfern Ave, Rockaway.
Gorritz, Gilbert, 775 175 St, NYC.
Gordon, James Edward, 130 Park Lane, Douglaston.
Greene, Evelyn Yvonne, 501 E 11 St, Apt 2, NYC.
Greifinger, Joel, 144 2972 Ave., Flushing.
Gyorgy, Anne Margaret.
Hackman, Robert Colby, 60 1st Ave., NYC.
Handerson, Paula D., 502 Clinton Ave., Brooklyn.
Helish, Howard Jefferson, 176 Dean St., Brooklyn.
Henderson, Delmar, 738 E 6 St, NYC.
Hicks, Paul Stanley, 11134 207 St, Hollis.
Hill, Gerarld, 1144 Franklin Ave, NYC.
Hinchen, Carol, 36 E 1st St, NYC.
Hodge, Leroy Lawrence, 1565 Park Ave, NYC.
Holt, Eric Reed and Frances C., 120 Kane St, NYC.
Hughes, Bernard, 220–20 145 Rd, Laurelton, Queens.
Hutchings, Phil, 355 Clinton Ave., Brooklyn.
Jackson, Bruce, 274 Coventry Rd., W. Hempstead.
Jarvis, Johnny, 144 Grafton St., Brooklyn.
Kanter, Judith Ellen, 1 Milburn Lane, Huntington.
Karlson, Thomas, 545 E 126 St 19 H.
Kassoy, Meredeth S., 130 Gale Place, NYC.
Kerr, Heanne, 66 E 7th St, NYC.
Kimerell, Allen Francis, 8705 Chelsea St, Jamaica Plains.
Koliner, Gail Therese, 640 E 6th St, NYC.
Korenbaum, Jan Martoria, 76 West Lane, Bayshore.
Kramer, Michele Ruth, 145 Lincoln Rd, Brooklyn.
Kreps, Jane Ellen, Nanuet.
Laredo, Andro, 145 2 Ave, NYC.
Larman, Lorraine Z., 162–01 73 Ave, Flushing.
Latham, Carol Ann, 346 E 156 St, NYC.
Lightenberg, Susan, 23 E 3 St, NYC.
Lobenstine, Farnsworth Elliot, NYC.
Logares, Rehand Gilbert, 1851 Schelffiin Pl, NYC.
McKetney, Michael, 144–47 183 St., Jamaica.
McNeil, Anthony Philip, 473 W 158, NYC.
Maldonado, Luis Antonio, 1235 E 15 St, NYC.
Melbourne, Dylan, 171 E 2, Apt. 5, NYC.
Melzak, Bennett, 4761 Broadway, NYC.
Meyer, Nancy Lee, NYC.
Miller, Joseph Evan, 3170 Broadway, NYC.
Miller, Paul Joseph, 3970 Hillman Ave., Brooklyn.
Morales, Elsie, 53 W 106 St, NYC.
Morgan, Margaret Ann, 41–31 77 St, Elmhurst.
Moritz, Thomas Daniel, White Plains.
Morris, George, 464 W 146 St, NYC.
Moseley, Paula, 503 W 177 St, NYC.
Myensberg, Susan, 220 W 21 St, NYC.
Nero, Raymond Rudolph, 154 W 71 St, NYC.
North, Nora, 225 W 25 St, NYC.
November, Margaret, 593 Mannix Rd, Brooklyn.
Orris, Maxine, 243 W 12 St, NYC.
Ortiz, Lino Herman, 40 Ave C, NYC.
Pasqual, Vangssa, 210 E 77 St, Apt. 615, NYC.
Payne, Roslyn B., 206 E. 17 St, NYC.
Pena, Jose Bienvernido Luciano Adrian, 562 W 174 St, NYC.
Plever, Terry Anne, 172–34–133 Ave., Jamaica.
Proujansky, Jed, 9701 Shore Road, Brooklyn.
Quinones, Carmelo, 287 E 4th St, NYC.
Reed, E. Ricky, 52 W 81st St, NYC.
Rinaldi, Matthew James, Valley Stream.
Romero, Lucia, 210 E 77 St, NYC.
Rosado, Juan Lois, 569 St. Marks Ave, Brooklyn.
Rossman, Lynn, 1493 E 92 St, Brooklyn.
Roth, Herbert Joseph, NYC.
Ruiz, Julio Gesar, 74–02 43 Ave, Elmhurst.
Ryan, Ruth Mario, 306 E 45 St, NYC.

Sadin, Arthur, 6 Poter Lane, New Hyde Park.
Saindon, Karl David, 151–17 84 Dr., Jamaica.
Sands, Patricia Claire, 31 W 11th St, NYC.
Sawberg, Paul, 93 Bedford St, NYC.
Schmidt, Eric W., 12 Charles St, NYC.
Schmidt, Martha, 26 Nantucket Dr, Scarsdale.
Schuartz, Jeffrey, 139–15 Pershing Crescent, Jamaica.
Seaman, Joy, 1047 Stratford, NYC.
Sekora, John, 226 Kansas St., Ludenhurso.
Sellinger, Gerald Martin, 5955 47 Ave, Woodside.
Sexbra, Stephen, 226 Kansan St, Lindenhurst.
Shriver, Stephen William, 530 E 23 St, NYC.
Shyner, Paul, 150–25 Reeves Ave, Flushing.
Siepierski, Paul Emit, 80 Crimson Lane, Elma.
Siskind, Amy Beth, 250 W 82 St, NYC.
Skinner, James Jr., 43 Sumner Ave, Brooklyn.
Sloman, Joel Morris, 1588 Independence Ave, Brooklyn.
Sloy Stephen Sin, 80 Charles St, NYC.
Smith, Bernard II, 40–25 Lawrence So., Flushing.
Smith, Mark Alan, East Meadow.
Sole, Harvey David, Flushing.
Spaulding, Earthy, GPO 603, NYC.
Spector, Marc Ira, 173 Riverside Drive, NYC.
Suhl, Beryl Joyce, NYC.
Sussman, Michael Steven, 945 E 178 St, NYC.
Tehelbaum, Maria, 845 W 2 Ave, NYC.
Tempro, James, 1029 Hopkinson Ave, Brooklyn.
Tobias, Allen, 255 W 108 St, NYC.
Toppins, Helen, 737 Quincy St, Brooklyn.
Torres, Emilio, 359 E 8 St, Apt. 10, NYC.
Tracer, Samuel and Yolanda, 337 E 6th St, NYC.
Trolin, Martha Jo, Cricklewood Lane, Harrison, N.Y.
Turner, Sandra, 137 Riverside Dr., NYC.
Vargas, Isolina, 16 Elliott Pl, NYC.
Velazco, Felipe Aponte, 418 W 17 St, NYC.
Warnick, Keith Franklin, 834 Stebbins Ave, NYC.
Weitz, Dorothy Victoria, 105 St Marks Pl, NYC.
Wilkins, Edward, 120 E 123 St, NYC.
Williams, Roger Carl, 23 Goodwyn Pl, Brooklyn.
Williamson, James Maynard, 120 Thompson St., NYC.
Wolf, Jill, 168 Glenmore, East Williston.
Wood, Jane, 274 W 19 St, NYC.

Washington, D.C.

Bauer, Antoniette, 4206 River Rd., Washington, D.C.
Fuller, Marian Elaine, 1620 S. St., N.W., Washington, D.C.
Harding, Pamela Jane, 4029 Benton St., Washington, D.C.
Leffler, Susan Elizabeth, 3110 Wisconsin Ave. NW, Washington, D.C.
Moore, Adelia, 3400 Neward St., Washington, D.C.
Riva, Pamela, 1729 35 St., Washington, D.C.

Delaware

Crichton, Dith, 94 Colorado Ave, Wilmington, Del.

Florida

Brown, Juliene Casandra, 1928 4 St., NE, Winter Haven, Fla.
Coe, Daurence Ann, 2100 NE 45 St, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.
Maness, William Holt, Jr., Jacksonville, Fla.

Illinois

Berman, Lowen B. and Jeanne R., Chicago, Ill.
Blackledge, Grace Louise, 310 W Ill, Urbana, Ill.
Boadu, Yale Akosua, 330 E 56 St., Chicago, Ill.
Boardman, Christopher, 4810 Ellis, Chicago, Ill.
Boardman, William Kropp, Chicago, Ill.
Boling, Kathleen, 1613 W. Albion Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Darl, Donna, 5012 S. Dorchester, Chicago, Ill.
Drury, Charles W., Chicago, Ill.
Ehrmann, Frank M., 434 W. Wellington, Chicago, Ill.
Fink, Janice F., 1952 N. Seminary Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Gonzalez, Caesar Augustus, Jr., 5316½ Cornell Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Gutman, Janice S., 271 Andy Dr., Milrose Park, Ill.
Hall, Nancy Ellen, 5515 West Race, Chicago, Ill.
Harber, Rebecca, Chicago, Ill.
Holmes, Yvonne Shirley, Chicago, Ill.
Husband, Gregory Lord, 9715 So. Merrill Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Loes, Francine Marjorie, 5448 S Cornell Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Nemetz, Mary Elizabeth, 5132 Woodland, Chicago, Ill.
Nussbaum, Karen Beth, 920 Ridgewood Pl., Highland Park, Ill.
Odel, Laurie Whirl, 1523 No. Dearborn, Chicago, Ill.
Porter, Clarence Henry, 6455 S. Greenwood, Chicago, Ill.
Porter, Terrance Lamont, 6455 Greenwood, Chicago, Ill.
Robinson, Gwendolyn, 8036 S. Evans, Chicago, Ill.
Rosenstien, Joanne P., Chicago, Ill.
Riff, Bernard, Chicago, Ill.
Sanderson, Nancy Lynn, 1271 Wendy Dr., Berthbrock, Ill.
Sheist, Robert J., 1834 S. 5th, Haywood, Ill.
Sherrard, Daniel Brian, Chicago, Ill.
Shipman, Drussilla, 5316½ Cornoll Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Smith, Marguerite Rose, N.W. College Ave., Normal, Ill.
Stark, Melvin C., 2951 Dr. Martin L. King, Jr., Chicago, Ill.
Stevenson, Miriam Jeannette, 330 Water St., Lincoln, Ill.
Swann, Steve, 7347 S Paston, Chicago, Ill.
Vergara, Basilio Ortis, 1822 S. Blur Island, Chicago, Ill.
Wachtel, Pegg Ann, 1743 N Sedgwick, Chicago, Ill.
Young, Lillie T., 2358 N. Lincoln, Chicago, Ill.

Indiana

Bennett, Gertrude A., 1145 E 57 St., Indianapolis, Ind.
Johnson, Sandra Gail Vernardo, Gary, Ind.
Williams, Myrna, 2137 N. New Jersey, Indianapolis, Ind.

Pennsylvania

Ackerman, Daren B., 262 W. Harvey St., Phila.
Ars. Ep Sa, Ie. c/o Grafdon Rd., New Hope.
Bates, David Lelan, 565 Taylor Dr., Canonsburg.
Beciter, Thona Hope, 7616 Brentwood Dr., Phila.
Bergad, Laird William, Pittsburgh.
Boyce, John Patrick, 3839 N. Darion, Phila.
Camp, David Ira, Rd. 3, Reading.
Eastman, Catherine Ann, Phila.
Fisher, Glenn Luce, 19 Brookside Trailer Park, E. Stroudsburg.
Fitz, James L., R.D. 3, York.
Fliegelman, Marc L., 7756 Sennett Rd., Wyncote, Pa.
Guest, Regis James, 280 Chicago Rd., Butler.
Hope, Marguerite, Rd. 2 D, Stroudsburg.
Hoser, Raymond Lee, 38 N. Broaden St., Uniontown.
Kallish, Robert Jay, Phila.
Koenig, Elsa, 566 Haverford, Havertown.
Luschinsky, Frank Walter, Ringtown, Pa.
McAfee, Peggy Louise, 909 E. Market St., York.
McGehee, Sharon, 31 Starlane Dr., Warrington.
Margolis, Jane Swan, Phila.
Mondon, Eva Ernestine, Brooksville.
Myerson, William Bernard, Latches Lane Apt., Merion.
Olsen, Richard, 116 Aikens Pl., State College.
Rose, Stephen Gould, 3737 Traxler Blvd., Allentown.

Oregon

Cobb, David Holbrook, 1214 SE Reynolds St., Portland, Oreg.
Sanders, Nancy, 1315 SW 10th, #5, Portland, Oreg.
Sanders, Steven, 419, NE Nazelforn Pl., Portland, Oreg.

Oklahoma

Williams, Matilda Katherine, 10018 NW, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Ohio

Allen, Marion Austin III, 736 N. Nelson Rd., Apt. B, Columbus, Ohio.
Baker, Jonathan L., 404 Giles Rd., Moreland Hills, Ohio.
Braur, Martha, 1057 Gulf Rd., Elvira, Ohio.
Brenner, Howard, 4173 Eastway Rd., Cleveland, Ohio.
Bulley, Jessica, 73 S. Columbus Apt. 2, Xenia, Ohio.
Cleveland, William Alexander, 2929 Fairfax, Cleveland, Ohio.
Emery, Thomas Andrew, 4780 Miami Rd., Conn., Ohio.
Gish, Rachel Hepburn, 527 Dayton St., Yellow Spring, Ohio.
Gordon, Ann Marcia, Dayton, Ohio.
Greenways, Joyce, Madison, Ohio.
Harris, James Edward, Jr., Cleveland, Ohio.
Hoover, John Dewitt, 236 Holt St., Dayton, Ohio.
Nagler, Larry, 236 Holt St., Dayton, Ohio.
Rotj, Alan Morman, 1163 Washington Blvd., University Heights, Ohio.
Rudd, Nancy Ann, 3220 N. Whitetree Cr., Cinn., Ohio.
Stevenson, Mark Twain, 2168 S. Belvoir Blvd., University, Ohio.

Rhode Island

Meyer, Carole, 71 No. Rd., Teesdale, R.I.

South Carolina

Laitala, Emmet Mills, 122 Koowottran, Clemson, S.C.
Wallace, Susan Benton, 112 Koowottran, Clemson, S.C.

Texas

Lozano, Edgar, 1122 S. Comal, San Antonio, Texas.
Stevens, Pauline, Box 354, Pilot Pt., Texas.

Tennessee

Taylor, Samuel Jared, c/o Board of World Missions, Box 330, Nashville, Tenn.

Vermont

Cook, Thomas B., St. Johns St., Johnson, Vt.

Virginia

Hickey, Roger Dennis, 1406 Floyd Ave., Richmond, Va.
Smith, Bruce James, Richmond, Va.

Wisconsin

Barnes, Sara Katherine, 1914 N. 357A5, Milwaukee, Wis.
Cole, Stephen W., Milwaukee, Wis.
Fan, Frances, 408 No. Francis St., Madison, Wis.
Klumb, William Henry, 408 No. Francis St., Madison, Wis.
Kwasinski, Christine Gertrude, Milwaukee, Wis.
Lighter, Laurence Jeffrey, 540 W. Mifflne, Madison, Wis.
Miller Carolyn Strandell, 3 Francis Court, Madison, Wis.
Santrago, Salvador, Madison, Wis.
Stergar, Laureen Jeanne, Milwaukee, Wis.
Wilson, Gerald Earl, Milwaukee, Wis.
Wiretrack, Mary Johanna, Monroe, Wis.

Washington

Baker, Barbara Conha, 4400 S. Hilly St., Seattle, Wash.
Baker, Laurl Joan, 6618 Maywood Ave., Middleton, Wash.
Brown, Christopher Mark, Olympia, Wash.
Bucknell, Susan Elaine, 3436 E Huran, Seattle, Wash.
Domingo, Nemario Dagdugan, Seattle, Wash.
Hicok, Larry Richard, 3841 Woodland NW, Seattle, Wash.
Jaranullo, Robert Anselmo, Seattle, Wash.
Kurose, Hugo Jetsuo, 1918 E Lynn, Seattle, Wash.
Lewis, Anthony R., 2919 Franklin Ave., Seattle, Wash.
Lindberg, Eric John, Tacoma, Wash.
McCraw, Nancy Ann, 4323 Thackery Pl., Seattle, Wash.
McLeod, Duncan, 402 S G St., Tacoma, Wash.
Marago, James Richard, Tacoma, Wash.
Peffers, John Kirkland, 4051 7 Ave., Seattle, Wash.
Rabbitt, John Reed, Seattle, Wash.
Rathison, Russell, 1101 17th Ave., Seattle, Wash.
Ricker, Judith Clare, 1108 39 E. Seattle, Wash.
Ruckert, Patrick, 1601 8 Ave., Seattle, Wash.
Slick, Daniel Rees, 3841 Woodlawn No., Seattle, Wash.
Swisshelm, Bobbie, 2112 Ferry Ave., Seattle, Wash.
Teofanoo, Sarah Jane, 1111 Key St., Bellingham, Wash.
Van Dyne, Shirley Ann, 3835 Wallingford No, Seattle, Wash.

Puerto Rico

Alonzo, Luis, Azalia No. 1, Manoz Riviera, Quagabo, P.R.
Buenos Aires, Joaquin Flores, No. 24 PDA 27, Haterey, P.R.
Colon, David Cruz, San Juan, P.R.
De Alonso, Norma Iris, Tapia, P.R.
Dela Madrid, Mario Gil, San Juan, P.R.
Garcoa, Emroqie Arriup, P.R.
Hernandez, Pilar and Ismael, Rio Piedroe, P.R.
Lauraso, Juan Cosme, Ciles, P.R.
Marrero, Sonia, 9 St., Elena Guay, P.R.
San Tiago, Leopoldo Rivera, Callejon Bolivar, P.R.
Tapia, Santos Humberto, P.R.
Torres, Manelo, Calle Hueso, San Jose, P.R.
Varquez, Jorge David, San Juan, P.R.

No address

Bailey, William.
Christiansen, Michael.
Cervantes Luige, Jose Antonio, 7003 11th Ave., N.W., Seattle, Mexico.
Cohen, David Paul.
Garland, Edward.
Lugo, Raul.
Manase, David Edgar, Canadian Indian, born in B.C.
Paras, Melinda.
Peacock, Ralph.
Peters, William.
Pullen, Elinor.
Rodolfo, Klien, Peruvian.
Salper, Martha.
Segal, Jane.
Schneider, Estelle.
Swakum, Doreen Frances, Canadian Indian, born in B.C.
Turner, Linda.
Whitehead, Shari.

THIRD VENCEREMOS BRIGADE

Aaron, Paul Gaston, 38 Paradise Road, Northampton, Mass.
Abboutt, Darcy, 407 Dourtown Ct., Cal.
Acevedo, Norberto Jose, 125 E 94th St., New York.
Adair, Nancy, 7 Miller Ave., San Salito, Calif. 804 Bassar, Albuquerque, N. M.
Aeziman, Candice Jan, 2213 Cardinal Pl., St. Paul, Minn.
Aguina, Wayne John, 4722 S. Elisabeth, Chicago, Ill. 1745 E. 23rd St., N.Y.
Aleswang, Hope, 52 Riverside Dr., N.Y.
Ali, Colette Kadejach, 731 St. Nich., New York.
Allen, Janet Marie, 1131 W. Sta. Barbara, Los Angeles, Cal.
Allen, Mildred Jean, 1131 W. Sta. Barbara, Los Angeles, Cali.
Allison, Margaret Ann, 3131 College Ave., Berkeley, Cal.
Alvarez, Hector Eligio Cardona, 750 Bryan Ave., New York.
Ambrose, Kenneth John, 19 Lux Drive, Lowell, Mass.
Anderson, John James, 1127 E. Michigan Ave., Jackson, Mich.
Arias, Veda Juliette, 262 Valencia, San Francisco, Cal. 1233 Guerrero, San Francisco, Cal.
Arruda, Linda Irene, 57 Lyons St., Falls River, Mass.
Ayala, Ramon Gil, N–16 Ave. Lomas Verdes Bayamon, P. R.
Avery, Martha Lou, 4321 Tarpon Lane, Alexandria, Va.
Avilez, Thomas F., 290 Manzanillo St., Woodlake, Cal.
Bacon, Patricia A., 24 W 76th St., New York.
Baker, Linda Claire, 6618 Maywood Ave., Middletown, Wisc.
Baldivia, Albert John, 110 Faculty Dr., Alamosa, Cal.
Baptist, Williams Mobile, Jr., 3445W 75th St., Los Angeles, Cal.
Bayala, Federico, 54 E 116 St., New York.
Razfil, Marti, 5484 S. Everet, Chicago, Ill.
Berman, Janice, 10807 Franklyn Ave., Culver City, Cal.
Bichot, Chelwood 3rd, 1217 Wichita, Houston, Texas.
Biller, Marcia Pearl, 3267 Bayley Ave., Buffalo, New York.
Black, Williams Philliep, 454 30th St., Laramie, Mich.
Boatman, Glenwood Lowel, 2936 No. Way Dr., Minneapolis, Minn.
Bonner, Alice Mae, 2610 67th Ave., Oakland, Cal.
Brooker, Christoper Bryan, 3765 Philadelphia, Detroit, Mich.
Bookwalter, Sharon Marie, 424 E 17th Ave., Columbus, Ohio.
Boswell, Thomas James, 2208 W. State, Milwaukee, Wisc.
Boulding, Susan Vandale, 106 No. Buchanan Pl., Durhan, N.C. P.O. Box 1152, Chapel Hill, N.C.
Bowdish, Jean Ann, 218 Constantine Rd., North Three Rivers, Mich.
Bragg, Kathleen, Box 30087 Lafayette Sq., Sta., New Orleans, La.
Bray, Richard Daniel, 197 Steiner, San Francisco, Cal. 735 Wisconsin St., San Francisco, Cal.
Brewington, Beberlye Louise, 193–54 Williamson Ave., Sprinfigeld, New York.
Bronson, Shelley, Turk Hill Road, New York.
Brown, Carolyn Linda, 2613 Oakley Ave., Baltimore, Md.
Burguillo, Luis, Jr., 1575 E 174 St., Bronx, New York.
Campon, Michael John, 95 Broad Ave., Binghamton, New York.
Candelaria, Maria Antonia, c/o Esperanza Martella, New York, Ria Piedras, Puerto Rico.
Cappas, Albert Oscar, 271 7th St., Buffalo, New York, 67 W 108th St., New York.
Cardona, Cesar Gilberto, Jr., 95–18 126 St., New York.
Carliner, Shelley, 9423 41 St., Road Elmhul St., New York.
Carlson, Kate Foster, 159 E 99 St., New York.
Caro, Oscar, 701 So. St. Clair St., Toledo, Ohio.
Carpenter, Joyce Bernardettte, 1812 N Appletown St., Baltimore, Md.
Carrasco, Cristina Virginia, 2234 E 22nd St., Oakland, Cal.
Carion, Sigeredo, 669 Broadway, Paterson, New Jersey.
Castro, Lonnie Cristine, 776 Libbys, Riverside, Cal.
Cerda, Teresa, 106 Edgewood Dr., Cal.
Cintron, Pedro Juan, Calle Millones No. 94 Bayamon, P.R.
Champion, Virginia Mary, 47 Monroe St., New Haven, Conn.
Chang, Howard Woo, 16613 Estrella Gardena, Los Angeles, Cal.
Chann, Barry Choong, 618 Blair Ave., Calif.
Chapman, George James, 1205 Oven Ocean Ave., Minneapolis, Minn.
Charlot, Jewell Price, 357 W. Elmst, Cal.
Chatters, Edward Parker, Jr., 5728 DeBore Dr., Sta., New Orleans, La.
Chavez, Leonardo, 1364 E 27th St., Oakland, Cal.
Cheeseboro, Gray Darryll, 754 E. 228th St., New York.
Chell, David Scott, 314 2nd S.W., Albuquerque, N. Mex.
Chune, Harding Hone, 1841 Hayden St., San Francisco, Cal.
Clark, Joyce O-Rita, 1258 Olivera Ave., N. Minneapolis, Minn.
Clarke, Juanita Isabel, 251 136 St., New York.
Clay, Andrei Bernard, 34 Sheppard, Charleston, S.C.
Cohen, Virginia G., 1414 Clarklane, Montgomery, Ill.
Cohn, Jeffrey Franklin, 16 S Broom St., Madison, Wisc., *802 Erlington Rd., Pa.
Coleman, Bernal Thomas, 85 Sea Coast, New York, *E. Falmouth, Mass.
Coleman, Lillian E. Stelle, 215 Ave. A., New York.
Colon, Monserrate, 298 Pemborque St., Conn.
Conn, Mayo Valerie, 14922 Jerkins Hawthrone, Cal.
Cook, Patricia Hetael, Buttles Rd., Granby, Conn.
Covert, John Ralston, 320 Johnquill Pl., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Cox, Catherine Linda, 409 Poenix, Bloomington, Ill.
Crawford, Ilene Fay, 9614 58th Ave., So. Seattle, Wash.
Cruz, George Antony, Jr., 19415 S. Reinhart Ave., Cal.
Cruz, Manuel A., 3250 W. Crystal, Chicago, Ill.
Cruz, Roberto, 70 James St., Newark, N.J.
Csheskier, Richard Vicent, 304 E 120th St., New York.
Davis, Linda, 1256 Olivera Ave., N. Minneapolis.
De Graaf, John Edmund, 231 Manor Dr., San Francisco, Cal.
Demmigs, Eddie Manuel, Jr., 1619 36th Ave., Seattle, Wash., *7144 32nd Ave., S. Seattle, Wash.
De La Pena, Kelbj Felino, 2520 15th Ave., South, Minn., *2631 14th Ave., Minneapolis, Minn.
Dick, Philip Wiens, 206 W. Lincoln, Normal, Ill.
Doner, Craig James, 6515 Widown, Clayton, Mo.
Doner, Patricia Renee, 722 East Gate Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
Doner, Sally Michael, 6515 Widown, Clayton, Mo.
Dorsey, Kathy, 216 Tennis Rd., Alameda, Cal.
Dudley, Patricia Anne, 96 Chenango St., Buffalo, New York, *123 Fleetwood Ter., Williamsville, N.Y.
Dumbar, Roxanne Amanda, 1024 Jackson, New Orleans, La.
Duncan, Susan M., 4829 E. Lake Harriet Pl., Minneapolis, Minn.
Dunn, Sheila Grace, 809 Pacific Ave., Venice, Cal.
Dyches, Waldron Hayes, Jr., 10125 SW 212th St., Miami, Fla.
Eckstein, Enid Adelaide, 2242 Hall Pl.,

Wash., D.C., 54 W 16th St., New York.
Ellis, Stavroura Joane, 4831 Lake Land Ave., Minneapolis, Minn.
Elsenhout, Linda T., 164 Woodworth Ave., N.Y.
Epstein, Alice Dina, 411 E. 10th St., N.Y.
Ernest, Sherie Susanne, 5084 McKean St., Philadelphia.
Esbenchade, John Fowler, 972 Lindavista Ave., Pasadena, Cal.
Esquerre, Robert Palmer, 114–54 Francis, New York.
Eubanks, Michael Kevin, 1256 Olivera Ave., N. Minneapolis, Minn.
Eubankas, Stephens Williams, 1256 Olivera Ave., N. Minneapolis, Minn.
Fallon, Joseph Michael, 334 E. 8th St., New York.
Farber, Ann Hellen, 16631 S.E. 8th St., Vellebue, Wash.
Farley, Frances Elizabeth, 2106 Elliott Ave., S. Minneapolis, Minn.
Fell, Ronald Victor, 922 N. 18th St., Milwaukee, Wisc.
Fine, Joseph S., Waine 21 Lancaster Ct., New Jersey.
Firpi, Carlos, Manuel Perez G–12, Rio Piedras, P.R.
Flores, Gamaliel Vazquez, Nemesio Canales, Rio Piedra, P.R.
Flores, John Martin, Stanford University, Cal., 21747 51st Ave., Bayside, New York.
Flores, Tina, 409 Bissell Ave., Richmond, Cal.
Fortney, Caria Lee, 1827 21st Sta., Santa Monica, Cal.
Frappier, Jon Frederic, 582 61 St., Oakland, Calif.
Frazier, Dennis Janes, 33–25 Prince St., Flushing 54, N.Y.
Freeman, Pamela Tina, 360 W. 15th St., N.Y.
Frye, Tommie Lynn, Jr., 708 E. Phil-Ellen St., Phila.
Gabb, Sally Slater, 2615 Th. St., Atlanta, Ga.
Galvin, Earl Wiliams, 13738 Ida. Warren, Mich.
Galvin, Susan Thekala, 520 N. Pinckey St., Madison, Wis.
Ganseky, Alice Christine, 240 Sullyvan St., New York.
Garcia, David Carles, 3136 High St., Cal.
George, Barbara, 422 Chippewa St., Eauclaire, Wis.
Georgiou, Tyrone George, 300 State St., New Haven, Conn.
Gibson, Stephen Evans, 1506 17th St., N.W. Wash., D.C.
Givens, Eddie C., 1815 Lane St., Seattle, Wash.
Goodman, Robert Lee, 831 Brateliff Rd., N.E., Atlanta, Ga. 857 West Ave., Atlanta, Ga.
Good, Robert Glenn, 1703 W 32 Rd., St., Cleveland, Ohio
Good, Ursula Genevieve, 121 Second St., S. Orange, New Jersey
Gomon, Robert Louis, 32240 Wisconsin Livonia, Mich.
Gonzalez, Hector E., 2216 Blake, Berkeley, Alameda, Cal.
Gonzalez, Veronica Leal, 5.5528 Dover St., Oakland, Cal.
Gordon, Thomas Lee, 1422 Severn, Pittsburg, Pa.
Gould, Richard, 601 Vine St., Denver, Colorado
Grabelsky, Jeffrey Mark, 16 Nassau Tri., New York
Grant, Kent David, 10001 Windsor, Los Angeles, Cal.
Grant, Leonard, Jr., 1472 Garfield St., N. O., La.
Green, Martina Elizabeth, 486 W. Overbrook St., Largo, Fla.
Greene, Patricia Marylyn, 368 Carlton Ave., Brooklyn, N.Y. 120 19 Lakeview Blvd., Jamaica, N.Y.
Greenman, Karen, 117 E 77 St., N.Y.
Griffin, Jennifer Lee, 327 14 Ave., CE, Minneapolis, Minn.
Gutman, Richard Martin, 271 Andy Dr., Melrose Park, Ill.
Gudwin, Mitchel M., 936 E. 15th St., Brooklyn, N.Y.
Hadden, Patsy, 4214 Judeah St., San Francisco, Cal.
Hallinan, Eda Godell, 1712 Channing Way, Alameda, Cal.
Halperl, Juliet Maxine, 19 Farragut Pl, Morristown, N.J. 349 Putney, Vert.
Halverson, Louise M., 5133 Dupont Ave., So., Minneapolis, Minn.
Hamilton, Jennie Martin, 40 Beach Tree Pl., Atlanta, Ga.
Hargrave, Lucinda Susanne, 7070 Dearwestern Tr., Cincinnati, Ohio.
Harper, Aquanetta, 1326 College Ave., Bronx, New York
Harris, Julie Rose, 1721 Francisco St., Berkeley, Cal.
Harrison, Amy Jayne, 1004 Brooks, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Harvey, Sarah Shwan, 10 Hueter Lane, Mill Valley, Cal.
Harader, Anne Aloaa, 133 Beaver St., San Francisco, Cal.
Harader, Kathryn Mary, 133 Beaver St., San Francisco, Cal.
Haugton, Fannie Mae, 1235 S 76th Pl., Los Angeles, Cal.
Hayes, Roberta Joyce, 5817 Dover, Oakland, Cal.
Heartsill, Robert, Calle 4–D–23 Hnas Davila Bayamon, P. R.
Hernandez, Daniel Villanueva, San Jose Sta., Clara, Cal. 79 So. 5th St.
Hewitt, Michael Antony, 1669 Hood Ct., Sta., Calra, Cal.
Hill, David Byron, 2808 Sunset, Waukegan, Ill.
Holder, Ana Maria, 5817 Dover St., Oakland, Cal.
Holland, Jessica Ellen, 230 Beach 142 St., Neponset.
Holmes, Stella Louis, 154 W 71st St., N.Y.
Hood, James Magill, 5526 Morris St., Phila., Pa.
Howe, Bruce Ellis, 639 Brooks St., Ann Arbor, Mich., 35 Rock Lane Dr., Fairborne, Ohio
Howze, Ronald Henry, 221 Corelton 31, Berkeley, Cal. 2200 Roosevelt St., Richmond, Cal.
Hoyt, Richard Paul, 74 Warren Ave., Marlborough, Mass.
Hughes, Linda Marie, 1702 So. Perkins St., Appletown, Wis.
Hurley, Mary Ellen, 240 Sullivan St., New York
Hurwitz, Daniel Lewis, 2205 E. Newton, Seattle, Wash.
Ingersoll, Joseph Akida, 11905 Park Ave., Tacoma, Wash.
Irons, Michael, 1256 Oliver Ave., N., Minneapolis, Minn.
Jauregui, Graciano, 5671 Genoa St., Oakland, Alameda, Cal.
Jauregui, Maria Pilar, 5671 Genoa St., Oakland, Alameda, Cal.
Jeffries, Simon, Jr., 2728 E. Biddle St., Baltimore, Md.
Jenkins, Anne Louise, 343 Eight St., N.E., Atlanta, Ga.
Jenkins, E. Allan, 13309 Bea Kay Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Johnson, Marvin Donald, 3516 Slady Lane, Dr., Kansas City, Miss.
Johnson, Williams Victor, 780 Red Oak Vencenville, Ill.
Jones, Monta Christa, 1325 N.E. 16th St., Okla City, Okla. 2630 Haste, Berkley, Alameda, Cal.
Jones, Karen Jean, 908 Mechanic St., Decorah, Iowa
Jordan, Fania Elisabeth, 8334 F Redwood La., Joya, Cal.
Jordan, Samuelreginald, Jr., 9334–F Redwood La., Joya, Cal.
Kaiper, Donald Dickson, 2346 Baidez St., Oakland, Cal.
Kanapp, Kristan Barbara, P. O. Box 8, Corbett, Oregon.
Kanor, Susan Gail, 873 Summit Ave., River Edge, New York.
Kahn, Geralynn, 8359 264th St., New York.
Kaplan, Cory 807 C Eagle Hts., Wisc. 1623 Madison St., Madison, Wisc.
Katz, Ronnie Jean, 750 Carrol St., Brooklyn, New York.
Kay, Virginia Elizabeth, 143 Belmont St., Englewood, New Jersey.
Kearns, Thomas Conrad, 17 Glenbourne Ct., Williamville, N. Y.
Kohlmeyer, William Martin, 206 W. Lincoln, Normal, Ill.
Kolb, Elaine Marie, 234 St. Charles Stas., Johnson City, N.Y.
Krakalia, Victoria Mary, 9313 Chicago Ave., S. Minneapolis, Minn.
Kruces, Edwards Roberts, Jr., Box 65 RFD, Michelton, N. C.
Kutaka, Geraldine Natsue, 333 Nancy Lane, San Jose, Cal.
Lagares, Arleen Joy, 1851 Schieffelin, New York.
La Luz, Jose A., P. O. Box 1043 Cagyasm, P. R.
Lawson, Wilber Benson,, 5822 Osage Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.
Lee, Fay Ben, 781 16th Ave., San Francisco, Cal.
Lee, James I-Chien, 1666 Montgomery Ave., Bronx, N. Y.
Leice R., Roslyn Joyce, 765 Westwood, Clayton, Mo. 6515 Wytown, Saint Louis, Mo.
Leitson, Karen Sandra, 3810 Brentwood Dr., Genesse, Mich.
Letven, Nonelle, 4609 Louise Ave., Encino, Cal.
Lewis, Daniel Williams, 7614 N. Boxworth, Chicago, Ill.
Lewis, Russell Lance Van, 320 N. Willard, San Francisco, Cal.
Lewis, Tome Joe, 3462 Plata St., Los Angeles, Cal.
Leys, Melody Ann, 1169 E. Sta., Clara, San Jose, Cal.
Liebowitz, Martin, 31 Michael Ro., Syossete, N. Y.
Lima, Carlos Antonio, Carr. 167 Sm. 2hm 4, Pajaros Americanos, Bayamon, P. R.
Lima, John Albert, 603 Tower Ave., Superior, Wisc.
Lima, Rachel, 6115 Dover St., Oakland, Cal.
Linthurst, Christopher Geoffrey, 2600 Chicago, Minn. 712 1th St., SE, Minneapolis, Minn.
Lisse, Emily Edda, 65 Columbia St., New York.
Loleaud, Bruce Jules, 4215 Grove Ave., Brookfield, Ill.
Lopez, Trinidad, 1107 E. Sixty St., Berkeley, Cal.
Lopez, Josephine, 1107 E. Sixty St., Berkeley, Cal.
Loran, Marc Jhonathan, 3475 Paradise Tiburon Mavin, Cal.
Lott, Henry, Jr., 1816 N. Daxton, Chicago, Ill.
Lovett, Katherine, 702 Balazy Dr., Grand Junction, Col.
Lucey, Meira Ann, Phill Saarza, 8072 N. Fowler, Cloves, Cal.
Luna, Margaret, 2816 Via Sandelarro, Montebelo, Cal.
Mac Carry, Timothy James, 54 Leona Ave., New York City.
McClure, Mack Patrick, 128 Master Ave., Riverside, Cal.
McCue, Maureen F., 8862 W. Palmetto Ave., Milwaukee.
McCutchan, James Duncan, 250 Maple St., Mahtomedi, Minn.
Maas, Steyen, 733 The Alameda, Berkeley, Cal.
Macias, Ysidro Ramon, 5528 Dover St., Oakland, Alameda, Cal.

Madox, Evelyn Ann, 260 West 117 St., New York.
Maechiro, Sandra, 3830 Welland Ave., Los Angeles, Cal.
Mahon, Kristin, 50 Reid Ave., Passaic, New Jersey.
Majerus, Patricia N., 206 W. Lincoln, Normal, Ill.
Major, Anna Marie, 7642 WoodPine, San Diego, Cal.
Major, Daniel Edmundo, 7642 WoodPine, San Diego, Cal.
Malavet, Isabel V., 400 E. 9th St., New York.
Malchow, James A., 6208 Arlington, Appletown, Wis.
Mann, James Gary, 52 Birch Ave., Princeton, N.J.
Marcus, Deborah, 1828 W. Lombard St., Baltimore; 2900 Manhattan Ave., Baltimore, Md.
Martell, Esperanza, 4–6 West 101st, New York.
Martinez, Dimas Joel, 714 East 18th, Oakland, Cal.
Mastroleo, Robin Antony, 273 Cipres St., Rochester, New York; 64 Pleasant St., Cambridge, Mass.
Mattew, Susan Elizabeth, 1025 Richwood, Cincinnati, Ohio; RT 2, Plainville, Vt.
May, Stephen, 2214 N. Rocme Ave., Chicago, Ill.
McLinn, Teloca, 433 Mt. View Rd., Englewood.
Meade, Teresa Ann, 1117 Erin St., Madison, Wis. Rural Route 4, Mt. Pleasant, Iowa.
Medina, Jose, 834 W Arlington, Chicago, Ill.
Melero, Selia G., 2176 48th Ave., Oakland, Cal.
Melnick, David Melvin, 1517 Hawthornest, Pittsburg.
Mendez, Luis Alberto, Madrid, 1003 Sta. Rita, Rio Piedra, P. R.
Mercado, Victoria Ellen, 150 Second St., Sta., Cruz, Cal. 1064 No. 8, Delock St., San Francisco, Cal.
Merritt, Regina Lee, 1655 W. 184 Place, Homewood, Fl. 219 N. Bassett, Madison, Wisc.
Meyerson, John Edward, Latches Lane, Apt. 105, Old Lancaster Rd., Pa.
Milan, Rafael Herminio Brigante, Villa Grillasca M–20B Ponce P. R.
Miller, David Lawrence, 210 N Homer Haven, Cortland, New York.
Miller, Jossua Lee, 220 Scarsdale Rd., New York.
Miller, Melba Marie, 6126 NE 15th, Portland, Oregon.
Minehart, David Lewellyn, Master Office, Betanford College Yale U., Conn.
Molina, Maria Mercedes, 15 AE 99 St., New York.
Monte, Atanasio Del Roberte.
Moritz, Ann Martha, 6 Soundview Circle White Plaine, Westchester, N.Y.
Murguia, Guillermo Alejandro, 2216 Blake Berkeley, Cal.
Murphy, Larry Eugene, 308 S. Macombe St., Tallahassee, Fla.
Musson, Natalie, P. O. Box 4035 N. O., La.
Navas, Jose Noel Hernandez, Espana J–232 Forrest Viw, Bayamon, P. R.
Nelson, Janet Arline, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio. 433 Parkview Dr., South Lake.
Nelson, Lynn, 451 W End Ave., New York.
Nevel, Rudy Salatiel, 2831 Octavia St., Oakland, Cal.
Newton, James Robert, 70 W 1007 St., New York.
Nichols, David Walker, R. T. 5, Box 5, Lexington, N. C.
Nygaarda, Deena Sue, 1761 E. 27th S. Salt Lake, Utah.
Ollie, James Lewis, 153 Ave. C, New York.
Orozco, Benita, 2228 S. 18 St., Milwaukee.
Ortiz, Martin Gerald, 5818 Dover St., Oakland, Cal. *2180 Ashby Ave., Berkeley, Cal.
Palmer, Sussan Chandler, Box 4035, New Orleans, La.
Patt, Robert Irwing, 4855 Reistertown Rd., Baltimore.
Peang, Rodney Kwai Ming, 3443 Ramona St., Palo Alto, Cal.
Perez, Ernesto C., 1726 18th Ave., Oakland, Cal.
Perez, Linda Maria, 260 Valencia St., Cal.
Perez, Louis Anthony, 2000 N Humbolt, Chicago, Ill.
Perez, Robert, Jr., 911 Red Bird, San Jose, Cal. *6304 Colby St., Oakland, Cal.
Perry, Thomas Jefferson, 16 Third St., NW, Atlanta, Ga.
Perry, Francis Stokes, Pleasant St., Dover, Mass.
Pestana, Lee Kidwell, 7279 Mulholland, Los Angeles, Cal.
Peterson, Sandra Doreen, 3762 Humbolt Ave., Cal.
Phillip, Stephanie La Verne, 218 Dayton St., Yellow Spring, Ohio.
Pina, Luis Raul, 2342E 19th St., Oakland, Cal.
Pineda, Theodore, 25 Alisos St., Sta., Barbara, Cal.
Price, Adrian, 60 E 96 St., New York.
Putian, Elena, 5025 Melrose Ave., Oakland, Cal.
Pyne, Catherine Casey, 5485 Dorchester, Chicago, Ill.
Pyne, George Clifton, 806 Vikers Ave., Durham, N.C.
Quevedo, Olivia T., 206 N. Irving Blvd., Cal.
Quindell, Roger Henry, Jr., 1745 Kettley Cove Ct., Harland, Wis.
Rambeau, Laura Lee, 5467 W 8th St., Los Angeles, Cal. P.O. Box 93, Big Pine, Cal.
Ramos, Roberto, Magnolia 6, Puerto Rico.
Reed, Gail Ann, Box 2137, Denninson, Granville, Ohio.
Renda, Yvonne, 566 Boston Ave., Bronx, New York.
Reynolds, Wayne Rogers, Jr., 1318 Fillmorest St., San Pablo, Cal.
Rice, Barbara Lorraine, 731 St. Nicholas St., New York.
Richter, Dennis Leo, 1421 Desoto Ave., Glencoe, Minn.
Ritterman, Michelle Dee, 1230 E. Dayton St., Madison, Wisc.
Rivera, Luis Ramon, 2096 Boston Road, Bronx, N.Y.
Rivers, Donna Elaine, 1934 Miranonte Ave., Mountain View, Cal.
Robin, James Mattews, Forrest Ridge, Claxton, Mo.
Robinson, Curtiss Joel, 1125 W. Thomas St., Southbend, Ind.
Robinson, Stephen Samuel, 4704 SE Henry St., Portland, Oregon.
Rodarte, Diana Maria, 1528 36th Ave., Oakland, Cal.
Rodriguez, Luis Antonio, 307 Keap St., Brooklyn, New York.
Rodriguez, Marcos Gonzalez, B. O. Calabaza Yabucoa, P.R.
Rodriguez, Miguel A., 2333 Channing, Berkeley, Cal.
Rodriguez, Rene, 1699 Lexington Ave., New York.
Roldam, Hector, 618 E. 9th St., New York.
Romero, Frances, 1736 E. 22nd St., Merced, Cal.
Rosenthal, Judy Vernell, 944 No. Field, Rdad. Long Island.
Rudolph, Leslie, 1823 W. Lombard St., Baltimore, Md.
Russell, Deloris Virginia, 10554 83 Ave., Edmonton, Alberta.
Samburg, Harry J., 66-a Panaramic, Berkeley, Calif., 29 Washington Square West, N.Y.
Sanchez, Gladys, G, Eagle Heights Apts., Madison, Wisc.
Scheer, Henry Holloway, 3829 Oakland Ave., Minneapolis, Minn.
Schietinger, Ellen Kae, 4852 Leitforrest Dr., Atlanta, Ga.
Schleinz, Sandra Lee, 1294 Piedmont Rd., N.W. Apt. 12, Atlanta, Ga.
Scott, Wade, 1310 Noble Ave., Bronx, N.Y.
Scott, Evelyn Celia, 582 Eagle 14210, Buffalo, N.Y.
Shapiro, Lynn, 63 Derby Ave., New Haven, Conn.
Shapiro, Naomi Ann, 1919 Cleveland, Hudson, N.Y.
Shea, Sandra Louise, 24 Waterhouse St., Summerville, Mass.
Shervo, Angela, 243 Kensington, E. Lansing, Mich.
Shearer, Linda Louise, 1818 Warren Ave., Seattle, Wash.
Shoher, Linda Anne, 446 60th St., Oakland, Cal.
Simpson, Penolope Terrell, P.O. Box 911, Chapel Hill.
Sokolow, Ellen, 4829 Commonwealth, Detroit, Mich.
Sol, Tim Del, 1754 15th St., San Francisco, Cal.
Sorman, Steven Robert, Minneapolis, Minn.
Spang, Raymond, P.O. Box 83 Lame Oer, Montana.
Spaulding, Margaret Patricia, 1028 W Montana, Chicago, Ill. RR #1, Oakwood, Ill.
Spector, Deborah Hanan, 251 Clermont Ave., Brooklyn, N.Y.
Stacy, Barbara Ann, 5424 Trinidad Bay, San Diego, Cal.
Stearns, Elizabeth Stephenson, 5801 SW 108th St., Miami, Fla.
Stein, Michael Bruce, 22–05 90th St., Jackson Hts., N.Y.
Stein, Nancy Gail, 582 61st St., Oakland, Cal.
Stone, Lucien Scott, 1256 Oliver No. Hennepin Co., Minn.
Stone, Susan Elizabeth, 16 Home St., Worcester, Mass. 809 Bassar N. E. Albuquerque, N.M.
Straley, Leslie Mae, 53 Davis Circle, Chapel Hill, N.Y.
Stubbs, Michael Edwin, Topecal 626 W. 28th, Kansas.
Sullivan, David Irish, 70 W 11, New York.
Sulsona, Jose Cadilla, Romani 51, Sta. Rita, P.R.
Tachiro, Joseph Kyllo, P.O. Box 464, Falmouth, Mass.
Tapaoan, Chester, 4215 Normal Ave., Los Angeles, Cal.
Tavlin, Barry Conrad, 20372 Birch St., Cal.
Teao, Barbara, 167–18 Jewell Ave., Flushing, N.Y.
Teeter, Donald Mark, 1548 W. Garland Ave., Fresno, Cal.
Terrell, Marvin Darnell, 24 Earl Place, Buffalo, N.Y.
Thomas, Patricia Ann, 2145 Marlan Springfield, Ill.
Thompson, Aidan P., 204 Marion St., Madison, Wisc.
Thorson, Williams Ward, 6333 Pheasant Lane, Middletown, Wisc.
Tinker, Mary Elisabeth, 1336 Midland Dr., St. Lovis, Mass.
Toots, Marion Lucille, 40–15 10th St., Long Island, N.Y.
Trammell, Deborah Kay, 3835 Wallingford, No., Seattle, Wash.
Trejan, Lares, 113 S Roberts Rd., Dunkirk, N.Y.
Trojan, John Vicent, 13719 Lemoles Ave., Cal.
Turner, Anne Maylinson, 2015 Mount Vernon St., Pa.
Tyotome, Joie Meiko, 445 Oakland Ave., Oakland, Cal.
Valentin, Juan Irrizarry, Sta. Rita 106, Rio Piedras, P. R.
Vann, Gregory Arthur, 23 Worhlers, Buffalo, New York.
Vazquez, Arthur Tinoco, 633 Jaunita Ave., L.A., Cal.
Velazquez, Irma, Rt. 1, Box 92, Landora, Ohio.
Velez, Frank, 217 E 33 Ave., New York.
Villeagas, Jose L., BO Caimito Bago Kl Hg Rio Piedra, P.R.
Webre, Phillip Chisholm, P. O. Box 2268, W. Palm Beach, Fla.
Weekley, Carl Wrigt, Jr., 52 Arlington Place, Buffalo, N. Y.

Weiss, Mona Rae, 351 Parkdale Ave., Buffalo, N. Y.
Welmann, Mark Douglas, 18121 Patton St., Detroit, Mich.
Wenzi, Thurman Bader, 415 Attamont St., Charlottesville, Va. 83 Gordan Blvd., Delmar, New York.
Wheeler, John Charles, 780 Grande Ave., San Marino, L. A., Cal.
White, Hugh Carleton 3rd, 17187 Wildamede, Detroit, Mich.
Wiecking, Frederick August 3rd, 140 Prospect St., New Haven, Conn.
Wieching, Olive Hackett, 2225 Main St., Stratford, Conn.
Wieder, Fredda Edmee, 49 St. Alban Rd., Boston, Mass.
Wilburn, Elayne Adele, 9128 So. Stewart, Chicago, Ill.
Wilburn, Gerald Houston, 6706 Everhart Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Williams, Gary Roman, 3777 151 St., Cleveland, Ohio.
Williams, Maxine Laverne, 70 James St., Newark, New York.
Wilson, Gary Arthur, Berkeley 1925 Dwight Alameda, Cal. 609 Santa Rosa Ave., Berkeley, Cal.
Wing, Loren Clifton, 2636 Warren St., Berkeley, Cal. 5326 Caleb Ave., Sacramento, Cal.
Wiser, John Wilson Stephenson, Jr., P. O. Box 7611, Station C, Atlanta.
Wolf, Willam Miller, 58 Farfield Beach Rd., Fairfield, Conn.
Wong, Janet Suet, 1373 4th Ave., San Francisco, Cal. 2745 Anza St., No. 3, San Francisco.
Wright, Phyllis Michelle, 6106 Plimouth Ave., Richmond, Cal.
Yaple, Pauline Ruth, P. O. Box 74, Hurleyville, N. Y.
Yates, Lawrence Anthony, 1407 Bouvier St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Ybarra, Felix Zamora, Jr., 14402 Devreauz Rd., Albion, Mich.
Ybarra, Leonarda M., 419 K St., Sanger, Fresno, Cal.
Yndman, Bette Frances, 2720 Reynier Ave., Los Angeles, Cal.
Young, Barbara Wendy, 4923 So. Greenwood, Chicago, Ill.
Young, Frances Peola, 2641 23 Rd., Ave., Oakland, Cal.
Yue, Adams Kia, 72–50 153 St., Flushing, New York.

FOURTH VENCEREMOS BRIGADE

Arizona

Bitker, Darry L. (see California), 903 Valencia Rd., Tucson.

California

Adelman, Susan, 1035 Summit Dr., Beverly Hills.
Allen, James V., 1131 W. St. Barbara, Los Angeles.
Alverio, Nilda, 774 Capp St., San Francisco.
Bitker, Darry L. (see Arizona) Alvarado, Monterrey.
Blanch, Ramon J. Castell, 106 Oak Crest Rd., San Anselmo.
Braga, Selvestry C. Fdez, P.O. Box 252, Woodville.
Candell, Peter Lawrence, 586 58th St., Oakland.
Cannon, Terence M., 196 Bocana St., San Francisco.
Carrillo, Rebecca Alice, 1185 Capitol Ave., San Francisco.
Castorena, Mari Anna, 28 Fayette St., Colusa.
Chavez, Miguel (see Oklahoma), 4002 Elsa St., Lakewood.
Chow, Lisa Pearl, 5303 N. Fruit, Fresno.
Clark, Donald McKinley, 3361 Partridge Ave., Oakland.
Dixon, Evan, Fairview W., Berkeley.
Dyson, John Alvin, 9616 Parmalee St., Los Angeles.
Flores, Francisco, 521 Capp St., San Francisco.
Gallegos, Luz Oropesa, 10841 Lehiga Ave., Pacoima.
Gardner, Phillip Steven, 788 65th St., Oakland.
Holman, Andrea Lynn, 747 Delores St., Stanford.
Hughes, Sandra Kitty, 74 Eureka St., San Francisco.
Jackson, Jo Ann, 706 Drake Ave., Marin City.
Kaufmann, Louise Paula, 2907 A Grover St., Berkeley.
Lerma, Irma Conception, 7125 34th St., North Highlands.
Lopez, George Martin, 2673 Eulalic, San Jose.
Lopez, Linda Ann, 2755 El Camino Real, Redwood City.
MacLemore, Raleigh Banes, 790 39th Ave., San Francisco.
MacNeja, Sharen Ann, 5024 Ygnacio Ave., Oakland.
McKee, Rebecca Inez, 1271 Redwood Lane, Lafayette.
Martinez, Rosa, 823 S. Alma Ave., Los Angeles.
Ortega, Rebecca Ann Alvarez, 68 Randolph St., So. San Fran.
Payne, Theresa L., 2040–2 4th Ave., Oakland.
Perez, Josue Roberto, 1629 Walnut St., Berkeley.
Perry, Frederick Douglass, 2905 Grove Berkeley.
Phillips, Clifton Gerard, 3145 Texas St., Oakland.
Poulson, Mary Melinda, 125 Valdiva Dr., Santa Barbara.
Ramos, Bernardo Daniel, 2107 W. Aaron, Los Angeles.
Richard, Arnold Gerard, 1911 19th St., Santa Monica.
Rios, Daniel Marcos, 3605 May St., Los Angeles.
Rodriguez, Celie Herrera, 422 9th St., Sacramento.
Rodriguez, Ruben, 2755 El Camino Real, Redwood City.
Savellano, Silva Ann, 5029 Melrose Ave., Oakland.
Solinas, Christine Ann, Box 252, Woodville.
Sterwart, Donald Dean, San Rafael, Santa Barbara.
Tervalon, Melanie Arie, 1613 Oracon St., Berkeley.
Toldon, Richard Antony, 1650 8th St., Oakland.
Treisman, Naomi, 1456½ Hopkins St., Berkeley.
Vazquez, Richard Rene, 1341 Mohawk St., Los Angeles.
Williams, Pamelia S., 4739 Saratoga, San Fran.
Proctor, Oleta Maé (see N.Y.), Obregon St., Berkeley.
Spriggs, Peter Kent (see Fla.), 181 V 6th, Los Angeles.

Colorado

Baca, Eric, 145 W. Byers Pl., Denver.
Calvin, John F., 1174 Race St., Denver.
Glikman, Joan Anne, 1173 13th St., Boulder.
Wallace, James Ellis, 5705 S. Monaco, Englewood.

Connecticut

Johnson, Carl Alexander, 61 Lake Place, New Haven.
Sullivan, Marilyn, 470 Prospect St., Apt. 63, New Haven.
Gottlieb, Barbara Rose (see Ohio), 102 Helen St., Hamden.

Delaware

Price, Julia Hortense (see Ohio), Saturn Dr., Newark.

Florida

Brandon, Gail Elizabeth, 1434 Old St. Augustine Rd., Tallahassee.
DeHoff, Philip, William, 4815 Algonquin Ave., Jacksonville.
Hartline, Edward George, Holiday Homes, Pensacola Bch.
Hornbroox, Erika Louise (see Pa.), 2008 North Village, Tampa.
Jacobsen, Katherine Ann, 518 N. Bronough St., Tallahassee.
Millikan, James Dean, Ph.D., 120 N.E. 8th St. Gainesville.
Rankin, Charles Wesley, Jr., 120 8th St., Gainesville.
Spriggs, Peter Kent (see Calif.) 427 McDaniel St., Tallahassee.

Georgia

Dennehy, Kathleen Margaret, 330 Criston Rd., NE, Atlanta.
Kaufman, Marianna B., 336 Clifton Rd. N., Atlanta.
Kelly, Barbara Jene, 500 Howard St. N. 3, Atlanta.
LaFrenier, Douglas E., 252 5th St., NE., Atlanta.
Liffiander, Jane Sara (see N.Y.), 234 Ave., Atlanta.

Hawaii

Catania, Matthew Alfred, 53022 Poki Wai St., Hawla.
Iharra, Juffelia, 66–657 Haleiwa R., Haleiwa.
Kelly, Sheila Kum Lai, 512 Panui St., Honolulu.

Illinois

Ashby, Lorraine Marie, P.O. Box 2117, Station A, Campaign.
Devito, Charlotte E., 204 N. Dee Rd., Park Ridge.
Feldman, David T., 707 W. Vermont, Urbana.
Glick, Brian (see N.Y.), 212 Heather Lane, Wilmette.
Hudson, John William, 1106 N. Logan, Danville.
Martinez, John Anthony, 450 St. James Pl., Chicago.
Mills, Pamela Bond, 2010 N. Howe St., Chicago.
Parrish, Robert Franklin, 1234 Franklin, Danville.
Perez, Carlos Oscar, 2000 N. Humboldt St., Chicago.
Rivera, David, 1827 N. Howe St., Chicago.
Schuman, Carolyn Ann, 611 Judson St., Evanston.
Smith, Steven Leslie, 4938 W. Louis St., Chicago.

Indiana

Casey, Charlotte, 2419 Linden, South Bend.
Cline, Marcia Ann (see Mo.), 1506 Oakwood Trail, Indianapolis.
Curtin, Timothy Paul, 310 Highland, Indianapolis.
Kathman, Nancy Reed, 314½ E. 10 St., Indianapolis.
Schosker, Cynthia Ann, 1125 W. Thomas St., So. Bend.

Kansas

Bosley, Christine Susan, 8707 Goodman, Overland Park.
Warner, Michael M., 1406 Tennessee St., Lawrence.

Kentucky

Farris, Susan Lee (see Louisiana), 302 E. Main St., Horse Cave.

Louisiana

Farris, Susan Lee (see Ky.), 1427 Ave., New Orleans.
Marden, Judy, 921 Port St., New Orleans.
Murrell, Wynn (see Texas), 1439 La. Ave., New Orleans.
Walsh, Dennis Patrick, 4630 Venus St., New Orleans.
Wells, David Lee (see Tenn.), 451 Gloria St., Shreveport.

Maryland

Delano, Lewis Adair, 204 W. Martin St., Snow Hill.
Gabler, Sandra Jane, 405 Benninhaus Rd., Baltimore.
Green, David Howard, 2310 Sugarcane Rd., Baltimore.

Kline, Ronald Albert, 6205 Slipview Bay, Baltimore.
Myers, Barbara Jean, 1023 Quebec Terr., Silver Spring.
Pumphrey, Paul A., 1516 Foster Rd., Silver Spring.
Wallace, Sylvia Eileen, 829 Powers St., Baltimore.

Massachusetts

Acevedo, Sylvia Maria, 32 Dartmouth St., Boston.
Cabrera, Arthur William, 30 Kimberley Ave., Springfield.
Crittendon, Mary Elizabeth, Chesterfield R., Chesterfield.
Devio, Jacquelyn Ann, 227 King St., Springfield.
Donato, Joan Marie, 177 Harvard St., Dorchester.
Flynn, Shelagh Ann, 85 Plummer Ave., Winthrop.
Phillips, Gail A., 11 MacArthur Rd., Beverley.
Queen, Robert Elliot (see Wisconsin), Arrowhead Dr., Paxton.
Roberson, Sandra, 49½ Pine St., Springfield.

Michigan

Ahmed, Ismael Nijahe, 2534 Holly St., (Dearborn) Detroit.
Casey, Thomas Blane, 9911 Cascade, Detroit.
Curry, Kenneth Eugene, Jr., 734 Coplin, Detroit.
Gruchala, John Steven, 30727 Geraldine, Westland.
Heath, Linda Susan, 734 Coplin, Detroit.
Himel, Margery, 520 Hill St., Ann Arbor.
Martin, Franz Barclay, 46 Alexandria, Detroit.
Todd, Carol Mateel, 616 Sugnet, Midland.
Washington, Kaye, 631 Englewood, Detroit.
Wrigley, James Alexander, 722 Glena Ave., East Lansing.

Mississippi

McNamara, Michael Edward, 114 Idlewild St., Jackson.

Missouri

Backus, Margaret Lynn, 1422 Ferry St., St. Louis.
Bronson, Arthur Hayden, 2622 Wabash, Kansas City.
Cline, Marcia Ann (see Ind.), 614 Pershin 9-B, St. Louis.
Gentry, Kathleen Ann, 1 Forest Ridge (Rear) St. Louis.
Mallios, George James, 6261 Clemens St., St. Louis.
Rust, Helen Jean, 3312 Summit, Kansas City.
Showalter, Paul Gale, c/o New Earth Book Store, 1106 E. 47th St., Kansas City.

New Hampshire

Shields, Mary Rerwin, 6 Rumford St., Concord.

New Jersey

Alexander, Eric Brian, 670 W. 4th St., Plainsfield.
Collins, Barbara Ines (see New York), 35 Hillside Rd., Elizabeth.
Estomin, Orrin Charles, 17 Koenis Lane, Freehold.
Gomez, Joseph (see Wy.), 180 Sip Ave., Jersey City.
Kay, Barbara Jane, 143 Belmont St., Englewood.
Lockard, Janet Frances, 120 Randolph Rd., Princeton.
Nagi, Mae M., 281 Edgewood Ave., Teaneck.
Shapiro, Nancy Jane, 332 No. Ridgewood Rd., South Orange.
Thetford, Lois Catherine (see Wash.), 68 So. St., Eatontown.
Van Liew, Alfred R., Old Road No. 4, Box 734, Princeton.

New York

Alicea, Angel, 1014 Hoe Ave., Bronx.
Beller, Ruth Ellen, R.D. 1, Tivoli.
Bracero, Carmen Idelisa, 113 E. 102 St., New York.
Carperter, Robert Michael, 332 W. 17th St., New York.
Collins, Barbara Ines (see N.J.), 35 H6 74th St., Jackson Heights.
Cortes, Felix, 648 Amsterdam Ave., New York.
Crawford, Jewel Loretta, 102-02 34th Ave., Corona.
Crowley, Lynda Claire, 1135 University Ave., Bronx.
Curren, Madeline, 204 W. 107th St., New York.
Fine, Lisa, 855 Central Parkway, Schenectady.
Finn, Ronald Michael, 2121 Westbury, Brooklyn.
Glick, Brian (see Ill.), 532 57th St., New York.
Green, Judith Charlotte, 80-43 268 St., Floral Park.
Haber, Karen Phyllis, 286 Warren St., Brooklyn.
Haisfteld, Ronald Nathaniel (see Pa.), 239 W. 16th St., New York.
Hamilton, Valli Lorraine, 55 Barnard Rd., New Rochelle.
Hoesner, Rita Ann, 647 Delaware, Buffalo.
Johnson, Cheryl Anne, 1310 Noble Ave., Bronx.
Kadison, Karen Joyce, 898 Union St., Brooklyn.
Lifflander, Jane Sarah (see Ga.), 208 E. Broadway, New York.
Marcoccia, Sandra Lee, 401 Grand Central Ave., Horse Heads
Moore, Robert Jean, 816 Dongan Ave., New York (Scotia).
Morawetz, John Synge (see Ohio), 246 W. 12th St., New York.
Nieves, Antonio, 194 Flatbush Ave., Brooklyn.
Nishi, Geoffry Kene, 95 Hickory Hill Rd., Tappan.
Nunez, Wilma Zeneida, 257 W. 116th St., New York.
Perkel, Amy Frances, 285 Station Plam, Great Neck.
Price, William Addison, 61 W. 87th St., New York.
Proctor, Oleta Mae (see Calif.), 505 W. 162nd St., Apt. 107, New York.
Rivard, Gerald Harvey, 39 Courier Blvd., Kenmore.
Romney, Patricia Ann, 229 W. 139th St., New York.
Rosa, Joaquin, 429 E. 139th St., Bronx.
Russo, Sandra, 55 LeRoy, New York.
Salomon, Patricia A., 201 W. 85th St., New York.
Sanabria, Olga Irish, 1694 Madison Ave., New York.
Sankel, Mindy Beth, 268 St. Floral Park, New York.
Segarra, Marilyn, 5210 Broadway, Bronx.
Siegel, Sonia S., 302 Ave. C., Brooklyn.
Siegelbaum, Portia, 170 State St., Brooklyn.
Smith, Martir Gaylord, 74 Forsyth St., Apt. 11, Manhattan.
Tsujimoto, Taekoto, 221 E. 32nd St., New York.
Waring, Zorena, 601 E. 179th St., Apt. 1D, Bronx.
Wilson, Joseph F., 223 W. 135th St., New York.
Young, Jacque Line Ann, 47 Warwick Rd., Bronxville.
Zapata, Ramon, 1238 Webster Ave., Bronx.

North Carolina

Carothers, William Alexander, 293 Hillside Ave., Fayetteville.
Honeycutt, Judy Carol, 223 Hillside Ave., Fayetteville.
Porter, Marion Raine, 150 E. Pine St., Goldsbore.
Sanders, David Eugene, 820 S. State St., Raleigh.
Teague, Diana Horne, 412 Kinsey St., Raleigh.
Tieger, Joseph Harold, 1108 Nations Dr., Charlotte.
Tieger, Virginia Ericson, 1108 Nations Dr., Charlotte.

Ohio

Alford, Anne Kathleen, 2622 Hampshire Rd., Cleveland.
Claxton, Gary Russell, 1703 W. 32nd St., Cleveland.
Clunn, Carol Lynn, 4010, Clinton Ave., Cleveland.
Leslie, Marjorie Ellen, 128 W. Davis St., Yellow Springs.
Morawetz, John Synge (see New York), 1321 River Road, N.J.
Price, Julia Hortense (see Delaware), Antioch College Union, Yellow Springs.

Oklahoma

Chavez, Miguel (see Calif.), 201 So. 8th St., Okemah.

Pennsylvania

Covert, Andrew Roger, 320 Jonquil Pl., Pittsburgh.
Donnelly, Elizabeth June, 5754 Howe St., No. 6, Pittsburgh.
Druskin, Denise Estelle, 4015 Brunswick Ave., Drexel Hill.
Faithfull, Lugia, 2865 N. Howard St., Pittsburgh.
Haisfteld, Ronald Nathaniel (see N. Y.), 1914 Fawn Dr., Philadelphia.
Hill, Jerry Loise, 2925 N. Waterloo St., Philadelphia.
Hornbroox, Erika Louise (see Fla.), 5480 Pennsylvania Ave., Pittsburgh.
Knerr, Robert Dennis, 216 St. Croix Dr., Pittsburgh.

Tennessee

Langfield, Marylin Irene, 334 22nd Ave., N., Nashville.
Sullivan, Larry Michael, 1511 Laurel Ave., Apt. 1, Knoxville.
Wells, David Lee (See La.) 118 Louise Ave., Nashville.

Texas

Calmock, Ronald G., Box 53221, 200 Welch St., Houston.
De Borge, Tony, 314 Gale St., Houston.
De Leon, Maria Guadalupe, 723 Leal St., San Antonio
Duncan, Green Cameron, Jr., 347 Bushnell, San Antonio.
Niemann, Doyle Larry, 1217 Wichita, Houston.
Murrell, Wynn (see La.) 111 R. Dr., Dallas.
Olivares, Ernest, 223 Florida St., San Antonio.
Salazar, Gregorio, 1110 Boswell, Houston.
Shelton, Sharon, 4736 Augusta, Wichita Falls.
Valasquez, Andrea Gamez, 218 Panuco, Apt. 2, San Antonio.
Velazquez, George Louis, 218 Panuco, Apt. 2, San Antonio, 1220 Buena Vista, San Antonio.

Virginia

Doran, Thomas Lewis, Jr., 214 Rugby Rd., Charlotteville.
Long, Alvin Penrose, 3rd, 508 16th St. N.W., Charlotteville.
Smith, Patricia Ann, Bena, Va., 23018.

Washington

Gottlieb, Barbara Rose (see Conn.) 2423 E. Miller St., Seattle.
Haggerty, Patrica A., 2057 24th E., Seattle.
Ray, Patricia Marie, 4608 51st Ave., Seattle.
Stone, Mary Ellen, 911 29th Ave., Seattle.
Theteford, Lois Catherine (see N.J.) 911 29th Ave., Seattle.

Wisconsin

Calangelo, William Alan, 11138 N. 24th Pl., Milwaukee.
Leyes, Richard A. 2nd., 54 S. Mut St., Jamesville.
Queen, Robert Elliott (see Mass.), 10 E. Dayton St., Madison.
Roland, Dianne Christina, 1246 No. Cass St., Milwaukee.

Smoller, Mary Sue, 405 Eagle Heights, Madison.

Wyoming

Gomez, Joseph (see N.J.), 300 Culbertson, Worland.

Washington, D.C.

Huff, Julie Ann, 2916 18th St.

Read, Robert Prentice, Jr., 4409 Garrison St.

Sigal, Regina Miriam, 1854 Wyoming Ave., N.W.

Sopho, Katherine Alice, 1747 Lanier Pl., N.W.

Steffens, Reidi Sue, 1854 Wyoming Ave., N.W.

FIFTH VENCEREMOS BRIGADE

California

Achziger, Gary M., 1402 18th Street, San Francisco.

Alexandre, Gordon David, 14541 Deervale Place, Sherman Oaks.

Allen, Robert L., 1001 Sunnydale Ave., San Francisco.

Allen, Pamela P., 1001 Sunnydale Ave., San Francisco.

Austin, Kathryn, 114 Lowt Ave., Salinas.

Burnham, Linda L., 1402 18th St., San Francisco.

Casazza, Linda Antoinett, 325 Bridgview Dr., San Francisco.

Castorena, Maria Del Carmen, 1127 B. 9th St., Albany.

Connely, Barbara L., 516 19th St., Costamesa.

De Hoyos, Benigo, 540 No. Sangabriel Ave., Asusas.

Duncan, Patricia Louise, 129 Fraxer Ave., Santa Monica.

Fernandez, Migual Raul, 5817 Dover St., Oakland.

Hernandez, Roberto M., 22758 4th St., Hayward.

Herring, Neil Mendon, 11846 Washington Pl., Mar Vista.

Irving, Richard J., 4901 Oakfield, Santa Ana.

Kameda, Terry Teryo, 565 No. 5th St., San Jose.

Lai, Carol, 4780 Rex Center, Sacramento.

Litt, Paula Kirshbaurn, 11840 Washington Pl., Los Angeles.

Mayfield, Judy L., 605 Clayton St., San Francisco.

Mitchell, Lisa Helen, 2417 Grant St., Berkeley.

Montana, Susan Christine, 13064 Potts Dr., San Jose.

Oxios, Arthuro Roland, 999 56th St., Oakland.

Pickus, Mark Edward, 2545 Dana St., Berkeley.

Richardson, Victoria Stella, 5817 Dover St., Oakland.

Rodriguez, Frank David, 650 No. Jackson, San Jose.

Rollo, Jana Dorcille, 14 S. Madrid, Newbury Park.

Shima, Bukuro Leota C., 3807 Westside Ave., Los Angeles.

Silva, John A., 2520 Hillegass, Berkeley.

Stayshich, Janice M., 541 S. Raitt, Santa Ana.

Talmadge, Robert Lee, Jr., 3522 Pitcaira Way, San Jose.

Tockman, Susan A., 4225 Glenalbyn, Los Angeles.

Uno, Victor K., 2520 Ellsworth St., Berkeley.

Weinberg, Barry S., 210 W. 3rd St., Santa Ana.

Colorado

Adams, Brian Ross, 1607 Race St., Denver.

Gensler, Elin Jane, 1607 Race St., Denver.

Lemmo, John R., 1073 13th St., Boulder.

Lucero, Mitchael P., 4270 Stuart St., Denver.

Lucero, Robert C., 4270 Stuart St., Denver.

Luevano, Angelica, 725 Main St., Ft. Lufton.

McCane, Larry Leroy, 309 E. Warsatch, Colorado Springs.

Mayfield, Ernest Eugene, 3539 Race St., Denver.

Connecticut

Ruiz-Soto, Carlos E., 994 Broad St., Hartford.

District of Columbia

Jackson, Zachary M., 37 Brian St., N.W., Washington.

Knapp, Douglas A., 3156 18th St., N.W., Washington.

Florida

Goodman, Dianne E., 503 S. Copeland, Tallahassee.

Mastarka, Edward T., 503 S. Copeland, Tallahassee.

Georgia

Demmings, Eddie M., Jr., Atlanta.

Finley, Juanita Vaughn, 2591 Etheridge Dr., Atlanta.

Singh, George, Albany.

Illinois

Burke, Christopher Raymond, 212 E. Stoughton St., Champaign.

Foy, Florizella, 4603 W. Monroe, Chicago.

Goldman, Lawrence A., R.R. No. 2, Middleton Dr., Long Grove.

Neuman, Douglas A., 212 E. Stoughton St., Champaign.

Santiago, David, 2425 No. California, Chicago.

Kansas

Martin, Jane Ellen, 1219 Kentucky St., Lawrence.

Louisiana

Crews, Dwight Douglas, 637 Vermillion Blvd., New Orleans.

Fernandez, Dolores Agnes, 820 Belle Castle, New Orleans.

Massachusetts

Averbach, John Michael, 976 Main St., Worcester.

Butler, Majorie, 148 Morrison Ave., Somerville.

Driscoll, Sara Perkins, 10 Woodside Ave., Jamaica Plain.

Flores, Heriberto, 514 Chestnut St., Springfield.

Kurtz, Alan, Box 288, Belchertown.

Maguire, Laurence Paul, 14 Bloomfield St., Dorchester.

Maycock, Peter Paul, 273 Converse St., Longmeadow.

Rasmussen, Charles Ross, 16–12 Cambridge St., Cambridge.

Stolongo, Gilverto, 54 W. Court St., Holyoke.

Sotolongo, Maria Ester, 54 W. Court St., Holyoke.

Reid, Gail Ann, Danville.

Michigan

Bridge, Karl Stephen, 410 Oxford Rd., E. Lansing.

Dennis, Ellen Jane, 4325 Buena Vista, Detroit.

Fry, Patricia Louise, 286 Ashland, Detroit.

Heaphy, James Cullen, 18345 Fremont, Livonia.

O'Leary, Mary Patricia, 1803 Canterbury, Dearborn.

Otter, Leslie Sue, 2190 Chalmers, Detroit.

Pavlik, Karen Ann, 38435 Mason, Livonia.

Smith, Wendy, 19178 Collinson, East Detroit.

Missouri

Knapp, Jane Duggan, 915 W. 7th St., Kansas City.

Knuti, Barbara J., 2725 Listel St., Kansas City.

Maine

King, Deborah Ann, 32 Williams Ave., Kittery, Maine.

New Hampshire

Kelley, Gerald Joseph, 6 Rumford St., Concord.

Pettiford, James Warren, 117 Rockville Ave., Portsmouth.

Polonsky, Richard Brian, S. Newington Road, Newington.

New Jersey

Bailey, Willie Jr., 155 Throckmorton St., Freehold.

Benitez, Antonio, 87 Jefferson St., Hoboken.

Herzon, Melanie Enid, 801 Elizabeth Ave., Newark.

Santiago, Sanchez Leopollo, 182 Brookdale Ave., Newark.

Vanlanti, Lisa E., 555 Ivy Ave., Haworth.

Velanguez, Victor, 409 1st St., Hoboken.

Webster, Winnie Wanda, 7 Sunnfield Terrace, Neptune.

New York

Aviles, Pedro L., 370 Bushwick ave., Brooklyn.

Bellett, Kenneth James, 258 Columbus Ave., Buffalo.

Catalinotoo, Ellen, 326 Lincoln Place, Brooklyn.

Cohen, Leonard, 858 Prescott St., Valley Stream.

Cruz, Leonardo, 105 West 55th St., New York.

Diaz, Elsa, 124 111 St., Manhattan.

Frank, Barry R., 4737 215 St., Bayside.

Knapp, Frederick I., 119 Bank St., New York City.

Lewis, Veronica A., 238 E. 6th St., New York City.

Ojeda, Robert, 1337 Pophan Ave., Bronx.

Rodriguez, Jose E., 238 West Ave., Buffalo.

Sparonese, Ann Carol, 17 Oxford Ave., Buffalo.

Torres, Felcianao, 328 2nd St., Brooklyn.

Weinberg, Gloria, 235 Barret Road, Lawrence.

Wool, Julius A., 47–24 15 St., Bayside.

Zarba, Joseph A., 446 W. 25th St., New York City.

North Carolina

Blakewood II, Benjamin Franklin, 3707 Rockingham, Greensboro.

Scott, Sara M., 1014 West Rowan Street, Fayetteville.

Valsits, George M., 1074 Brenda Dr., Fayetteville.

Vlasits, Rudolf M., 184 G Howard Dr., Bergenfield.

Ohio

Francis, Steven Paul, 3168 W. 50th Street, Cleveland.

Robinson, Debra Elizabeth, 901 S. Wittenberg, Springfield.

Stoll, Russ Elwood, 316 Phillips St., Yellow Springs.

Pennsylvania

Blalock, David G., Rd. #3, Bov, 294, Johnstown.

Charlton, Sanda J., 3506 W. Pwelton Ave., Philadelphia.

Cubas, Rosemary J., 3710 Spring Garden St., Philadelphia.

Seawright, Rosa L., 5313 Pine St., Philadelphia.

Whitehorne, Rose M., 3624 Baring St., Philadelphia.

Rhode Island

Gomes, Vernon Jr., 229 Calla St., Providence.

Texas

Birdwell, Yolanda, 6619 Rutgers, Houston.

Brieno, Sonia M., 406 Alta Sita, San Antonio.

Carter, Michael Anthony, 3109 Grandview, Austin.

Lerma, David, 703 Archer, Houston.

Naranjo, Elinda Erebia, 1521 Hughes No. 1, Houston.

Naranjo, Jesus Umberto, 1521 Hughes No. 1, Houston.

Pearcy, John Carroll, 3109 Grandview, Austin.

Phillips, Tina Lee, 4834 San Jacinto, Houston.

Robinson, Michael Lynn, 3622 Grider, Killeen.

Toyama, Richard Shrinkichi, 6619 Rutgers, Houston.

Virginia

Mathiowetz, Dianne M., 508 16th St., Charlottesville.

Moore, Melvin G., 508 W. 16th St., Charlottesville.

Washington

Day, Donald M., 3966 E. Pine St., Seattle.

Rosen, Jerome George, 4065 4th Ave., Seattle.

Thompson, Sanford R., 525 16th Ave., Seattle.

Wisconsin

Bentley, Sara Sue, 719 E. Johnson, Madison.

Berg, Edward Elling, 1323 E. Dalton, Madison.

Clague, David Charles, 274 Hazel Lane, Hartland.

Heitzer, Arthur, 8011 W. North Ave., Milwaukee.

Kaminash, Benjamin Harris, 108 E. Dayton St., Madison.

SENATOR KARL MUNDT

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, for many years I served with KARL MUNDT both in the House and the Senate. I have never known an abler or more articulate statesman. His was a happy combination of outstanding ability coupled with a most attractive personality. He was a fluent and at times dynamic speaker, but always to the point and never lengthy or repetitive.

I particularly recall one occasion in which he accepted my invitation to speak in New Hampshire at an important statewide gathering. During the years many Senators have come to our State, invited by the late Senator Styles Bridges and, since his passing, by me, some of them outstanding national figures. In my opinion, KARL MUNDT made the ablest and most penetrating presentation of them all.

The sudden illness that struck him down was one of those strange tragedies that we find hard to understand or accept. The loss of this experienced, seasoned, competent Member during a particularly crucial period in our history was irreparable. It taught every one of us that there are tragedies even worse than death.

Our sympathy goes out to his devoted wife who has had to live through this terrible experience and to his State and Nation that have been deprived of his invaluable services.

TRIBUTE TO WAYNE ASPINALL

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, with the closing of the 92d Congress, Congressman WAYNE N. ASPINALL of Colorado, chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will end his outstanding career of nearly 24 years of service to the people of his district and the Nation in the Congress of the United States.

I served with WAYNE ASPINALL in the House of Representatives before coming to the Senate and have worked with him over the years on Interior Committee legislation. Both of us have had the honor of chairing the Interior Committees in the House and Senate. In that capacity we have worked together closely during the past several years on important legislation related to the Nation's natural resources. Thus I have had an opportunity to observe at first hand the qualities that characterize this distinguished Member of Congress.

I have always found Congressman ASPINALL to be very reasonable, cooperative, and constructive. He is extremely knewledgeable in the field of legislation which comes under the jurisdiction of the Interior Committee. WAYNE ASPINALL is very diligent and faithful to his duties and a man of high integrity. He was a tough bargainer and most dedicated to his point of view. But he combined these qualities with fairness and consideration of the other fellow's point of view. The record of achievement in national parks, wilderness, recreation, and resource conservation legislation over the past dozen years attests to the progressive leadership in this area by Mr. ASPINALL and our other colleagues working with us on the two committees.

Congressman ASPINALL will be missed very much, not only by his colleagues in the House but also by those of us in the Senate who had the privilege of working with him.

VETERANS' EDUCATION

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, this past May it was my privilege to serve as honorary cochairman of a Conference on Education and the Returning Vietnam Veteran which was sponsored by the American Veterans Committee. The conference was quite helpful in bringing together a number of people to discuss the problems which face our returning veterans. Recently June A. Willenz, the executive director of the American Veterans Committee, published an article entitled "The Returning Vietnam Veterans: The Challenge to the Nation's Conscience." I believe my colleagues will find this article of interest, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered inserted in the RECORD as follows:

THE RETURNNG VIETNAM VETERANS: A CHALLENGE TO THE NATION'S CONSCIENCE

(By June A. Willenz)

The Vietnam War is generally considered the most unpopular war in American history, one which has strained the basic fibers of the body politic and polarized the nation. No other war has been brought so close to the American home through the news media and the television camera; yet, ironically, no other war has been so remote from the daily lives of the citizenry.

Perhaps no other war has produced the phenomenon of a country blotting from its consciousness the men it sent to distant battlefields. Only sporadically does society wrestle with its conscience and pay attention to those who have survived and returned to "the world."

Veterans returning from Vietnam are different from veterans of previous wars and they are returning to a different society, under different conditions. As of November, 1971, five and a half million had returned and many more will be returning. Over 300,000 have suffered injury and disease—many would have died on the battlefields except for the miracles of military medicine.

A number of complex factors determine the particularly difficult situation the Vietnam veterans face, factors which contribute to their alienation not only from other generations, but from their own generation. Included in these factors is how they entered military service.

The draft law and its antiquated administration caught a much narrower segment of society in this war than in World War II. The educational and occupational deferments favored the middle-class, college youth and discriminated against those from less advantaged backgrounds. The President's Committee on the Vietnam Veteran reported in 1970 that 22% of these veterans did not have a high school diploma. Furthermore, qualification tests showed that 30% of the high school graduates scored as poorly or worse than those without high school diplomas. A significant proportion of these veterans require additional education and training before entering any demanding post-graduate training or educational program.

Those without high school diplomas or with poor test scores have much less opportunity in military service to acquire skills applicable to civilian jobs. These are the men of the combat infantry units with marksmanship the only additional skill. These men suffer an unemployment rate considerably higher than that of other veterans, and those who most needed further schooling pursue it least. The stark reality facing society is that "participation in the G.I. Bill training is inverse to need."

A major factor in the difficult readjustment process is the indifference, even hostility, of a society weary of the war, a society identifying those who fought in the war with the war itself. Many veterans feel uncomfortable with members of their own generation, particularly those on campuses where there are many activists in "anti-war" protests. Often they do not wish to be identified as veterans, and some group in "veterans clubs," setting themselves apart from the rest of the student body. Furthermore, many citizens believe reports of high drug usage among the military and assume that all veterans have a "drug problem."

While veterans of previous wars had their problems in the transition period from military life to civilian pursuits, the testimony of many psychiatrists and social scientists indicates that this group of veterans is suffering particular difficulties. The veterans indicate that in coming back home there is a real trauma, little appreciated by official agencies like the Veterans Administration (VA), or by the private sector, including the families as well as prospective employers. The lack of support from society has intensified the sense of isolation. The veterans have recognized the serious re-entry problem and have urged that "half-way houses" or communities be set up to serve as a kind of decompression chamber. (The abruptness of the return, sometimes still in battle fatigues, contributes to the shock.) Those who made the re-entry successfully, without help, re-

port it was nevertheless a painful and discouraging process, one requiring support from fellow veterans.

What is ironic is the official report from Department of Defense psychiatrists that the rate of psychiatric casualties has been much less during the Vietnam War than in either of the two previous ones. The lower reported casualty rates are due perhaps to earlier treatment by general medical officers as well as differing attitudes and diagnostic techniques. Another observation is that many so-called psychiatric casualties never get into medical hands: administrative or disciplinary casualties and those removed from their units for behavioral problems.

Besides the psychological and social adjustments on return to the family and civilian society, a significant number of veterans have a drug problem most often picked up in service; some have been severely handicapped while in service; others suffer the more subtle handicap of a less-than-honorable discharge.

EDUCATION

According to November, 1971, Veterans Administration figures, 1,884,304 Vietnam-era veterans entered some kind of training under the present G.I. Bill—i.e., out of 5,524,000 eligible, about 20% participate in the educational benefits. On the other hand, about 50% of the 7.8 million World War II veterans did so, with an imprint on society evident in human resources and in economic gains.

One major reason why few Vietnam veterans take advantage of the G.I. Bill is because its inadequate financial allowances make a supplementary income necessary. The Veterans Administration claims that the increased cost of living since World War II has been taken into account. Overlooked is the fact that educational costs have more than tripled. World War II educational benefits are an estimated 43% higher than Vietnam rates. Under the present system a single veteran gets $175 a month to meet educational and living expenses. This arrangement has channeled veterans into low-tuition schools, a source of discontent. World War II's G.I. Bill opened up Harvard, Yale, and similar institutions to veterans.

The American Veterans Committee (AVC), traditionally concerned with the readjustment process and successful re-entry of veterans into civilian society, disturbed by the relatively low utilization of the present G. I. Bill, convened a major national conference in May, 1972. Some of the facts and proposals from the Conference follow. (A complete Report is to be issued in November, 1972.)

In addition to facts already stated, the veterans have to overcome their own negative attitudes towards school, as well as fears of failure and inadequacy. They are severely handicapped by these problems.

Veterans seeking further education often have problems with admissions and accreditations. Many schools, such as community colleges, have open admission policies; others do not. Admissions offices do not always recognize either service learnings or the relationship of maturity to learning. Many veterans feel that their experiences in the military provide as important a background to further schooling as formal credit courses. A great deal more needs to be done in recognizing not only these learnings, but other life experiences that mold an individual.

Contributing to their difficulties are age and the maturing nature of military service. Veterans reported feeling "alienated" or out of place on college campuses. Many already have families, and the inadequate allowances of the G. I. Bill necessitate a job. For those who had difficulties in school before they went into service, "keeping-up" is a major task. The time and energy invested in a job add to the intensity of the problem.

Another irritant is dealing with the bureaucracy, whether the VA, other federal agencies, or educational institutions. Veterans seek a more personal setup for counseling and advice and assistance in housing, personal, financial, and domestic problems. Their questioning attitude toward authority also means that they are far less tolerant of the formal procedures concomitant with traditional education.

Furthermore, except for certain isolated veterans' programs, colleges have tended to ignore the Vietnam veteran. The AVC Conference recommended a wider choice of educational institutions, with greater financial benefits and programs and curricula that would attract the Vietnam veteran. Also special programs should be set up allowing the veterans to make up the educational gaps *without* using up the G. I. benefits.

Since minority and disadvantaged veterans form a large proportion with educational handicaps, new and imaginative programs are needed to overcome their difficulties. With several strikes against him, the veteran must have the feeling that what he is doing will be personally satisfying and worthwhile. It is doubly hard for the Black who must feel that he is not being patronized.

An inequity in the present G. I. Bill concerns the treatment of students pursuing vocational or technical post-secondary education. They have a 25 clock hour requirement instead of the 12 credit hour requirement for full time college work and are limited to one change in their educational objective. They may not take liberal arts or elective courses not immediately germane to their occupational goal. A significant number is suffering from these discriminatory clauses of the G. I. Bill.

HANDICAPPED VETERANS

The VA estimates that 10% of those who suffered injuries are 80–100% disabled. The problems they share with their fellow veterans are compounded by this handicap. It is clear that the ambiguous position of the Vietnam veteran in society is more complex for the severely disabled veteran because the worthiness of the cause for which he gave so much has been questioned.

A great problem facing the disabled is employment. Those who were more exposed to combat came from the sector of society with the fewest skills and the lowest educational attainment. These are the men who relied on physical strength in their occupational roles in civilian life and are doubly handicapped when they seek to enter the job market. For minority disabled veterans, offered little opportunity when whole, the problems which must be faced are further complicated.

DISCHARGE PROBLEMS

While not suffering the devastating effect of physical or mental injury, the men and women who receive less-than-honorable discharges are handicapped in their attempt to resume their places in society. Most of them have not committed serious crimes, but got into trouble, often as a consequence of using alcohol or drugs, or both. Others suffered discriminatory treatment, went AWOL at a time of stress, or went berserk marking time the last few months after a combat tour in Vietnam. Also there are those who for mental or psychological reasons should not have been inducted in the first place. Often under 20 years old, their chief character defect was immaturity. Many waived their rights, or did not know their rights and accepted an administrative discharge to get out fast or to avoid the greater threat of a court-martial.

A former Judge Advocate has remarked "the administrative discharge system allows the government to stigmatize a discharge carrying all the legal ramifications of a court-martial sentence, without providing him with the protection of due process of law . . . It is entirely possible for a young man of 18 years, with no prior record of involvement with school, juvenile or police authorities, to be discharged from the military against his wishes, with an undesirable discharge under other than honorable conditions, based solely on the unsworn statement of a confessed drug pusher who is not present at the hearing."

At the moment when the serviceman is in trouble, the consequences of such a discharge do not occur to him, nor is it always pointed out. After leaving service, these veterans are barred from veterans benefits including hospital and medical care, and training and educational programs. AVC's Legal Aid Program and other organizations assisting veterans have learned of case after case of veterans functionally handicapped by the nature of their discharge.

For the period June, 1970–June, 1971, the Navy awarded 88,408 discharges: 18% for General, Undesirable, Bad Conduct, and Dishonorable. In 1968, only 14% fell into these categories. The combined services in 1970 have 39,334 Administrative Discharges for "unfitness" or "unsuitability" whereas 3,542 were given for Misconduct. Some of the Administrative Discharges were honorable but were coded in such a way as to carry a stigma which prejudices chances of employment. The statistics for administrative discharges do not reveal how many honorable discharges were given for unfitness and unsuitability.

Official figures for the first half of 1971 show that 93.8% of the 517,194 discharges were honorable, while 6.2% were less-than-honorable. It is not known how many of the honorable discharges carry the coding stigma, nor how many were for volunteers or draftees. From the numbers of veterans who come to the AVC and for other reports, it would seem that the problem is significantly greater than is acknowledged by the Department of Defense.

DRUGS

No discussion of the returning Vietnam veteran can ignore the problem of drug usage and abuse in the military services. Colonel Stewart Baker, Department of the Army, has reported that in the spring of 1970, a sudden increase in the supply of easily available heroin in Vietnam heralded a drug problem which continues as the number one health problem for Army personnel in Vietnam. He also reported an increase in the number of deaths brought on by drug overdose and drug related causes.

The armed forces announced in December, 1970, a drug "amnesty" program, which "guaranteed" freedom from legal jeopardy for those who requested medical help and committed major resources to identification and rehabilitation of drug abusers in the Service. A test used in the new program to detect heroin in the urine revealed in September, 1971, that 5.2% of the 92,096 men tested showed a positive reaction.

There is a wide divergence of opinion as to how many men have actually become addicted to hard drugs while in military service, particularly in Vietnam. Reports from Europe indicate that drug traffic and usage there have also taken an upward turn. Some veterans who saw action and are ex-addicts have said that half to three-quarters of their units were on hard drugs during combat periods—including officers.

At Congressional hearings, the former chief of Stanford Psychiatric Services at the Palo Alto VA Hospital, Dr. George Solomon, maintained that heroin addiction was part of the broader problem of psychiatric casualties in Vietnam and that the low rate of such casualties cited by the Department of Defense was misleading. He indicated that very few of these casualties ever came to psychiatric or medical attention in Vietnam; most came to VA Hospitals through police. Over half of 50 random psychiatric admissions of Vietnam veterans to Palo Alto had a drug abuse problem. He suggested that heroin was being used as a tranquillizer by people with emotional problems. Other mili-

tary psychiatrists corroborate the seriousness of drug abuse in the Services.

The new policies of involuntary testing and detoxification when heroin usage is detected have not been evaluated. The volunteer "amnesty" program failed because drug users feared prosecution. Veterans have received other-than-honorable discharges even though they voluntarily turned themselves in for drug usage, and such veterans are ineligible for medical treatment at VA hospitals except on an emergency basis.

The Department of Defense officially encourages veterans to seek changes of their discharges if drugs are involved, but the burden is on the veteran to make formal application.

Veterans are reluctant to turn to the VA for help and have requested half-way houses with ex-addicts having a prominent role. Some medical authorities see them as a more effective way of approaching the addiction problem.

At a hearing on his veterans' bill, Senator Cranston charged that the VA is only scratching the surface. He estimates that there are at least 100,000 veteran addicts, and the VA's 42 special centers are treating only 5,600; that at least 60 such centers are needed. The Senator urged that the VA offer various programs, not just methadone, with more veteran ex-addict counsellors and more realistic acceptance regulations. Also, comprehensive follow-up rehabilitation services should be provided and could be provided under contract with outside agencies. (AVC testified to this at the June, 1971, hearings.)

It is both tragic and ironic that veterans who picked up the habit while in service, often in combat, are denied medical assistance from the government which placed them in these situations.

EMPLOYMENT

The question of employment ranks high among Vietnam veterans' concerns. For many it is the key focal point of their return to civilian life. During periods of high unemployment, veterans' unemployment rate is always a few points higher than that of the general population. Bureau of Labor statistics confirm this. Age, race, and type of service are all negative factors in veterans' chances at jobs. In the second quarter of 1971, the unemployment rate for veterans 20–24 years of age was 12.4%; all veterans, age 20–29, averaged 8.5%. Rates for nonwhite minorities were considerably higher, particularly in the younger age brackets. Other figures cited ranged from 20% to 30% for veterans' unemployment. It was reported in 1972 that veteran unemployment also persists longer. About 24% have been job seekers for 15 weeks or more, compared with 16% in 1971.

Nor is it certain that all veterans are being measured in statistics on employment. If they do not attempt to get unemployment benefits or contact government agencies for assistance, they are not counted.

Again, in job placement, veterans fare worse than non-veterans; only 13% of the veterans who applied at employment service offices last year received placement in any kind of job.

Society's ambiguous attitudes towards the veterans have made their employment prospects dimmer. Many employers are leary of hiring Vietnam veterans because of the publicity on the drug problem; a result of such incidents as My Lai has been a tendency to view all veterans as irresponsible killers. The veterans find their military skills are not transferable to civilian jobs. This is especially true for the infantry veterans who had no skills and little education to begin with. They don't have any hope in a tight job market.

It seems inconceivable that the most powerful nation in the world will not come to grips with the potentially explosive situation of large numbers of demobilized troops who are neither employed nor in school.

In 1970, the President indicated an all-out national effort under way to help veterans and he set up a "Jobs for Veterans" Committee "in a massive effort to find suitable employment opportunities for the more than one million men and women completing military service each year." No statistics are available on the accomplishments of the campaign.

Job Fairs and Job Opportunity Fairs for veterans have been sponsored by the VA, and/or the Department of Labor, often with the co-sponsorship of community organizations. The overall record of accomplishment is poor.

The Department of Defense, some years ago, initiated "Project Transition" to give servicemen, during the last few months of their tour, opportunities to acquire skills and technical training directly applicable to jobs. A number of manufacturers and businesses cooperated with the Department. The program depended on the cooperation of the commanding officers of the installations in encouraging their men and working with Project Transition officers. Since no strong directive ever came from the Military Departments giving the project high priority, real cooperation was not forthcoming, nor did the business sector push its resources. (There have been some isolated success stories.) In a recent survey of 80 firms asked about the project, 58 had never heard of it. The Department of Defense's efforts are the only noticeable efforts made toward improving the employability of veterans. Without cooperation and active support from all areas and levels of government, and from the businesses of the United States, the gestures of any single agency are meaningless.

CONCLUSION

Although legislation designed to assist Vietnam veterans has been enacted in the last two years, and agencies like the Veterans Administration and the Office of Education have initiated new programs recently, the veterans still feel cheated and have called for parity of benefits with those of World War II. They want increased allowances, advance payment, loan programs, work-study arrangements, outreach and counseling services, and additional innovative education measures. They want to be consulted in the formation and design of relevant programs, and to be involved in the delivery of services.

There seems to be a trend away from joining traditional veteran organizations. This could be a wish not to be identified as veterans, as well as with the feeling that these organizations are remote from their interests and perceptions. Veterans clubs have appeared on many campuses, and some have affiliated with the National Association of Collegiate Veterans which is concerned with promoting more adequate benefits for veterans in school. The other organization which came out of this war, the Vietnam Veterans Against the War, has one major objective—ending the war. Both groups have been essentially one-issue oriented. What their future is, once the issue is resolved, cannot be predicted.

Government programs and institutions supposedly serving the veterans have been the chief target of the veterans' bitterness. From the findings of the 1972 AVC Conference and from the viewpoints expressed by veterans in other conferences and hearings, a large number of the Vietnam veterans are eager to take part in the established educational and employment institutions, and are anxious for realistic opportunities to do so. They are looking for more choices, more diversity, a minimum of bureaucratic tangles; for a strong sense of personal worth and identity. Among those veterans not being reached by existing programs, many may find more comfortable and convenient nontraditional frameworks of education and training. More flexible ways of carrying out the education process should be available; new programs, either legislative or private, should be encouraged to stimulate diversity and innovation. Some veterans have called for a similar plurality of options and direction in the occupational world.

Important questions must concern the nation if the Vietnam veterans are not to be another "problem" group within our society, a generation of "wasted men."

Although the unique configuration of circumstances has created a "new veteran" different in many respects from his predecessor, both the Vietnam veteran and society are at the same crossroads that characterized the return of the citizen-soldier at other times in history.

SENATOR B. EVERETT JORDAN

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, who has served this body with honor and distinction and is now ending a long and distinguished career of public service with the expiration of the 92d Congress.

Senator JORDAN has served the people of North Carolina and his Nation very well. He has been an aggressive and effective advocate of programs of immense benefit to this country. As a member of the Public Works and Agriculture and Forestry Committees, Senator JORDAN has been responsible for the development of legislation which has proven effective in dealing with the needs of this Nation.

Hard work, a sense of humor, and a dedication to his duties mark Senator JORDAN's public career. His decisions were arrived at only after thoroughly exploring the issues.

As chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, Senator JORDAN operated with a wisdom which contributed greatly to the effective operation of the Senate, and this, in turn, aided this body in being more responsive to the needs of this country.

It is with regret that I view the conclusion of EVERETT JORDAN's career. However, I want to wish him the best in future years.

CO-OP CITY GROUP RESPONDS TO ENVIRONMENTAL CHALLENGE

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the task of cleaning up and preserving our environment is going to require, in addition to sound Federal programs, the individual attention and cooperation of every American citizen in every community in this land. A group of citizens in the Bronx, organized as the Environment Action Committee—EAC—of Co-op City, are doing a particularly energetic and excellent job of stimulating local interest and action to protect and preserve the

environment. Their local program could well serve as a model for other local groups, and I take pride in commending all the members and leaders of the EAC and I submit for the record a report of this organization's recent activities by Mr. Harry Hertzberg:

EAC LOOKS AT PROGRESS

(By Harry Hertzberg)

The Environment Action Committee of Co-op City celebrated its second birthday on April 30th, and looked ahead to many more years of progress and service to the Co-op City community. It is more than appropriate at this time to inform you of the actions and accomplishments of your EAC.

The Environment Action Committee is composed of four major subcommittees and many temporary Ad Hoc subcommittees. The permanent standing subcommittees are: Noise, Solid Waste, Arts Projects, and Fund Raising. At this time, the Ad Hoc subcommittees are: Pelham Bay Dump, Nuclear Power, and Consumerism.

The Noise Pollution subcommittee has been chaired for the past year by Ira Pers who has done a tremendous job. Mr. Pers has just been elected cochairman of the EAC, and has been replaced by Ms. Alyse Weitz, a capable and dedicated environmentalist. The problem of tugboat noise on the Hutchinson River has plagued many cooperators in buildings facing the waterfront. Correspondence has been extensive with the U.S. Coast Guard, and with Congressman's Biaggi's office, which have both been working on this problem. We have received word that there are many avenues by which we may approach this problem. Installing two-way radio equipment in every boat and on every bridge; limiting the number of "tools" that any vessel may give; limiting night use of the bridge and re-routing the sea traffic away from this bridge have been suggested. A feasible solution should be forthcoming very shortly.

The problem of noise from the New England Thruway has still not been resolved. The only realistic solution to this problem is that trees be planted along the Thruway. Trees produce a sound-muffling effect, and thus, the sound would be absorbed and not heard in the apartments. The next problem in the area of noise is that of sound trucks, especially political sound trucks. For the recent primary campaign, the EAC issued an order that no sound trucks be allowed in Co-op City. This resolution was followed in good faith by most of the politicians campaigning for office, and there was only one serious offender who showed his contempt for the environment by blasting his sound truck all day in Co-op City on several occasions. Otherwise, we were pretty effective in keeping out the noise.

The Solid Waste subcommittee has been the EAC's busiest one. This subcommittee was engaged in an can-recycling program for the most part of 1970 and 1971. The response of the cooperators was so enormous that we soon found ourselves overloaded with cans. We had a great deal of trouble securing adequate pick-up accommodations for this program, and regrettably, we had to stop this program last summer. We are now working on some ideas to revive this program, and will pass along information as soon as possible.

This subcommittee was also involved in the recent primary election, in trying to remove the posters and leaflets that all the candidates paste up and hand out. We were responsible for the removal of over 1,000 campaign posters from the lamposts of Co-op City, and also did a most successful job in getting most of the candidates to clean up any of their literature that was dropped on Co-op City property. The Solid Waste Subcommittee has been chaired by Kenneth Newman for the past year, and Ken has done remarkable work in handling one of the toughest environmental jobs in this community.

The Arts Projects subcommittee of the EAC is headed by Mrs. Environmentalist herself, Arline Greene. Arline has been the creative mind behind the two EAC Ecology Fairs. Arline has also given much prominence to Co-op City by setting up an EAC exhibit in last year's Bronx Day celebration. Mrs. Greene's most recent project has been the signs that you might see on the cash registers of the Co-op Supermarket. These signs tell all consumers to reuse their paper bags, as it so eloquently says: 'You can't plant a bag and grow a tree!"

The Fund Raising subcommittee is chaired by Keven Pecker, treasurer of the EAC. Keven has run many low-keyed fund-raising efforts, which includes our ongoing membership drive. Membership in the EAC is just $2 per person per year, and the EAC desperately needs this money for printing, mailing, and subcommittee expenses. Since all EAC work is voluntary, the dues go directly into helping the environment.

The Pelham Bay Dump Ad Hoc subcommittee is doing much work in hopes of ending the horrible conditions there. We are backed up in our efforts by a number of other major community groups. We have had a mass petitioning campaign, and we now have over 3,500 signatures. We have enlisted the aid of Assemblyman Hochberg, Congressmen Scheuer and Bingham, Councilman Ryan, and have received assurances that these persons will help us in any action we take against the dump. As soon as we have arrived at our final course of action, a special meeting will be held in Section 5 for the information of the residents who are plagued by the dump.

The Nuclear Power subcommittee has been working very closely with the CLEAN group in New Rochelle, which opposes the creation of a Nuclear power plant on David's Island which is only two miles from Co-op City. EAC chairman Hertzberg has testified at New Rochelle City Council hearings, and last word from Con Ed is that they are not planning to build on that site for some time now, which we believe, can be attributed to all the community opposition they have run into.

The EAC also set a precedent by running a slate of candidates for office on the Consumer Society Board of Directors. Since environment and consumerism go hand-in-hand, the EAC felt that we should have a positive input on the Board of the Society. The nod was given to Joseph Kahane, Arline Greene, Essie Morris, and Art Plutzer. It was heartening to see that the cooperators do care about the environment, and swept our slate into office. Greene, Kahane, and Plutzer are serving three-year terms, while Morris is serving a one-year term. Now all environmentalists in the community can take heart, knowing that there are people fighting for you in the area of consumerism.

Much credit also goes to Harvey Silverman, EAC co-chairman, and one of the founders of the committee, for his devoted work to the organization. Harvey has been a driving force on the EAC, and is indispensable to the workings of this committee.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. ELAINE EDWARDS

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to pay special tribute to a colleague who, although with us for too brief a period of time, gained the admiration and respect of us all. I am speaking of Mrs. ELAINE EDWARDS of Louisiana.

Mrs. EDWARDS came to this body as a result of a tragedy—the death of our beloved friend and colleague, Senator Allen Ellender. It would have been easy for Mrs. EDWARDS to merely assume the role of finishing out the term of Senator Ellender, who was up for reelection this year. Nobody would have faulted her if she had chosen to do so. However, Mrs. EDWARDS accepted her appointment in a very serious manner. She worked hard and diligently for her Louisiana constituency. She learned the ropes very quickly.

I am sure my colleagues agree with me when I say that Mrs. EDWARDS was very conscientious in her temporary duties in the Nation's Capitol. We were very fortunate to be associated with Mrs. EDWARDS and I know that many of us regret that she will not be serving with us, at least not in the near future.

She briefly stepped into the shoes of a man whose career was marked by dedication, hard work, and outstanding public service to his State and Nation. Mrs. EDWARDS carried on in the tradition of Senator Ellender. She will be missed when the 93d Congress convenes in January.

BUSINESS FRAUD AND EMBEZZLEMENT SEMINAR

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, every Senator and Representative is aware of the efforts that the Congress exerts to control and reduce business losses from crime. In doing this, our concern is not just for business, but for the good of society as a whole.

All of us condemn the airplane hijacker, the robber, the burglar, or the vandal. But there is another kind of offender, often of the white-collar variety, who does not get as much attention as he deserves. This criminal commits fraud or embezzlement. This criminality is particularly objectionable to moral sensibilities because the offender operates with intelligence and often from a position of trust. Generally, he does not need to be dishonest in the sense of wanting food or money to live.

When Gulliver was traveling through the land of the Lilliputians, he found that fraud was a greater crime than theft there. In Swift's novel, theft was seldom punished by death since "care and vigilance, with a very common understanding, may preserve a man's goods from theft, but honesty has no defense against superior cunning."

Fraud and embezzlement are tough categories of crime to deal with, and because of this the leadership of private industry, institutions, and the government is tending to overlook the need for

safeguards in this area to a large extent. The business that takes elaborate precautions against the loss of merchandise, for example, may fail to assure itself that it does not routinely pay false invoices generated by a dishonest supplier and approved for payment by a collusive employee.

The fact is that some industries must bear losses from fraud and embezzlement that are several times higher than losses from "ordinary crime," that is, robbery, burglary, shoplifting, and vandalism. There is, furthermore, a direct impact on the community. Bankrupt businesses and failed banks create unemployment, additional costs for government, burden for insurance carriers and underwriters all of which erode public trust in private enterprises, institutions, and government.

To date there is no book or training session to educate management on the ways fraud and embezzlement are practiced most effectively these days. That is why my colleagues will be interested to know of an unprecedented seminar to be held this January 15 and 16 at New York City's Plaza Hotel, the "First International Seminar for the Detection and Prevention of Fraud and Embezzlement."

The seminar plans to bring together for the first time administrative managers plus representatives from psychiatry, insurance, management and psychiatry consulting, and government to focus on the controls needed now and in the future by commerce and industry to minimize these types of loss. The seminar is sponsored by Security Letter, 475 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. I believe sessions of this type help to focus interest on a problem apparently becoming increasingly difficult in our business world.

HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE SUMMARY

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, during the 92d Congress, meetings of the House Republican policy committee provided an opportunity for thorough discussion of pending legislation by a broad-based representation of the House Republican membership. Policy statements adopted by the committee have played an important role in converging Republican support of sound legislation and in fostering the broadest possible public understanding of Republican legislative postures.

In the 92d Congress, 23 meetings of the committee were held; 20 policy statements were adopted. In the 19 instances in which floor action reflected Republican response to policy committee recommendations, 83 percent of the Republican Members voted in agreement.

Present members of the policy committee are as follows:

LIST OF HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

John J. Rhodes, Chairman; Gerald R. Ford, Leslie C. Arends, John B. Anderson, Samuel L. Devine, Jack Edwards, Barber B. Conable, Jr., Bob Wilson, H. Allen Smith.

Charles M. Teague, Page Belcher, James Harvey, James T. Broyhill, John Kyl, Delbert L. Latta, Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, Marvin L. Esch, John T. Myers.

J. Kenneth Robinson, Hamilton Fish, Jr., John W. Byrnes, William L. Springer, Albert W. Johnson, Thomas M. Pelly, James R. Grover, Jr., Robert Price, J. William Stanton, Alexander Pirnie.

Four Members, ROBERT J. CORBETT, ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Richard H. Poff, and HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI served for a portion of the 92d Congress.

Summaries of the House Republican policy committee statements and Republican floor votes in support of committee recommendations are as follows:

HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENTS AND FLOOR VOTES, 92D CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

I. Supported the passage of H.R. 6531, Amending the Military Selective Service Act of 1967.

Extended the draft for two years, increased military pay, dropped student deferments and authorized military active duty strengths for fiscal years 1972 and 73.

Passed: April 1, 1971.

Republican Vote: Yeas, 147; Nays, 15.

Percentage: 91%.

II. Opposed the passage of H.R. 3613, the Emergency Employment Act of 1971, and urged the adoption of the Esch Amendment.

Substituted an Administration-supported manpower revenue-sharing program providing $500 million upon enactment (for fiscal 1972) and $2 billion during fiscal 1972 for manpower training.

Rejected: June 2, 1971.

Republican Vote: Yeas, 159; Nays, 6.

Percentage: 96%.

III. Supported President Nixon's all-out assault on the menace of drug abuse, and urged the immediate passage of his legislative proposals to supplement the Comprehensive Drug Prevention and Control Act of 1970.

H.R. 12089. Drug Abuse Prevention. Created a Special Action Office on Drug Abuse Prevention in the Executive Office of the President which would coordinate drug abuse prevention programs of all federal departments and agencies except those in the law enforcement field.

Passed: February 3, 1972.

Republican Vote: Yeas, 162; Nays, 0.

Percentage: 100%.

IV. Supported the passage of H.R. 1, the Social Security Amendments of 1971.

Increased Social Security benefits and Medicare and Medicaid assistance programs for the needy aged, blind and disabled and disabled and established a national family assistance program for incapacitated or unemployable adults.

Passed: June 22, 1971.

Republican Vote: Yeas, 112; Nays 64.

Percentage: 64%.

V. Demanded that immediate attention of the Congress be given to the forward-looking and progressive domestic legislative proposals of President Nixon.

VI. Urged the immediate consideration and passage of H.R. 9727, a bill to control the dumping of harmful waste materials into America's coastal and offshore waters.

Established controls over the dumping of waste materials in the oceans and set up a marine sanctuaries program in the Commerce Department.

Passed: September 9, 1971.

Republican Vote: Yeas, 127; Nays, 1.

Percentage: 99%.

VII. Supported the passage of H.R. 8432, as amended, the Emergency Loan Guarantee Act.

Authorized a federal guarantee of bank loans for failing major businesses.

Passed: July 30, 1971.

Republican vote: Yeas, 90; Nays, 60.

Percentage: 60%.

VIII. Urged the enactment of H.R. 9247, a substitute for H.R. 1746.

Provided authority for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to bring suit against recalcitrant, discriminatory employers in federal court.

Adopted: September 16, 1971.

Republican vote: Yeas, 131; Nays, 29.

Percentage: 32%.

IX. Supported deferral of federal employees wage increases.

H. Res. 596 vetoed President Nixon's alternative federal pay plan ordering scheduled salary increases for federal employees delayed until July 1, 1972.

Rejected: October 4, 1971.

Republican vote: Yeas, 16; Nays, 148.

Percentage: 90%.

X. Supported passage of H.R. 9166, authorizing the appropriation of $77,200,000 to finance the operation of the Peace Corps for fiscal year 1972.

Amendment to committee bill cutting the overall authorizations by $27 million to $50,-200,000.

Rejected: September 23, 1971.

Republican vote: Yeas, 63; Nays, 86.

Percentage 58%.

XI. Supported the passage of H.R. 10947, the Revenue Act of 1971.

Reduced federal individual and business taxes to stimulate the economy and established a federal presidential election campaign fund effective in 1973.

Approved: October 6, 1971 by voice vote.

Conference report adopted: December 9, 1971.

Republican vote: Yeas, 158; Nays, 9.

Percentage: 95%.

XII. Urged the enactment of H.R. 10729 the Environmental Pesticide Control Act of 1971.

Revised federal pesticide statutes.

Passed: November 9, 1971.

Republican vote: Yeas, 139; Nays, 6.

Percentage: 96%.

SECOND SESSION

I. Urged immediate consideration and passage of H.J. Res. 1025, to provide a reasonable settlement of the West Coast dock strike.

To end the West Coast dock strike and to resolve the contract dispute by compulsory arbitration.

Passed: February 9, 1972.

Republican vote: Yeas, 139; Nays, 10.

Percentage: 93%.

II. Supported the passage of H.R. 11021, the Noise Control Act of 1972.

To control the emission of noise detrimental to the human environment by providing for coordination of federal programs and identification of major noise sources and authorizing the setting of standards for, and research and testing of new products.

Passed: February 29, 1972.

Republican Vote: Yeas, 153; Nays, 8.

Percentage 95%.

III. Supported the passage of H.R. 11896, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972.

Provided a $24.6 billion program to clean up the nation's waters, eliminates pollutant discharges, builds new municipal waste treatment plants and establishes a federal-state discharge permit program.

Passed: March 29, 1972.

Republican Vote: Yeas, 156; Nays, 11.

Percentage: 93%.

IV. Opposed the passage of H.R. 12202, providing for increased Government contributions under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program.

Increased the federal government's share of the costs of health insurance premiums for federal employees, including U.S. Postal Service workers, to 55 percent from 40 percent in 1972—with an additional 5 percent increase each year through 1976, at which time the federal government payment would

reach 75 percent of the total cost—and extending health benefit coverage to include unmarried dependent children over the age of 22 who are full-time students.

Passed: April 27, 1972.

Republican Vote: Yeas, 65; Nays, 89.

Percentage: 58%.

V. Supported the passage of H.R. 14370, the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972.

Provided assistance payments totalling $29.6 billion over five years to states and local governments for high-priority expenditures, encouraging states to broaden their tax systems and authorizing federal collection of state personal income taxes.

Passed: June 22, 1972.

Republican Vote: Yeas, 122; Nays, 42.

Percentage: 75%.

VI. Opposed the passage of H.R. 7130, the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1971, and urged the enactment of H.R. 14104, a substitute therefor, amended to extend the minimum wage increases by steps.

Amended substitute amended the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, to raise the hourly wage floor for most non-agricultural workers covered under the Act to $1.80 in 1972 and $2 the following year from $1.60 under existing law.

Passed: May 11, 1972.

Republican Vote: Yeas, 148; Nays, 20.

Percentage: 89%.

VII. Supported the passage of H.R. 13366, the Cyclamates Indemnification Bill.

Permitted domestic food growers, manufacturers, packers and distributors to sue the federal government for payment of losses sustained as a result of the 1969 ban on cyclamates—an artificial sweetener.

Passed: July 24, 1972.

Republican Vote: Yeas, 85; Nays, 64.

Percentage: 57%.

VIII. Urged the passage of H.R. 16810, the public debt limitation.

Authorized a temporary increase to $465 billion in the public debt limit, placed a $250 billion limitation on expenditures and net lending for fiscal year 1973, and granted to the President budget-cutting authority to enforce the limitation.

Passed: October 10, 1972.

Republican Vote: Yeas, 141; Nays, 21.

Percentage: 87%.

WHY WE MUST GET BACK ON THE TRACKS

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an eloquent article by Lewis Mumford entitled "Why We Must Get Back on the Tracks." Mr. Mumford sets out with refreshing clarity the mess we have created for ourselves in our single-minded fixation with the automobile as the sole means of passenger transportation. Where the automobile was once a convenient and pleasant means of transportation, today it all too often brings aggravation, congestion, environmental disaster, and a heavy toll of fatal accidents. The automobile was once an alternative mode of transportation; it is today in many places the only form of transportation. We have lost its benefits by failing to treat it in proper balance with other modes of transportation.

Mr. Mumford delineates the proper role of the railroad in our passenger transportation system and suggests a series of steps by which we can return to a rational view of railroads as a means for passenger transportation.

I ask unanimous consent that the attached article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Sunday Star and Daily News, Washington, D.C., July 23, 1972]

WHY WE MUST GET BACK ON THE TRACKS

(By Lewis Mumford)

When trains began vanishing in America, people blithely assumed that the bus, the truck, the plane, and the private car could perform all of the railroad's specialized functions and could do a better job as well. Only now have we begun to recognize the appalling results.

By shifting the main burden of transportation to cars and trucks, we have extravagantly multiplied the number of vehicles in constant operation, decreased their speed, wasted time, money and petroleum, slowed freight and mail deliveries, and increased human tensions. Meantime, we have nullified the shorter work week—and the promised gain in leisure—by spending more hours in monotonous daily travel, under conditions highly inimical to health.

This is locomotor ataxia, a fatal disease. Already the creeping paralysis has set in: congested airports, delayed landings and departures, stalled expressways, choked streets, clotted parking lots, lethal smog—all these are early warnings of far more serious breakdowns ahead.

Motoring was once a psychological stimulus and recreation: in urban areas it is no longer even a convenience. People who have to go a quarter of a mile or more to find a single parking space—if they are lucky—can hardly boast of "door to door" transportation. So much for free movement and speed!

No one has summed up this situation better than Gov. William Cahill of New Jersey, a state that is one of the chief victims of lopsided highway modernization. "We are choking," he observe lately, "We are choking," he observed lately, "on the fumes of our own exhaust. We are spending literally millions of unproductive hours examining the bumpers of our neighbors' cars, and we stand immobilized, waiting for trains that never arrive. The time has come to say "Enough!"

By rights, this outcry should come mainly from the old, the feeble, the crippled, the sick, and the many people with defective eyesight who cannot or should not drive motorcars. It should also come from the poor, who have neither private nor public vehicles to carry them to work.

Even in cities, these groups have become "shut-ins" through the abandonment of public transportation. They must now depend almost entirely upon the charity of their neighbors and relatives for occasional transportation. *Their* pathetic voice has still to be heard.

But those who most unmistakably have had enough are the motorists who commute daily to the city. More and more, they recognize that the expressway has become a creepway.

WHAT WE LOST

To understand all the working parts that that must be restored or freshly invented to create a balanced transportation system, let us first take a look at what we have lost. This is all the more necessary because people born since 1930 have no notion of the central role of the railroad or what a wonderful sense of freedom it gave the individual traveler.

Between 1920 and 1940 the United States still had one of the best passenger services, both regional and national, on the planet. Contrary to the illusions of short-sighted railroad executives, these passenger services, because of the urban concentrations they made possible, were the essential underpinning of profitable freight and express operations.

During this period the railroads, though badly handicapped by their own bureaucratic procedures and inflexible trade-union regutions, instituted many vital improvements.

While some of the local parts of the rail system were prematurely abandoned after 1920, no heavy damage had yet been done. The abandonment of the electric trolley network and local steam railroads was more than made up for by the extensive use of the family auto and the motor bus.

At the same time, newly surfaced rural roads and parkways opened up many beautiful landscapes and picnic areas. The whole transportation system was actually improved by the motorcar, not yet devastated by it.

Meanwhile the railroads themselves had initiated various overdue technological improvements. The more progressive railroads electrified both their surburban lines and their long-distance routes, as between New Haven and Washington. They introduced streamlining and powerful diesel locomotives for swifter freight trains, and made air-conditioned coaches as comfortable as Pullman cars.

In all these innovations, the *railroad was years ahead of the auto industry.* If technological backwardness had been the deciding factor in the competition between trains and autos, the motor car would have lost out, not the railroad.

Indeed, far from being put out of the running by the steady increase of motor traffic after 1920, railroads flourished and reached their peak of service during World War II.

As long as the transportation system was in balance, the railroad, as the central element is a national system, enabled all the subordinate parts to function effectively. When the railroads walked out of their responsibility for passenger transportation, the whole system became unbalanced.

Both air and motor transportation required heavy public assistance in order partly to offset the railroad's deliberate junking of passenger services. Instead of moving to nationalize the railroad system, the government connived at its demise. It subsidized private transportation by building a vast highway system on a national scale at the taxpayers' expense.

The most fatal blow was delivered by the Highway Revenue Act of 1956. This act was jamed through the Congress, without serious public discussion, on two pretexts: that it would vastly improve transportation facilities, and that it was an imperative military measure to provide for mass evacuation from cities in case of an atomic attack.

When one realizes what happens on a throughway in the very partial evacuation that takes place at the end of the day, it is a wonder that even the Pentagon could have lent itself to this flagrant nonsense.

The Highway Act allotted $26 billion to the states, to be spent over 20 years. This supplied 90 percent of the funds needed to build land-eating highways, mainly throughways, with the states contributing only 10 percent. No larger or fuller pork barrel had ever been opened.

State highway engineers, contractors, and subsidiary interests, acting without the slightest professional knowledge of the problems of urban and regional development, became the arbiters of our national destiny. On the assumption that the sole object of a highway system is to increase the speed and volume of motor traffic, they have laid waste the central city, butchered the landscape, opened up the countryside to random exploitation by real estate speculators, and turned precious recreation areas into smog-filled motor slums.

The effect of the national Highway Act was to duplicate the existing national railroad network. As a result, the net gain for

efficient *transportation*, not just motor traffic, was much smaller than people have assumed.

Too often the new motorways have closely paralleled existing railroad lines. No quicker way of killing off the railroad could have been invented. And among other things, this modernized national highway network was an outright gift to the trucking industry.

This was the final blow. If even half the amount devoted to highway building had been assigned to rehabilitating the railroad—to repair 30 years of making do with obsolete equipment, with deteriorated trackage and roadbeds, with scamped and underserviced passenger facilities—the railroad would not have fallen into disrepute.

SAVING LIVES

The most signal advantage of railroad transportation over the motorcar is never mentioned when the claims of the railroad for public support and rehabilitation are being weighed. This is the railroad's remarkable performance in conserving the traveler's life, as opposed to the motorcar's annual record for wholesale slaughter.

The difference in safety between the two systems is so fantastically in the railroad's favor that most people are understandably reluctant to acknowledge the full price in human lives we have paid for the motorcar.

Between 1903 and 1931 the highest number of railroad passengers killed over the worst *four-year* period was 460, with 10,321 injured. But in the four years between 1928 and 1931 the total number killed was only 78, an average of 26 a year—repeat 26—while only 3,021 were injured. Compare this record with the murderous body count of the motorcar: now over 56,000 dead a year, with more than two million annually injured or maimed for life. Even when corrected for total mileage, the motorcar's rate of death per 100,000 miles is colossal: 53 times greater than the railroad's.

Until now, this wholesale sacrifice of human life has been cheerfully written off as necessary price for technological progress. But note that loss could be cut at least in half by decreasing the amount of unnecessary motor travel—made possible by restoring a larger share of both passenger and freight traffic to the railroad.

By now even the auto industry has become sensitive to the disgraceful safety record of the car and has, though reluctantly, gone along with the effort to lessen the body count in injuries by the kind of technological devices many people pin so much faith on.

In the interests of safety, the motorist is now to be harnessed and imprisoned as if he were an astronaut. Since this will take away the last vestige of freedom the auto once promised, the only compensation will be higher speeds on the road, and still worse accidents, for the protective armament now advocated is completely crashproof only at a speed far lower than that imposed by any state law.

To cut down on the annual loss of life on motorways, a radical proposal is needed: namely, to shift an increasing amount of passenger mileage back to the railroads and other safer if slower forms of locomotion.

When we are prepared to go even further in restoring life, literally, to the whole transportation system, we shall build walkways, bicycle paths, and bridle paths to encourage means of getting about other than by motorcars.

And if our society knew the meaning of recreation, we would deliberately restore older means of transportation by river and canals and sea as alternatives to our high-speed monomania. Thanks to a more enlightened younger generation, the horse and the bicycle and the hiker are in fact all coming back.

Even people who perceive both the limitations of the motorcar and the advantages of passenger trains still exaggerate the importance of speed as a main factor in the transportation crisis. They believe that, except for short-distance commutation in heavily populated areas like the Boston-Washington corridor, the railroad has been knocked out by the plane.

So many proposed to design trains that will be fast enough to compete with planes over long distances.

Both the diagnosis and the cure are faulty. To focus on speed alone is to forget that regularity, reliability, and frequency are equally important. If trains were running at 300 miles an hour between Boston and Washington, the airlines would be more completely underused and crippled than the railroad now is.

In a diversified transportation system, designed to distribute its load over different carriers to meet many different needs, the plane is obviously a desirable addition to, but not a substitute for, the railroad. For distances over 500 miles, the jet plane has of course a tremendous advantage in speed over the motorcar and the pollution, congestion, and blockage under bad weather conditions. Even on the score of fatal deaths and crippling accidents, the plane's record, calculated in passenger miles, is far superior to the motorcar's though inferior to the railroad's.

IN-BETWEEN REGIONS

But in achieving speed, the jet plane must bypass local stops, and this leaves the in-between regions stranded. Obviously one of the factors that slows up the railroad—short intervals between station stops—would also slow up the plane.

No single mode of transportation and no single speed can satisfy the needs of a balanced transportation system. But properly treated, as cooperators not competitors, the railroads will remain an indispensable auxiliary to the plane even over long distances under those weather conditions when air flights are impossible.

But there is certainly no sense in frittering away government funds trying to duplicate the speed of the airplane with an entirely new kind of land vehicle, on the latest science-fiction model.

What is needed for a balanced transportation system is the recognition that the plane is not an acceptable agent of mass transportation: hence its use should be encouraged only when it functions more competently than the motorcar or the railroad train.

Once air travel is cut back to reasonable proportions by the withdrawal of government subsidies, the railroad and the plane would become partners, not rivals, each specializing in those facilities it can handle most efficiently and economically.

But many other factors besides speed must enter into our calculations. Convenience, comfort, frequency of service, safety, and a minimum waste of land and energy resources are infinitely more important than speed or financial profit.

This gives the railroad once more a central position in any rational transportation policy, provided the American people open their eyes to all they have lost by permitting our national railroad system to be dismantled and junked.

What steps must be taken, then, to rebuild a balanced transportation network—national, regional, and local?

First: Revise our present priorities in transportation. Halt further highway construction before any more urban neighborhoods are depopulated or spoiled for family residence by high-rise buildings, and before any more agricultural land is covered with wall-to-wall carpets of concrete.

Turn the federal funds allotted to highways over to rebuilding of the entire rail network—not just to maintain transportation already cut back to the barest minimum but to extend services deliberately abandoned by Amtrak. The needs of *public* transportation must not be confused with mere mass transportation.

Second: As a *minimum* immediate goal, restore as many passenger trains as were available in 1950, and enlist the aid of the labor unions in keeping them running, by providing at least minimal trains of two or three cars, newly designed, with full provision for baggage, manned by skeleton crews.

This restoration of adequate service is the prime condition for making the railroad popular again. Insofar as this demands sacrifices from labor, let the railroad hierarchy set an example by taking commensurate cuts and making even more unthinkable sacrifices.

Third: Banish trucks and trailers of freightcar dimensions from all public roads, urban or rural. This should shift much long-distance freight to smaller vehicles, usable for piggyback transportation by railroad. This is an imperative measure for bringing back the recreational advantages of the motorcar.

Fourth: Phase out jumbo passenger jets for mass travel; likewise jumbo freight planes. Eliminate supersonic planes permanently as an ecological misdemeanor and a human disaster. Supersonic planes are undemocratic toys serving as national status symbols. Their supposed saving in hours has been made absurd by the fact of worldwide instant telephone communication.

Fifth: Back to the rails. Allocate public funds not only for redesigning and manufacturing rolling stock, as well as repairing neglected equipment, but for training and reassembling a new generation of railroad workers, and regaining traditional know-how lost with the pensioning off of experienced workers.

Sixth: Reduce the disgraceful body count from auto accidents by lessening needless motor travel—such as long-distance commutation and cross-country haulage. This can be achieved largely by restoring all of the railroad's attractions of comfort, safety, absence of tensions, and diminishment of fatigue over long haul distances.

THE IDEAL MEDIUM

To cope with our varied transportation needs, we must use and unify every available method of transportation, not just the fastest or the most profitable.

Human legs, for example, are crucial to any organic system. The pedestrian, who relies on food for fuel, and who needs no special parking facilities, remains the ideal transportation medium. The most useful contribution to overcoming urban congestion and pollution has been the provision of walkways and pedestrian malls—not moving sidewalks or automated vehicles. To bring more of the necessary goods of life within walking distance was the original contribution of the city, and it will once more become the goal of intelligent city planning.

Waterway transport for both passengers and freight has become as essential today as it was originally, if the transportation system is not to collapse from overload. In fact, the restoration of waterways has already begun. This is all the more important since more than half the U.S. population lives in counties within 50 miles of the coasts, and an even larger percentage lives near navigable lakes and rivers and canals.

Such major canals has survived railroad competition and were not filled up or covered by highways are once again in profitable operation and are taking freight away from the railroads.

To ensure a diversified transportation system and a wider distribution of the load, substantial government subsidies should be given to encourage the building and using of vessels of all kinds for water transportation—emphasizing economy in handling heavy loads and recreational pleasure rather than speed.

Obviously there is much more to creating a diversified, economical, and efficient transportation system than merely keeping the railroad from permanently going out of business. But for the present, the rehabilitation of the railroad is the key to getting a new grip on the whole problem of transportation and communication, of urbanization and recreation. We cannot introduce all the facilities for a balanced transportation system without introducing many coordinate measures and activities outside the field of transportation itself.

What is hopeful about the situation is that the change, if it takes place at all, will probably come at many places at once: beginning at first with protests against traffic slowdowns, smog, and the mounting spoilage by industrial polluters and highway engineers. From all over the country one gets reports that people are at last awakening to the fact that they have been cheated and deceived by the promises of corporate technological progress and merely pecuniary affluence. The environmental deficits and human penalties are increasingly outweighing the supposed technological benefits.

NOTE.—Lewis Mumford has been writing on urban planning and non-planning for many years.

SENATOR CLINTON P. ANDERSON

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, an English proverb says:

Work bears witness who does well.

Mr. President, the works of Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON are so varied, of such lasting effect and of such distinction as to assure him a prominent place in the history of America.

His steady and purposeful application to duty has written a magnificent record of achievement spanning 37 years of public service during a period of technological advances of the utmost magnitude. From the time of 100-mile-an-hour propeller aircraft to manned spacecraft flights to the moon, from the hydropower of the Tennessee Valley Authority to nuclear reactors, from radio to television and space satellite communications, from ledgers to computers, the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico served his country.

CLINTON ANDERSON is a truly 20th-century man, at ease with the enormous scientific and technological progress of his time. He was a respected insurance executive, and a newspaper editor but he could have been a distinguished electrical, electronics, or mining engineer, an agronomist, ecologist, or lawyer, a mathematician, aerospace scientist, or nuclear physicist. This versatility together with his great political talent made him a superb legislator. Moreover, from the time of his appointment by Franklin D. Roosevelt as Director of Relief for New Mexico until his retirement from the Senate, Senator ANDERSON's first thought was for the people of the country he loves so well. In his hands, a burgeoning technology was made to serve them, and that was his particular genius.

His guardianship of the public interest was fierce. It was CLINT ANDERSON, managing editor of the Albuquerque Journal who broke the first story on the Teapot Dome scandal because he became curious about the sudden wealth of Albert Fall who, until early 1921, had been the owner of a rundown ranch in New Mexico.

In later years when a conflict of interest tainted decisions affecting the Tennessee Valley Authority, in the Dixon-Yates affair, Senator ANDERSON engaged in a titanic struggle with another giant of the Senate, the late Robert Kerr, and prevailed. He clipped the rollcall vote on the Strauss nomination from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and pasted it on his office door jamb, as he said, "to remind myself who I am mad at."

Mr. President, others have spoken in this Chamber of CLINTON ANDERSON's devoted service to the development of atomic energy and space aeronautics.

Senator HUMPHREY has spoken of his sustained leadership on the Finance Committee that gave us medicare, among other social security reforms. I would like to recall particularly his contributions to the causes of conservation, reclamation, forestry, mining, recreation, Indian affairs, and other matters within the jurisdiction of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on which it was my privilege to serve with him.

In 1954 at the western conference of Democratic Senators, Senator MANSFIELD asked for a consensus of the members on the serious problems of a limited supply of clean water. A resolution was drawn up pursuant to Senator MANSFIELD's request and introduced by my predecessor, the late Senator James E. Murray, then chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

The resolution, calling for the establishment of a Senate Select Committee on Water Resources, was adopted and the committee was formed with Senator Kerr of Oklahoma as chairman. As ranking Democrat on the Interior Committee, CLINTON ANDERSON was a member of the select committee. Lengthy hearings were followed by long study and the preparation of 32 reports on all aspects of water, the supply situation, and the approaching shortages.

Characteristically, Senator ANDERSON took the view that the committee's work would be incomplete if it stopped with publication of its findings and did not include recommendations.

Chairman Kerr disagreed but CLINT took his case to the other members and corralled the votes to win. Senator Kerr agreed to vote with the majority and the committee made its recommendations.

Soon after, Senator ANDERSON became chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. One of his first acts was to guide the preparation of measures consonant with the select committee's advice to the Senate.

The Congress subsequently approved the water resources research program. the River Basin Planning Act, and the National Water Council. Chairman ANDERSON had propelled still another monumental task to completion.

Chairman ANDERSON soon became known as Mr. Conservation for his achievements in behalf of the preservation of our natural resources. Greatest of these was the landmark Wilderness Act.

My predecessor, the late James E. Murray, had guided the legislation through extensive hearings prior to his retirement. Acceptance seemed near, but there was no time to lose. Senator ANDERSON seized the opportunity afforded by that preliminary work in which he had played so important a role and in 3 years the wilderness bill was law, despite the fact that its major sponsor had in the interim relinquished the chairmanship of the Interior Committee to take on new duties as chairman of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee.

A direct man, with the westerner's distaste for beating about the bush, CLINT ANDERSON did not attend meetings or hearings as a silent observer. He took no assignment casually.

By law, Cabinet officers are members of the establishment of the Smithsonian Institution. Soon after Senator ANDERSON assumed the post of Secretary of Agriculture under President Truman, notices went out of a forthcoming meeting of the Smithsonian regents. Note was duly made and Secretary ANDERSON appeared at the appointed hour. Total consternation greeted him. While aides scurried about finding a chair, others consulted about protocol. When the dust settled all began the process of accustoming themselves to the presence among them of a Cabinet officer who intended to perform his additional duties for the Smithsonian.

Thus began an association that was to endure to the present.

For over a quarter of a century Senator ANDERSON served the Smithsonian Institution for 24 years as a Regent and for 8 years as a member of its executive committee, the Institution's administrative body.

Senator ANDERSON guided through Congress the legislation that authorized construction of the Museum of History and Technology. He sought and obtained the necessary appropriations and when there was difficulty with the contractor, used his considerable powers of persuasion to resolve it. It was CLINTON ANDERSON who found a way to assure the construction some day of a Space Museum and who fought to save the Hirshhorn collection for the Nation's Capital.

Mr. President, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON will be remembered for his many works—the Space Museum, the Meson Physics Facility at Los Alamos, nuclear powerplants, and a living wilderness. He will be remembered for his diligence and for his great probity. He will be admired for his brilliance. Above all, this remarkable man will be revered as a good and faithful servant of the people of the United States of America.

I am immensely proud to be his friend.

SENATOR CLINTON ANDERSON

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, it is with a deep sense of regret that I note the voluntary retirement of a distinguished colleague and friend—Senator CLINTON ANDERSON of New Mexico.

Senator ANDERSON has been one of the most outstanding and effective members of the Finance and Interior Committees. There has been no stronger defender of the interest of the Western United States than CLINTON ANDERSON. He has made innumerable valuable contributions in the areas of agriculture, the environment, and the development of the vast natural resources in our Western United States. His compassion for the Indians and Spanish-speaking people of the Southwest, along with an astute understanding of their unique problems, has given rise to the establishment of close ties between Senator ANDERSON and these minority groups.

In my earliest days as a U.S. Senator in 1959, I learned to rely on CLINTON ANDERSON'S judgment and sense. His counsel, based on long and valuable experience, has been most helpful to me in my job as a U.S. Senator. For all this, I deeply appreciate the opportunity I have had to be associated with CLINTON.

While I want to wish him the best in his retirement, I will deeply miss CLINTON ANDERSON when we open the 93d Congress in January.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALAN BIBLE, CHAIRMAN, SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE, SUMMARIZING COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES FOR SECOND SESSION, 92D CONGRESS

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I submit to the Senate a report of the activities of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business for the second session of the 92d Congress. It is the function of the committee to study and survey, by means of research and investigation, all problems of American small business enterprises and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation and to report to the Senate from time to time the results of such studies and surveys. I wish to express to my colleagues on our committee my appreciation for their helpfulness and assistance in carrying out our congressional responsibility. I believe they are deserving of the gratitude of the entire Congress as well as the small business community nationwide.

I would also like to express my appreciation for the cooperation which I, as chairman, have received from the chairman and members of the House Small Business Committee. Likewise, I wish to commend the staff members of the House Small Business Committee for the cooperation which they have extended to the staff members of my committee during the 92d Congress.

During the second session of the 92d Congress, the Senate Small Business Committee considered a number of matters reflecting the concern of the Congress for the more than 95 percent of American business firms which are small businesses, which provide employment for more than 35 million people, and which contribute 37 percent of the country's gross national product annually. However, the full committee and its staff concentrated its major attention on the areas cited hereafter:

CARGO THEFT

Becoming alarmed with the scope of the problems associated with the economic impact of crime against the small businessman, the committee initiated a major investigation which has resulted in the introduction and passage by the Senate of a number of pieces of legislation, as follows:

S. 942, which recommended the establishment of a Presidential Commission to conduct an extensive study into the various factors of cargo theft and pilferage from all transport modes, air, water, rail, and motor carriers.

Amendment No. 994 to S. 2994 was incorporated into S. 16, which passed the Senate on September 5, 1972. This legislation seeks to dry up the profits inherent in cargo thievery. It would hold civilly liable those persons who steal, receive, or market stolen property and enables persons in legal possession of goods to sue for treble damages any person or groups of persons responsible for stealing, buying, or reselling such goods in interstate commerce.

Additionally, three bills dealing with the safe and secure movement of goods in interstate transportation originated from this committee's activities, but failed to win Senate passage. They are:

First. S. 1763, to establish actual cash value liability for airlines and air freight forwarders for loss, damage, or injury to cargo.

Second. S. 3717, to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to require railroads and water carriers to provide insurance to shippers to cover any claims for loss or damage.

Third. S. 3718, to grant to the Interstate Commerce Commission additional authority to develop a claims adjudication program beneficial to carriers and shippers.

As a result of the committee's interest in freight claims for loss and damage, the Interstate Commerce Commission in ex parte 263 issued new rules affecting regulated motor carrier claims practices.

The committee, during the 92d Congress, began what we believe is the first investigation by a congressional committee into the criminal "fence," or redistribution racket. A report on the committee's extensive data in this area prepared by the staff, was released by the committee.

Likewise, this year the committee saw several years of efforts meet with success when the adoption of a coordinated Federal program was announced by the Department of Transportation to combat the growing incidence of theft and pilferage of goods moving in interstate and foreign commerce. All Federal transport regulatory agencies either began or were in the final stages of adopting a system of uniform loss reporting. The Department of Transportation responded to appeals of the committee by instituting pilot projects to examine security and technology and to establish security advisory standards for carriers and shippers. The Treasury Department began projects aimed at curbing theft of goods in international commerce at both seaports and airports.

In 1972 the committee also issued a report on the effect of cargo loss, theft and hijacking in the trucking industry.

TAXES

In the tax area, the concern of the committee members over the particular impact of inequities in the tax system upon small business, magnified by economic recession and declining profits of small business, resulted in the reintroduction of the Small Business Tax Simplification and Reform Act (S. 1615) which was referred to the Senate Finance Committee, but no action taken on it.

This bill represents the most comprehensive small business effort to reform the Internal Revenue Code ever to come before Congress, and contains 40 suggestions for tax reform, relief, and simplication.

The committee continued its study of the effects of the tax structure on small business and consulted with professional and business organizations in order to refine the bill and thereby increase prospects for legislative action which would bring increased tax equity to approximately 12 million small, family, and independent business enterprises.

The committee also conduced a revision of the "Tax Guide for Small Business," in cooperation with the Internal Revenue Service. This guide, originally issued as a committee print in 1956, last year had 450,000 users. The revised version will be available in early 1973.

ENVIRONMENT

Against the background of mounting pressure of consumer, environmental, health and sanitary laws and regulations, the committee continued its efforts to assist small firms to adjust and thereby remain in a profitable business status. In early 1971, a conference of representatives of a dozen leading small business organizations and trade associations with the committee staff reemphasized the severe financial and regulatory impact of these laws upon small and independent businesses.

This sentiment was conveyed in testimony to the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee on S. 1649, a bill which I authored to provide general authority for small business administration economic disaster loans to permit compliance with Federal standards. The bill was reported and passed by the Senate as a part of the Disaster Relief

Act of 1972. Although subsequently deleted in conference, because House hearings had not been held on it, assurance was given that the other body will hold hearings on this legislation early in 1973.

Committee members likewise sponsored an amendment to S. 2770, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1971, which would facilitate making loans to small business concerns for water pollution control facilities, now Public Law 92–500.

The committee's efforts also led to cooperation in the drafting and development of S. 3873, a bill to permanently improve the administration of the Occupational Safety and Health Act from the viewpoint of small businesses wishing to effect compliance with this statute.

Committee members developed and introduced legislation to identify and reduce paperwork burdens, including those generated by consumer-environmental statutes. In another related field, the committee took the initiative in strengthening the legislative history of the Cooperative Forestry Act, to provide a basis for increased participation by private foresters in the interests of conserving the Nation's forests.

DRUGS

The second session of the 92d Congress was an especially busy one for the Monopoly Subcommittee, chaired by Senator GAYLORD NELSON of Wisconsin. In a continuing investigation into the drug purchasing practices of Federal agencies, the subcommittee, in 4 days of hearings, was advised that its recommendations had resulted in: First, extensive dollar savings to the Government and indirectly to the taxpaying public; second, large savings to municipalities and the States; third, better therapy because of the elimination of inferior and generally high-priced drugs; and fourth, increased competition for Government business and better opportunities for small business.

As a result of these and previous hearings before the Monopoly Subcommittee, the following legislation was introduced by Senator NELSON:

S. 2812, which would establish a National Drug Testing and Evaluation Center, require the publication of a Federal Drug Compendium, and establish a Drug Formulary of the United States.

S. 3254, which would require applicants for manufacture and distribution of new drugs to submit to the Food and Drug Administration certain additional information in drug labeling.

S. 3296, which would remove exemptions given drugs placed on the public market before 1962, thus requiring drug manufacturers, otherwise under no compulsion to do so, to prove the safety and efficacy of their products.

CORPORATE SECRECY

In 1972 the Monopoly Subcommittee also continued its examination of corporate secrecy, the vital business information that the corporate giants do not share with their small business competitors and the public. One highlight was a 2-day hearing on corporate farming which pointed up the movement of giant corporations into the field of agribusiness; and a 1-day hearing on the ownership and control of industry and natural resources.

FEDERAL PAPERWORK BURDEN

The Subcommittee on Government Regulation, chaired by Senator THOMAS MCINTYRE of New Hampshire, began an investigation and public hearings into the impact of the growing Federal red-tape and paperwork burden on the small businessman. The subcommittee held 3 days of field hearings in Chicago, Boston, and Concord, N.H., which revealed that the paperwork burden is estimated to cost businesses in excess of $50 billion per year with a proportionately greater detrimental impact on smaller business than large business. Later the subcommittee held 3 days of hearings in Washington to hear representatives of Federal agencies responsible for generating the bulk of Federal reporting and paperwork requirements. The subcommittee was advised that 6,400 public use forms are required of the business community, not counting the 14,000 different forms required by the Internal Revenue Service.

SOFT CONTACT LENS

Also in the second session of the 92d Congress, the Subcommittee on Government Regulation held 2 days of hearings on the manufacture and sale of soft contact lens with consideration given to safety and efficacy, competitive and technological problems of the lens, and the role of the Food and Drug Administration. Subcommittee Chairman MCINTYRE announced he was hopeful that the hearings would encourage more competition in the soft contact lens market. It was revealed that the Food and Drug Administration has scheduled a meeting for those who desire to enter the soft lens production field in order to acquaint them with the agency's requirements.

A more detailed report of the committee's activities plus a comprehensive listing of small business legislation introduced and acted upon during the 2d session of the 92d Congress will be contained in the annual report of the committee which will be issued early in 1973. Likewise, it is anticipated that the committee will be issuing committee reports dealing with railroad cargo theft and loss, the Federal paperwork burden on businesses, competitive problems in the drug industry, and a primer for the small businessman concerning his rights in pursuing contract claims against the Federal Government.

TRUTH IN SAVINGS

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, last year I introduced the Hartke Truth-in-Savings Act (S. 1848). This bill is designed to provide consumers with the information they need to know about money they have or intend to place in a savings institution.

As with so many similar proposals, the Truth-in-Savings Act has met with a certain amount of cynicism. Some claim that the consumer will be confused by such facts as periodic earnings rates and annual percentage yields. The terms may sound complicated, but they can be reduced to simple dollars and cents concepts.

My office files are filled with letters from people who have learned what can happen when you do not have the information provided by the Hartke Truth-in-Savings Act. One letter, for example, recites the case of a man who withdrew a sizable sum from his savings account and then replaced it within a matter of days. To his astonishment, he learned at the end of the quarter that his bank figured earnings on the basis of the lowest balance in the account during the quarter.

Recently, I sent letters to the Governors of each State and territory asking for their comments about my truth-in-savings proposal. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a sampling of the responses which I have received to date be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the responses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUSTA, MAINE,
June 28, 1972.

Hon. VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: Many thanks for your informative letter relative to introduction of the Truth in Savings Act (S. 1848). There is no question but what there is considerable confusion and misunderstanding by depositors in savings accounts as to the effective yield of their accounts. The variables are such as to make it extremely difficult to inform the public effectively.

It has been our policy to support any legislation which would be of benefit to the average consumer and there appears a definite need in the area cited.

The bill as proposed would appear quite comprehensive and possibly cause significant additional expense to the financial institutions, making it possible that an increase in the annual percentage rate by an institution might be precluded because of this additional expense. This stands out in Section 5 (d) in which notification will be required to all depositors of any change in policy or procedure. Possibly this might well be amended to require notification of any change that would reflect an adverse effect upon the true yield of the depositor.

Sincerely,

KENNETH M. CURTIS,
Governor.

STATE BANKING DEPARTMENT,
Baton Rouge, La., June 19, 1972.

Hon. VANCE HARTKE.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: This is in reply to your letter of June 5, 1972, addressed to Honorable Edwin W. Edwards, Governor of Louisiana.

Your proposed legislation to disclose the truth in savings accounts is needed legislation.

We should like to suggest under Section 8 (3), after the words *"any Federal Credit Union,"* insert the words: State insured Credit Union.

Sincerely yours,

CLEBERT C. SMITH,
State Bank Commissioner.

BISMARCK, N. DAK.,
June 13, 1972.

Hon. VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: This is to acknowledge your letter of June 5.

I certainly agree with the legislation as proposed in S. 1848.

In my opinion, every family needs to prepare for emergencies, education, home building and other worthwhile projects.

I commend you for introducing this significant legislation.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM L. GUY,
Governor.

PIERRE, S. DAK.,
June 16, 1972.

Hon. VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: Thank you for your letter of June 5 concerning your proposal for a Truth-in-Savings Act.

In South Dakota, we have not experienced a great public concern in this area but fully realize that in more populated states, there may be significant need for this legislation.

I am certainly in accord with any requirements which would require full disclosure to the public by publicity chartered financial institutions.

Sincerely,

RICHARD F. KNEIP,
Governor.

LANSING, MICH.,
June 21, 1972.

Hon. VANCE HARTKE,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: Governor Milliken has asked me to thank you for sending information on your Truth in Savings bill (S. 1848). We share, with you, a genuine concern for the need for consumer protection guidelines.

This, certainly, is one area in which the U.S. Congress should study present procedures and offer appropriate recommendations for improving, if necessary, information to consumers. I trust the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs will study in depth your proposal and take appropriate action.

Thank you, again, for calling your bill to my attention.

Kind personal regards.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. KELLOGG,
Executive Assistant.

JUNEAU, ALASKA,
June 30, 1972.

Hon. VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senate,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: Your letter of June 5 regarding the Truth-in-Savings Act was very much appreciated. I concur with many of the remarks contained therein.

While the majority of savings institutions in Alaska do disclose the annual percentage rate on their savings accounts to depositors, we do have the same problem that seems to appear nationwide. Specifically, that is with the vast number of different types of accounts available to potential depositors, it is very confusing at times to determine exactly what type of account is best suited to an individual's needs. Therefore, it would seem to me that legislation delineating the comments contained in your letter would be in the best interest of all Americans.

As you know, each person making a deposit in a financial institution has a different reason for doing so. Legislation spelling out the net yield to the depositor would, I believe, be in the best interest of the public in much the same manner as the Truth-in-Lending Act enacted a few years ago.

If I may be of further service, please let me know.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. EGAN,
Governor.

CHARLOTTE AMALIE, ST. THOMAS,
July 25, 1972.

Hon. VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: I am pleased to have your letter of June 5, 1972, together with the enclosure of your remarks introducing the "Truth in Savings Act" (S. 1848).

This is a most important piece of legislation, in which the Government of the Virgin Islands is vitally interested for the reason that a substantial amount of territorial government funds are deposited in savings accounts in the local banks as the best available means of earning interest on these funds while making sure of their easy and ready accessibility. The choice of local banks for this purpose has not been based on the very important facts which your Bill would require the savings institutions to disclose, quite often for the simple reason that the information is not given in advance of the deposits being made, and further, because it is not usually given in the simple form which would permit easy interpretation by the territorial officers at the operational as distinct from cabinet level.

It is, therefore, with genuine enthusiasm that we applaud the step you have taken to improve the availability of basic information to assist the consumer to invest his money wisely, and would request that your staff keep me advised of the further developments in this matter.

We appreciate very much having been included in the list of those from whom you wish to have an expression of need for this type of legislation.

Sincerely,

MELVIN H. EVANS, M.D.,
Governor.

DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATION,
Annapolis, Md., July 14, 1972.

Hon. VANCE HARTKE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: Your recent letter addressed to Governor Marvin Mandel regarding (S. 1848) Truth in Savings Act, has been referred to me for a direct reply. Since the aforementioned legislation is consumer oriented, this Department would view its enactment favorably.

At the time of a deposit, the consumer should be furnished adequate information concerning methods of computing interest, rates of interest, compounding of interest, length of time money must be held on deposit before interest is earned and many other facets which can be readily and satisfactorily understood by a depositor. The earning rates and the methods of calculations should be pronounced emphatically so that the average depositor will be able to determine his own yield, whether monthly, quarterly, semi-annually or annually, with little or no difficulty.

Each savings institution should be compelled to exhibit and/or distribute to depositors its method of earnings computation in order that a depositor will have first-hand information for comparison with other savings institutions.

I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your interest in keeping the consumer informed and in this way, he will be in a better position for his own self-protection.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. JEWELL,
Secretary.

AGANA, GUAM, *July 7, 1972.*

Hon. VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: This acknowledges receipt of your letter of June 5, 1972 with reference to your introduction of the "Truth in Savings Act" (S 1848).

After reviewing your introductory remarks and the bill my staff and I are in full agreement with the purpose and intent of your bill.

The scope of this bill is broad enough so that the provisions would apply to all banks, savings and loan associations and credit unions licensed to operate in this territory.

Sincerely yours,

CARLOS G. CAMACHO.

SENATOR DAVID GAMBRELL

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a colleague who has rendered exceptional service the past 2 years to his native Georgia and the Nation—DAVID GAMBRELL.

In February of 1971, tragedy struck this body with the death of Senator Richard B. Russell. DAVID GAMBRELL was appointed to fill the unexpired term of the late Senator Russell and he did so by immediately plunging into his duties with great vigor.

Senator GAMBRELL earned the intense admiration and respect of his colleagues in a very short time. He actively participated in all aspects of the legislative process and was aggressive on the floor of the Senate in protecting and promoting the interests of his State and the Nation. I found him to be extremely intelligent and thoughtful in his approach to the problems of this country.

Therefore, I want to offer my congratulations to DAVID GAMBRELL for a job well done. He will be missed.

AN INVALUABLE RESOURCE: OUR CHILDREN

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, there are currently an estimated 2.5 million gifted and talented children in our Nation's school systems. All too often in the past commentators have stressed the need to develop programs responsive to the needs of these children because they constitute an invaluable national resource. I strongly believe that new programs in this area are in dire need and I also submit that these efforts should be rooted in the guarantees of freedom of will and individualism.

The burden of potential these children have borne in the past has too often resulted in deprivation and various forms of psychological and emotional injuries

which have tended to restrict their abilities to lead fulfilling lives.

Legislation has long been overdue to meet the special needs of these children; S. 3382, introduced in the last session, was an admirable attempt toward this end. Mr. President, I recently had the opportunity to discuss this legislation before the Association of the Gifted in San Diego and I ask unanimous consent that those remarks be inserted into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were inserted in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS BY SENATOR JOHN V. TUNNEY TO THE ASSOCIATION OF THE GIFTED

Everyday throughout our lives we all make assumptions—assumptions concerning ourselves, assumptions concerning our institutions, assumptions concerning our children. Today I would like to speak with you about assumptions which concern our children—specifically those which concern children who are gifted. Many of those assumptions are not only erroneously made, but can have disastrous consequences on the welfare of gifted children. Assumptions by parents, by educators and by elected officials have led to far-reaching implications affecting the welfare of those children. No longer can we allow assumptions to interfere with our meeting their special needs.

Today educational programs develop and support curriculum designed to meet the needs of what is commonly referred to as "the majority." What is overlooked in this philosophy of educating children is that "the majority" describes a statistical group and neglects to define each individual child that makes up this group. In reality by designing a system to meet the needs of a statistically defined group, "the majority," we may indeed be failing each and every member of the group—each and every one of our children.

As a country, we provide education for all of our children because we feel it is a necessity for the future of our country and our world. Every child has the right to develop to his full potential and our educational system and philosophy should guarantee this right. The gifted child in society today holds a position of limited status—he is respected by the public at large, he is envied by the parents of his peers, and he is neglected by our educational system. Society and educators alike expect him to be able to cope with his environment because of his special abilities; he is expected to succeed in spite of us rather than because of us.

The gifted child is just like any other child in our society—he is a human being. Just because he is different from other children, different from "the majority", doesn't entitle him to any more than any other child in our educational system, but conversely it does not entitle him to any less!

Today an equal philosophy of education means that both teaching and learning should be directed toward meeting the needs of the individual child. We must strive to strengthen each child in the areas each needs most. In meeting the needs of the gifted child in this country we must create new programs that cut across cultural and economic barriers, programs that bridge the gap between the rich and the poor, between urban and rural, and between slum and suburb: programs that are directed toward meeting the individual needs special to these children.

It is to these needs that the legislation I cosponsored is directed. The legislation is designed to serve those children who have special abilities, the development of which requires activities or services not ordinarily provided by local educational agencies.

First, the legislation would establish a national clearinghouse on gifted and talented children to obtain and disseminate information on education, counseling and identification. Identification of gifted and talented children, as I see it, is an area of major concern and emphasis. I have been informed by experts that restandardizations of current IQ tests would not measurably increase their effectiveness in the identification process. Present measures now fail to locate half of the gifted and talented in our population. I urge educators to start now in developing and instrumenting innovative techniques to attempt to assure the recognition of gifted children, particularly among ghetto youngsters. There is grave reason to believe that existing unfavorable environments—cultural or social, hostile to learning—may result in a substantial failure to discover and develop latent talent among minorities.

For example, in Illinois a standardized test as sole indicator of talent has been abandoned. In any identifiable minority subgroup they take the top 5% of that subgroup, whatever their scores were, and treat them as a gifted and talented population. This sometimes amounted to having youngsters of IQ 115 in a talented and gifted group, instead of an IQ of 130. However, to obtain an IQ of 115 under the circumstances and environment that prevailed, is a substantial accomplishment in itself. This provision of the legislation, as I see it, can aid in the preservation of talent in the same sense that we are trying to preserve our environment and thus rescue children from environmentally "polluted" areas.

Secondly, the bill will authorize funds to states for educational programs for gifted and talented children from pre-school through high school. The funds would be allocated to states on the basis of population between the ages of 3 and 18. In addition, 15% of the appropriations would be reserved for special project grants outside of the state allocation formula. This will allow for creative projects such as those now existing and under consideration by the exceptional child services department of the San Diego city schools.

Thirdly, the bill will authorize funds for the training of personnel for the education of the gifted and talented youth. One of the most important and complex areas of educational quality involves the training and the selection of teachers to work with these exceptional children.

Lastly, funds will be authorized for research and demonstration projects for the education of gifted and talented children. Under this area there must certainly be more attention received than in the past in the specific nature of planned curriculum changes for working with the gifted and talented. These children can understand ideas and concepts beyond that of the average child. They can see linkages between ideas. They have a greater capacity for original thought. What then does this mean for curriculum in mathematics, in the arts, in the sciences, etc.? There has not been enough existing experimental curriculum adventures based upon these distinctive talents of these distinctive youngsters. This bill could establish the opportunity for curriculum development projects that could become major stimuli for improved program changes in all areas of education.

This is not the first time funds have been proposed or appropriated to meet these recognized existing needs under legislation for exceptional children, but too often, the gifted child is defined as the lowest priority and such funds are non-existent long before his level of priority is ever reached. We must not let this happen again. The gifted child is considered exceptional, not because of his giftedness alone, but because of the special problems he faces as an individual. The gifted child suffers social and emotional problems that are real and grave, not only to his mental health, but also to his ability to function as a part of our social system. Society over-emphasizes the academic ability of the gifted child. His brightness is easy to identify and to instruct; it is, however, his social and emotional make-up that contribute to his self-value, which must be taken into account by society and educators alike. We must have programs and legislation alike that concentrate on the gifted child as a whole person with his own special problems that must be recognized as well as solved.

The gifted child is not a miniature adult, and we must not treat him as one, either in our society or in our educational system; rather we must provide the best possible environment both socially and educationally in which he can grow and develop—learning from, as well as enjoying, his childhood. Every child must be allowed to be a child! Today in this age of science we seem to want to relate every child to a hypothetical group that forms a neat, normal curve; but it is the child himself, the why and the how of his behavior that makes him an individual who can never be adequately or completely described by a test or a number. A child is not a symbol but a real person interacting with his environment; he has real needs and real problems; the goals of educators and legislators must be to help the individual child to be understood for his uniqueness rather than categorized for his sameness.

What then is the answer? Many idealists in education have written about the system—change the system, and the problems for all children, including the gifted, will be solved. I find the ideas interesting but far from inspiring. I most definitely agree with the premise that "every child, every person, can delight in learning." The educational system should use every means at its command to make learning, as well as school itself, an intrinsically rewarding and joyful adventure. I agree also that learning should and must be life-long, that joy in learning can aid joy in life. It definitely is the responsibility of every person, parent or teacher, to aid each child to attain a level through school where learning in life is a pleasure.

As long as teachers are human, they will be imperfect just as education itself will be imperfect. Each teacher, parent and child must work toward the ideal knowing that joy is only defined because of sorrow, happiness only known through unhappiness, good exists only in relation to bad. Emotions in extremes are necessary for learning enjoyment in life; is it possible to explain to a child the meaning of hot without his ever feeling something hot and then what is hot without its opposite cold? Learning is exciting because sometimes it is ordinary and sometimes it is insightful. Is it possible to define any act of learning as joyful or ecstacy if one has never known boredom? Learning for every child must be more than just knowledge.

At this point I would like to refer to Nietzsche to remind us all: "The surest way to corrupt a youth is to teach him to esteem more highly those who think as he does than those who think differently."

Too long has the gifted child been impersonally looked at as a natural resource to be developed for society and then exploited by society. Children—all children—are not inanimate objects because their abilities are not finite, not limited; rather their abilities are limitless in the development of the mind. Gifted children must never be referred to as objects for society—objects which can do things we want done, done in the way we dictate, done to meet our expectations. Rather society must cultivate what our children want, what our children need as individuals in our society.

We can talk about freedom—freedom of choice, unstructured classes and curriculum in education, but until we also allow our children the freedom to be themselves, we are defeating our own purposes as well as the

purposes of the new progressive education itself. All children must be free to accept or reject what we as parents, educators and legislators feel is best for them after we have given them the necessary information with which to make their own decision. But more important, if freedom is going to be more than just a meaningless word in their vocabulary, whether we agree or not, we must be prepared to accept their decision. Otherwise the progressive education and legislation are meaningless; merely old ideas re-written using new terms.

I have heard it said that by neglecting our gifted children we might be losing vast creative potential that could solve problems like manned space flights to Mars and beyond; find solutions to air pollution and over-population. I have heard it said that the gifted child trained and educated could develop his creative potential, producing a Nobel prize winner. I ask, do we have to try to create an Einstein, a Frank Lloyd Wright, a Charles Eames, a Van Cliburn or a Bobby Fischer? I say let us provide the funds, the facilities, the programs, the teachers for the gifted and talented children—then let us let the children be individuals and make their own decisions, live their own lives, find their own success, their own joy. All I ask is that, then, we as parents, we as educators, we as legislators, make "no assumptions, please."

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 382, on September 25, 1972, No. 420, on October, 10, 1972, and No. 457, on October 17, 1972. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall 382, and "aye" on rollcalls 420 and 457.

BOOKMAN'S SALUTE

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, an October issue of Publishers Weekly, the trade journal of the book publishing industry, featured an article entitled "Salute to Bob Frase: a Committed Bookman." It is indeed a salute to Robert W. Frase, whose resignation as vice president, economist and Washington director of the Association of American Publishers, Inc., came as unhappy news to many of us.

During the 22 years that Bob Frase has served the book publishing industry in Washington, he has become well known to all people concerned in the fields of education, American libraries, and the free flow of information to the public.

His efforts have not gone unrecognized, as is shown by the "Salute" in Publishers Weekly.

I know I speak for my colleagues and the staff members of Senate committees who have known and worked with Bob in joining the salute to Bob Frase and wishing him well for the future. Mr. President, I include in the RECORD the text of this "Salute":

SALUTE TO BOB FRASE: A COMMITTED BOOKMAN

In resigning as vice-president, economist and Washington director of the Association of American Publishers, Robert W. Frase leaves all the producers, disseminators and users of books deeply in his debt. For 22 years, he has given extraordinary energy and single-minded commitment to the cause of books.

Bob Frase, as one colleague remarks, has been at once a champion of books and reading, and "a hardnosed lobbyist for the business." With a background in governmental economic research and wartime intelligence, Bob Frase joined the American Book Publishers Council in 1950 and quickly plunged into the successful effort to save the postal rate for books; this has been a continuing fight, and recently Bob had a strong hand in the Mansfield-Scott Amendment protecting the flat rate for books in the new U.S. Postal Service. At the same time, he has played a vigorous role in turning aside many legislative and administrative attempts at censorship. It is hardly necessary to point out what all these efforts have meant to writers, publishers and booksellers, to libraries and the ultimate users of books.

Just a few years ago, Bob drafted the amendment to the Federal Tort Claims Act, making the government and its contractors liable for copyright infringement—a provision that publishers sorely needed. At the same time Bob has held the respect of library representatives, with whom, except on copyright, he has but rarely had to differ. Meanwhile he has worked closely with those members of Congress who still labor towards a new copyright law. And he has been a key U.S. expert in working out the new (Paris) copyright treaty.

More than any other person, it has been said, Bob Frase—through quiet mobilization of testimony and close contact with State, Congressional and industry personnel—was instrumental in U.S. ratification of the Universal Copyright Convention (1954) and the Florence Agreement (1966)—vital events in the expansion of international (most certainly including U.S.) trade in books.

Perhaps most important of Bob's labors has been to help bring about the library and education legislation of the past two decades. He showed rural members of Congress that the library services bill would be in the interest of their constituencies. He worked for the book-related provisions of the National Defense Education Act, including a modification to include printed materials. He worked strongly for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act and subsequent acts—laws that led to vast purchases of books and educational materials, and released massive funds that were then applied directly to textbook purchases. In 1969 he had a key part in the Joelson Amendment which established the pattern for restoring educational budget cuts by the Nixon administration. In 1970, he had a similar role in the Eagleton Amendment which saved school library programs under Title II of ESEA.

How have such accomplishments come about? Through topnotch legislation liaison; through person-to-person work with State, Defense, Commerce and other offices; with USAID, USIA, Library of Congress, Copyright Office; with staffs and leaders of national associations allied to the book groups. These relationships are not spectacular, but they are the essence of effective Washington work.

With other farsighted leaders of the industry, Bob Frase realized early that the health and economic growth of the book business depend heavily upon its perceiving and maintaining identity with the public interest; that the book industry has to team up on a continuous basis with its natural allies in the worlds of education, libraries, rural and urban development, civil liberties, and so on; and that integrity and expert knowledge go further than showmanship to win long-term respect from Senators, Congressmen and—vital among government personnel—their staffs.

We'll expect to hear more from Bob Frase. He is indeed a crusty economist, but a devoted bookman, and effective where it matters. We all need him.

B. EVERETT JORDAN

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, it is an honor for me to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to EVERETT JORDAN. Since 1958, EVERETT JORDAN has served the people of North Carolina with uncommon distinction. He came to the Senate with a deep understanding of the needs of the people of his State, an understanding which he translated into a record of concrete achievements.

EVERETT JORDAN's work for America's farmers through his service on the Agriculture Committee is well known. His colleagues on the Public Works Committee can testify to his strong interest in flood control. EVERETT JORDAN also held the chairmanship of the Committee on Rules and Administration, one of the key positions as far as the management of Senate business is concerned. In this capacity, Senator JORDAN was the epitome of fair-minded and judicious leadership. He could be relied on to resolve the numerous problems of Senate administration in an equitable manner. He contributed much to the smooth running of the Senate. Certainly, EVERETT JORDAN was one of the warmest and most generous men I have met in the Senate, and that warmth and generosity will be missed by all of us.

WILLIAM H. SUTPHIN, FORMER CONGRESSMAN, DIES

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, recently, the State of New Jersey and the Nation lost a great friend and statesman, William Halstead Sutphin, a former Member of the House of Representatives.

This vibrant man, who served his Nation and his district so well will be sorely missed. He was a good friend of mine, and I have often enjoyed visits from him in my office, learning much from his own great experience. His was a fine mind, coupled with a great sense of compassion and understanding. Mrs. Howard and I extend our greatest sympathies to Mr. Sutphin's wife and family. Knowing

him has been a privilege for us, and we will all remember him with great respect and fondness.

Without objection, I would like to commend to my colleagues an article from the Asbury Park, N.J., Evening Press, which tells of Congressman Sutphin's great accomplishments and service over his many years of public life.

W. H. SUTPHIN DIES; WAS CONGRESSMAN

BERLIN, MD.—William Halstead Sutphin, the former Matawan, N.J., mayor who served for a decade as New Jersey's 3rd Congressional District representative, died Saturday at a nursing home in Salisbury. He was 85.

Mr. Sutphin began his political career in New Jersey at age 28 when he was elected on a Democratic ticket as mayor of Matawan in 1916. It was then a town that had been strongly Republican for years.

After four terms as mayor, he entered the congressional race in New Jersey's 3rd district in 1930 and on March 4, 1931, began his service in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Sutphin quickly identified himself as a friend of the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, but asserted he was not a "rubber stamp".

Twice he was urged by home supporters to run for United States senator, but each time declined on the grounds he believed he could best serve his district by remaining in the House. He was asked to run in 1936, for the term begun by Sen. William H. Smathers, and again in 1938, as successor to Sen. John Milton.

The legislation he sponsored included bills to aid the poultry industry, borrowers from the Owners Loans Corporation, home builders and New Jersey industries.

During his term years, Mr. Sutphin served in the 75th Congress as a member of the busy Naval Affairs Committee and was on the Committee for Conservation of Wildlife Resources. He was also assistant majority whip of the House.

Autographed pictures of President Roosevelt, Vice President John Nance Garner, Postmaster General James Farley, Gov. A. Harry Moore of New Jersey, and other prominent Democratic leaders covered the wall near his desk in the House office building.

Scattered among them were pictures of hunting parties with their bags of game and snapshots of airplanes. Hunting, aviation and swimming were his diversions. The first two he sometimes combined by taking airplane trips to the south or back to the New Jersey meadows for quail and duck shooting.

His interest in airplanes was born during World War I when, while still mayor of Matawan, he entered the officers' training camp at Ft. Myer, Va., in 1917. During that year he was transferred to the air service and sailed for France. There he served as commanding officer of the U.S. Air Base at Chateau Roux and met his first wife, an Army nurse, the former Catherine Bonner. He first saw her at a base hospital where he was treated for leg injuries suffered in an airplane crash.

She died in 1956.

During and after the war he frequently piloted airplanes, but with development of aviation and introduction of new instruments and equipment for flying he gave this up to travel in the air only as a passenger.

During his time as a congressional representative the door to his office was always open and visitors were warmly greeted by his booming voice which echoed down the halls of the House building. On the floor of the House this same strong voice held the attention of his colleagues in his speeches.

When William H. Sutphin was born in the Browntown section of Madison Township, N.J., in 1887, he represented the ninth generation of family which had sprung from the Netherlands.

He came to Matawan as a child and attended public schools there. He later was a student at Wood's Business College in Brooklyn.

Only months before he came to terms with the enemy on the airfields of France he began his military career in 1917, when he first interrupted his tenure in office to join Troop B, 1st Squadron, Cavalry National Guard of New Jersey at Red Bank, during which time he served on the Mexican border for several months.

During his administration in Matawan, he established a sinking fund to take care of bond issues as they became due; new streets were opened, a sewerage system and disposal tanks were built; land was acquired for the Memorial Park and Lake Matawan was created.

During his career he served as chairman of New Jersey's Monmouth County Democratic Committee and as Monmouth County commander of the American Legion.

He was a former member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Masonic Lodge of Matawan, the Elks Lodge of Freehold, N.J., the First Presbyterian Church of Matawan and the fire department there.

After leaving politics he served as vice president of M. J. Merkin Paint Co., New York, and moved here in 1952 after he retired.

Surviving besides his son and his daughter, William T. Sutphin, Princeton, N.J., and Mrs. Susan S. Bennett, Alliance, Ohio, is his widow, Mrs. Katharine Whaley Sutphin, his second wife.

The Levin Wilson Funeral Home, Princess Anne, is in charge of arrangements.

DR. DURWARD HALL

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues the highest respect and admiration for Dr. DURWARD HALL, of Missouri, who has chosen to voluntarily retire from the Congress at the end of this session.

Dr. HALL has been my personal friend for many years. I have served with him on the House Armed Services Committee, and I have had an opportunity to observe him closely. He has been one of the most knowledgeable, alert, and able Members of this body. It is most unfortunate that men of Dr. HALL's caliber are not retained in the Congress. He has served his district, State, and Nation with extraordinary distinction.

To Dr. HALL and Mrs. Hall I extend my very best wishes for them in their future endeavors.

TRUTH-IN-FOOD LABELING

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently the Subcouncil on Packaging and Labeling of the National Business Council for Consumer Affairs issued a series of "Guiding Principles for Responsible Packaging and Labeling" which are designed to encourage businessmen throughout the country to adopt food labeling practices which will be informative to consumers.

The recommendations of the subcouncil follow closely the requirements of the Hartke Truth-in-Food Labeling Act (S. 3083) which I introduced earlier this year. Among the major points of similarity are the following:

1. "The name and address of the manufacturer, packer or distributor." (This requirement is contained in Title VI of my bill.)

2. "The date beyond which the product should not be sold if the product is perishable." (This requirement is contained in Title V of my bill).

3. "The common or usual name of ingredients or, where appropriate, the class of ingredients, listed in order of decreasing predominance." (This requirement is contained in Title III of my bill).

4. "A statement of nutrient value conforming to applicable federal guidelines." (This requirement is similar to one contained in Title II of my bill).

Mr. President, I am pleased to see the businessmen of this Nation come to the realization that it is good business from their point of view and the consumer's point of view to provide shoppers with adequate information about the products on supermarket and store shelves. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the subcouncil's guidelines be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR RESPONSIBLE PACKAGING AND LABELING

PREAMBLE

It is our intent that these guiding principles be given the broadest possible application wherever they would assist the consumer in making his purchase or use decision and wherever the value received by consumers from their application exceeds the cost of their implementation. We urge industry associations and individual businesses to develop specific policies and manufacturing practices consistent with these principles.

Packages and labels should meet the consumer's need for useful information to facilitate value comparison prior to purchase and to promote the economical and safe use of the product after purchase. The information should be presented in a clear and conspicuous manner. The seller or supplier should be able to document adequately all performance, safety or economy claims listed or depicted on the package or label.

More specifically, businesses should provide the following information on packages or labels of *consumer products* unless the provision of such information would be clearly irrelevant within the context of the total circumstances surrounding the sale.

1. The identity of the product by its common or usual name, description, generic term, or the like,

2. The net quantity of the product in terms of weight, measure, size, or numerical count,

3. The name and address of the manufacturer, packer or distributor,

4. A prominent warning of imminent hazards inherent with the use, maintenance, storage, or disposal of the product, and a description of the necessary treatment or antidote if the warning is ignored or misunderstood,

5. Clear and complete directions for use and care of the product. Separate use and care instructions should be provided for those products not normally consumed from or stored in the original package,

6. Relative price information in a convenient and understandable form. Price in-

formation should be displayed at the point of purchase when it is impractical for the seller or supplier to include price on the package or the label,

7. The date beyond which the product should not be sold if the product is perishable,

Businesses should also provide the following information on packages and labels of *processed food products* offered for sale.

8. The size, weight, or measure of servings where the label states number of servings,

9. The common or usual name of ingredients or, where appropriate, the class of ingredients, listed in order of decreasing by percentage if it will aid consumers in assessing economic value and food quality,

10. A statement of nutrient value conforming to applicable federal guidelines.

In addition to the above, all packages should contain the full and declared weight, measure or numerical count and be filled as full as practicable in accordance with good business practices. Packages should be designed to:

11. Protect the quality and form of the product,

12. Protect the persons who come into contact with the product during use, storage, maintenance and disposal,

13. Offer sufficient variety to serve the varying needs of consumers without unnecessarily complicating selection.

Finally, for the benefit of society in general, businesses should conserve natural resources in the original package, encourage, reuse of both packaging materials and packages themselves, and, minimize pollution in the disposal process.

SENATOR KARL MUNDT

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, when the Senate convenes in January for the beginning of the 93d Congress, we will do so in the absence of a colleague who had served his State of South Dakota for five terms in the House of Representatives and four terms in this body.

Senator KARL MUNDT was an effective spokesman for his State in his 34 years of public service in the Nation's Capital. It was unfortunate that illness curtailed his legislative activity the last few years. However, I wish to take this opportunity to wish him the best in his retirement and in his efforts to fully regain his health.

Senator MUNDT has served his State and Nation with dedication and honor.

THE 92D CONGRESS

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker—

The Ninety-second Congress could have been a great Congress. It was not.

In those few words, GERALD R. FORD, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, succinctly summarized the congressional record of the past 2 years. Though we can point to a number of noteworthy achievements, partisan politics of this Democratic-controlled Congress prevented passage of many legislative proposals aimed at making the Federal Government more responsive, more efficient, and more effective.

President Nixon in his January 22, 1971, state of the Union message outlined a bold blueprint of action and reform. He set six great goals for the Congress: Welfare reform, a full prosperity in peacetime, restoration and enhancement of our natural environment, improvement of America's health care, strengthening and renewing our State and local governments, and reform of the Federal Government.

Despite this great challenge, despite the opportunity to "seize the moment and achieve these goals," the response of the 92d Congress was tragically lacking. Of the President's six major legislative proposals only three—revenue sharing, environmental protection, and Federal spending control—received any consideration, inadequate as it may have been. For the remaining three there was virtually no definitive progress.

None of President Nixon's proposals for departmental reorganization designed to maximize the efficiency of the executive branch and eliminate the duplication, overlap and confusion of the present structure ever received floor consideration. Similarly, special revenue-sharing programs proposed by the President, under which more than $11 billion annually would be returned to States and local communities to bolster their efforts in the areas of education, rural development, urban development, manpower training, transportation and law enforcement, received little, if any legislative attention. And, perhaps most serious, the Congress failed to enact the desperately needed reform of the Nation's chaotic welfare system. Three and one-half million persons have been added to the welfare rolls during the past 3 years, and Federal welfare costs have increased 55 percent during that period. Although the urgency of action is obvious, Senate inaction thwarted the passage of welfare reform measures.

A comprehensive national health insurance program to protect Americans from the financial ruin of catastrophic illness and accident; private pension plan reform; effective consumer protection; powerplant siting measures designed to ease the energy crisis; effective before-the-fact protection against national emergency work stoppage; a $250 billion limit on Federal outlays in fiscal 1973; these and numerous other important legislative measures supported by President Nixon failed of passage. Of 64 major requests sent by the President to Capitol Hill, only one-third were enacted.

The 92d Congress, however, was not devoid of activity. The first session ended only late in December of last year; there were 648 rollcall votes during the two sessions. However, despite the exercise, legislative accomplishments were limited.

Perhaps first in importance was the passage of the $30.2 billion 5-year general revenue-sharing bill—as contrasted with the above mentioned special revenue-sharing measures—whereby Federal tax dollars are to be returned to State and local governments for a wide range of services and programs. Two constitutional amendments, the 26th, to allow 18-year-olds to vote in Federal and State elections, and the 27th, to provide equal rights regardless of sex, were passed, the former having been quickly ratified. The Rural Development Act, to improve job opportunities and the quality of life in rural America, received favorable action. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments which were enacted provide the Federal thrust needed for a massive cleanup of our Nation's waters. The Pesticide Control Act of 1972 and the Noise Control Act of 1972 are important environmental accomplishments.

Enactment of the Health Manpower Assistance Act and the Nurses Training Act, authorizing increased funds for the training of health professionals and construction of health research and teaching facilities, are major advances in our efforts to meet the Nation's health manpower requirements. Passage of the National Cancer Act; the National Sickle Cell Anemia Control Act; the Communicable Diseases Control Act Amendments to strengthen research, treatment and preventative efforts in those fields; and the establishment of the National Institutes of Arthritis, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases, will all contribute substantially to the Nation's health betterment.

The National Drug Abuse and Treatment Act of 1972 provides much needed assistance in the fight against drug addiction, through prevention, rehabilitation, and education programs.

The Higher Education Act Amendments of 1972 authorizes $18.5 billion over 3 years to extend and expand higher education program aid.

The strategic arms limitations agreement reached with Russia, a significant step toward peace, was approved.

And, late in the session, the social security laws were amended to provide a number of equitable changes, increasing benefits by 30 percent, adding automatic cost-of-living provisions, improving widows' benefits and raising outside income limitations.

The 92d Congress could have been a landmark Congress. It emerged with a partisan political record falling short of the goals President Nixon had set for it. There remains considerable unfinished work to be done; and there must be new solutions to meet new problems. Hopefully, the 93d Congress will rise to its task.

FOREIGN TRADE AND INVESTMENT ACT OF 1972

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the American balance of trade continues to suffer serious deficits. In 1971, the United States suffered the first balance-of-trade deficit in this century. At the present rate

of imbalance, last year's $2.2 billion of red ink will become a monstrous $6 billion this year.

To remedy our foreign trade disaster, to protect the American workingman, and to preserve America's diversified industrial base, I introduced the Hartke Foreign Trade and Investment Act of 1972. Few journalists read the bill in any detail, but many were quick to characterize the bill as a second Smoot-Hawley tariff bill. Ignoring the proposed tax changes, distorting the nature of the import quotas involved and passing over a host of other features in the bill, many journalists gave a very one-sided picture of the Hartke bill.

Not long ago, the Washington Post ran a two-part series on foreign trade that moved a considerable distance toward a balanced view. Written by the Post's Marilyn Berger, the first article explores the nature and origins of the Hartke-Burke Foreign Trade and Investment Act of 1972 and the response of the multinational companies. A companion piece explores the thorny problem of United States-Japan relations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two pieces by Marilyn Berger be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIONS MOUNT DRIVE AGAINST IMPORT CRISIS

(By Marilyn Berger)

A cartoon at the turn of the century depicted small European characters wielding tiny brooms in an attempt to sweep back a huge wave labeled "Uncle Sam's goods for the world." The caption declared: "They cannot keep back the rising tide of American competition."

That was in 1901. Seventy years later that tide turned. The wave is now lapping at both American shores and it is the American worker who is trying to hold back the flood.

As a result:

Claiming that more than a million jobs have been lost to imports since 1966, the AFL–CIO is backing the most protectionist legislation in 42 years.

In May, the AFL–CIO set up a special task force to lobby in Congress and to mount an educational campaign to win public backing of the legislation, known as the Burke-Hartke bill. Pilot projects are already under way in four states, with plans to move into the remaining 46.

As a result:

Labor leaders pressed their case before the Platform Committees of the Democratic and Republican Parties for protectionist planks.

The International Ladies Garment Workers Union (AFL–CIO) has been placing full-page ads in The Washington Post, The New York Times and other publications, showing an American flag with a "Made in Japan" label and warning that "If Betsy Ross were alive today she might be standing in an unemployment line." Along with other unions, ILGWU is pushing a "Buy American" campaign to educate consumers to buy products made in the U.S.A. and to leave the competing products on the shelves.

The ILGWU, which has set up its own special office to battle imports, is planning a series of "Save-Our-Jobs" rallies, to end with a march on Washington. The rubber workers in Akron held a similar rally in June.

"It's a concept whose time has come," says Ray Dennison, a congressional lobbyist for the AFL-CIO. "If there were no problems of unemployment and no problems in the export of technology and capital, the (Burke-Hartke) bill wouldn't have gotten all the attention and support it has already gotten." Dennison says more than 70 members of the House of Representatives are sponsoring the proposal.

The high rate of unemployment and the increasing U.S. investment in manufacturing plants abroad have undercut organized labor's traditional internationalist bent. Where before only a few unions in such industries as textiles and mining sought legislation against foreign imports, now workers in almost all manufacturing trades are demanding relief from competition from abroad.

What the captains of industry used to be saying has now become the theme for their former adversaries in the early battles between management and labor.

"The industrial base of the American economy is being undermined and narrowed," according to Nathaniel Goldfinger, the AFL–CIO's research director. Statistics vary, but all show the rising level of manufactured imports.

According to a congressional estimate called "conservative" by the AFL–CIO's legislative director, Andrew J. Biemiller, imports now account for 20 per cent of all U.S. automobile sales, 30 per cent of television sets, more than 40 per cent of glassware and about 60 per cent of sewing machines and calculating machines.

"As far as the AFL–CIO can learn," said Biemiller in testimony to Congress a year ago, "about 100 per cent of all (tape recorded) cassettes that are sold in this country are now imported; 95 per cent or more of all radios . . . are imports."

To illustrate the magnitude of the problem, Biemiller said that between 1962 and 1970 exports of rubber manufacturers rose 27 per cent, while imports rose 266 per cent; textile exports rose 23 per cent, imports 71 per cent; autos, trucks and parts exports rose 138 per cent while imports shot up to 884 per cent.

The latest trade figures issued at the end of July by the Commerce Department show that despite Washington's efforts to realign world currencies to get a more realistic valuation of the dollar, the level of imports continues to rise.

The trade balance, which for the first time in this century turned against the United States last year, showed a deficit for the first seven months of 1972 of almost $3.9 billion, compared with $642.3 million during the same period in 1971.

Organized labor lays the blame for the loss of American manufacturing advantage directly on the big U.S. corporations which have gone international, moving money, technology and plants overseas. They hold these multinational corporations responsible for robbing the American workers of his means of subsistence.

English-built Fords and General Motors-manufactured Opels, in labor's view, mean less sales for Detroit. Remington Rand Vienna means that Remington Rand Elmira is no longer needed.

Writes Goldfinger: "A U.S. based multinational corporation can produce components in widely separated plants in Korea, Taiwan and the United States, assemble the product in a plant on the Mexican side of the border and sell the goods in the United States at American prices—perhaps with a U.S. brand name. Or the goods produced in foreign subsidiary plants are sold in foreign markets in competition with U.S.-made products."

In its proposals presented to both the Democratic and Republican Platform Committee the AFL–CIO stated: "Today the U.S. worker is virtually helpless in protecting his job and his standard of living. U.S. markets have been overrun with imports costing tens of thousands of U.S. jobs. . . . At the same time U.S. owned multi-national firms, seeking to maximize profits, have moved production of huge parts of U.S. industry abroad . . . Helping to spur these global runaways . . . are the U.S. tax and tariff laws with their incentives to encourage U.S. firms to manufacture their goods abroad. These loopholes should be removed . . ."

AFL–CIO President George Meany told the Senate Subcommittee on International Trade that the multi-national corporations "can juggle the production of parts and finished products from one subsidiary in one country to another . . . juggle their bookkeeping and their prices and their taxes. Their export and import transactions are within the corporations, determined by the executives of the corporation—all for the benefit and the profit of the corporation. This is not foreign trade. Surely it is not foreign competition."

Said Meany: "The complex operations of multi-nationals—with the aid of Madison Avenue advertising—have utterly confused the picture of the national origin of products. For example, Ford's Pinto has been heralded as the U.S. answer to imported small cars. But the engines are imported from England and Germany, and standard transmissions are imported from Europe."

Dennison said decisions that determine whether people are jobless, which are now being made by private industry, should be made by Congress, "not by companies that brag about not being American anymore."

He adds: "Do you know that Ford now brags that it's not an American company anymore?"

Labor's prescription to cure all these ills would become law if the Burke-Hartke bill were adopted. First introduced in September, 1971, "to promote full employment and restore a diversified production base," it would amend tax laws "to stem the outflow of United States capital, jobs, technology, and production, and for other purposes.

The major provisions of the bill would:

Establish quotas on virtually all products entering the country by requiring that the total of any 1972 imports not exceed the average of the year 1965 to 1969. In subsequent years imports would be permitted to reach the same "share" of the market they held in 1972. For example, if 40 per cent of all leather shoes sold in the United States during that year were imported, the same percentage could be imported in following years.

Give the President power to limit the export of capital if he determined that the outflow would lead to a decrease in domestic employment.

Repeal the foreign tax credit which makes it possible for corporations to get a dollar-for-dollar reduction on American taxes for taxes paid to foreign governments. The Burke-Hartke bill would make these foreign taxes deductible, meaning that the corporations would have a sharply increased U.S. tax to pay.

Eliminate tax deferrals which now permit corporations to pay taxes on money earned abroad only at the time it is repatriated, not necessarily during the year in which it is earned.

Eliminate tax exemptions for Americans living and working in foreign countries.

Although the bill is considered dead for this year—trade legislation has traditionally been ignored at election time—it is expected to be re-introduced in the next Congress. Tax aspects of the bill may also be considered in overall tax reform.

The proposals go against the grain of American tradition as a free trading nation, but the situation is untraditional. Congressmen faced with the shutdown in their districts of factories that mean not only unemployment but lost buying power in the community are going to come under heavy pressure from organized labor's campaign.

Hit with this challenge from organized labor, which would force a complete transformation in the way the multi-national

corporations operate, big business has countered with its own lobbying campaign to fight Burke-Hartke:

Fifty-eight of the major multi-national corporations formed the Emergency Committee for American Trade to fight protectionist legislation and limits on investments abroad and to conduct surveys on the impact of these businesses on the American economy.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce set up a special task force on multinational enterprise. It, too, took a survey and came up with statistics that rebut labor's contentions.

Individual corporations have drawn up profiles showing how their activities, contrary to labor's contentions, have not resulted in the loss of jobs but in job increases.

According to the Chamber of Commerce study, the multi-national corporations do not go abroad to locate near cheap foreign labor, as the unions charge, but rather to retain foreign markets that would otherwise be forfeited to foreign producers. Only by locating within certain countries can many of these firms have access to markets by getting around such things as tariff barriers and other regulations. Drug firms, for example, claim that a maze of health regulations would bar them from certain markets if production were not located within the country of sale.

Income from abroad, these corporations argue, make them better employers at home, where they say they are increasing their employment levels faster than the national average.

One Commerce Department study showed that "U.S. foreign direct investment abroad has not been a significant source of job-displacing imports into the United States," and that, in fact, 250,000 jobs would be lost if this kind of investment ceased. The choice for industry, according to this study, is often not between setting up operations in the United States or abroad "but between foreign operations and no operations at all."

Historically, barriers to trade have always invited retaliation. The 1930 Smoot-Hawley tariff was blamed for deepening the Depression, and industry and government officials argue that a similar move today would lead to a bruising trade war.

Robert L. McNeill, executive vice chairman of the Emergency Committee on American Trade, conceded, however, that it is a difficult argument to sell at this time.

"The swing in the trade balance is killing us," McNeill said in a recent interview. "It's difficult to argue national interest in trade with a deficit in the trade account of $5 to $6 billion this year."

Threats of retaliation to import barriers do not concern Sen. Vance Hartke (D-Ind.), who introduced the Burke-Hartke bill in the Senate.

"If you want to go into a trade war the United States can sustain it," said Hartke in a recent interview. "I don't want to let those countries contribute to our depression."

Hartke's fighting words find a sympathetic hearing not only because imports are increasing and exports are not keeping pace. America's economic troubles come at a time when, under the umbrella of the Nixon Doctrine, the nation has begun to cut down its overseas commitments, in the aftermath of the painful lessons of the Vietnam war which graphically illustrated the limits of power.

Disillusion with military force, combined with a diminished economic power as Europe and Japan became aggressive traders, contributed to a climate in which isolationist ideas such as protectionism have become respectable.

Wilbur Mills (D-Ark.) chairman of the powerful House Ways and Means Committee that would hold the inital hearings on any trade bill, warns, however, that the legislative quotas required by Burke-Hartke are "the last thing in the world we should have."

Mills, who was active in getting voluntary quotas on textile imports and who would like to see other voluntary agreements negotiated, said in an interview recently: "Burke-Hartke wouldn't result in more jobs . . . If you reduce imports you of necessity threaten jobs involved in the import of goods that may not develop on the export side either. You could actually reduce jobs in both instances . . . Burke-Hartke would result in a net reduction of jobs. I can't prove it, but it's logic.

Acknowledging that an election year is not the time to get trade legislation, Mills said: "We must try to have a trade bill in '73. You can't go and go and go without knowing what our policy is." But, said Mills, "I hope it will not be a bill developed in hysterical fear of imports."

That is for next year. For the remainder of this year there is the campaign. Democratic vice presidential candidate Sargent Shriver last week told a crowd in Detroit concerned with steel imports that "we have to make American steel more competitive. You can't do something simple like stop all steel imports because they will then say we won't take any agricultural products from you or something." Negotiations with U.S. trading partners were necessary, Shriver said.

The Democratic platform, while nodding to labor's demands, gave little encouragement to protectionists, and the Republican platform expounded more on past actions than on future programs.

The Republicans seemed to be trying to court labor's vote while not alienating traditional supporters in big business:

"We deplore the practice of locating plants in foreign countries solely to take advantage of low wage rates in order to produce goods primarily for sale in the United States. We will take action to discourage such unfair and disruptive practices that result in the loss of American jobs."

For most of this year the unions will be trying to get sympathetic congressmen elected or reelected and to keep the issue before the public. The big push will then come with the new Congress in the new year.

MANY ANSWERS, NO SOLUTIONS: UNITED STATES-JAPAN TRADE DILEMMA

(By Marilyn Berger)

An administration official and a reporter were speculating recently on ways to even out the worsening trade balance with Japan.

"We could get them to buy more grain," suggested the official.

"Yes," replied the reporter, "but then they'd produce more cattle and increase meat exports."

"Perhaps we could get them to eat more meat at home," mused the official. "Then they'd have more heart attacks," the reporter said.

"Well, that's one way to make them less productive."

The conversation illustrated the growth of concern in Washington over the rising volume of imports coming into the United States, particularly from Japan.

The problem is serious. Just before President Nixon met last week in Hawaii with Japanese Prime Minister Kakuei Tanaka, the government estimated that the United States will suffer a $3.8-billion deficit this year in its trade with Japan alone.

Overall, the U.S. deficit for the first seven months of 1972 was $3.9 billion, six times greater than the same period in 1971. Official figures show that the trade balance ran against the United States in 1971 for the first time since 1893.

One of the most drastic responses to this situation has come from organized labor in this country, specifically the AFL-CIO. It is urging Congress to enact a highly protectionist measure called the Burke-Hartke bill, which would not only cut imports of foreign goods but also severely limit American investment in plants abroad.

The core of labor's argument is that hundreds of thousands of American jobs are being destroyed by foreign competition. "We need a Congress that will stop the growing export of American jobs, capital, technology and production by multi-national corporations based in the United States," George Meany declared in his prepared Labor Day message.

"Organized labor is not against foreign trade—of course not," said Meany. "But we are against the outmoded 19th Century trade policies that have lost American workers nearly one million job opportunities in the last six years. We are against trade policies that are eroding entire U.S. industries—textiles, shoes, clothing, steel, auto, rubber, electronic equipment. We are against trade policies that fatten corporate profits while undermining the American economy."

Meany called for passage of the Burke-Hartke bill next year. The proposal would fix import quotas on virtually every product imported into the United States, from steel and automobiles to tape recorders and shoes, and would, in Meany's view, protect American jobs and the American worker's standard of living.

Another view—quite extreme in its own way—is that the United States is inevitably moving into a post-industrial phase in which trade balances are unimportant.

Lawrence B. Krause, an economist at the Brookings Institution, says that investments made abroad by U.S. companies are now yielding large dividend and interest returns to their parents and that these returns are likely to grow substantially during the decade of the 1970s.

"Indeed," wrote Krause in the Columbia Journal of World Business, "one may question how other countries will be able to balance their accounts if the United States does not run a substantial trade deficit."

Herman Kahn of the Hudson Institute told a White House conference in February that unless some unforeseen changes occur, the world of 1990 will be one with fewer blue-collar workers, with "construction" and manufacturing industries . . . a smaller and smaller part of the nation's activity . . . and . . . an enormous increase in the technical and professional labor force."

Economists acknowledge that the transition to a "post-industrial" economy would cause severe hardship to displaced industries and countless workers. But, they argue, the dislocation would be "temporary" in historical terms and would lead in the end, to a higher American standard of living.

The Nixon administration buys neither of these drastic solutions to our international trade difficulties. It has tried to improvise stop-gap remedies such as the unilateral economic and monetary actions of last summer, the import surtax, and devaluation, for example. It was an effort to bring other countries into line but the effects were limited, and the trade balance continued to tip against the United States.

"We found out that brute force doesn't work," said one administration official. "We're powerful, but not that powerful."

Another short-term remedy has been the series of "voluntary agreements" with countries such as Japan to limit exports of specific classes of goods including textiles, steel and shoes. In the absence of any coherent policy, one official conceded, the Nixon administration "lurched toward protectionism."

A third response by the administration has been the effort to open up new export markets, especially in the Soviet Union and China, as part of its new diplomacy. Businessmen are also being encouraged to increase exports to traditional buyers with Americans

now taking lessons from the Japanese in marketing techniques, an art that was once thought to be exclusively American.

For the longer term, the administration is preparing for a new round of multilateral trade negotiations in 1973. But the prospects for these negotiations are uncertain.

The American negotiators will be confronted abroad by aggressive trading powers like the Japanese and the European Common Market and by the less developed countries seeking preferential arrangements to encourage their own industrialization. And at home, they will face the conflicting demands of disparate economic interests.

There are the unions, for example, which argue persuasively and with strong political support in Congress, that a million jobs have been lost to imports since 1966, with some industries, such as home entertainment electronics and shoes, being particularly hard hit.

There are the huge multinational corporations, based in the United States but with vast investments and markets abroad. These companies, which have launched a public relations campaign to counter labor's arguments are telling congressmen that their activities contribute to America's balance of payments as well as to the rate of employment in the United States by creating markets for American production and by developing earnings abroad.

A third force is the increasingly vocal and influential consumer movement. Largely through the efforts of major companies, the consumer is being made aware that the availability of imports is critical to keeping prices down and to maintaining the wide variety of products.

Statistics are assembled to support all these positions. Labor can "prove," for example, as one of the studies prepared for the AFL–CIO's Industrial Union Department asserts, that "between 1966 and 1969 U.S. foreign trade produced the equivalent at a net loss of half a million American jobs." (Labor spokesmen say the number by 1972 has reached one million.)

Labor contends that investments by multi-national corporations abroad have further deprived Americans of jobs. The AFL–CIO's director of research, Nathaniel Goldfinger, simply to cite one example, points to a decision by Zenith Radio Corp. to build a plant in Taiwan, leading to an initial reduction in its American work force by 3,000 jobs, with probably another 4,000 layoffs to follow.

The multi-nationals say they can "prove" not only that they do not export jobs, but that they are far ahead of the overall national average in increasing employment.

A U.S. Chamber of Commerce task force on multi-national enterprises conducted a survey represented as providing "positive evidence" that 121 firms replying to questionnaire increased employment by 31.1 per cent between 1960 and 1970, "significantly higher than the national percentage increase for that period."

The same survey credits 81 multi-nationals with "export performance . . . far superior to the national experience during 1960–1970." It contends that, by the testimony of the multi-nationals, the corporations invest abroad to retain foreign markets and not to take advantage of cheap foreign labor.

These corporations have done internal studies to prove their case. Take the Bendix Corp., for example. Employment increased by roughly one-third between 1965 and 1971; domestic sales virtually doubled over the last decade, while exports during the same period more than tripled, from $35 million in 1960 to $124 million in 1971.

"Using Secretary of Commerce (Peter G.) Peterson's measure of every billion dollars of U.S. exports creating 60,000 to 80,000 new jobs, this means that close to 8,000 Bendix jobs were export-related (in 1971)," according to one of the company's reports.

The report goes on to state that "a significant share of our direct exports would not have been possible in the absence of our foreign industrial base. . . . Our foreign investments, therefore, have not deprived American workers of jobs. Quite the contrary, they have created additional exports from the U.S. and additional income flows into the U.S., thereby adding to employment in this country. . . . It is our estimate that the total net income of the corporation in . . . 1970 would have been reduced by $7.5 million. Representing more than 20 per cent of our total earnings that year . . . imagine the effect such a reduction would have had on Bendix' employment and on the general welfare of everyone involved with our company, as well as on the U.S. economy as a whole."

Consumers are just beginning to be made aware of the implication of limiting imports. A Council on International Economic Policy report touches on the issue:

"If restrictions were to limit the availability or increase the price of such (imported) products, consumers would no doubt feel that their 'quality of life' has suffered.

'To illustrate this," the report continued, studies of such products as shoes and television sets suggest that without import, their prices in the United States might rise 30 per cent. For tape recorders and a number of other key items, prices could rise as much as 50 per cent. Asides from unfavorable consumer reaction, restricting these products would obviously add to inflationary pressures."

The conflicting statistics, all of them based on assumptions that are questionable, pose great problems for politicians, notably members of Congress who, in the final analysis, will have a large voice in any future trade policies.

The administration must go to Congress to negotiate on tariffs if it is to enter into the multilateral trade negotiations it has been pushing for in 1973. Such legislation, along with tax reform, will determine the future U.S. position in international trade.

Some politicians have already taken sides.

Sen. Vance Hartke (D-Ind.) is the most outspoken supporter of labor's position. He says he doesn't believe the statistics presented by the companies and is unafraid of threatened retaliation by other countries if import quotas are imposed.

Wilbur Mills (D-Ark.) chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee that would be the first to hold hearings on trade legislation, remains an advocate of voluntary agreements to limit imports. He says Burke-Hartke-type quotas are "the last thing in the world we should have."

The administration has remained out of the battle over Burke-Hartke, but most official statements dwell on the problems that would result if quotas were imposed. In an election year, however, no administration wants to alienate either side in such conflict.

The Republican platform hedges. The Democrats gave a nod to labor's contentions but stick with free trade. "When a job is available for everyone who wants to work imports will no longer be a threat."

Democratic Presidential candidate George McGovern talks of jobs as the "cornerstone" of his economic policy. He called last Wednesday for 'even-handed tax treatment for American business abroad and enterprises here at home." He said: "Corporations should be encouraged to export their products, but they should not be allowed a special tax break merely because they earn their income overseas," one of the conclusions of Burke-Hartke both.

Both the Democrats and the Republicans talk of assistance to industries and workers affected by imports.

The entire argument over the effects of imports on jobs and foreign investment and the distribution of technology around the world by the multi-national corporations is further complicated by the political impact of these giant businesses.

In addition to labor's attack on the multinationals for moving the American manufacturing base abroad and for robbing the country while they juggle profits and production of its technological advantage, the companies are also under fire for their alleged attempts at political influence in foreign countries.

Following disclosures that the International Telephone and Telegraph Corp. allegedly sought to influence the Chilean election in 1970, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee decided to investigate the relationship of these businesses to U.S. foreign policy and the U.S. national interests.

This investigation will be designed to determine whether the activities of corporations that operate beyond national laws serve the national interest. It could lead to some deep probing into the internal workings of their business conduct.

The administration is now preparing its position for the 1973 negotiations in which it expects to deal with tariff and non-tariff barriers such as health and safety regulations that are used to hold down import levels. It also hopes to establish "safeguards" that will allow countries to take certain steps when a too-rapid rise in exports causes severe social and economic problems.

Any administration would be hamstrung if the Burke-Hartke bill were enacted. Willis C. Armstrong, assistant secretary of state for economic affairs, said that if the bill were approved the United States would be left with nothing to negotiate.

"If you expect to get any concessions," Armstrong said in a recent interview, "countries have to be prepared to make concessions themselves."

The state of the economy at the time Burke-Hartke and other trade legislation is considered could well determine the outcome. Administration officials predict a bruising trade war that would depress the world economy if barriers were set up.

That international trade policy has been uneven and unclear can be attributed partly to the acknowledged fact that it has been an afterthought in the formulation of foreign policy. But it can also be attributed to the fact that this is a period of transition in domestic economic thinking.

"Attitudes and philosophies are changing rapidly," Harald B. Malmgren, deputy special representative for trade negotiations, said in a recent interview. While organized labor in the manufacturing industries is convinced that more government controls are needed to organize the economy, particularly to curb imports, business corporations are torn between the traditional desire to see the government keep hands off and a perceived need for the kind of industry-government coordination that has made Japan such a powerful exporting nation.

"Ten years ago," says Malmgren, "businessmen wanted to be left alone; now they talk about close industry-government cooperation. After being told to stay away for years the bureaucrats now don't know what to do.

"If you sat down and had a meeting with the Chamber of Commerce or the National Association of Manufacturers . . . you'd find that people can't make up their minds about what policy should be. Everyone's questioning the conventional wisdom."

The questions being asked are a reflection of the fact that the United States position in the world economy is also in transition. Implicit in much of Mr. Nixon's foreign policy so far—his trips to Moscow and Peking, the summit conference with Japanese Premier Tanaka, talks with European leaders—is the

recognition that the United States is no longer the dominant nation in a world that has several power centers.

The administration—along with labor, business and the consumer—is only beginning to recognize and deal with the United States' reduced economic power position.

SENATOR KARL MUNDT

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, at the end of this session the great KARL MUNDT of South Dakota is to leave the Congress after a career of much distinction. His retirement was forced on him due to illness. It is, of course, most regrettable because Senator MUNDT was widely recognized as one of the most able, courageous, and valuable Members of the Senate.

It happens that I have known KARL very well for many years. His devotion to patriotic and related causes is well known. His contribution to improvements in our governmental structure is equally well known. Above, all, Senator MUNDT never faltered in the many battles he waged for the preservation of constitutional government. In that respect he has had few equals in his time.

Let us hope and pray that KARL will continue to improve and that he and Mrs. Mundt will enjoy good health and happiness during the years ahead.

THREE STEPS FOR COLLEGE ENTRANCE

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, having passed historic legislation this session in the area of higher education, this Congress has affirmed a deep commitment to our Nation's colleges and universities. We have an opportunity now to enhance this commitment by assisting those who are contemplating college entrance.

Many potential students have questions about what to study and what it will cost. Handicapped students, in particular, are in need of such assistance. A leaflet has been published under the auspices of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Washington, D.C. 20210, and the B'nai B'rith Career and Counseling Services, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036. This sets forth valuable information for the individual preparing for school or college. I am pleased to insert "Three Steps for College Entrance" in the RECORD, and commend it to the attention of my colleagues at this time:

THREE STEPS FOR COLLEGE ENTRANCE

Today, many teenagers—particularly the handicapped—want to know what to study and what it will cost. This flyer helps answer these questions.

ONE, TO GET READY

Begin talking about your tentative vocational objectives the first year of high school. Include required education and costs. Discuss these important topics with your parents or guidance counselor. Initiate counseling with the vocational rehabilitation counselor in your area.

Maintain positive study habits. Admission to higher educational institutions often depends on high school grades. If your grades are below par, find out what you may do to improve them.

Participate in extra-curricular activities to extent studies permit. School and community activities are an important factor considered in school and college admission.

Record your achievements. This record will be a valuable reference for your schooling or employment.

Outline your educational and vocational objectives. Narrow your choice. Take courses that prepare you for college or for advanced training. Consult your parents, guardian, your guidance counselor.

Start writing to colleges, business, trade or technical schools, home study schools for catalogs in your sophomore year.

Are the schools you are considering accessible to a person with your handicap? Find out.

Set up an education planning calendar. Record the date, time and location for each required examination. Record the deadline for filing applications. Meet Your Deadlines.

Each college-bound student takes certain examinations in the junior year and senior year of high school. If your handicap requires special arrangements, make them in advance. Your guidance counselor can tell you which examinations you must take.

Try to visit as many schools and colleges as possible. If you require assistance in getting about, arrange for this in advance. Suggestion: Read, "How to Visit Colleges," available from the National Vocational Guidance Association, 1607 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

TWO, FOR THE MONEY

When you start your planning for school or college—you'll realize the expense involved. To cushion the shock, here are some self-help ideas.

Looking for a scholarship? Obtain scholarship application forms and the financial statement forms appropriate to your abilities and interests. Fill them out accurately and return them as soon as possible. Check with your guidance counselor where you may obtain the necessary forms.

Most schools have financial aid officers. Most provide financial information in their catalog or in a separate statement and bulletin. If you need financial assistance, ask about it when you are choosing a school. Applying for student aid won't lessen your chances for admission.

If possible, establish a savings plan in a bank or savings and loan association.

While you are in high school, scout actively for work, if your condition permits. Look for full-time summer work. Studies permitting, try to obtain part-time work on Saturdays and during vacations.

Start a student aid scrapbook. Include data on scholarships, grants, fellowships, awards and educational loans available from public and private sources.

Check your high school, community center or public library bulletin board for announcements of contests, grants, loans or scholarships. Many contests offer either cash or scholarships. Enter those contests open to you. Who knows, you may be a winner!

Here are Some Resources Which May Help. Write To Them Today!

The Foundation Center, either 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022 or 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006. The Center maintains a directory that lists the area of study covered by grant-giving foundations.

The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036, prepares a list of approved National Contests and Activities. Get a copy of that list. Don't Overlook The Following Publications. Many Are In Your Public Library Or You May Write For Them.

A Chance to Go to College: A Directory of 800 Colleges That Have Special Help for Students from Minorities and Low-Income Families. College Entrance Examination Board, 888 Seventh Ave., New York, N.Y. 10019.

Counselor's Manual for "How About College Financing?" The American School Counselors Association, 1607 New Hampshire Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

Directory of Accredited Private Home Study Schools. 1971. National Home Study Council, 1601 Eighteenth St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

Directory of Organizations Interested in the Handicapped. Committee for the Handicapped, 1218 New Hampshire Ave. NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

How About College Financing? A Guide for Parents of College-Bound Students. The American School Counselor Association, 1607 New Hampshire Ave. NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

Financing a College Science Education. The National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C. 20550.

Latest Information on Scholarships in the Space Age. B'nai B'rith Career and Counseling Services, 1640 Rhode Island Ave. NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

More Education—More Opportunity. U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.

Need a Lift? The American Legion Education and Scholarship Program, Box 1055, Indianapolis, Indiana 46206.

Scholarships, Fellowships and Loans, Volumes III and IV. Bellman Publishing Company, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138.

Scholarships, Fellowships and Loans Newsletter. Bellman Publishing Company, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138.

Student Aid Planning in the Space Age: A Selected Bibliography. B'nai B'rith Career and Counseling Services, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Student Aids in the Space Age: Educational Resources for the Handicapped—1971 Revision. B'nai B'rith Career and Counseling Services, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Many state departments of education publish a state directory of student aids available to residents. Check this resource. Your local librarian can help.

Consult your State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. The local address can be found in your telephone directory under the State Government listings.

The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Washington, D.C. 20210.

B'nai B'rith Career and Counseling Services, Washington, D.C. 20036.

STEP THREE

Keep looking, keep trying, and good luck. Your future is in your hands.

THE FOREIGN TRADE AND INVESTMENT ACT OF 1972

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the steady flight of American industry to

foreign shores has cost thousands upon thousands of American jobs.

Our current tax laws create an attractive tax shelter for earnings on foreign investments and thereby encourage a growing outflow of much-needed capital investment.

With the advent of price and wage controls, the Nixon administration created a second incentive to move American industry abroad. By exempting the overseas operations of American-based multinationals from the wage-price guidelines, the Nixon economic policy is guaranteed to add to our disastrous balance-of-trade deficit.

Mr. President, a recent article in the Journal of Commerce spells out how the current wage-price guidelines have helped boost the earnings of multinationals. Because of its import for future trade policy, I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Overseas Operations Help Multinationals Earnings," be reprinted in the RECORD at this point.

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

OVERSEAS OPERATIONS HELP MULTINATIONALS' EARNINGS

(By Sidney Fish)

Profits on overseas operations played an important role in the strong improvement in earnings reported by multinational companies for the first half of this year.

The upturn in business in Europe is only one of the factors accounting for the rise in overseas profits. Prices of foreign subsidiaries are not subject to price controls by the U.S. Price Commission. The commission's rules, moreover, exclude profits of foreign subsidiaries from total company profits, in calculating the margin of allowable profit on company sales. Under the Price Commission's regulations, each company that raises prices must not allow its margin of profit in 1972 to exceed the margin realized in the company's base period, which is usually two of the three years, 1968, 1969 and 1970.

PROTECTION FROM CONTROLS

The effect of this exclusion of foreign subsidiaries' earnings is to give companies that have extensive operations abroad considerable protection from the impact of the price control rules.

Many American companies now derive 25 to 50 per cent of their earnings from their foreign subsidiaries. A leader in this respect is ITT. The latter reported record sales of $2.1 billion for the second quarter and $4 billion for the first half of this year, up 12 and 16 per cent respectively, over a year ago. ITT indicated in its annual report for 1971 that only 56 per cent of its net sales and revenues of $7.3 billion was accounted for by operations in the U.S. and Canada. Europe alone accounted for 35 per cent of ITT's sales and revenues last year, according to Harold S. Geneen, chairman and president.

ITT's consolidated income in the second quarter of this year amounted to $121 million or 99 cents a share, a gain of 10 per cent over the 90 cents a share for the similar period of 1971. For the first half, sales were up 15 per cent, and per share earnings were up 10.1 per cent to $1.74 a share. The company's European telecommunications products are showing continued strength, Mr. Geneen said.

U.S. AUTO SALES ABROAD

General Motors, Ford and Chrysler reported record-breaking sales of vehicles produced in overseas markets during the second quarter. This performance helped these companies to set records in world sales.

The Singer Co. derived 38 per cent of its sales from operations outside the U.S. last year. In its report for the second quarter, which showed an 8 per cent gain in sales and a 36 per cent rise in earnings, Donald Kircher, president, said worldwide sales of consumer products rose 5 per cent in the first half, due to improvement in overseas countries, while in the U.S. sales of sewing machines were down somewhat.

Singer, like other companies with large investments overseas, gained from the realignment of currencies, excluding the devaluation of the British pound.

Goodyear and other major tire companies have received strong contributions to their earnings from overseas subsidiaries. Goodyear, for example, reported first half profits of $93,190,000, an increase of 16 per cent over a year ago. Foreign profits of Goodyear for the first half were $29,082,000, or 9.2 per cent above last year's $26,554,000, despite a strike at the company's largest facility in Great Britain, according to Russell DeYoung, chairman of Goodyear.

Continental Can, which boosted its earnings 18 per cent in the second quarter, on a sales increase of 10 per cent, derives about 25 per cent of its sales and income from overseas operations. The company developed a strong position in overseas countries many years ago, when it began to offer its research and know-how to foreign packaging companies, in exchange for an equity position in these companies. Today Continental has a 2 to 10 per cent interest in nearly 40 overseas packaging companies, to which it sells machinery and expertise.

STANDARD BRANDS

Standard Brands, Inc. which reported worldwide sales and earnings records for the first half and the second quarter, said that international operations made a major contribution to this performance. Henry Weigl, president, said better results were achieved at Walker Crisps (United Kingdom) which makes potato chips; Leite Gloria (Brazil) which makes condensed milk; and Calona Wines (Canada).

Standard Brands announced in its annual report for 1971 that operations outside the U.S. last year accounted for 23 per cent of the company's total sales and 24 per cent of net income. Profits overseas have improved thus far this year.

AMF, Inc., boosted the earnings of its overseas operations substantially in recent years, and continued this trend in the first half in which it set records and sales and earnings. Overseas operations accounted for 27 per cent of the company's operations last year, up from 15 per cent in 1969. In the first half of 1972 AMF's net profit rose 35 per cent to a new record of $27.7 million or $1.48 a share, against $20.5 million or $1.11 a share in the similiar period of 1971. The company makes leisure time and machinery products. It is forecasting growth for both lines overseas.

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. INDEPENDENT TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 75th anniversary of one of America's largest but least known industries, the independent—non-Bell—telephone companies. Since 1897, when the predecessor organization to the U.S. Independent Association was formed, the industry has demonstrated remarkable ingenuity and enterprise in providing telephone service to the public.

The independent companies last month held their diamond jubilee convention October 9–12, 1972. Their anniversary provided an opportunity to reflect on the accomplishments of the independent movement, as well as the future problems of these pioneering businessmen.

Today there are 1,800 independent companies, ranging in size from giants with multistate operations and operating revenues in excess of $1.5 billion to small, family owned companies. They operate 22 million telephones throughout the country. In fact, one of every six phones is operated by a non-Bell company.

Independents provide exclusive service in Alaska and Hawaii and serve many large cities, including Long Beach, Calif.; Lincoln, Nebr.; Rochester, N.Y.; Tampa, Fla.; and Las Vegas, Nev. They also provide service in the capitals of the States of Alaska, Hawaii, Missouri, Nebraska, and Florida.

Because the independents are still primarily located in suburban and smaller communities, where the Nation's population growth is the greatest, the independents are growing faster percentagewise than the Bell System. For example, total independent company revenue climbed 15 percent last year—to about $3.5 billion—while Bell System revenue increased 9 percent.

The independent telephone companies now have a plant investment in excess of $14 billion and are increasing their facilities by about $2 billion a year. The companies employ more than 155,000 people.

Independents began springing up in the early days in the tradition of our free enterprise system. Using equipment which they believed differed sufficiently from Bell's to avoid patent infringement, the independents formed more than 125 companies before Alexander Graham Bell's basic telephone patents expired.

In 1894, when Bell's patents lapsed, the Bell System was serving fewer than 240,000 telephones, mostly on business premises in larger cities. Rural areas and smaller communities were without telephones until enterprising doctors, lawyers, livery stablemen, and others formed their own telephone companies.

Competition with the Bell System began in earnest and by 1897 more than 6,000 non-Bell companies were started throughout the country. Although the telephone experience of the early independents may have been limited, their enthusiasm and ingenuity were not. Farmers and others pooled their resources and established their own systems—some even using barbed wire fences to conduct the current. Single families often ran these businesses from farmhouses in rural America.

During the early years of the independent movement, fierce competition raged between the much larger Bell System and the small non-Bell companies. Many communities had two or even three telephone systems, with increased costs because of duplicate equipment. The in-

dependents realized the advantages of a united front and organized a national association, which held its first annual meeting in Detroit in 1897.

Although the independents were small, to Bell interests they were still competitors. When litigation and competition failed to stifle them the Bell System tried to purchase them outright. The ensuing rivalry lasted until 1913 when N. C. Kingsbury, vice president of American Telephone & Telegraph Co., acted to establish a fair commercial relationship between Bell and the independents. A.T. & T. agreed to discontinue acquiring other telephone companies operating in competition with it, with certain exceptions.

The A.T. & T. also agreed to provide arrangements for long distance toll connections between itself and the independents. Prior to that time the Bell system had refused access to its national network of lines, a serious disadvantage for independent customers.

Kingsbury's move was in large part prompted by increased government regulation of the telephone industry. As early as 1907, New York and Wisconsin established commissions with authority to set rates and regulate telephone service. In 1910 Congress placed certain aspects of interstate telephone operations under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the total industry's leadership realized that Federal regulation might go much further if voluntary tranquility in the public interest were not forthcoming.

In 1922 E. K. Hall, another A.T. & T. vice president, announced that his company would not purchase or consolidate with connecting or duplicating companies, except in special cases. At the USITA convention that same year Hall reaffirmed his statement, concluding that it was in the interest of both the independents and the Bell system to have two strong groups in the industry.

It is certainly fair to say that the existence of the independents may have saved the industry from Government ownership. Today the United States undoubtedly has the best telephone service in the world, clearly the result of our system of privately owned companies operating under Government regulation.

Over the years the independents have made many improvements to the telephone. The most spectacular was development of the dial system by Almon Brown Strowger, a Kansas City undertaker who wanted to circumvent a telephone operator he believed was screening his business calls and directing them to his competitor. Other independents designed a handset telephone, the forerunner of the instrument in use today, as well as scores of improvements in switchboards, transmitters, and receivers.

Since the early years the Bell and independent systems have expanded tremendously and developed into a fully integrated national network. During this period of growth and cooperation, the U.S. Independent Telephone Association has played a vital role in uniting the industry and providing information and assistance in many phases of communications service.

The telephone industry's growing range of services coupled with the needs of a growing population and business community, make it clear that the pace of activity will continue to accelerate for the independents as well as for the Bell System. Thus there are many challenges ahead.

Expanded service must be financed in a competitive money market. An expanding scale of investment will be required in coming years as the independents strive to meet increasing service demands of our Nation's growing population and an increasingly sophisticated telecommunications technology. The industry is spending almost $2 billion annually in new facilities.

Another challenge will be Government-stimulated competition in the area of interconnection equipment and specialized communications carriers. Recent decisions by the Federal Communications Commission indicate that the telecommunications industry is entering a new era. The independents are not strangers to competition and are preparing for this development.

Over the years the independent telephone industry has met every challenge before it in order to provide, with the Bell System, the best telephone service in the world. The independent companies and the Bell companies cooperate as a team in this endeavor. Continued operation under creative private enterprise and judicious Government regulation will insure even greater success in the future. The history of the origin of the independent segment of the telephone industry portrays a good example of the working of the American free enterprise system.

FOREIGN TRADE AND INVESTMENT ACT OF 1972

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, our foreign trade and investment policies are in such disarray that only a comprehensive remolding will restore a balance to our international trade and payments accounts.

A glaring example of a misguided program can be found in two tariff loopholes. Under sections 806.30 and 807 of the tariff schedule, components can be manufactured here, shipped abroad for assembly, reimported for the American market with a duty being levied only on the value added overseas. Tens of thousands of American jobs have been sacrificed to these two loopholes.

Mexico has been a major beneficiary of the American tariff law and has added a number of other incentives to attract industry to the area just beyond the American border. Three hundred and forty-five firms, 85 percent of which are American owned and operated, now dot the Mexican border. Employment in those plants already stands at 50,000—at wages only a quarter of American pay.

The United States has long undertaken a commitment to help developing nations fulfill their industrial aspirations, but there is no reason why thousands of American workingmen should bear the total burden of building up Mexican industry and fattening the coffers of American-based multinational firms.

Mr. President, because of the importance of this issue to the American worker and to American industry, I ask unanimous consent that a recent article in Industry Week concerning the border industry program be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From Industry Week, Oct. 2, 1972]

COMPETITOR EMERGING SOUTH OF THE BORDER

Mexico may be emerging as a significant low-cost competitor to the U.S.

When the bracero program which permitted temporary Mexican farm labor to enter the U.S. was terminated in 1965, the Mexican government decided to bring jobs to Mexico.

Its Border Industry Program (BIP) will by year-end have created jobs along the U.S. border for about 50,000 workers who perform labor-intensive assembly and processing tasks on items imported into Mexico duty-free, mostly to U.S.-owned plants. The finished goods are sent back to this country, with the companies here paying a U.S. tax only on the value added by Mexican labor.

Now, there are signs the program will embark on a major expansion which, using borrowed technology, could lead to the full development along the border—and elsewhere—of industries new to Mexico.

Instead of providing labor only, the Mexican government is seeking to have some manufacturing done in Mexico and to supply some raw materials for goods processed there. Subcontracting of labor-intensive tasks also appears to be growing among Mexican-owned firms.

The expansion applies to U.S. firms, which have accounted for about 85% of the plants on the Mexican side of the border (the rest are Mexican-owned) and to other foreign-based companies about to enter the program. Also, Mexico wants to broaden the program to port areas along the Gulf of Mexico, the Pacific side of Baja California, the Gulf of California, and, in some cases, to areas beyond the traditional 20-kilometer zone.

Since the realignment of currencies, a number of countries have wanted to locate plants in Mexico because of the low labor rates, which range from about 60 to 87 cents an hour along the border, including fringe benefits. (BIP always has been open to companies from all nations, provided all goods are exported.) Although a minimum base wage is established every two years by the government, sources say lower labor rates are available in the interior because some cities there want to compete with the border cities.

Negotiations are underway involving several Japanese companies, and the Philippines also is interested, says Richard Jacinto, Los Angeles attorney and consultant to the Mexican Commercial Consulate in Los Angeles. Other Asian entities reportedly have been inquiring, including Hong Kong and South Korea, whose apparel manufacturers are finding Mexico more attractive as a base from which to market goods to the U.S. European firms also may be in the picture.

Three Japanese companies—Omron, Sony,

and Mitsubishi—either have plants in Baja California or will have shortly.

Perhaps a handful of foreign companies are already using raw materials from Mexico, and it is hoped this trend will grow, says Salvador Alvarez, Mexican commercial consul in Los Angeles.

The primary purpose behind the desire to expand BIP is to create more jobs, because just along the border there are 350,000 available laborers, Mr. Alvarez notes. These jobless workers have created friction between the U.S. and Mexico, and the BIP is partly aimed at alleviating that problem.

HEAVY INDUSTRY INTERESTED

While activities thus far have been concentrated in labor-intensive light industries (electrical-electronics, textiles, metalworking, furniture and wood products, leather, and plastics), heavy industries are taking a look, but there have been no commitments yet, says Adolfo Loera, El Paso, Tex. Mr. Loera, who retired after 34 years with the U.S. Customs Bureau in El Paso and set up his own consulting firm, says some new industries are about to enter the program .

Entry of heavy industry into the program would help alleviate what Mr. Loera sees as a problem. Some 80 to 85% of the Mexican labor force consists of women because they are more suited to perform many of the manual assembly tasks. However, once the women get married, they quit their jobs. Heavy industry would bring more men into the program and at the same time reduce turnover, says Mr. Loera, who believes the program is on the verge of "phenomenal" growth. His optimism is supported by reports of U.S. customs agents along the border who report substantial increases in paperwork.

The manager of an electronics manufacturer which set up an assembly plant in Mexico earlier this year says the Mexicans are trying to sell him solder and simple parts. "It's a good idea," he notes, but adds that the quality and prices will have to be competitive.

MORE ELECTRONICS, LESS TEXTILES

One pronounced trend noticed during the last year, reports a study made by the U.S. Embassy in Mexico City, is an increase in the percentage of firms involved in electric-electronic assembly, and a corresponding decrease in the percentage of textile operations. Part of this can be attributed to low U.S. duty rates on electronic components and relatively high rates for textiles. Other factors affecting textile operations are limitations imposed by transportation costs and by style and seasonal variations. Electronic components are not so subject to demand variations and can usually be shipped by air at relatively low cost.

The U.S. Embassy, which estimates some 350 firms are involved in BIP, is particularly struck by another development. During a recent visit to numerous plants along the border, an embassy officer noted a number of instances in which the assembly program was cited as being responsibile for increased exports and substitution of imports.

REIMPORT RATE SOARS

A large portion of reimports into the U. S. under Mexico's Border Industry Program are made under Sections 806.30 and 807.00 of the U. S. Tariff Code. These provide that under certain conditions manufactured products of U. S. origin when reimported into the U. S. are assessed import duties only on the value added through foreign processing. Schedule 807.00 accounted for $260 million in imports in 1971. However, the statistics do not include presumably large but not-measurable quantities of border industry production which does not make use of the schedules, operating for the most part in free zone areas.

U.S. IMPORTS FROM MEXICO UNDER TARIFF SCHEDULE 807.00

Year	Duty free	Dutiable	Total (millions)
1967	$12	$7	$19
1968	50	23	73
1969	96	49	145
1970	134	78	212
1971	160	100	260

Source: U.S. Embassy, Mexico City.

FIFTY-TWO FIRMS ADDED IN A YEAR

The bulk of work done by Border Industry Program plants in Mexico is electrical-electronics, and this portion is expected to grow. Textile operations, however, are expected to decline. The 345 firms involved in the program in June this year were employing 46,000 Mexicans, and this figure is expected to grow to 50,000 by yearend because of new firms entering the program and expansion of existing plants.

	Number of BIP firms	
	June 1971	June 1972
Electric-electronics	118	152
Textiles	77	76
Metalworking	26	22
Furniture and wood products	16	20
Leather	6	12
Plastics	6	10
Other	44	53
Total	293	345

Source: U.S. Embassy, Mexico City.

"Many of these firms indicated that their parent U.S. organizations are now realizing exports of either components or finished products to markets [in third countries] in which they were previously unable to compete," says an embassy report. "Others stated that they have gained a greater share of the U.S. market by either cutting back on their own imports or by being more competitive in the U.S. market with foreign-produced goods. In several cases, these firms indicated that, as a result of greater exports and import substitution, the U.S. operation had actually increased employment, which more than offset the decrease from transfer of assembly operations to Mexico." However, the embassy says it is unable to evaluate the degree to which these reported developments may have affected U.S. trade and employment.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS: UNKNOWN QUANTITY

Perhaps the most distressing aspect of the entire BIP, believes the U.S. Embassy, is the lack of adequate investigation concerning the socioeconomic effects of the program.

"Leaving aside for a moment the questions of U.S. trade and employment and additional jobs in Mexico, we have no real idea of what the long-term effect of the program may be for the Mexican border cities—and the related effect on U.S. border cities," says an embassy report. "Several border observers taking an intentionally negative position, suggest these peripheral effects of the program:

"Prostitution and delinquency are increasing as a result of heavier-than-normal migration to the border zone combined with unfulfilled job expectations.

"The traditional relationship between parent and adult daughter is being rapidly changed, and illegitimate births are increasing.

"Traditional male-female family roles are changing, with male frustration leading to greater delinquency.

"Border cities are rapidly losing ground in their efforts to provide housing, sewage, medical care, and other services—and their responsibilities in these areas are increasing faster than new revenues.

"Some border cities may have already passed the level of inhabitants for whom they can ever provide, particularly in areas of relatively absolute limits such as water.

"Social tensions in the border cities are increasing as a result of the above problems, rather than decreasing through increased employment.

"The embassy is not in a position to evaluate these suggested negative results," it adds. "While it is improbable that adverse factors such as these outweigh the overall benefits derived from the contribution to border city economies made by assembly operations, no satisfactory data are presently available."

One problem could be disastrous to some firms: the U.S. Customs Bureau is investigating allegations that some components entering Mexico have not been made in the U.S.—as required by Tariff Schedules 806.30 and 807.00—but in a third country.

During recent years, some small and marginal firms have quit doing business in Mexico, and this is one of the developments feared most by the Mexican government because it throws people out of work again. Mexican officials discourage firms from setting up operations unless they intend to operate over a long period, although permits on machinery (which must be renewed every year) and on raw materials (which must leave the country processed after six months are the only time limitations on activities in that country.

One Mexican banker notes there is a constant effort to streamline movement of goods back and forth across the border.

One U.S. manager says this was the most difficult part of the program until he learned that the key is the Mexican union boss. "He's powerful, and he controls the border. He can slow your shipment, or he can shut down your plant." The solution is the traditional Mexican mordida euphemistically called a "tip." But it's all fairly reasonable," says the manager.

THE 54TH ANNIVERSARY OF LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on November 18 the United Latvian Associations of Chicago will commemorate the 54th anniversary of Latvian independence at Mather High School, 5835 North Lincoln Avenue in Chicago.

The program will include a religious service and a Latvian lecture to be followed by a concert with the participation of the United Latvian Choir.

The United Latvian Associations of Chicago, an organization dedicated to the preservation of Latvian cultural awareness, is ably headed by Rolands Kirsteins, president; Alberts Raidonis, vice president; Rudolfs Arums, secretary; Olgerts Cakars, in charge of special events; and Arvids Barda, treasurer.

Latvia, a nation situated on the eastern side of the Baltic Sea, was privileged to enjoy only a brief period of national independence between the world wars. From their declaration of independence on November 18, 1918, to the reoccupa-

tion in 1940 by Communist armies, the Latvians opened the way to economic, social and political progress.

Latvia was one of the first European countries to reform the currency and financial system. The land reform law of 1920 was a model of fair, democratic dispersal of feudal estates.

By 1937, there were 5,717 industrial enterprises in Latvia; 70,000 farmers were enrolled in 2,300 educational societies; hydroelectric stations were numerous. The national income increased 120 percent between 1927 and 1938 despite the depression. The Latvian National Bank's assets rose from 48.2 million lats, the local currency, in 1934, to 125.6 million lats in 1939.

Latvian foreign policy was founded on friendly relations with the West and trust in the League of Nations. In fact, 95 percent of Latvian trade was with the West, especially Great Britain, Germany, and the United States, carried in 103 Latvian ships. By 1939, Latvia was almost self-supporting.

In June 1940, Latvia, along with Estonia and Lithuania, was invaded, brutally occupied by the Red army, and subsequently incorporated into the Soviet Union. The Soviets cynically disregarded their earlier treaty commitments in which they "voluntarily and forever" had renounced all sovereign rights over the people and territory of Latvia.

We in the U.S. Congress can do no less than reassure the Latvian people of our moral support. May the ideals of freedom and democracy be vindicated by the gallant determination of the people of Latvia. Their sacrifices should remind us all that we must continue to strive for a world in which all people can have the opportunity to live their lives as they themselves choose.

Mr. Speaker, as an ethnic myself, I have always been aware of the cultural richness of the various ethnic groups in our city of Chicago, and the creativity and dynamism they contribute to our city and the Nation. For this reason, events such as the Latvian Independence Day observance are very important, not only because they help to preserve ethnic identity and culture, but also because they remind us all, as Americans, of our heritage of freedom.

I am pleased, therefore, on this occasion to extend my greetings and best wishes to the Americans of Latvian descent in the city of Chicago who are participating in the 54th anniversary commemoration of Latvian independence.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it is most regrettable that our friend and colleague, WAYNE ASPINALL, is leaving the Congress. His district has undoubtedly been one of the best represented districts in the Congress. Not only his own district, but the entire Nation benefited from the presence of WAYNE ASPINALL in this body.

As is well known here, WAYNE commanded what might be properly described as total respect and confidence on the part of all his colleagues, when matters relating to water, reclamation, irrigation, parks and recreation, and related topics were under consideration. In that respect he was indeed a tower of strength—a strength that was applied with becoming restraint and always in the national interest.

To WAYNE and Mrs. Aspinall I extend my very best wishes for the future.

PRODUCTIVITY IN TRANSPORTATION

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, it is no secret that our Nation has serious transportation problems. Our largest railroad, the Penn Central, collapsed to everyone's dismay a little more than 2 years ago and still has not been put back onto a viable, self-supporting basis.

Our transportation problems are not limited to the financial conditions of railroads. One cannot study transportation problems without coming to the realization that there has been a continual decline in service, particularly with regard to small shippers and small shipments. There is growing dissatisfaction in this country because freight rates are going up while service is going down.

The problems of transportation are quite complicated, and there are no simple answers. In a speech recently brought to my attention, Mr. J. Scott Morrison discussed several fundamental issues. I believe that his main point—that great advances in transportation productivity are within each technological grasp—is a most important point. As Mr. Morrison sees it, if only the capital investments needed to produce such advances can be secured, service can be improved, rates lowered, and carriers' financial positions strengthened.

Mr. Morrison refers to the Surface Transportation Act, S. 2362, as an important way to achieve greater investment in transportation facilities and thereby to achieve the productivity advances of which he speaks. As author of the Surface Transportation Act, I would like to take this opportunity to reiterate my belief in the need for improved productivity and to stress that improved service through such productivity advances is a primary goal of the act.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Morrison's speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

TRANSPORT PRODUCTIVITY ADVANCE LINKED TO IMPROVED EARNINGS

(Remarks of J. Scott Morrison, Executive Vice President, Sea-Land Service, Inc., American Society of Traffic and Transportation, University of Akron, Akron, Ohio, August 29, 1972)

A serious discussion of productivity in transportation is long overdue. Looking back over many years of debates on transportation policy before the Transportation Research Forum, before the Transportation Association of America, before the Interstate Commerce Commission, in the Council of Economic Advisers and the DOT, before the various shipper groups, before the various academic groups which chew over transportation policy periodically, in the endless series of government studies on transportation the subject of transportation productivity hasn't had the priority it deserves.

When the word is used it is almost always associated with some sort of labor legislation and the issue discussed is not how to improve transport productivity but how to prevent strikes in transportation. The labor relations people have monopolized the subject. Important as minimizing work stoppages in transport has become, the productivity issue is much broader than the issue of work stoppages.

A session of this kind is therefore to be welcomed. The water carriers have been insisting that government and shippers take a new look at this important subject.

The ICC and the Price Commission and also the shippers are showing considerable interest. A proper understanding of how improved productivity in transportation is achieved is essential. We are not as clear as we should be on this subject.

Freight transportation accounts for 10 per cent of the gross national product—one dollar in 10 of all production expense. Improvement in transport productivity has fateful implications for the efficiency of the economy as a whole and for improving the cutting edge of the nation's ability to compete on the world scene.

Many experts in transportation appear to be stumbling around in considerable confusion when they discuss national policy.

They seize on numerous interesting themes and explore them in detail. How to invigorate competition—that's certainly important. Competition is a useful prod to improve efficiency. There is much discussion of government guaranteed loans for railroads. That's important if over decades the wellsprings of capital usually fed by improved productivity have been running dry. Shippers are active in knocking down rate increases. In a short-run, let-the-devil-take-care-of-the-future-sense that issue will absorb the energies of thousands of lawyers and cost experts. Since the ICC was formed in 1887, there has not been a single year in which the subject of freight car shortages hasn't been a lively topic. But shortages of freight cars are a symptom of neglect of the productivity issue, not the issue itself.

So it is good to see the productivity question itself taking center stage.

There are in fact two aspects to productivity.

The first involves the worker himself, the quality of his skills, the speed with which he produces, and how well he cooperates on the production team.

The other aspect is how management uses labor.

If management buys new technology which, for example, enables a worker to turn out twice as many buttons which the same effort and in the same time, then management has improved the use of labor. Similarly, mass production techniques have the effect of magnifying the effectiveness of a given labor input. Management can put the same crew, the same engine, the same basic facilities in a ship, but when it increases the carrying capacity from 10,000 tons to 100,000 tons, management improves its use of labor, achieving what the economists call "economies of scale.

Better use of labor is closely related to the amount of capital behind each worker. During the depression when there was massive

unemployment, labor was plentiful and willing to work at low wages. There was little incentive to add to the capital behind each worker and, on the average, in the depression years little or none was added.

But since the war, the price of labor has been increasing. There has been incentive to back up the labor force with a major deepening of capital and the value of capital behind each worker has been increasing at slightly less than three per cent a year. Deepening the capital behind each worker is one way management makes more effective use of labor.

We are all familiar with the pressures operating in our economy. Wages of workers are not going down in the near future. The economy has been producing more jobs but also much better jobs and will continue to do so in the future. We have not heard that the price of ships is likely to go down, or the price of fuel, or other costs of production. Indeed for most of these items prices are continuing to climb.

Let me illustrate this from Sea-Land's experience.

Since 1960, fuel has increased by about 75 per cent. Wages of seamen have more than doubled, wages of long shoremen have more than doubled. Land costs for terminals have more than doubled. Prices of tractors for hauling containers have doubled. Construction costs in port have tripled. Prices of ships have increased ten times. Only containers themselves have been stable in price.

The rates Sea-Land has charged over the same period, however, have in fact declined!

Average rates to Puerto Rico, for example, are 12 per cent less than they were in 1960. To Alaska, containerized service rates are down 18 per cent. These percentages relate to the rates actually collected on cargo actually moved. On international services, average rates today are slightly less than when the service started in 1966.

Costs have risen sharply, but there is a tremendous gap between the trend in costs and the trend in rates; in fact, the two trends have gone in opposite directions.

And this is only part of the story. While rates on container services have declined, the introduction of the container system itself produced enormous savings to the shipper in his overall costs of handling freight.

Think back to the days when a shipment went through all the many handlings of the break-bulk system and the importance of productivity improvement resulting from containerization comes into focus. The old system required loading the package into a truck or rail car, out of the truck or rail car usually into a warehouse, out of the warehouse onto the dock, off the dock into the hold and the reverse of the process on the other side. Costly delays, breakage and pilferage, and the labor of constant rehandling, the insurance charges and all the rest made the use of ocean freighting expensive.

By introducing many times the investment per ton capacity, the container system was able to reduce costs to the consumer very substantially.

But since the introduction of the container system there has been a refinement and improvement of the system which has overcome very substantial cost increases. Let me now analyze how those cost increases have been contained.

Naturally, a very detailed study would be required to include every refinement, but a strong indication is the comparison of Sea-Land's World War II concerted tankers and its latest 33 knot super container ships.

The converted 15-knot tanker cost $4.2 million for 226 container spaces or about $20,000 of investment per container space. The newest ships cost slightly over $40,000, but carries 1,100 containers at 33 knots. This works out at $40,000 per container space, double that of the first ship, while the total cost of the ship is almost 10 times that of the first ship.

Thus the willingness to dramatically deepen the investment behind each container space and each employee, to employ the latest in technology, and take advantage of the economies of scale which result from a larger ship has had a profound effect on the level of rates paid by the shipper and the impact of transportation charges on the nation's international trade.

Before containerization, the American merchant fleet was limping into discard. But U.S.-flag container companies, without subsidy have been able to hold their own against low wage foreign competitors. There is a bright and growing future for U.S. employees in the container trade.

Transportation is usually described as a labor intensive industry, but an examination of the facts shows a different picture. It is probably slightly less labor intensive than manufacturing generally, certainly not more.

Wage and salary expenses are approximately half of the value added by manufacturing, $151 billion compared to $305 billion for 1970. For the most recent year available, employees compensation paid in the trucking industry amounted to $4.9 billion compared to total revenues of $11.5 billion, about 42 per cent, according to ICC figures. In railroads, employee compensation for 1970 was $5.5 billion compared to total revenues of about $12 billion, about 46 per cent. Class A and B barge lines paid out $110 million in employee compensation compared to total water line operating revenues of $370 million, or about 30 per cent. Sea-Land's wage and salary bill in 1970 was about 37 per cent of revenues.

But transportation *is* highly capital intensive, far more so than is generally recognized. In manufacturing, 50 cents of investment will produce a dollar of revenue. In railroading, it requires $3 in investment to produce $1 of revenue. In barging about $2 in investment are required to produce a dollar of revenue and the relationship is the same for Sea-Land—$1 billion in investment produces $360,000,000 in revenues.

Thus not only is the deepening of capital a critical factor in improving productivity, as I have said, but the availability of an adequate supply of capital is far more critical for transportation than it is for manufacturing.

Hence capital starvation for transportation is not just one factor among many causing difficulty, it is the paramount, the most important, the most crucial factor of all.

We are reaching some sort of crisis of understanding between the transportation industry and its shippers and regulators. The productivity battle has to be won. Buying more 15-knot converted World War II tankers won't do it for Sea-Land. The old type freight cars, control systems, yards, and track won't do it for railroads. The old type barges and towboats won't do it for the inland waterways. The old type system won't do it for trucking.

If there is to be any hope of stable or lower rates in the future, transportation must invest in the 33-knot ships, the electronic classification yards, the computer control systems for freight cars, and improved systems for trucking and barging.

Unless it has adequate revenues and earnings to invest in improved productivity, shippers and consumers are irrevocably condemned to a lock-step pass through of cost increases into rate increases.

The barge lines and container operators have demonstrated that it is possible, with appropriate investment, to contain cost increases. I have no doubt that if the performance of the economy generally were as good as that of Sea-Land and prices were today 12 per cent below the 1960 level there would be dancing in the streets. Inflation would be licked. Pressures for those mountainous wage and salary increases would be minimized and we could start living in a real world instead of the Kafka-like world of inflation.

Shippers are showing an appreciation of the situation. They are beginning to talk about allowing a fair return on investment, an "economic" profit. If they understood more of what adequate investment could do to buy productivity improvement they would do much more than say they are willing to allow it, they would make *sure* the revenues and earnings are adequate to attract the investment necessary—something like $40 billion—repeat, $40 billion—for surface transport alone between now and 1980, according to the DOT.

Adequate earnings are one side of a coin of which the other is adequate service. Starving transportation of funds for investment is the consumer's certain ticket to higher rates and prices.

Shippers are understanding this problem more and more clearly. But the regulators seem almost totally unaware of the role of investment in improving the productivity and efficiency of transportation. The bankers keep warning them that their actions have started a flight of capital from transportation but they pay no attention.

In one recent rate increase case in which the carrier involved was operating at rates well below the 1960 level, whose productivity improvement had been outstanding, whose service was excellent in every respect, the ICC approved a rate increase of 2 per cent which, the ICC calculated, would provide a rate of return of 3.3 per cent on investment.

The carrier involved could have taken his entire investment and put it in the savings bank at no risk and done substantially better. Such a decision may seem at first glance to be a victory for the shipper, but it is certain to be a pyrrhic one. It represents hopelessly benighted thinking. Somehow both consumers and producers of transportation must find a way to modernize such thinking. The hour is late.

On another occasion, in testimony before a Congressional committee, one of the regulatory Commissions said it was the view of the Commission that financing for modernization "should be sought in the capital markets and not be exacted from the shipper." Since all financing, debt and equity, is ultimately underwritten by the revenues and earnings of the carriers, all of which come from their customers, it is difficult to know even where to start in reaching common ground with such a total misunderstanding of the imperatives of financing transportation.

It is difficult to imagine an advocate of rate increases becoming a folk hero, but obviously the consumers of transportation have a vital stake in making sure that the $1 of every $10 of production expense spent on transportation is performed as efficiently as possible. The really ironic part of the story so far is that there is so much new productivity to buy.

We are not talking about esoteric technology with pie-in-the-sky possibilities. We are talking about ordinary things already available such as fixing the railroad road beds so that freight trains can go faster than an average of 20 miles per hour, consolidating many railroad freight terminals, building superports for the big tankers, improving computerized control of freight cars and containers, better distribution and gathering from truck terminals. The technology is there; the benefits in improved productivity are substantial and undisputed; the money to buy the technology is not there.

How translate the shippers' expressed willingness to pay a rate which will produce revenues and earnings that are "economic",

that is will attract investment on a competitive basis?

The railroads, truckers and regulated water carriers a year ago agreed to support an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act which would in fact provide Congressional guidelines to the ICC requiring it to develop standards for determining whether revenue and earnings levels are adequate. Such standards and guidelines would modernize the Commission's approach to the financing of transportation. The proposal pending in the Surface Transportation Act of 1972 was recently voted out of the subcommittee on transportation in both houses.

The idea of statutory revenue standards is now supported by very substantial segments of the shipping community, by water carriers, by the railroad industry and by the trucking industry. It is of course opposed by the ICC which naturally would like to retain the vague phrase "just and reasonable" as its only guide. But a Commission which can determine a 3.3 per cent rate of return as "just and reasonable" is urgently in need of far better guidelines.

The Civil Aeronautics Board, by contrast, over a decade ago on its own initiative developed guidelines for adequacy of revenues and earnings for airlines. There really is no excuse for the ICC not having done so long ago.

With such standards could come a proper future capital requirements study and an audit of the relationship of revenues to investment. The ICC might usefully develop a freight rate index and a productivity index and at long last an element of rationality can be introduced into the financing of transport productivity.

Expecting new investment in water carrier improved productivity on a 3.3 per cent rate of return isn't rational. Expecting railroads to improve their productivity on a rate of return of less than 2 per cent isn't rational. Lawyers for certain shippers argue in rate increase cases that because the railroads have staggered along for many years with a rate of return of less than 3 per cent they can continue to do so. That isn't rational. Expecting the "capital markets" to provide the money for improvement in productivity when the enterprise itself is faltering on the edge of bankruptcy isn't rational.

A new start is needed on this whole question of proper financing of transportation recognizing that transportation is unusually capital intensive and that therefore formation of capital adequate to take advantage of opportunities for improved productivity is the most important single question.

Shippers have long ignored the implications of low rates of return in transportation. As inflation continues and capital starvation becomes more pronounced, they are increasingly having to face the facts of life.

Many experts in transportation believe we may have only one more chance to keep railroads from being nationalized. That chance is contained in the shipper, water carrier, railroad and trucker supported Surface Transportation Act now on the verge of being voted out of both the House and Senate commerce committees. It could be enough to reverse the unfavorable trends of the past and turn the transport industry around by making possible investment in new productivity which is so urgently needed.

TRIBUTE TO JIM KEE

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, during these last days of the 92d Congress, I would like to pay a special tribute to JIM KEE, a most worthy Member of this body and of the House Public Works Committee, which I chair.

I have worked with JIM KEE since he came to Congress in 1965, and with his mother, Hon. Elizabeth Kee, and father, Hon. John Kee, since my own first election in 1946. The Kee family has left a long and lasting mark on the course of this Nation and a record of excellence of service to their district, to the State of West Virginia, and to the Nation.

Though I knew and esteemed JIM's parents, I am honored to know JIM best, as friend, colleague, and coworker in the fields of community development, pollution control, and the betterment of our most precious resource, the American people.

I have worked closely with JIM on the Public Works Committee where, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Conservation and Watershed Development, he brought his full knowledge, experience, and compassion to bear and produced some of the most far-reaching legislation ever to come out of the committee.

JIM also made a meaningful contribution to other legislation under the jurisdiction of the committee, such as water pollution control, economic development, especially the Appalachian Regional Development Act, highways, including our Interstate Highway System, disaster relief, and river and harbor development.

But with all his knowledge and grasp of national issues, the people of West Virginia came first with JIM.

He pioneered black lung legislation in Congress and introduced measures providing broader coverage for health and safety in the coal mining industry.

But beyond the great impact of his legislative record, JIM KEE is a compassionate man who cares deeply for his people. His warmth has shown through in committee and on the floor of the House and has been the inspiration and guiding force behind all his work in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, JIM KEE will be greatly missed by the Public Works Committee on which he served so well and by the Congress, even as his presence in the House will be missed by his constituents.

But I know that JIM's service to his people will be long remembered and I am confident that he will enjoy many years of respect and love from the people of West Virginia.

I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to join the legions of JIM KEE's admirers in wishing him long years of health, of continued service in many capacities, and the fulfillment of his dreams.

A SUMMARY OF THE GREAT AMERICAN GRAIN ROBBERY AND OTHER STORIES

HON. FRED R. HARRIS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I inserted in the last issue of the RECORD the first half of a summary of "The Great American Grain Robbery and Other Stories," by Martha M. Hamilton. At this time I ask permission to have the second half of the summary printed in the RECORD.

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

A SUMMARY OF THE GREAT GRAIN ROBBERY AND OTHER STORIES

(By Martha M. Hamilton)

SEPARATING THE WHEAT FROM THE STAFF

Between the grain trade and the wheat grower stands the United States Department of Agriculture, supposedly a fair-handed referee on the issue of who gets the money involved in wheat production and marketing. Export Marketing Service (EMS) is the center of USDA's wheat export activities.

When Earl Butz bumped into Clifford Hardin as the new Secretary of Agriculture left Ralston Purina's board room and the former Secretary entered, the collision had some noisy repercussions. But former trade officials and USDA administrators glide noiselessly past each other through the doorway of EMS, changing faces and places but not policy. EMS handles export activities that enrich or depress the fortunes of the giant grain firms and influence the well-being of wheat growers.

The four firms that handle 90 percent of U.S. wheat exports have more than a passing interest in EMS personnel. Two former top USDA administrators now work for grain trade firms; two former grain trade officers work for USDA. One of the four firms recently picked up a fifth USDA official, EMS's retiring chief administrator.

The grain trade offers an attractive future for public administrators. As a result, administrators acquire an early overriding interest in the health of the industry, though no deals have been cut, no jobs have been offered. In the shuffle between industry and government, wheat growers' interests are lost. EMS officials perceive their job not as handling export operations to benefit the trade and producers, but as protecting the export industry—and themselves.

EMS is a relatively new branch of the Agriculture Department, a creation of former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Clarence Palmby. Palmby left USDA in June 1972 to become corporate vice president for market planning and development for Continental Grain, one of the world's two largest grain shippers. Before he left, however, Palmby put together the precendent-breaking 1972 sale of feed grains and later wheat to Russia (with Continental handling the largest part of the sales).

Palmby's replacement was Carroll G. Brunthaver, who moved up from associate administrator of another USDA division. Brunthaver was associate director of research for an affiliate of Cook Industries, another large grain and cotton exporting company, before he joined USDA.

Claude Merriman, EMS assistant sales manager for commodity exports and a veteran USDA employee, retired in January 1972. He surfaced six months later as a consultant at Louis Dreyfus Corporation, an export firm which recently announced it is handling a 500,000 ton shipment of American wheat to mainland China.

Merriman's successor at EMS, George S. Shanklin, had managed Bunge Corporation's Washington, D.C. office for nearly seven years. Going to work for USDA was a homecoming for Shanklin, who served as chief of the commercial export branch of the grain division of the Commodity Stabilization Service from 1956 to 1965, in charge of wheat and wheat flour export payment programs. Export payments came under his purview again—one of the duties he took over from Merriman.

A fifth USDA official, EMS General Sales Manager Clifford Pulvermacher, was the next crossover: he left to take a job with Bunge.

In an interview with a trade publication, Pulvermacher reminisced about industry-government dealings:

"I've always felt strongly, it had to be a two-way street. It could not be the government imposing a rule. It had to be rather, the government suggesting it needed a rule and then asking the industry which rules do you think most workable. . . ."

The questionable aspect of the USDA-grain trade closeness is the lack of balance it brings. The program EMS administers are as important to farm income as they are to the grain trade and the national trade picture. Yet the attention and concern of EMS officials seem riveted on the trade and its needs. One outcome of this industry-government closeness is extreme protectiveness of the grain trade industry.

In an interview with two EMS officials in October 1971, the protective nature of the EMS bureaucracy came out in response to questions about who exports wheat from the United States. USDA doesn't keep such information about who sells how much, the AAP was told, because the Department didn't want to be in the position of explaining why a small number of companies sells a large percentage of the grain.

A second request for this "public" information provoked telephone calls from Phil Shapiro, assistant to the general sales manager for compliance, and Clyde Merriman. The officials stressed the difficulty of compiling such information and said that the Department does not "allow people to peruse these files." After still another effort AAP was told that the "public" subsidy figures might be available but only if the organization paid $1,493.28 to compile them. Senator Fred Harris (D.-Okla.) made similar inquiries. After months of correspondence, USDA acceded to a greatly simplified request—causing speculation among Harris' staff that USDA wanted to delay action on this request until January 1973, when Harris leaves the Senate.

USDA AS A PROCURER

Hunger, USA, a 1968 report, helped shake the nation into awareness of hunger in these fat United States and castigated USDA on several scores. It charged, among other things, that USDA's commodity purchasing and distribution programs operate to improve farm income rather than feed hungry people.

"Surplus commodities bought with Section 32 funds were sometimes distributed to the needy. But the commodities purchased were selected to maintain producers' markets, and consequently profits."

The report was only half accurate. Section 32 programs may not benefit the poor, but neither do they significantly improve farm income.

Recipients are not well served by a program that fails them nutritionally, culturally, in quality, distribution and lack of variety. Farmers are not well served by a program that removes a tiny amount of total production from markets, buys from agribusiness middlemen instead of farmers, buys products produced under circumstances that isolate growers from improvements in markets, and relies on trickle down benefits and psychological boosts to carry its good intention to producers. Farmers are charged with the costs of the program, even with its failure, in the public mind. But the only measurable benefit from purchases under Section 32 go to agribusiness middlemen.

In addition to its other relationships with farmers, USDA is a consumer. The Department buys food through three programs. Two programs are designed to improve farm income. A third exists to feed school children.

In their day to day operation, distinctions between the programs blur. Both Section 32—intended as an economic tool to improve farm income—and Section 6—primarily a child feeding program—are administered by the same department, Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS). AMS buys all non-dairy foods purchased under the two programs. Food purchase operations are operated by commodity divisions within AMS.

USDA begins thinking about what it will buy for each fiscal year when budget requests are drawn. Commodity divisions try to anticipate national supply and demand for each item they usually buy. While AMS is determining which commodities will need removal from the market, USDA's Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) projects its clients' demand for commodities.

Trade groups such as the Turkey Federation and National Canners Association maintain close relationships with commodity staffers in AMS. In many cases, according to a former administrator, these groups are actively involved in the decision about how much to buy.

The programs allow USDA and the comptroller general access for a period of three years to all company records related to purchase. USDA could use this provision to check on returns to producers and the efficacy of its program, but it rarely does. The department works to enforce some purchase requirements—particularly those relating to health and equal opportunity employment compliance.

Other rules receive no active enforcement. To determine whether its programs affect producers for whom they were designed, AMS relies on intuition. The department runs no analysis.

Section 32 which buys foods for distribution to needy families, disaster victims, school lunch programs, hospitals and others is the sole survivor of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1935. Section 32 is aimed at restoring the "price of the farmer's product to a parity to the same purchasing power that he had before 1929". Cynical congressmen expressed misgivings that the legislation would be abused by middlemen. The cynics were right.

Section Six of the National School Lunch Act of 1946, the School Lunch Program, had its roots in the same impulse—improving farm income. But the public sentiment fastened on to another issue and by the time it became law, concern for children overwhelmed concern for farmers, at least in the rhetoric.

The Agribusiness Accountability Project found that the programs have had small impact on improving farm income:

Most of the food the government buys is processed food. USDA relies on middlemen to relay benefits to producers but makes no attempt to determine whether or not processors it buys from are paying a fair price for raw produce.

While the rewards of the purchasing program to agribusiness middlemen are not huge, they receive a real measureable benefit from the program. Benefits to producers are described as "psychological."

Many of the products USDA buys are produced under vertical integration. Often commodities are produced under contract—with terms and conditions of sale negotiated in advance of delivery to the middleman and well in advance of USDA's purchase from the processor.

The amount of food removed from the market through purchases under Section 32 and 6 is small—too small to have much impact on prices.

THE MAN IN THE MIDDLE

USDA buys primarily from middlemen, not farmers, for the Commodity Distribution and School Lunch programs. Convenience and consumer tastes are said to be the overriding reasons for buying processed foods. Whatever the reasons, the processor and not the farmer gets the money that USDA spends through these programs. The sums are large in comparison to farm program payments.

The largest sum received by a processor under these procurement programs was more than $17 million paid to subsidiaries of Ling-Temco-Vought. The largest farm program payment in 1971 was only a third of that—$4.4 million.

Who, then, are USDA's suppliers? Fifty-six processors sold more than a million dollars' worth of goods each to USDA in fiscal 1971:

Wilson and Company, third largest meat packer in the United States, sold more than seventeen million dollars' worth of meat and poultry to USDA;

Oscar Mayer, the nation's sixth largest meat packer, sold over 12 million dollars worth of canned pork, canned chopped meat, and frozen pork to USDA;

Armour and Company, the Nation's second largest meat packer, sold over two million dollars worth of cut-up chicken, frozen turkey, frozen ground beef and frozen pork to USDA;

Sunsweet Growers, the world's largest dried tree fruit handlers, sold almost four million dollars worth of dried prunes to USDA;

Del Monte, reportedly the largest producer and distributor of canned fruits and vegetables in the world, sold over two million dollars worth of goods to USDA;

Ralston Purina, leader in vertical integration of poultry production and presently integrating hog production, sold over one million dollars worth of frozen turkey to USDA; compared to only nine growers who received more than $1 million in farm program payments in 1971. Here is the list of USDA's million-dollar sellers, ranked according to their sales to the Department:

Sellers from whom USDA procured more than $1 million worth of commodities in fiscal year 1971

Wilson & Co. (subsidiary of LTV)	$17,210,680
Blue Star Foods	17,050,563
Carnation Co	13,236,244
Oscar Mayer	12,041,106
Krey Packing Co	8,603,281
Tony Downs Foods	8,539,274
Packerland Packing Co	7,721,957
North American Packing Corp	7,191,852
Midcontinent Meats	7,181,845
Southeastern Poultry, Inc	7,158,296
Armour & Co. (subsidiary of Greyhound Corp.)	5,215,237
Tri/Valley Growers	4,750,993
Marshall Produce Co	4,433,396
Needham	4,115,599
Wilbur-Ellis Co	4,081,567
Sunsweet Growers	3,912,612
Granite State Canning	3,657,092
Sunkist Growers	3,362,875
Royal Meat Co	3,227,529
Hygrade Food Products	2,940,682
Max Bauer Meat Packer	2,913,030
Norbest Turkey Growers Association	2,884,784
Roberts Dairy Co	2,430,396
Milton G. Waldbaum Co	2,420,722
Montemelo, Inc	2,315,042
California Canners and Growers	2,191,910
Kauzor and Co	2,178,920
Dubuque Packing Co	2,146,857
Del Monte Corp	2,121,112
Rogers Brothers	2,026,575
Schwartz & Co	1,956,084
Michigan Bean Co. (division of Wickes Co.)	1,946,408
Stokely-Van Camp	1,803,980
Castle & Cooke Inc	1,790,670
Marnat Packing Co	1,572,197
Monark Egg Co	1,539,442
Dennis Foods Co	1,473,965
Ben Hill Griffin	1,408,461
B. C. Rogers and Sons	1,390,190
Mayfair Packing Co	1,343,122
Tillie Lewis Food (Subsidiary of Ogden Corp.)	1,326,763
D & D Bean Co	1,319,177
Koch Beef Packing	1,281,179
Sun Garden Packing Co	1,264,352
Swift & Co	1,258,166
California Bean Growers Association	1,207,043
The National Fruit Product Co	1,182,456
Iowa Beef Processors	1,141,718

Sellers from whom USDA procured more than $1 million worth of commodities in fiscal year 1971—Continued

Tabor City Foods	$1,106,570
World Wide Meats	1,102,980
Gem Inc	1,088,068
Joan of Arc Co	1,078,234
Citrus World Inc	1,077,427
A. J. Pietrus and Sons	1,064,141
Ralston Purina	1,154,361
Valley View Packing	1,026,348

WHO KNOWS?

Though it is not necessarily important to know how well USDA procurement programs work, it is still worth noting that there are those who are interested in selling to USDA who are not informed that the opportunity exists.

The AAP asked meat packers why so few of them sell to USDA. Two hundred meat packers selected at random from the Directory of Meat and Poultry Inspection Program Establishments issued by AMS received questionnaires in the mail. Slightly more than a third of the companies contacted responded. (One plant owner suggested that the low response may have been due to fear that the AAP was a bogus front for competitors.)

Many did not know that USDA purchased meat. One meat packer said: "We always thought only large companies could bid on government food orders . . ."

Unlike some government agencies, USDA does not have a program to set aside funds for purchases from small businesses. When someone within a division of the Department decides to identify purchases according to company size, it is done on the basis of an "educated guess."

In short, USDA has not opened its competitive bidding operation to assure that information on its purchases is widely available. And in some commodities an imbalance exists between the shares of the market held by large and small businesses.

THE TRICKLE DOWN THEORY

USDA literature on food donation programs focus on the recipients and not the producers. For years now, USDA's food distribution failures have been said to be induced by USDA's service on behalf of farm income. A bill by Senator Charles Percy noted that the "program now in effect is said to be designed and administered for the benefit of the producers of surplus agricultural commodities rather than for the benefit of low income households in need of adequate nutritious food."

Purchases made under the school lunch and commodities programs do not even have that redeeming value. Under these programs USDA buys from agribusiness processors and relies on "unloading the market" to trickle down to farmers.

Trickle down benefits and psychological boosts for farm prices are poor tools for improving farm income. In some commodities, shape of production has changed so radically since the programs were formulated that income improving features seem hopelessly out of tune. For example, vegetables used for processing are no longer produced by independent growers acting individually who occasionally create price depressing surpluses. Some 95 percent of all vegetables grown for processing are produced under vertically integrated contracts. Only three percent of the total national broiler production is independent. Vertical integration in the production of every commodity that USDA programs handle (except potatoes and dried peas and beans) increased from 1960 to 1970.

USDA's purchase programs are designed for open market situations where price improvement can be taken advantage of by farmers. But producers of the commodities USDA buys have moved away from an open market toward contracting to eliminate risks. When contracts for farm produce set low prices, USDA's purchases cannot help; they do little to increase farmer bargaining power. The balance of power between processors and contract farmers usually is lopsided.

Unless USDA buys from cooperatives which have vertically integrated from farming into processing, financial ripples from the money spent may never reach the farmer. The average USDA payment for canned corn to processors in 1970, for example, was 11 cents per pound, while the average price received by the farmer was 1.2 cents per pound.

With a few exceptions, USDA purchases under the food programs are too small to influence prices. In fiscal 1971, USDA removed less than one percent of total pork production from the market, although production increased by 18 percent.

The Commodity Distribution program has two goals—to improve farm income and to feed hungry people.

Does it do an adequate job in achieving either goal? AAP research suggests it does not.

Are both goals worth accomplishing? The answer is an unequivocal yes.

Can programs with a dual focus do an adequate job of accomplishing either an improvement in farm income or in the diets of those who need assistance? Each goal deserves undivided attention.

Who benefits from the program? The man in the middle does best from it.

CONCLUSION

One thread runs through USDA's handling of its procurement policies, USDA's stand on the International Wheat Agreement and wheat exports, and USDA's management of the great American grain robbery. In programs and activities originally designed to improve farm income, there are substantial benefits (often in the form of direct cash payments) to large agribusiness corporations and conglomerates as well.

USDA's actions may not benefit the farmer at all, or may only after they trickle down to the farmer through an agribusiness sieve. The farmer's welfare generally seems incidental.

The farmer is not well served in terms of the money and manhours spent by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. USDA officials are always quick to point out the money and effort that goes to serve consumers rather than farmers. The Department fails to point out that a large share of the budget is spent on behalf of agribusiness corporations—corporations frequently at odds with the American farmer.

(FIGURE I)

STORAGE AND HANDLING PAYMENTS TO 6 MAJOR GRAIN TRADING FIRMS

	1971	1970	1963	1962	1961
Archer Daniels Midland	2,499,887	4,311,652	4,875,545	2,779,579	5,134,987
Bunge	1,853,922	2,161,594	1,821,093	1,852,199	1,696,717
Cargill	8,776,475	4,707,859	5,831,717	19,376,218	24,925,192
Continental Grain	5,357,486	3,499,887	4,059,334	3,728,182	6,190,879
Dreyfus			1,057,940	602,365	816,077
Peavey	3,459,059	2,391,055	4,690,655	4,604,223	4,169,304

TABLE 2.—WHEAT EXPORT PAYMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971

Exporter	Total quantity bushels (1,000)	Total estimated f.o.b. value (1,000)	Total export payments (1,000)
Cargill, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn	147,362	$238,797	$34,836
Continental Grain Co., New York, N.Y	124,750	200,614	25,512
Cook Industries, Inc., Memphis, Tenn	94,089	149,279	16,619
Bunge Corp., New York, N.Y	38,348	62,035	8,346
Louis Dreyfus Corp., New York, N.Y	30,050	47,867	7,307
Union Equity Cooperative Exchange, Enid, Okla	29,621	47,298	3,605
Garnac Grain Co., Inc., New York, N.Y	22,533	36,237	4,381
Mitsui & Co. (U.S.A.), Inc., New York, N.Y	20,767	33,539	4,564
Goodpasture, Inc., Galena Park, Tex	19,189	31,022	2,495
Nichimen Co., Inc., New York, N.Y	15,665	25,456	4,519
Kanematsu-Gosho (U.S.A.), Inc., Portland, Oreg	11,896	19,112	3,675
C. Itoh & Co. (America), Inc., New York, N.Y	10,216	16,332	3,425
Mitsubishi Corp., New York, N.Y	9,427	15,365	2,408
Agricol Corp., Inc., Philadelphia, Pa	8,541	13,866	2,731
Marubeni America Corp., New York, N.Y	8,075	13,193	2,155
United Grain Corp., Portland, Oreg	6,931	10,975	1,355
Peavey Co., Minneapolis, Minn	6,660	11,611	1,876
Toshoku America, Inc., New York, N.Y	6,239	9,751	1,517
C. B. Fox Co., New Orleans, La	5,811	10,103	1,432
North Pacific Grain Growers, Inc., Portland, Oreg	5,075	$8,138	$778
Toyomenka, Inc., New York, N.Y	4,841	7,734	1,486
International Multifoods, Corp., Minneapolis, Minn	4,542	8,168	1,440
The Pillsbury Co., Minneapolis, Minn	4,399	7,939	1,342
West Coast Resources, Inc., Portland, Oreg	4,085	6,292	620
Nissho-Iwai American Corp., New York, N.Y	3,292	5,272	831
Sumitomo Shoji America, Inc., New York, N.Y	2,350	4,055	194
General Mills, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn	2,005	3,493	698
Ataka America, Inc., New York, N.Y	1,704	3,041	680
Producers Grain Corp., Amarillo, Tex	1,243	1,839	132
Alfred C. Toepfer, Inc., New York, N.Y	275	437	104
Garvey Grain, Inc., Wichita, Kans	260	404	54
Tidewater Grain Co., Philadelphia, Pa	225	348	47
Archer-Daniels Midland Grain, Minneapolis, Minn	113	267	39
Barzen of Minneapolis, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn	14	48	2
Berns & Koppstein, Inc., New York, N.Y	5	20	1
Total export payments			141,206

Source: From figures supplied to Senator Fred R. Harris by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

TV AND VIOLENCE

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, America has always been a relatively violent Nation. Considering the tremendous historical forces that have shaped us, it would be astonishing were it otherwise. With increasingly rapid social change in recent years, different forms and nuances of violence have been produced with varying patterns of motivation, aggression, and victimization. It is my belief that much of that motivation comes from an unjustified amount of violence on television. Others concur.

In 1969, the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence issued a statement in which it concluded that violence on television encourages real violence. The Commission recommended: First, a reduction in programs containing violence; and, second, elimination of violence from children's cartoon programs—instead, children's cartoons are the most violent part of TV today. The FCC has also addressed itself to the problem of violence in the media. More recently, the "Report of the U.S. Surgeon General on Television and Growing Up: The Impact of Televised Violence," and hearings on the Surgeon General's report by the Subcommittee on Communications of the Senate Commerce Committee, have established the justification for possible controls on the use of violence in television programing.

Today, the television industry reaches an audience of varying age, intelligence, literacy, interest, and sociocultural background. Of great concern to me is the effect television violence will have, and has had, on our children. To a large degree, television has increasingly become a surrogate for parents as a definitive voice and national shaper of views. In spite of its increasing responsibilities, the television industry has been reluctant to take action in reducing violence on programs because of their fear that such action might reduce audience attention and advertising dollars. In challenging the television industry to institute some manner of controls, former FCC Commissioner Newton Minow stated that—

> It is not enough to cater to the Nation's whims but that it is essential to serve the Nation's needs.

I subscribe to that view. Controls are needed. Others have also responded to the challenge to limit violence on television include the National Business Council for Consumer Affairs—NBCCA.

I commend them for their efforts in this field and urge them to do more. I ask unanimous consent that a press release on their report entitled, "Violence and the Media" recently released by the NBCCA and excerpts from the report itself be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NBCCA SEEKS VOLUNTARY CURBS ON VIOLENCE IN THE MEDIA

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.—The National Business Council for Consumer Affairs today released a report entitled "Violence and the Media" calling for further voluntary restraints by advertisers and others in the use of violence in the media pending the results of in depth research.

In a report to Commerce Secretary Peter G. Peterson, the NBCCA Advertising and Promotion Sub-Council cited the U.S. Surgeon General's report on *Television and Growing Up: The Impact of Televised Violence,* and the Senate Commerce Committee's hearings on the subject and said that "there may be a link between televised violence and aggressive behavior by certain individuals in our society."

Recognizing that advertisers should not attempt to "censor" program content—particularly in areas such as news reporting, the Sub-Council declared, "To the extent that depiction of violence in media may contribute to the encouragement of violence, those of us who bear any responsibility for media presentations must be concerned."

U.S. Surgeon General Jesse Steinfeld—in Minneapolis for the news conference—hailed the report as "a welcome commitment from the business community to take immediate, positive steps to significantly reduce violence in the media, especially in children's programming."

Dr. Steinfeld joined William D. Lee, Executive Director of the NBCCA; Robert Keith, Chairman of the Board, The Pillsbury Company; and Archibald McG. Foster Chairman of the Board, Ted Bates & Company, for the morning news conference. Mr. Keith and Mr. Foster serve as Chairman and Co-Chairman of the NBCCA Sub-Council.

Mr. Keith explained that the Sub-Council urged immediate adoption of a three-point program which he said "might stimulate further voluntary action to eliminate the use of gratuitous violence in the media.

The program calls for:

The encouragement and development on an individual basis of specific policies and procedures by media, program producers, and all involved in creation and delivery of media presentations, which will "help eliminate gratuitous use of violence" and provide standards for acceptable depiction of violence, when it has material relevance to the message conveyed.

Encouraging advertisers and advertising agencies to establish individual policies designed to "reduce further the use of violence as an attention-getting device in any and all contexts, whether it be an attempt to win attention for an advertisement or to win audience for a program, and

Encouraging intensive and careful research by academicians and appropriate agencies to determine more specifically the impact of depicted violence on the media's consumers, in the realization that further work is needed to identify clearly the nature and extent of the problem.

The National Business Council for Consumer Affairs was established by President Nixon in August, 1971, to help formulate voluntary action program by business to aid consumers.

It is composed of over 100 leading U.S. business executives.

In June, the NBCCA Sub-Council on Packaging & Labeling published "guidelines for Responsible Packaging and Labeling" which outlined a set of broad proposals within which businesses could act to better inform and better serve consumers through more effective packaging and labeling practices.

In early October, the Sub-Council on Advertising and Promotion will release two additional reports—Corporate Advertising and Promotion Policies and Procedures, and Substantiation of Advertising Claims.

VIOLENCE AND THE MEDIA

Richard Nixon, August 5, 1971:

"In recent months I have been gratified by the increasing desire of the business community to take a more active role in meeting the concerns of the American consumer. These businessmen recognize that the concerns are widespread and often spring from valid complaints. They also share my belief that neither the government nor the consumer movement can alone solve these problems, but that we must also rely upon the traditional goodwill and sound practices of the business community.

"Because of this growing interest, I have today signed an executive order creating the National Business Council for Consumer Affairs . . ."

STATEMENT ON VIOLENCE AND THE MEDIA

The issue of the impact of violence in the nation's media has surfaced as a major concern in the past months. The Surgeon General recently has published a comprehensive study entitled "Television and Growing Up: The Impact of Televised Violence." Intensive hearings on the subject have been held in the Congress of the United States, through the Sub-Committee on Communications of the Senate Commerce Committee. While existing data are not conclusive, we do feel that these recent contributions indicate that there may be a link between televised violence and aggressive behavior by certain individuals in our society.

As members of the Sub-Council on Advertising and Promotion of the National Business Council for Consumer Affairs, as businessmen, and as advertisers, we are concerned. We are concerned about the violence and crime in this country, and about any actions that might help provide prevention and cure.

Until the results of more definitive research are published, we presume televised violence in the media may be a factor in stimulating aggressive and violent behavior by some members of our society. In recognizing this fact, we do not suggest that the elimination of violence in media will eliminate crime. It won't. However, to the extent that depiction of violence in media may contribute to the encouragement of violence, those of us who bear any responsibility for media presentations must be concerned. At the same time, we recognize also that advertisers should not attempt to "censor" program content, particularly in areas such as news reporting, but we do believe that certain positive steps can be taken now by all involved.

We therefore request the Secretary of Commerce to call on all members of the business community, including advertisers, advertising agencies, and media, for their support of the interim principles and goals indicated in the following statement:

First, to encourage the development on an individual basis of specific policies and procedures by media, program producers, and all involved in the creation and delivery of media presentations, which will *help eliminate gratuitous use of violence* and provide standards for acceptable depiction of violence, when it has material relevance to the message to be conveyed.

Second, to encourage advertisers and advertising agencies to establish individual policies designed to *reduce further the use of violence as an attention-getting device* in any and all contexts, whether it be an attempt to win attention for an advertisement or to win audience for a program.

Third, to *encourage intensive and careful research* by academicians and appropriate agencies to determine more specifically the impact of depicted violence on the media's

consumers, in the realization that further work is needed to identify clearly the nature and extent of the problem.

As representatives of major advertisers, advertising agencies, and media . . . and as members of the NBCCA Sub-Council on Advertising and Promotion . . . we pledge our personal commitment to these objectives.

In this regard, we commend particularly the television network representatives who have outlined specific new policies and practices designed to control further the use of violence on television, and particularly in children's programming.

It is not our intent to imply that it is in the best interest of society for television programming to depict our community as being free of violence. Presentations by media are often necessarily a reflection of life as it was lived that day, and as such must mirror truthfully the good and the bad. It would serve us little were television programs to portray only the credit side of the ledger of life and fail to prepare society, particularly our youth, to recognize and be able to cope with the debit side. We recognize, however, that much is at stake, and careful consideration must be given to any depiction of violence.

As members of the National Business Council for Consumer Affairs we are charged by Executive Order of the President with the responsibility of advising the President through the Secretary of Commerce on programs of business relating to consumer affairs. Accordingly, we are also asking Secretary Peterson to convey this statement to President Nixon, both as an expression of our concern, and as a commitment on behalf of the business community to seek further definition and resolution of the problem.

WILLIAM R. HULL, JR.

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able and faithful men who has served in this body in recent years has been BILL HULL of Missouri. His decision not to seek reelection this year is most regrettable. BILL has always put the welfare of the country ahead of politics when the big decisions have been made here. It is too bad we do not have more like him in the Congress.

In his retirement I wish BILL the very best of good health and happiness. Now in the prime of life, we must assume he will continue to be actively interested in those things which will promote the cause of good government at all levels.

BILL HULL has a host of friends in the Congress who will miss him and hope for the better things in life for him in the years ahead.

THE NUTRIENT CYCLES OF AN ECOSYSTEM

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, there is mounting evidence, not only that an increasing number of citizens are dissatisfied with the management of our public forests, but that scientists, too, are becoming more deeply concerned about the effects of widespread clear-cutting in our national forests. The approach of these men was, perhaps, best summed up by Donald L. Dahlsten, associate professor of entomology at the University of California, when he told the Public Lands Subcommittee last month—

Now is the time to consider our forest management practices with a fresh approach so that forestry in the future will have an ecological and biological orientation and not just have an economic orientation as exists now in all the responsible agencies. A truly interdisciplinary approach is mandatory if healthy stands are to be maintained.

Other scientists have raised issues. Dr. Donald H. Gray, associate professor of civil engineering at the University of Michigan, working with the support of the National Science Foundation, has been studying slope stability and the impact of clear-cutting on that important factor. Based on his still-underway research, he has reported that there is overwhelming evidence to suggest that large-scale clear-cutting promoted accelerated soil erosion and increased the susceptibility to mass soil movement. His statement too was given to the Public Lands Subcommittee in its April hearings.

Yet another field of inquiry has been studied and reported upon in the October 1970 edition of Scientific American by two distinguished natural scientists whose work has been conducted in the White Mountains of New Hampshire in cooperation with the U.S. Forest Service itself. The project involved the denuding of one small watershed, part of an overall ecosystem. Admittedly, the technique was a bit extreme, but it has demonstrated that there was in this instance an accelerated loss of soil nutrients as the result of defoliation of the forest. The necessary implication that must be pointed out, I feel, is that we must simply begin to give serious consideration to the impact of logging operations, especially the ever-widening practice of taking all timber from a given area, at each and every turn. We must consider entomology, soil stability, soil fertility, water quality, regeneration. Or, as Dr. Dahlsten testified, we must move toward an ecological and biological orientation and not just an economic orientation with regard to the management of our national forests.

That, Mr. President, is the purpose of the bill, S. 1592, which I have introduced with the aim of establishing an interdisciplinary commission to make a thorough study of clear-cutting practices.

Mr. President, because it has not appeared in the record of the subcommittee considering forest management prior to this, and because it bears importantly upon the issue at hand, I ask unanimous consent that the article "The Nutrient Cycles of an Ecosystem" by Dr. F. Herbert Bormann, professor of forest ecology at Yale and president of the Ecological Society of America, and Dr. Gene E. Likens, of Cornell University, which appeared in the October 1970 Scientific American be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE NUTRIENT CYCLES OF AN ECOSYSTEM

(By F. Herbert Bormann and Gene E. Likens)

(NOTE.—F. Herbert Bormann and Gene E. Likens ("The Nutrient Cycles of an Ecosystem") are respectively Oastler Professor of Forest Ecology at Yale University and associate professor of zoology at Cornell University. Bormann, who obtained his Ph.D. in plant ecology from Duke University, taught at Emory University from 1952 to 1956 and at Dartmouth College from 1956 until he went to Yale in 1966. He is president-elect (for 1970–1971) of the Ecological Society of America. Likens, who received his bachelor's degree at Manchester College and his master's and doctor's degrees from the University of Wisconsin, was on the faculty at Dartmouth before going to Cornell last year.)

An ecological system has a richly detailed budget of inputs and outputs. One of the reasons it is difficult to assess the impact of human activities on the biosphere is the lack of precise information about these inputs and outputs and about the delicate adjustments that maintain a balance. As a result the people planning a project such as the logging of a forest or the building of a power plant often cannot take into account or even foresee the full range of consequences the project will have. Even if they could, the traditional practice in the management of land resources has been to emphasize strategies that maximize the output of some product or service and give little or no thought to the secondary effects of the strategies. As a result one sees such ecological maladjustments as the export of food surpluses while natural food chains become increasingly contaminated with pesticides and runoff waters carry increasing burdens of pollutants from fertilizers and farm wastes; the cutting of forests with inadequate perception of the effects on regional water supplies, wildlife, recreation and aesthetic values, and the conversion of wetlands to commercial use with little concern over important hydrologic, biological, aesthetic and commercial values lost in the conversion.

It seems evident that a new conceptual approach to the management of resources would be desirable. One approach that has been suggested is to consider entire ecological systems. In an experimental forest in New Hampshire we and the U.S. Forest Service have been conducting a large-scale investigation aimed at supplying the kind of information that is usually lacking about ecosystems. The investigation represents a multidisciplinary collaboration between workers at a number of universities and in several government agencies.

The investigation has involved two major operations. First we attempted to determine the inputs and outputs affecting the forest under normal circumstances. Then we inflicted a serious disruption on an ecosystem by cutting down an entire section of the forest. Over a period of years we have been measuring the results of that drastic action on the ecosystem's budget of nutrients. We believe our findings help to show how a natural ecosystem works and what happens when man perturbs it. Moreover, our data provide a conceptual basis for taking into account the ecological factors that in the long run determine whether or not a new technology or a particular economic policy is wise.

An ecosystem, as we use the term, is a basic functional unit of nature comprising both organisms and their nonliving environment, intimately linked by a variety of biological, chemical and physical processes. The living and nonliving components interact

among themselves and with each other; they influence each other's properties, and both are essential for the maintenance and development of the system. An ecosystem, then, can be visualized as a grouping of components—living organisms, organic debris, available nutrients, primary and secondary minerals and atmospheric gases—linked by food webs, flows of nutrients and flows of energy.

A typical forest ecosystem might be visualized as a 1,000-hectare stand of mature deciduous forest. (A hectare is 2.47 acres.) The lateral boundaries of the system can be either an edge of the stand or an arbitrarily determined line. The upper boundary is the treetop level, and the lower one is the deepest level of soil where significant biological activity takes place.

Our ecosystem is in the Hubbard Brook Experimental Forest, which is maintained in the White Mountain National Forest by the Forest Service. We have focused on the movement of nutrients across the boundary of the system (both in and out) and their circulation within it. Nutrients are found in four basic compartments of the ecosystem that are intimately linked by an array of natural processes. The organic compartment consists of the living organisms and their debris. (There are probably more than 2,500 species of plants and animals in a 1,000-hectare system.) The available-nutrient compartment is composed of nutrients held on the surface of particles of the clay-humus complex of the soil or in solution in the soil. Roots as they grow produce positively charged hydrogen ions that exchange with the nutrient ions (of calcium, magnesium and so on) held on the negatively charged particles, and the nutrients are then taken up by the roots. The third compartment consists of soil and rocks containing nutrients in forms temporarily unavailable to living organisms. The atmospheric compartment is made up of gases, which can be found not only in the air but also in the ground.

Nutrients can flow between these compartments along a variety of pathways. In most cases the flow is powered directly or indirectly by solar energy. Available nutrients are taken up and assimilated by vegetation and microorganisms. They also circulate in complex food webs within the organic compartment, subsequently being made available again through decomposition or leaching. Minerals in soil and rock are decomposed by weathering, so that nutrients are made available to organisms. Sometimes available nutrients are returned to the soil-and-rock compartment through the formation of new minerals such as clay. Nutrients tend to cycle between the organic, available-nutrient and soil-and-rock compartments, forming an intrasystem cycle. Nutrients in gaseous form are continually being transferred to and from other compartments by inorganic chemical reactions such as oxidation and reduction and by organic reactions related to such processes as photosynthesis, respiration and the fixation and volatilization of nitrogen.

An ecosystem is connected to the surrounding biosphere by its system of inputs and outputs. They arrive or leave in such forms as radiant energy, gases, inorganic chemicals and organic substances. Inputs and outputs can be transported across ecosystem boundaries by meteorological forces such as precipitation and wind, geological forces such as running water and gravity and biological vectors involving the movement of animals in and out of the system.

Ordinarily it is difficult to measure the input-output relations of an ecosystem, particularly those involving nutrients. The nutrient cycle is closely connected to the water cycle: precipitation brings nutrients in, water leaches them from rocks and soil and stream flow carries them away. Hence one cannot measure the input and output of nutrients . . . input and output of water. The problem usually is that subsurface flows of water, which can be a significant fraction of the hydrologic cycle, are almost impossible to measure.

Several years ago it occurred to us that under certain circumstances the interaction of the nutrient cycle and the hydrologic cycle could be turned to good advantage in the study of an ecosystem. The requirements are that the ecosystem be a watershed underlain by tight bedrock or some other impermeable base. In that case the only inputs would be meteorological and biological; geological input need not be considered because there would be no transfer between adjacent watersheds. In humid areas where surface wind is a minor factor losses from the system would be only geological and biological. Given an impermeable base, all the geological output would inevitably turn up in the streams draining the watershed. If the watershed is part of a larger and fairly homogeneous biotic unit, the biological output tends to balance the biological input because animals move randomly in and out of the watershed, randomly acquiring or discharging nutrients. Thus one need measure only the meteorological input and the geological output of nutrients in order to arrive at the net gain or loss of a given nutrient in the ecosystem.

This is the approach we use at Hubbard Brook, where we have been studying six contiguous watersheds ranging in size from 12 to 43 hectares. They are all tributary to Hubbard Brook and forested with a well-developed, second-growth stand of sugar maple, beech and yellow birch. The forest has been undisturbed by cutting or fire since 1919, when much of the first growth was removed in lumbering operations.

We measure the meteorological inputs to these watersheds by means of a network of gauging stations. We measure the geological outputs by means of a weir built at the foot of each watershed, that is, at the point where the principal stream leaves the watershed. With the weir, which also includes a ponding basin, one can both measure the water that is leaving the watershed and, by combining these data with frequent chemical measurements, ascertain the quantities of chemical substances that are leaving the watershed.

Inasmuch as the impermeable base prohibits deep seepage in these watersheds, the loss of water by evaporation and by transpiration through leaves is calculated by subtracting the hydrologic output from the hydrologic input. Water budgets for the six watersheds from 1955 to 1968 indicate an average annual precipitation of 123 centimeters and a runoff of 72 centimeters, with evapotranspiration therefore averaging 51 centimeters. Precipitation is distributed rather evenly throughout the year, but runoff is uneven. Most of the runoff (57 percent) occurs during the snowmelt period of March, April and May; indeed, 35 percent of the total runoff occurs in April. In contrast, only .7 percent of the yearly runoff takes place in August.

We accomplish chemical measurements by taking weekly samples of the water output (stream water at the weir) and collecting the total weekly water input (rain and snow) and analyzing them for calcium, magnesium, potassium, sodium, aluminium, ammonium, nitrate, sulfate, chloride, bicarbonate hydrogen ion and silicate. The concentrations of these elements in precipitation and in stream water are entered in a computing system where weekly concentrations are multiplied by the weekly volume of water entering and leaving the ecosystem. In this way the input and output of chemicals is computed in terms of kilograms of an element per hectare of watershed.

Knowing the input and output of chemicals, we have made nutrient budgets for nine elements. Considering four of the major ones, we find the following annual averages in kilograms per hectare entering the system and being flushed out of it: calcium, 2.6 and 11.8; sodium, 1.5 and 6.9; magnesium, .7 and 2.9, and potassium, 1.1 and 1.7. These inputs and outputs represent connections of the undisturbed forest ecosystem with worldwide biogeochemical systems. The data also provide a comparative basis for judging the effects of managerial practices on biogeochemical cycles.

Net losses of calcium, sodium and magnesium were recorded each year even though the period of measurement included wet and dry years as well as years of average precipitation. Potassium, a major component of the bedrock, showed net gains in two years and a smaller average net loss than was recorded for the other elements. Evidently potassium is accumulating in the ecosystem with respect to other elements. One reason may be that it is retained in the structure of illitic clays developing in the ecosystem. Perhaps also potassium is retained in proportionately larger amounts than other elements are in the slowly increasing biomass of the system.

Highly predictable relations appear between the concentrations of dissolved chemicals in stream water and the discharge rates of the stream. For example, the concentrations of sodium and silica are inversely related to discharge rates, whereas the concentrations of aluminum, hydrogen ion and nitrate increase as discharge rates increase. Magnesium, calcium, sulfate, chloride and potassium are relatively independent of discharge rate.

The magnitudes of change of concentration, however, are fairly small. The concentrations of potassium, calcium and magnesium hardly change at all, and the concentrations of sodium decreases by only three times as the discharge rate increases by four orders of magnitude. These results were unexpected: we had thought that during the spring melt period there would be considerable dilution, making the concentrations of elements in stream water relatively low. All these relations show how strongly stream-water chemistry is under the control of processes inherent in the forest ecosystem.

Because of the comparative constancy of chemical concentrations, the total output of elements is strongly dependent on the volume of stream flow. Hence it is now possible, knowing only the hydrologic output, to predict with fair accuracy both the output and the concentration of chemicals in the stream water draining from our mature, forested ecosystem. This relation would seem to have considerable value for regional planners concerned with water quality.

A particularly interesting finding is that almost the entire loss of cations (positively charged nutrient ions) from the undisturbed forest ecosystem is balanced by the input of positively charged hydrogens ions in precipitation. The proportion of hydrogen ions is related to the amount of sulfate in precipitation. It is estimated that 50 percent of the sulfate in precipitation results from industrial activities that put sulfur dioxide and other sulfur products into the air. These sulfur compounds may ultimately form ionized sulfuric acid, which consists of hydrogen ions and sulfate ions. When the precipitation enters the ecosystem, the hydrogen ions replace the nutrient cations on the negatively charged exchange sites in the soil, and the cations are washed out of the system in stream water. Thus air pollution is directly related to a small but continuous loss of fertility from the land area of the ecosystem and a small but continuous chemical enrichment of streams and lakes. The relation appears to represent an important hidden cost of air pollution, made apparent through the analysis of ecosystems.

So far we have mentioned only chemical losses appearing as dissolved substances.

Losses also arise when chemicals locked up in particulate matter such as rock or soil particles and in organic matter such as leaves and twigs are washed out of the ecosystem by the stream. We have measured these outputs and developed equations expressing the loss of particulate matter as a function of the discharge rate of the stream. The loss is highly dependent on the discharge rate.

Losses of dissolved substances account for the great bulk of the chemical loss from our undisturbed ecosystem. Whereas they are largely independent of the discharge rate, losses of particulate matter are highly dependent on it. This point is of particular interest since forest-management practices can either increase or decrease stream-discharge rates and thereby shift the balance between the loss of dissolved substances and the loss of particulate matter.

Weathering, or the release of elements bound in primary minerals, is another factor that must be considered in an ecosystem, since the elements thus released are made available as nutrients to the vegetation and animals. Based on net losses of elements from our ecosystem, a relatively uniform geology in the region and a knowledge of the bulk chemistry of the rock and soil, we estimate that the nutrients contained in some 800 kilograms per hectare of rock and soil are made available each year by weathering.

We now have for the undisturbed Northern hardwood ecosystem of Hubbard Brook estimates of chemical input in precipitation and output in stream water and the rates of generation of ions by the weathering of minerals within the system. To complete the picture of nutrient cycling it is necessary to measure the nutrient content of the four compartments and the flow rates among them arising from uptake, decomposition and leaching and the formation of new minerals. A typical set of relations, using calcium as an example, is shown in the illustration on page 99.

The annual net loss of calcium from the ecosystem is 9.2 kilograms per hectare. This loss represents only about .3 percent of the calcium in the available-nutrient and organic compartments of the system and only 1.3 percent of what is in the available-nutrient compartment alone. The data suggest that Northern hardwood forests have a remarkable ability to hold and circulate nutrients.

It was against this background that we and the Forest Service embarked on the experiment of cutting down everything that was growing in one watershed. One of the objectives of this severe treatment was to block a major pathway of the ecosystem—the uptake of nutrients by higher plants—while the pathway of ultimate decomposition continued to function. We questioned whether or not the ecosystem had the capacity under these circumstances to hold the nutrients accumulating in the available-nutrient compartment. We also wanted to determine the effect of deforestation on stream flow, to examine some of the fundamental chemical relations of the forest manipulation on nutrient relations and the eutrophication of stream water.

The experiment was begun in the winter of 1965–1966 when the forest of Watershed No. 2, covering 15.6 hectares, was completely leveled by the Forest Service. All trees, saplings and shrubs were cut and dropped in place; their limbs were removed so that no slash was more than 1.5 meters above the ground. No products were removed from the forest, and great care was taken to prevent disturbance of the surface of the soil that might promote erosion. The following summer regrowth of vegetation was inhibited by an aerial application of the herbicide Bromacil at a rate of 28 kilograms per hectare.

Deforestation had a pronounced effect on runoff. Beginning in May, 1966, runoff from the cut watershed began to increase over the levels that would have been expected if there had been no cutting. The cumulative runoff for 1966 exceeded the expected amount by 40 percent. The largest difference was recorded during the four months from June through September, when the runoff was 418 percent higher than the expected amount. This difference is directly attributable to changes in the hydrologic cycle resulting from the removal of the transpiring surface. Accelerated runoff has continued through the succeeding summers.

Our treatment also resulted in a fundamental alteration of the nitrogen cycle, which in turn caused extraordinary losses of soil fertility. In an undisturbed ecosystem nitrogen incorporated in organic compounds is ultimately decomposed in a number of steps to ammonium nitrogen (NH_4^+), a positively charged ion that can be held fairly tightly in the soil on the negatively charged exchange sites. Ammonium ions can be taken up directly by green plants and used in the fabrication of nitrogen-containing organic compounds. Ammnoium ions can also be used as the substrate for the process of nitrification. In this process two genera of soil bacteria, *Nitrosomonas* and *Nitrobacter*, oxidize ammonium to nitrate (NO_3^-). Two hydrogen ions are produced for every ion of ammonium oxidized to nitrate. As we have already mentioned, hydrogen ions can play a key role in the release of nutrient cations from the soil. Nitrate, being negatively charged, is highly leachable. If it is not taken up by higher plants, it can easily be removed from the ecosystem in drainage water.

The available evidence indicates that nitrification is of minor importance in undisturbed forests such as ours, underlain by acid podzol soil. The nitrate drained by our streams (invariably in low concentration) can be largely accounted for by its input in precipitation. In fact, our budgetary analyses show that undisturbed ecosystems are accumulating nitrogen at a rate of about two kilograms per hectare per year.

The concentration of nitrate in stream water from undisturbed forests shows a seasonal cycle, being higher from November through April than it is from May through October. The decline in May and the low concentration in the summer are correlated with heavy demand for nutrients by the vegetation and generally increased biological activity associated with warming of the soil.

Beginning in June, 1966, the concentration of nitrate in the deforested watershed rose sharply. At the same time the undisturbed ecosystem showed the normal spring decline. The high concentration has continued in the deforested watershed during the succeeding years. Average net losses of nitrate nitrogen were 120 kilograms per hectare per year from 1966 through 1968. We estimate that the annual turnover if nitrogen in our undisturbed forests is about 60 kilograms per hectare. Therefore an amount of elemental nitrogen equivalent to double the amount normally taken up by the forest has been lost from the deforested watershed each year since cutting. The magnitude of nitrate loss is a clear indication of the acceleration of nitrification in the watershed. There is no doubt that the cutting drastically altered the conditions controlling the nitrification.

Another factor of interest about nitrification is the body of evidence from other regions that certain types of vegetation can inhibit nitrification chemically. Presumably the effect is to inhibit production of the highly leachable nitrate ion. At the same time the positively charged ammonium ions may be held within the system on the negatively charged exchange sites in the soil. If this inhibition process goes on at Hubbard Brook, cutting the vegetation would promote nitrification. The effect may account for much of the nitrate loss from the deforested ecosystem.

The export of nitrate to the small stream draining the cut watershed has resulted in nitrate concentrations exceeding the levels established by the U.S. Public Health Service for drinking water. In general the deforestation has led to eutrophication of the stream and to the development of algal "blooms." This finding indicates that in some circumstances forest-management practices can contribute significantly to the eutrophication of streams.

Since nitrification produces hydrogen ions that replace metallic cations on the exchange surfaces in the soil, one would expect a loss of metallic nutrients from the deforested watershed. We have recorded substantial losses of this kind. The concentrations of calcium, magnesium, sodium and potassium in the stream water increased almost simultaneously with the increase in nitrate. About a month later the concentration of aluminum rose sharply.

It is . . . higher than those in an undisturbed watershed; of calcium, 10 times; of aluminum, nine; of magnesium, seven, and of sodium, three. These figures represent a substantial loss of nutrients from the ecosystem. The finding suggests that commercial forestry should focus more on the effect of harvesting practices on the loss of nutrients, giving more consideration to such corrective procedures as selective cutting and the promotion of regrowth on cut areas.

Our results indicate that the capacity of the ecosystem to retain nutrients is dependent on the maintenance of nutrient cycling within the system. When the cycle is broken, as by the destruction of vegetation, the loss of nutrients is greatly accelerated. This effect is related both to the cessation of nutrient uptake by plants and to the larger quantities of drainage water passing through the system. The loss may also be related to increased rates of decomposition resulting from such changes in the physical environment as higher soil temperature and moister soil.

We also found a basic change in the pattern of loss of particulate matter in the deforested watershed. The data for three years indicate an increase of some ninefold over a comparable undisturbed ecosystem. After an initial surge the loss of particulate organic matter has declined as a result of the virtual elimination of the production of primary organic matter in the ecosystem. In contrast, the loss of inorganic material from the stream bed has accelerated because of the greater erosive capacity of the augmented stream flow and also because several biological barriers to the erosion of surface soil and stream banks have been greatly diminished. The continuous layer of litter than once protected the soil surface is now discontinuous. The extensive network of fine roots that tended to stabilize the stream bank is now dead, and the dead leaves that tended to plaster over exposed banks are gone. The erosive trend can be expected to rise exponentially as long as regrowth of vegetation is inhibited in the watershed.

Our study clearly shows that the stability of an ecosystem is linked to the orderly flow of nutrients between the living and the nonliving components of the system and the production and decomposition of biomass. These processes, integrated with the seasonal changes in climate, result in relatively tight nutrient cycles within the system, a minimum output of nutrients and water and good resistance to erosion. Destruction of the vegetation sets off a chain of interactions. Their net effect is an increase in the amount and flow rate of water and the breakdown of biological barriers to erosion and transportation, coupled with an increase in the export of nutrient capital and inorganic particulate matter.

Three points, which are inherent in the

ecosystem concept and are emphasized by the Hubbard Brook study, should be recognized as being basic to any wise scheme for managing the use of land. First, the ecosystem is a highly complex natural unit composed of organisms (plants and animals, including man) and their inorganic environment (air, water, soil and rock). Second, all parts of an ecosystem are intimately linked by natural processes that are part of the ecosystem, such as the uptake of nutrients, the fixation of energy, the movement of nutrients and energy, through food webs, the release of nutrients by the decomposition of organic matter, the weathering of rock and soil minerals to release nutrients and the formation of new minerals. Third, individual ecosystems are linked to surrounding land and water ecosystems and to the biosphere in general by connections with food webs and the worldwide circulation of air and water.

Failures in environmental management often result from such factors as failure to appreciate the complexity of nature, the assumption that it is possible to manage one part of nature alone and the belief that somehow nature will absorb all types of manipulation. Good management of the use of land—good from the viewpoint of society at large—requires that managerial practices be imposed only after a careful analysis and evaluation of all the ramifications. A focus for this type of analysis and evaluation is the ecosystem concept.

AMERICA'S HOUSING CRISIS

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I have long been saddened at the shameful attitude of the President in failing to make even a minimal effort to provide decent housing for our Nation's poorest people. The fault lies not with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, who apparently has tried vainly to convince the President the Nation's housing shortage is a problem that needs immediate and drastic attention. However, the President has sacrificed the needs of the Nation's poor to racism and political expediency.

In the life of the Nixon administration, we have witnessed the growing crisis in the Nation's public housing program. The crisis has been brought on, not by the benign neglect of the President, but by the deliberate action of the President's Office of Management and Budget in cutting the subsidy requirements of the low-income and elderly residents of public housing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a newsletter from the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials describing the action they are taking to head off this crisis be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOUSING AND REDEVELOPMENT OFFICIALS TAKES ACTION TO SAVE HOMES FOR MILLION LOW-INCOME AND ELDERLY FAMILIES

A crisis has hit 2000 communities across the country. The crisis has been brought on by the failure of the President's Office of Management and Budget to fund the subsidy requirements of the low-income and elderly residents of public housing. The residents will not be the only ones to feel the impact of the crisis: adverse economic and social repercussions can also be expected for the general community.

EMERGENCY MEETING ON THE CRISIS

NAHRO called an emergency meeting in its Washington offices on Saturday, August 5, to face the crisis. It was attended by the executive committee of the NAHRO Board of Governors—by the presidents, or their representatives, of all seven of NAHRO's regional councils—and by directors of local housing authorities from all parts of the country.

The possibility faced at the meeting was that, by the end of this year, the nation's local housing authorities may no longer be able to keep open for occupancy some 1 million homes for their low-income and elderly residents. The further question faced was: if these homes *are* to be kept open, will there be funds available to assure that they are maintained at healthful standards, are properly protected for safety and security, and are effectively tied into a community services program.

The crisis has been building to a climax for a long time. It reached its peak within the last few months. The question now is whether the system of bringing housing assistance to low-income families is about to collapse.

Specifically, the 1969, 1970, and 1971 "Brooke amendments" are not being adequately funded. Under these amendments, which have had the full support of NAHRO, no public housing resident, including welfare families, pays more than 25 percent of his income for rent (a percentage higher than the ratio on which the average American family pays its housing costs). Since rents paid on this formula by low-income families frequently cannot cover the operating costs of a housing unit, Congress has said that local housing authorities are entitled to federal assistance to make up the difference between this rental income and operating cost. But available funding has not been released by the President's Office of Management and Budget in the amounts necessary. OMB has not permitted local housing authorities to receive the amounts requested but, instead, LHAs have been forced to deplete emergency reserves, lay off staff, postpone repair and replacement programs, and eliminate security and other services essential to residents. This OMB funding failure comes at a time when operating costs are going up: wages are higher, supplies cost more, services carry mounting price tags.

WHAT HAPPENED AT THE MEETING?

Reports on the situation were made at the August 5 meeting from two points of view: national and local.

Nationally, it was reported that the Congress has authorized funds sufficient to have met LHAs demands for fiscal 1972 but that such funds have been held back in the amount of 44 million dollars by OMB. For the 1973 fiscal year, the Administration has not sought funding to meet demonstrated need: the President has asked for 170 million dollars, as against an anticipated need in the amount of at least 325 million dollars.

On review of these facts, it was clear to those at the August 5 meeting that the only way the needed funds can be obtained is by direction of the White House: the President must instruct OMB to release them. It was agreed that the messages to this effect that have been going to the White House for the last two or three months must continue. George Romney has appealed for the funds; Senator Brooke has sought the President's help. NAHRO has put the case to Mr. Nixon. To date, a total of 73 Senators and Representatives have addressed the issue. Mayors, governors, and other elected officials have petitioned for full funding.

Meanwhile, in their attempt to keep their doors open and their residents decently housed, local housing authorities faced with mounting bills and dwindling income have undertaken a whole series of drastic measures. A growing number of LHAs are turning to the courts for relief under a variety of legal challenges. Some of them are suing the federal government for breach of contract. In other cases, local authorities are adopting operating practices that may be challenged in the courts by either the Department of Housing and Urban Development, tenants, or employees. Court actions either under way or threatened were reported from Norfolk, Virginia; 20 authorities in the state of New Jersey; Oklahoma City; St. Paul; Alaska; Baltimore; Las Vegas; a group of LHAs in Connecticut; Beaver County, Pennsylvania.

LOCAL EMERGENCY MEASURES

During the August 5 meeting, local authorities listed devices either already in use or potential for use in taking stop-gap action to stave off bankruptcy and the closing of projects. In the discussion of which of these devices a community might first put to work, it was the unanimous sense of the meeting that first priority should be given to those measures that would keep the most doors open for the most people—to those devices that would have the least impact on the residents. Among the emergency measures that LHAs either already have, or may, employ as discussed on August 5 are:

1. Stop further production of low-income housing throughout the community and use development funds for operating costs.
2. Defer payments in lieu of taxes.
3. Cancel leases in Section 23 housing.
4. Cut off all new applications for units and allow vacancies to occur.
5. Sell equipment.
6. Restrict new occupancy to families in only the highest eligible income quartile, thus eliminating the poorest families from occupancy.
7. Ignore Brooke amendments, since Brooke funds will not be available to cover income losses.
8. Refuse occupancy to all welfare families.
9. Stop utility payments.
10. Declare bankruptcy and ask for federal take-over.
11. Issue program-wide eviction notices and close out operation of LHA.

LOCAL EMERGENCY MEASURES CAN HAVE HARMFUL COMMUNITY-WIDE EFFECTS

The use of any of the devices listed above can have harmful effects, community-wide. If these harmful effects can be foreseen by the groups likely to suffer from them, those groups may agree to use their influence to have them stopped before they start. For if production of low-income housing is cut off, the community development program will be stymied by a lack of relocation housing. The supporters of community development (businessmen, chambers of commerce, civic groups) will want to fight a cut-off . . . and hence will want to fight for Brooke amendment funding.

If staff cuts and equipment sales occur, the maintenance of housing developments will deteriorate rapidly and tenants may respond with rent strikes and create political problems of a magnitude that governors, mayors, and other elected officials will not be able to ignore. Those officials will increase their pressure for Brooke funding.

If suppliers, utility companies, and all commercial interests related to low-income housing suffer severe financial losses as LHAs run out of money, they may want to put in some White House calls.

If builders and turnkey developers see their markets disappearing, they may want to bring some pressures to bear.

If building construction and maintenance trades begin losing jobs, the voice of labor

may be raised in protest of funding restraints.

WHAT NAHRO IS DOING

As an outcome of the August 5 meeting, NAHRO is committed to the following actions:

Continue, at a stepped up pace, demands for the release of authorized funds.

Retain legal counsel to investigate the best means of assuring that the Administration will meet its obligations.

Mobilize support for pending amendments to the United States Housing Act of 1937 to provide a sounder base for low-income housing and to assure the flow of funds for that purpose.

WHAT'S NEEDED FROM LHA

Briefs, in full, of any court action that has been taken and a statement of where the case is as of this date.

Descriptions of any court actions being considered.

Copies of any correspondence with Congressmen, the White House, HUD that LHAs have had on their fiscal affairs.

Copies of any newspaper coverage that the local situation has developed.

Statements on any emergency measures taken.

Estimates of the date when the LHA is likely to become bankrupt.

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, recently the Honorable DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III, who so ably represents Virginia's Third District in this body, addressed the Corporation Center for Scientific Research Relative to Tobacco—identified, for fairly obvious reasons as CORESTA/TCRA—at a joint conference held in Williamsburg, Va.

This was a fitting location for such a meeting, since the Virginia Colony introduced tobacco to Europe, and an apt choice of speaker, since Representative SATTERFIELD shares with other Members who represent tobacco-growing and processing districts a grave concern for the abuse—possibly undeserved—which has consistently been heaped on this important industry.

Instead of concentrating his remarks on the economic impact of this agricultural commodity, which is sizable, Congressman SATTERFIELD discussed at length the growing body of opinion which is beginning to have second thoughts about the medical impact of cigarette smoking.

Mr. SATTERFIELD strikes to the heart of the problem and throws out a challenge to his audience early in his statement when he says:

The truth of the matter is that the political controversy exists because there are vast gaps in our knowledge about smoking and health and that the existence of these gaps has been denied for too long by those who have a nonscientific stake in attacking tobacco. Make no mistake about it, well-intentioned forces are at work throughout the world to impose a guilty verdict upon smoking—without due process of science.

Since Mr. SATTERFIELD's statement and the testimony by experts at the time of hearings on the conquest of cancer bill have not received as wide distribution as have the claims of other experts who seem bent on outlawing cigarettes, I include his entire statement in the RECORD at this point, so that Members of the Congress may benefit from this other side of the story:

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III

I am pleased to join with Dr. Hahn and Mr. Kielmansegg in welcoming you to this Joint Conference of CORESTA and TCRC. It is good to have you here in Williamsburg where the early roots of our Nation took hold.

Williamsburg holds a special meaning for me as a legislator, for it was here, in 1619, that the House of Burgesses of Virginia, our first representative legislative body, was convened. I had the rare privilege of serving in that body, now called the Virginia General Assembly, which is the oldest continuous legislative body in the new world.

It is significant that this conference brings together representatives from industry, academia and government. I am encouraged by the opportunity it provides for enlightened communication between these sectors of our society—communication which must be nurtured if the great tobacco industry of this world is to flourish.

Dr. Wakeham originally suggested that I discuss the universality of tobacco and, of course, the complexion of this audience serves to remind one of that universality. I am told that more than 45 nations are represented by the participants in this conference. This fact alone speaks more clearly than I could ever hope to of the true universal impact of the tobacco industry throughout the world. The language of tobacco is universal, trade in tobacco is universal, the objective of economic advancement in this great industry is universal.

However, there is another element in the tobacco industry, an unwelcome element, which is equally universal in nature. That is the threat to the entire industry implicit in controversy over the relationship between smoking and health. There is no question but that the tobacco industry as a whole is under severe attack.

Although that attack is presently directed against the cigarette industry. I am certain that if it should succeed those who have instigated it will find a way to focus a new attack upon the remaining segments of the tobacco industry. The danger of this is self-evident.

The smoking and health question is both a political and a scientific controversy. Ultimately, I am hopeful that the bright light of scientific research will dissipate the political fog that surrounds it.

The truth of the matter is that the political controversy exists because there are vast gaps in our knowledge about smoking and health and that the existence of these gaps has been denied for too long by those who have a non-scientific stake in attacking tobacco. Make no mistake about it, well-intentioned forces are at work throughout the world to impose a guilty verdict upon smoking—without due process of science.

As a legislator, my major concern is to prevent a stampede that will condemn tobacco on-less-than-conclusive evidence. Fortunately, I am not alone. Many of my fellow Representatives join me in this struggle to prevent a non-scientific edict from foreclosing the search for scientific truth.

I am encouraged by the fact that many of you and your colleagues in the scientific community have deep reservations about the nature of the evidence used against tobacco. I am aware of the amount of private criticism leveled against much of the research dealing with the issue of smoking and health. I only wish this fact could somehow make its way into the general mass media and into public discussion. But the obstacles are great, I realize. They have to do with the habits and prejudices of the press, credibility and with so-called news values, including the preferred treatment often given those who attack rather than to those who must defend such attacks.

Nevertheless, greater obstacles than these have given way to honest men willing to express their honest dissent. Silence in the marketplace of ideas—scientific or political—have never been an instrument of change. After all, the walls of Jericho did not come tumbling down until the Ram's horn blew loud and clear.

In 1969, the Congress of the United States, after lengthy testimony from scientists on all sides of the smoking and health controversy, went on record to urge the Government to identify and close the gaps in our knowledge. I commend all of you here today for your efforts to do so. For without solid scientific truth, developed through good research and tested in the crucible of open discussion, policy makers will never know where to go. And as the old talmudic saying puts it, "If you don't know where you are going, any road will take you there."

Nearly nine years ago with the issuance of the surgeon general's report, one such road was selected, not knowing what caused lung cancer or other major diseases, a politico-medical arm of government launched America down the anti-smoking road. That road clearly leads to the destruction of the tobacco industry.

Imagine what would have happened had there been no active resistance movement on the political and scientific fronts. The tobacco industry might well have vanished from the scene. And if that had happened, it would have been too late to apologize for tobacco's untimely demise when just this year the National Academy of Sciences published a massive study which charges that air pollution is the probable cause of lung cancer.

This report is a model of scientific caution, carefully avoiding even the semblance of sensational statement aimed at creating panic in the public. As a scientific document, it stands in marked contrast to the various surgeon general's reports on smoking and health. Is it not strange that this official has failed to wage war on pollution as he has upon cigarette smoking, which he classified as being far worse than drug addiction or automobile accidents, or alcoholism or air pollution? I think it is—and frankly I cannot understand it.

I would like to list a few major points made by the National Academy of Sciences panelists.

They concluded that it is "likely" that deaths from lung-cancer would decrease if air pollution were substantially reduced in urban areas.

They said that although there is no "conclusive proof" that air pollution causes lung cancer, the report points out that the disease is twice as common among city dwellers as rural residents and is most common in areas of cities where general industrial pollution is worse.

While, they noted that cigarette smoking appears to be a major factor in the increase of lung cancer, they pointed out that smoking alone cannot account for the different rates in urban and rural areas.

They reported that studies of immigrants have shown an incidence of lung cancer somewhere between the rates in their country of origin and those in the country of destination. The older they are when they migrate, the closer their lung cancer rates are to their home countries. In some cases, where the lung cancer rate was much higher in the country of origin, rates among mi-

grants have decreased significantly—even though their cigarette smoking increased, the panel said.

They reported that "in no instance has exposure to a specific polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon, such as benzo(a)pyrene, been proved to have caused cancer in man."

Benzo(a)pyrene is a common ingredient of polluted air and tobacco smoke. It has been cited year after year in surgeon general's reports as a prime suspect causing cancer in smokers. And this has been done despite two pieces of evidence which are in conflict with that conclusion.

First, over 13,000 times more benzo(a)-pyrene is released into the ambient air by all sources of industrial pollution than by burning all the cigarette tobacco produced in the United States.

Second, and perhaps more important, research conducted by the American Cancer Society has virtually exonerated the substance as a suspect. The ACS studied 6,000 roofing workers, for example, who breathe heated fumes of tar containing 200 times more benzo(a)pyrene than the maximum levels in a large industrial city, or the equivalent of 705 cigarettes a day. These exposed workers amazingly had no greater incidence of lung cancer than the general population.

I applaud the National Academy of Science panelists, even though they were dealing with air pollution, I am happy to see that their objectivity and caution has a "fall out" effect upon the cigarette controversy. But I wonder, as many of you do, why such objectivity and caution did not reveal itself in documents prepared by the surgeon general. The same evidence was in existence. Some of it has been around for years. Can the surgeon general—indeed can the scientific community—afford to be objective regarding air pollution and not be objective regarding smoking? Can the official government attitude be different from shylock's? Can scientific truth—like the quality of mercy—be strained? Or must it not droppeth like the gentle rains from heaven impartially on all those below?

Perhaps, distance from the battle may be the secret of objectivity. I have observed that when tobacco is the subject of hearings or discussion, many eminent scientists and physicians find it difficult to utter any statement that could be used in defense of tobacco. Yet, when they are dealing with another subject, this is no longer the case.

For example, during hearings on the conquest of cancer bill in September of last year, a former president of the American Cancer Society boldly stated that cigarettes caused lung cancer. Up to this point, he had devoted his testimony to the need to find the cause of cancer, the problems involved and the need for upwards of a billion dollars to research the mystery. But he had no doubt when it came to cigarettes.

When I challenged him to name the agent in cigarettes which causes cancer, he admitted it has never been defined, and contended that the statistical association was strong evidence to his mind.

Representative PAUL ROGERS, the chairman of the subcommittee, who does not represent tobacco growers, then also asked him to clear up his previous statement. "Either we do know, or we don't know," he said.

To which, this distinguished physician and dedicated opponent of tobacco replied—and I quote his exact words:

"I think we can state now that we do not know the precise cause of malignant changes within the cell. We know a number of remote causes established by statistical methods by the correlation between exposure to the cause and the occurrence.

"We know a number of intermediate causes, particularly in experimental cancers one can take a human cell line and expose it to a monkey virus and get profound changes in the cell pattern.

"But I would agree with you, that we do not have full and precise knowledge of just exactly what causes the cancer."

Sometimes, the distance of sheer miles (or perhaps another culture) lends objectivity. All things Chinese seem to have great news value these days. So it was amusing to read a report of the travels of a medical delegation visiting this country from the People's Republic of China.

To a question about cigarettes, the Chinese specialist in internal medicine a doctor Hsu Chia-Yu, who is a spokesman for the delegation—and a smoker himself—replied. I quote from the news article which reported the incident:

"Well, I know smoking will do no good for me, but not much harm. I consider," said Hsu, "of course, to patients I may advise him, "Don't smoke, at least not smoke too much! But anyway, I don't think it does much harm to you if you're healthy."

The fact of this conference and this meeting today with the representatives from our universities, industry and government is a hopeful sign. It indicates that we can join together to discuss common, technical problems and, hopefully, to find answers to the questions clouding our future. Questions that only the scientific community can resolve. Questions which it must resolve.

And so in this climate—removed from the battle so to speak—I offer a challenge.

Why don't you—as an official body—take the necessary steps to compile all the data that does not support the antismoking position and translate it into information which your representatives can use in their legislative bodies.

As Professor Stafford Beer told a group of Congressmen some time ago, "We can generate data indefinitely; we can exchange data forever; we can store data, retrieve, and file them away, but we have to ask why. The purpose is regulation and that means translating data into information. Information is what changes us."

So far the information on smoking has been one-sided. It is now time to redress the balance by compiling and activating the data which will present the other side of the question. You have heard my challenge—I hope you will respond.

REVENUE SHARING

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the recently passed revenue sharing bill has brought forth a great number of inquiries from local governments all across the country.

An article in the Nation's Cities succinctly summarizes the distribution formulas incorporated in the revenue sharing bill. The same article spells out some of the difficulties that may be encountered in obtaining current figures for the various formulas.

Mr. President, because of its timeliness and general utility, I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Revenue Sharing's New Data Needs" be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

REVENUE SHARING'S NEW DATA NEEDS

(By Robert P. Strauss)

The historic action of Congress to create general revenue sharing represents not only a revolution in the form of American federalism, but also a revolution in the federal statistical base that will be used to administer the program.

As all state and local officials know, obtaining and using information on the 39,000 cities, counties, and townships in the U.S. is a monumental task that will require not only that currently available statistics be used, but also that new sources of statistics be generated to ensure that the program operates with the most comprehensive and up-to-date base possible.

The State and Local Assistance Act of 1972 distributes $5.3 billion in calendar 1972 to all general purpose governments in the U.S. The final distribution formula represents a compromise between the House and Senate versions of the legislation. In terms of data, the final bill requires the same information at the state area level as contained in both House and Senate bills. It is useful to spell these out in more detail:

Data Requirements for State Area Grant under:

HOUSE H.R. 14370

(1) State and local tax collections.
(2) Federal individual income tax liability.
(3) Resident population.
(4) State income.
(5) Urbanized population.
(6) State per capital income.

SENATE H.R. 14370 (AS AMENDED)

(1) State and local tax collections.
(2) Resident population.
(3) State income.
(4) State per capita income.

Information on these state area variables comes from several sources. The state and local tax collection data is provided annually by the Governments Division of the Bureau of the Census and published in annual numbers of *Governmental Finances* and in annual numbers of *State Tax Collections* and *State Governmental Finances*.

Federal tax liability by State is provided by the Internal Revenue Service and published in *Statistics of Income*. Population, urbanized population, and per capita income are also provided by the Bureau of the Census and found in the 1970 Census of Population. The Census Bureau also provided intercensal estimates of state population in its Current Population Survey series. Total state income is from the Department of Commerce and is published annually in the *Survey of Current Business*.

While the final revenue sharing bill relied on both the House and Senate formulas for the distribution of funds among the state geographic areas, the legislation adopted the Senate intra- or within-state allocation formula. And it is here that the greatest data demands are generated.

Very briefly, all localities in a state receive two-thirds of the state area grant; the state government receives one third. This local amount is then distributed among country geographic areas on the basis of population weighted by tax effort of the county area and weighted by state per capita income divided by county area per capita income. The tax effort is defined as the ratio of all non-school taxes collected by the county, cities, and townships within each county area. Once this county area amount is determined, it is then divided among types of government in the county area on the basis of relative non-school tax collections.

Thus if all cities in the county area collected 80 per cent of the non-school taxes in the county area, they would get 80 per cent of the county area allocation. This in turn is allocated among municipalities on the basis of population, tax effort, and county

area per capita income divided by municipal per capita income—now tax effort is measured as the total non-school taxes collected by a municipality divided by its total money income.

Townships are treated in an analagous fashion; an amount to all townships is calculated by taking their taxes as a percentage of all taxes in the county area and then allocating that portion of the county area funds on the basis of township population, tax effort, and county area per capita income divided by township per capita income.

There are then three kinds of data required at the municipal level: financial information on non-school taxes collected by cities, counties, and townships, and population and community income data for these various geographic configurations. While state area data is available annually (though with certain publication lags), this micro information is available only every five years in the case of the tax data on all 39,000 units, and every 10 years in the cases of population and community income. Moreover, the Census Bureau does not generate intercensal estimates for urbanized population.

To remedy this lack of micro data, two new sources are being generated by the Treasury Department.

First, it has funded an annual short Census of Governments to obtain the required non-school tax data from all general purpose local governments. The survey for fiscal year 1971 tax data is currently underway.

Second, it is modifying the individual income tax form (1040) to contain certain additional information which will enable the Internal Revenue Service and the Census Bureau to ascertain where individuals reside in terms of political subdivision. With this augmented geographic residence information, the Census Bureau will then be able to generate workable intersensal estimates of population and community money income (and hence per capita income). This change in the 1040 form is of sufficient importance to warrant further discussion.

Until now, tax filers have recorded their mailing address for the purpose of corresponding with the IRS. Under federal statute, this can be the address of an accountant who fills out the form for the filer, one's business address, or any post office box. While the majority of filers use their usual place of residence as their mailing address, a significant number do not. Moreover, the mailing address of most residences does not indicate the political subdivision of residence, but indicates instead a city name and Zip code which may be different from the city in which the house is actually located.

The Zip code, created to distribute the mail, crosses municipal as well as county boundaries, and frequently contains more than one city in it. As a result, it has been impossible to use information on adjusted gross income and exemptions by Zip code to estimate accurately county or city income and population.

However, by requiring the filer to indicate place of residence (state, county, city, township), we will have the right kind of geographic residence information to provide these sorely needed intercensal population and income data.

These new federal statistics will not only make the administration of federal revenue sharing more up-to-date and fair, it will also provide to the states requisite information to develop their own revenue sharing programs as well as to provide for a more orderly and knowledgable planning of regional and local growth policy.

It is particularly fitting that this bold new direction in America be accompanied by a significant breakthrough in our data base. Not only will general revenue sharing be administered better than any previous grant program, this new data will greatly improve our ability to understand the complex dynamics of urban economic change. [See Your Local Economy: Does City Hall Play a Role?" Nation's Cities, Sept. 1972, Page 21.]

"SOUNDER"

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, in the history of the American motion picture industry, an occasional film will stand above its contemporaries, a film which through its creativity and universal appeal is recognized as a classic piece of art.

I am very happy to acknowledge and alert my colleagues to a new film which more than fits this description—"Sounder." "Sounder" is directed by Martin Ritt, produced by Robert Radnitz, with Ruth and Eliott Handler of the Mattell Toy Corp. in their first venture into film production, and released through 20th Century-Fox Corp. I believe congratulations are in order for all concerned, for producing a film of such high caliber. And my enthusiasm is heightened further by the fact that "Sounder" presents such a beautiful example of the artistry which black films can exhibit.

"Sounder" is a family motion picture; but it is much more than that. It is a poignant, touching film about people. In a narrow sense, it is concerned with the trials of a black family in Louisiana during the years of the depression; but the film is not only the saga of one family, or one era in our Nation's history. Through the exceptional writing and direction and the magnificent performances by principal actors and actresses, "Sounder" becomes a story of the love and understanding in any family at any time. It is a powerful, personal drama of real people in a real situation.

Too often lately we have been bombarded by films—both black and white—which insist on presenting a violence-ridden sexual fantasy as fact. Blacks—and whites—have been ripped off time and again by low-grade films which personify only the worst in our culture and society. The newly discovered black audience has been subjected to insult and bad taste as it reaches for something of value from the motion picture industry.

I believe "Sounder" marks a turning point in the art of the motion picture. This is a black film to take pride in.

"Sounder" elevates the joys and sorrows of everyday life to epic proportions. The heartbreak of a hungry family is contrasted with their ecstasy at winning a baseball game with their neighbors. The agony of a father who watches his family in rags is offset by the pride he has in himself and in his wife and children. The fear of a wife and mother torn from her husband is matched by her courage and determination to carry on with the business of living.

Filmed in only 9 weeks on location in the East Feliciana and St. Helena Parishes of Louisiana, "Sounder" was produced by a magnificient team of artists, including:

Producer Robert Radnitz, whose screen credits include such children's classics as "A Dog of Flanders," "Misty," "Island of the Blue Dolphins," "My Side of the Mountain," "The Little Ark," and "And Now Miguel." Radnitz has been honored by the National Education Association, the National Council of Churches, the American Library Association, the National Catholic Office for Motion Pictures, the Children's Theater Conference; by Parents, Seventeen, and Cosmopolitan magazines; and even by the Belgian Government.

Director Martin Ritt, the acclaimed director of multimillion-dollar blockbusters such as "The Long Hot Summer," "Hud," "Hombre," "The Spy Who Came In From the Cold," "The Great White Hope," and "The Molly Maguires."

Screenwriter Lonne Elder III, black playwright who wrote "Ceremonies in Dark Old Men."

Cicely Tyson, the superb actress who portrays Rebecca Morgan. Miss Tyson is the two-time winner of the Vernon Rice Award and was featured in "The Heart Is a Lonely Hunter." The 1972 International Film Festival in Atlanta, Ga., has already chosen Miss Tyson "Best Actress for 1972" for her part in "Sounder."

Paul Winfield, an excellent actor who portrays Nathan Lee Morgan. Mr. Winfield's career includes parts in over 40 stage plays and 30 television shows.

Kevin Hooks, the young actor who plays David Lee Morgan, and has also captured the hearts of millions of Americans with his performance as the lonely Harlem boy in the television Christmas classic, "J.T."

Janet MacLaughlin, who plays David Lee's teacher, Camille, and the supporting cast.

Cinematogapher John Alonzo, whose marvelous camera work captures the beauty of the Louisiana countryside as well as the starkness of poverty;

And the rest of the production staff.

Mr. Speaker, superlatives have been used before to promote films, but I have rarely encountered the quantity or quality of praise for a film as I have seen for "Sounder."

One of the most interesting reactions to "Sounder" has come from William H. Armstrong, the author whose book, "Sounder," won the 1970 Newberry award of the American Library Association as the "most distinguished contribution to children's literature" and which served as the source of the film's screen play.

It is customary for the author whose literary work has been transmitted to the screen to complain that the essence of his work was lost in the translation, that his characters or story were distorted from the original. It is therefore a very welcome and refreshing change to read Mr. Armstrong's comments to "Sounder" producer, Robert B. Radnitz:

During the days before the preview of Sounder, I heard from dozens of wonderful people (saying):

You must by now be very anxious to see what has been done with your book.

So by preview time I was a bit anxious. But what a glorious experience awaited me. Your picture is so graciously and beauti-

fully done, the end results reflect such sincerity, complementing what I was aiming for in my book, that my feeling is one of unqualified praise and thanks.

I loved the characters in my book; now I love them more.

Very gratefully yours,

BILL ARMSTRONG.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to include at this time some of the comments which have been presented to 20th Century-Fox and the producer of the film:

Mrs. Martin Luther King, Jr.:

I appreciate the opportunity to be one of the first persons to see Sounder and to meet the principals who attended the premiere. The film provided me with a memorable evening of entertainment, stimulation, and enrichment.

Wilson Pickett, entertainer:

God, how that Sounder film moved me. It really tore me up inside. My grandmother used to talk to me about how it was in the old days, and while watching this picture it all fell into place.

Sounder showed me that Black films could be enjoyed and give a person that Soul feeling without resorting to violence and crime. I strongly urge all my fans to take in this flick. It's my pick of films I will always remember."

American Library Association:

The Children's Services Division of the American Library Association . . . endorses Sounder.

Sounder is a fine film with a positive, joyous portrayal of family relationships and the maintenance of human dignity and self-respect in the face of great obstacles. Although the film accents some facets of the story at which the book only hints, it is true to the spirit of the book and Armstrong's characters. . . . The (Children's) Division is glad that children and adults will be given a new dimension through which to explore the world of Sounder.

Rev. Jesse L. Jackson, president, Operation Push:

This letter comes to congratulate you on your excellent new film—Sounder. It is a sensitive film that provides an excellent portrayal of Blacks during the Depression era. Sounder comes at a time when it is crucial for positive Black imagery to be projected on the screen.

Much success to you on Sounder and thank you for a positive interpretation of the Black experience.

Roy Innis, national director, CORE:

I have long awaited Black films which Black families could view without feeling insecure or ashamed. Sounder represents a giant step in that direction and is additionally a manifestation of "healthiness" in at least a segment of the motion picture industry. It is thus that a long overdue tribute to the strengh of 30 million Black Americans has finally appeared.

Sounder merits acclaim not only because of its subject, which is presented with care and dignity, but also because it transcends the usual racist attitudes that have caused Blacks to be portrayed either as pitiful, dependent types or as vulgar, hippy characters.

Instead, Sounder brings out the many sorrows and conflicts of life in America as well as the strength of Black folks both now and during the period portrayed. The acting of the three leading performers was superb and they are indeed deserving of awards for their outstanding work.

Again many thanks for the opportunity of viewing such a fine human interest film.

National Council of Negro Women, Inc.:

Thank you for producing what I am sure will be an Academy Award-winning film, Sounder. . . .

The National Council of Negro Women with its outreach to 4 million women throughout the United States has as its program priority "Hunger, U.S.A.". This film graphically depicts the story we are trying to tell that many Black families are determined to stay in the South because of emotional ties to the land their fathers helped to develop. The portrayal of the pioneering spirit in the face of overwhelming odds gives fresh insight to what the struggles of the Black man in America are all about.

Special praise should be given to Cicely Tyson, Paul Winfield and Kevin Hooks for their sensitive acting that gave life to this fine story.

You may be assured that we appreciate the opportunity to see films of this caliber.

National Catholic Educational Association:

What a welcome departure from the usual run of movies on crime, drugs, war, robbery, death, etc.! The impression left on the viewers was so powerful that words failed to describe it. . . . Sounder has our wholehearted endorsement and it is our intention to urge the membership of our Associations to see this outstanding film.

Judge Julian F. King, Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia:

I found Sounder to be a very, very touching and sensitive story about human beings struggling for something more than survival in a difficult time and condition. Of course, there is an identity factor which . . . made me more aware and more proud of the work itself. I would highly recommend this picture for people of all age groups and backgrounds. This is a work about which the film industry can be exceedingly proud.

NAACP Image Awards:

At last an authentic Black film with a realistic portrayal of a Black family's struggle to survive in a suppressive white society.

Sounder is magnificently loaded with pathos, havoc, sorrow and an occasional ring of laughter and music—two indispensable Black luxuries.

Tom Stewart, Executive Secretary, Black Education Commission:

Sounder is a beautiful film. It is exquisitely produced and depicts Black life in America by reflecting the Black family's constant struggle for survival during a particular period. Superb acting—highly recommended for Black students and Students of Black of all ages!

Loften Mitchell, playwright and author:

Sounder is one of the most beautiful, beautiful films I have seen in a lifetime of movie-going.

Mr. Speaker, reviews in the press have been no less spectacular. Some of those which I have found include:

Washington, D.C., Star and Daily News:

O, ye of little faith, go and behold Sounder . . . if you want to see what the American movie industry is capable of producing when a few men of talent gird their loins against compromise and set out to make a picture true to their own vision. . . .

"Classic" may be a word that is thrown around a little too lightly these days, but Sounder, by virtue of its timeless theme and excellent production and truly universal appeal, looks like it's definitely bound in that direction.

Washington Post:

Sounder . . . is a remarkably touching and heartening film. . . . Critics like myself . . . need to resist the temptation to overrate Sounder. The temptation is very strong for a critic, since Sounder is the picture one had been waiting for—the Black picture that goes against the grain of the Black exploitation movies, that places the feelings and experiences of Black people in the mainstream of both film history and modern American film-making. . . . Congratulations are in order for producer Robert Radnitz, who at last has a family picture one can praise for its quality rather than its good intentions.

Variety:

A film which transcends space, race, age and time. It informs while it transforms, heartens, amuses and uplifts.

Reader's Digest:

Sounder is a cause for celebration. A brave, honest and entertaining film of humor, heart and imagination.

Life:

Sounder is a challenge to us all. It asks us to consider the possibility that an entertainment for all age levels can be something other than a bird-brained musical, a flat-footed Disney comedy or a goopy story about a cuddly animal. It asks us to share with our children hard times past instead of good times past, to explore with them the notion that injustices are not always righted in the last reel, that love cannot conquer all, that pain and sadness are part of life. . . . If you don't see Sounder, you don't deserve anything as good or better.

Time:

At last, a compassionate and loving film about being Black in America. Sounder has the strength of subtlety and the power of emotional commitment to its subject. . . . It manages as no other movie has done to take the special pride and trial of being Black and work it into an experience that can be shared and felt by anyone.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge every one of my colleagues, as well as all those across this country who are interested in quality entertainment, to see Sounder. It is an unforgettable experience. And I congratulate Robert Radnitz, Martin Ritt, 20th Century-Fox, and all those connected with the film, for creating a film Blacks—and everyone—can be proud of.

PENSION REINSURANCE

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Nation's system of private pensions is in desperate need of greater regulation. The few rules that presently exist do little or nothing to prevent plan failures, insure adequate funding for pension plans or provide the working man with a vested right.

The growth of private pensions has been of great importance to the retire-

ment security of millions of Americans. But many working people find that layoffs and plant closings rob them of any pension rights. The Hartke plan for pension protection has always focused on the need for Federal reinsurance of private pension plans as the necessary first step in securing the worker's rights.

A recent article by David Lawrence discusses a bipartisan effort to put the Hartke plan into practice and provide additional provisions for vesting, funding, and portability.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the David Lawrence article be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

CONGRESS GRAPPLING WITH PENSIONS

(By David Lawrence)

While the headlines are focused on presidential nominees and campaign developments, there is a tremendous amount of work being done at Washington by various departments and by congressional committees to deal with huge financial problems which will confront a growing population in the next four years.

Some emphasis has been given to revenue sharing by the federal government with the states and cities, which will start getting big sums from Washington in the next few weeks. Projects are under way to bring about constructive changes in the tax laws. Steps are being taken to make a number of other improvements, too. Thus, for instance, Social Security recipients will soon start to get larger checks monthly from the government.

There are, of course, reforms needed in different categories, such as regulation of private-pension plans. One measure which has been approved by a Senate committee would tighten the rules on pensions, with three objectives:

First, to make sure that more people hereafter do receive the pension benefits to which they are entitled.

Second, to improve various provisions in many pension plans by reducing the period during which an employee must work before being eligible for benefits.

Third, to set up new ways to protect the cash in pension-fund reserves, with insurance to cover benefits if a plan is ended before full funding has been reached.

This is a bipartisan bill which probably will be debated in the Senate shortly, though it is doubtful whether it will be ready for passage until next year.

More than $150 billion in assets are held by pension plans, and these are designed to benefit 30 million individuals. The big question always is how the funds shall be invested—whether in corporate bonds or in common stocks. The recent trend has been toward the latter. In 1971, the assets of non-insured pensions were 68 percent in common stock, up from 43 percent in 1960. Corporate and other bonds made up 39 percent of the pension reserves in 1960 but now are down to 21 percent. Government-bond holdings have dropped from 7 percent to 2 percent.

Heavy investment in stocks has raised questions as to whether the huge pension funds may not influence stock-market prices and also as to whether pension reserves might be wiped out in a market crash.

In the case of pension funds, there are other difficulties, too. Many workers forfeit their rights under a plan if they leave their jobs or are discharged, while others lost out when mergers occur or employers shut down operations. Obviously, there is need for regulation in order to protect employes against inadequate provisions in some pension plans.

Improvements in the pension plans themselves would be made by the proposed bill. A worker who remains in a job for eight years would obtain a 30 percent "vested" right to pension benefits. After 15 years of service, his "vesting" would be complete. There would be provisions to aid anyone who was 45 years old when the bill became effective so that he or she would be given credit for service prior to that date. Other changes have been suggested so that a worker who goes from one job to another would carry certain rights with him or her if the new job also is covered by a pension plan.

A federal official speaks of the private pension-plan funds as constituting "the largest sum of unregulated capital in the United States."

The proposed legislation will certainly be of far-reaching importance to put into effect a set of provisions to safeguard the billions of dollars which are now in retirement funds and to protect the workers' rights to them.

Various other measures related to the finances of the government will come before Congress after the election. The effort to reduce expenses which is going on is expected to make it possible to cut the present deficit and to avoid having to increase taxes. The administration is determined to do everything it can to make any raise in taxes unnecessary, and it can do so only if nonessential expenditures are eliminated and tax revenues are stimulated by better economic conditions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE 160-ACRE ANTIMONOPOLY WATER LAW

HON. FRED R. HARRIS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I inserted in the last issue of the RECORD the first half of an excellent bibliography on the 160-acre antimonopoly water law. I request permission at this time to have the second half of the bibliography printed in the RECORD.

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

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE 160-ACRE ANTIMONOPOLY WATER LAW

(By Charles L. Smith)

U.S. STATUTES AND COURT CASES (PART LISTING)

Burley v. United States, 179 Fed. 1, 7, 8, 11, 12 (1910).

King, Will R., Instructions, 43 Land Decisions 339 (1914).

California Highways & Public Works, Supreme Court Decision aids Central Valley Project, 13:9 Feb. 1935.

Stamm, G. G., Acting Assistant Commissioner, "Acreage Limitation Provisions of Reclamation Law," statement made on May 19, 1964 at public Hearing on Farm Labor and Rural Poverty, National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor. I.G.S. Library, U.C., Berkeley, Calif.

Ivanhoe Irrigation District vs. *McCracken,* 357 U.S. 275, 297 (1958).

Fulton vs. Brannan, 88 Cal. 454, 455.

Ivanhoe Irrigation Dist. vs. All Parties, 47 Cal. 2s 597, 306 P. 2d 824 (1957).

U.S. vs. Gerlach Livestock Co., 339 US 725 (1950).

U.S. CONGRESS HEARINGS AND DOCUMENTS (CHRONOLOGICAL LISTING)

Wagner, Walter, *Statement* to Senate Committee on Agriculture & Forestry, 72nd Cong. 1st Sess. S1856, Jan. 15, *1932,* p. 18 ff. How one corporation took over 200 farms and turned them into corporate farms.

Tulare County Water Commission, Analysis of SB 1948, Soldier Settlement Bill, July 15, *1944,* 78:2.

H.R. 3961, 78th Cong., 2nd Sess. (*1944*); S. 912, 80th Cong., 1st Sess. (*1947*): S. 44, H.R. 7155, 86th Cong., 2d Sess. (*1960*).

Hearings on H.R. 104, 384 & 3817, Subcommittee on Irrig. and Rec. 84:1 70 (*1955*).

Hearings, Subcommittee on Irrig. & Rec., 84:2 on S178 (Can Luis Portion), May 11, 12 & 14, *1956,* 323 pages.

San Luis Project Hearings, Subcommittee on Irrig. and Rec., 85:2 on HR 6035, 7295, 2452, 2521, and 9969, Jan. 15, 16, & 17, *1958,* 191 pp.

Hearings on S. 1887 Before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 85th Cong., 2d Sess. 89 (*1958*) (hereinafter cited as 1958 Hearings on S. 1887.) March 17 & 18, 1958.

San Luis—House Comm. P 2, HR 301, 302, 5681, 5682, 84, 87, March 16–19, 1959, 157 pp. (86:1) (Serial #3)

Report HR 7155, 25 pp., Rep. #399, May 27, 1959 (12160)

Pub. Law 86–488 approved & signed 6–3–*1960.*

Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District Diverter Contract, U.S. Bur. Recl. R.O. Draft 11/22–*1963,* 37 pp.

Acreage Limitation Policy, prepared by Dept. of Interior June 30, *1964,* for Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 88:2, 101 pp.

Weslands Water District contract hearing, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 88:2, July 8, 1964.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (PART LISTING) (CHRONOLOGICAL)

35 Cong. Rec. 6677 (1902).

Cong. Rec., San Luis debate, May 7, 1959, 6882–6908; May 5, 1959, 6725–6740; May 11, 1959, 7051; May 12, 1959, 7160.

Cong. Rec., June 1, 1948, Douglas, Helen Gahagan.

Cong. Rec., Feb. 4, 1954, Shelley, John F., 160-acre limitation and the Santa Maria Project.

Cong. Rec. 92 A–4657.

Knowland, Senator Wm., 104 Cong. Rec. A2705, 1958, March 21, 1958.

105 Cong. Rec. 7862–66.

104 Cong. Rec. 17730 (1958), 104 Cong. Rec. 17727 (1958), 104 Cong. Rec. 17735 (1958), 104 Cong. Rec. 17731 (1958).

105 Cong. Rec. 7495, 8000 (1959).

105 Cong. Rec. 7670 (1959).

105 Cong. Rec. 7668 (1959), 7989, 7870, 7672, 7854, 7671, 7496, 7666, 7668, 7673, 7987, 7988, 7673, 7496, 7857, 7858, 7857, 7994, 7993, 7989, 7994, 7496, 7597, 7673, 7871, 7670, 7861.

105 Cong. Rec. 7686 (1959).

106 Cong. Rec. 9707, 9798, 10560, 10563, 10564, (1960), 10450, 10458, 10463, 10560, 10470, 10471, 20560, 10464.

106 Cong. Rec. 10560, 10564 (1960), 10450, 10458, 10463, 10560, 10470, 10471, 20560, 10464.

Cong. Rec. April 10, 1962, 5746–5750; April 2, 1962, 5238–5276.

San Luis Contract Review, Mr. Miller: 90-day Count-Down, Cong. Rec. 11563, 11564, July 2, 1962.

Cong. Record A 5632, July 23, 1962, Sen. Alexander Wiley—Need for Family Farm Study.

Cong. Record Oct. 25, 1962 A7858–7859, Sen. Morse, Acreage Limitation of DiGiorgio Corp.

Cong. Rec. June 10, 1964 A3137–3138, Cong. Roybal, Pacific SW Water Situation.

Cong. Rec. June 19, 1964, 14013–14014, National Commission on Food Marketing.

Cong. Rec. June 24, 1964, p 14390, Senator Nelson: Windfall for Monopoly May 7.

Cong. Rec. Aug. 5, 1964 17493–17504, Westlands Contract debate.

Cong. Rec. Aug. 7, 1964, pp. 17912–17922, Westlands Debate.

Westlands Contract, Letter to President Johnson by 8 Senators dated Aug. 17, 1964, 110 Cong. Rec. 17493, + 17912+.

Cong. Rec. 88:2, Wed. Aug. 19, 1964, TVA Review.

Cong. Rec. 89:1 Vol. 111 No. 3, Jan. 6, 1965, Senator McGovern: National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission.

Cong. Rec. Feb. 9, 1965, p. 2393, Revised Pacific Northwest Water Plan Hosmer.

Cong. Rec. Feb. 10, 1965, A587–588, Cong. John Tunney: Is Imperial Valley Doomed by Land Limitations?

Cong. Rec. Aug. 23, 1965, 20591–20608, Westlands Debate.

Cong. Rec. Aug. 23, 1965, 20627–28, Sen. Kuchel: Lower Colorado River Basin Project.

Cong. Rec. Aug. 31, 1965, 21531–21538, Sen. Kuchel: Lower Colorado River.

U.S. BUREAU OF RECLAMATION PUBLICATIONS (CHRONOLOGICAL LISTING)

Letter from Harold L. Ickes to Governor Earl Warren, March 7, 1945.

San Luis Unit—U.S. Bureau of Reclamation:

Complete Plan, Nov. 1943, 281 pp.

Cen. Valley Basin, Aug. 1949, 431 pp. 81:1 S. Doc. 113 (11307).

San Luis Region 2—Feasibility Report, May 1955, 158 pp.

Calif. Elections on Reclamation Contracts (April 1952), Sacramento Regional Office, Bureau of Reclamation.

Dexheimer. W. A., "Reclamation in Western U.S." address Aug. 26, 1954, 9 pp., Bur. of Rec. Address Feb. 14, 1956, 9 pp.

Bennett, Elmer F. (Solicitor), Memo to Commissioner, Bur. of Rec. No. M–36457, July 10, 1957.

U.S. Dept. of Interior, Letter to Gov. Brown Oct. 27, 1960, 3 pp.

U.S. Dept. of Interior, Press Release Dec. 31, 1961, San Luis Project.

U.S. Bur. of Rec. June 21, 1962, 2 Tables, Acreage Breakdown of Central Valley Project.

Westlands Contract, Draft, R. O. Draft 7/10–1962, 37 pp.

U.S. Bur. of Rec. Press Release 64–11–140, Sacramento Diverter payment, April 3, 1964; Signed Contract, 64–10–140, March 17, 1964; Contract Approved by Carr, Dec. 17, 1963, 63–62–140.

U.S. Bur. of Rec. Press Release 64–19–140, April 27, 1964, Proposed agreement of Westlands Contract.

Bur. of Rec. Press Release 64–36–140, Aug. 1, 1964, DiGiorgio Land to be sold this fall; Oct. 2, 1964—64–44–140.

U.S. Bur. of Rec. Press Release 64–47–140, Repayment Contract for water users from Isabella Dam on Kern River.

U.S. Bur. of Rec. Press Releases:

Nov. 27, 1964, DeWitt, 343–4662, Repayment Con. water users on Terminus & Success Projects.

Dec. 11, McGuire, 343–4662, Int. Con. action accelerated to save Calif. Almond orchard lands.

Dec. 11, 1964, 64–51–140, Almond lands.

Central Valley Project Annual Reports, Dept. of Interior.

Udall, Stewart L., Statement before subcommittee on Irrigation & Reclamation, S1658, Dept. of Interior, 28 pp. mimeo 1965.

U.S. Dept. of Int. Press Release May 22, 1965, 65–23–140; 4356 acres of DiGiorgio Corp. Land for sale.

Statement to Prospective Buyers, DiGiorgio Land, May 20, 1965, R. J. Pafford, Jr. In reply refer to 2–440, Dept. of Int., P.O. Box 2511, Sacramento 95811, 33 pages, attach.

DiGiorgio Corp., 350 Sansome St., San Francisco, Aug. 27, 1965, To All Interested Parties, Bur. of Rec. has modified restrictions.

Bur. of Rec., 318 Patterson Bldg., Fresno, Calif. 93721—in reply refer to 2–440. Sales information on 31 units of Property located in the Delano-Earlimart Irrigation District. 50+ pages, attach.

CALIFORNIA STATUTES

Calif. Irrigation District Laws (1941 revision)—Bulletin 18–G, $2.08. Supt. of Documents, State Capitol, Sacramento 14, Calif.

California Attorney General Office, Analysis and scope of Water Code Sections 10505, 11460, 11463, 35 p. Opinion 53/298 Jan. 5, 1955.

California Water Code, 11500, 23195 (1956). 74 Stat. 156 (1960).

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATIVE REPORTS (CHRONOLOGICAL LISTING)

California Dept. of Water Resources, Progress Report, annual, State Water Project.

Calif. D.W.R., Allocation of Costs, Bulletin #153.

Journal of Calif. Senate & Assembly, 49th Sess. app. 3, *1931,* Statement by Div. of Water Resources, Calif. Dept. of Public Works, Bull. No. 25, Report to Legislature of 1931 on State Water Plan.

Calif. Dept. of Education, the Central Valley Project, 165 pp. *1942,* 8 p.bib, WPA.

Calif. Water Project Authority, Excess Land Provisions, 51 pp., Oct. *1945.*

Joint Leg. Comm. on Water Problems, Hearing on 160 acre limitation, Feb. 19, 1947, 94 pp (App. J Sen. 57 sess. V2, *1947*).

Williams, J. Howard, State Acquisition of C.V.P. Address at Irrig. Dist. Assoc. Farm Bur. Fed. State of C. of C. June 20, 1952 Speeches, p. 8–12, 1953; p. 13–20, *1953*

Sturm, Norman, Statement on C.V.P. to Calif. Assembly Int. Comm. on conservation, planning and public works, 10 pp., Nov. 20, *1953.*

Calif. Leg. Assembly Int. Cons. Pl., State ownership a/o operation of C.V.P. Hearings Visalia, Jan. 15, *1954,* 196 pp.

California State Water Resources Board Bulletin #3, Report on Calif. Water Plan, Vol. II, 9–239, Prelim. Ed. *1956.*

San Luis—Calif. D. Water Resources, Calif. rec., March *1956.*

San Luis—Calif. Jt. Comm., 8th Partial Report March *1956,* 153 pp. Feather River Pro.

San Luis—Calif. Int. Comm. on Cons. Pl. & Public Works, Coalinga, Sept. 10, *1956,* 211 pp.

Calif. Governor's Comm. on Water, Conference on Water Problems, Nov. 19, *1956,* 156 pp.

Calif. Leg. Assembly, State-wide water development, So. Calif. coord. conf., Jan. 14, *1957,* 8 pp.

Calif. Governor's Spec. lawyers' comm. on water rts. constitutional amendment, May 15, *1957,* 14 pp.

Banks, H. O., Calif. D.W.R., Water a nonlimiting resource? Soil Cons. Soc. of America, Aug. 30, *1957,* 18 pp.

Calif. Leg. Jt. Leg. Comm. on Water Problems, 11th Partial Report, Ivanhoe, et al, Jan. 24, 1957, 102 pp.; March 8, 1957. Appendix to J of Senate V3 *1957,* 12th partial report, subcomm. on econ. & fin policies of state water projects, 85 pp., Mar. 24, *9158.* (App. J. of Sen. 1958)

McGauhey, P. H., and Erlich, Harry, Statement to Jt. Leg. Comm. Wtr. Problems, Sept. 15 *1958,* 30 pp.

Calif. Dept. of Water Resources, Calif. Water Dev.: Joint U.S. Calif. San Luis Project 1 p. maps, July 15, *1959.*

Calif. Dept. of Water Resources, Investigation of Alternative Aqueduct Systems to Serve Southern Calif. Bulletin #78, Sacramento, 1959 (includes Tudor Report).

Weber, Chas. M., State Water Plan combined with other public works, 1. Preliminary report to Calif. Leg. April 28, 1955, 41 pp. 2. Weber Foundation Studies, Jan. 28, *1960,* 374 pp.

California Dept. of Water Resources—Some things you should know about State Water Program acreage limitation, etc., Mar. *1960,* 8 pp.

Banks, Harvey O., Adequate State Water Plan, *St. Govt.,* V33, pp. 133–139, Spring *1960.*

Calif. Dept. of Agriculture, Warne, Wm. E., What Calif. water res. dev. program means to farmers, 8 pp., Sept. 15, *1960.*

Calif. Dry Year Water Conference, July 12–14, Sacramento & Los Angeles, *1961.*

Goldberg, B. Abbott (Deputy Director of Contracts, Dept. of Water Resources), Letter to Frank J. Barry, Solicitor, U.S. Dept. of Int., Nov. 29, *1961.*

Calif. Dept. of Water Resources, Ground Water Quality, Bulletin No. 74, July, *1962.*

Calif. Int. Comm. on Water, Ground Water, Hearings: Nov. 29, 1961, Anaheim, 141 p. May 9, 1962, Hayward, 102 pp.; May 14, 1962, Ventura, 62 pp.; May 15, 1962, San Bernardino, 213 pp.; July 19, 1962, Long Beach, 112 pp.; Aug. 2, *1962,* Sacramento, 83 pp.

Dept. of Water Resources, 1120 N. St., Sacramento, Calif., Mar. 28, *1963,* 2 pages and tables, Breakdown of Excess Land Holdings for 3 service areas, Estimated Maximum Annual Water Deliveries.

California Farm Research and Legislative Committee, 740 Hilmar St., Santa Clara, Calif., May 14, *1963,* Statement on Assembly Bill No. 755.

Calif. Leg. Assembly Int. Comm. on Water, Ground Water Problems in Calif., 87 pp., Dec. 1962, Report 1961–63—V2 *1963.*

Contra Costa County Water Agency, statement to Calif. Water Commission, March 5, 1965, San Francisco, 5 pp. with attachments; incl. summary and conclusion of a report to Agency by Metcalf and Eddy, engineers, Boston, N.Y., Palo Alto, Oct. *1964.*

Western Governor's Conference, May 3–6, *1964,* Fairmont Hotel, San Francisco, Resolutions on Water and Land, 13 pp.

Warne, Wm. E., Dir., Calif. Dept. of Water Resources, Status of Plans and Development of the State Water Project, speech to East Bay Retired Teachers, Oakland, May 14, *1964,* 10 pp.

Committee on Agriculture, Calif. Assembly, Room 4098, State Capitol; Hearings, July 1, *1964,* Agricultural Exports.

Calif. Int. Comm. on Water, Hearings—State Water Pol., Santa Monica, July 23, *1964.*

Calif. Legislature, Joint Hearing: Pacific S.W. Water Problems, Sacramento, Part 1, August 13, 1964, 254 pp.; Part 2, Aug. 14, *1964;* Oct. 31, 1963, 178 pp. mimeo.

Davis-Grunsky Act—Int. Comm. Water, State fin. assist. to water dev., 54 pp., Nov. *1964.* (Assembly Int. Comm. Report 1963–65 V 26 No. 10.)

Assembly Int. Committee Reports, *1963–1965,* Vol. 26, No. 11, Reports of Subcommittee on Water Pollution, Dec. 1964, 54 pp.

PRO AND CON RECENT ARTICLES IN CALIFORNIA FARMER AND CALIFORNIA FARMER-CONSUMER REPORTER

California Farmer (83 Stevenson St., San Francisco 94105, $4 a year)

Nov. 6, 1965: Look a Long Way Ahead on Water, Sorenson Warns.

Dec. 4, 1965: Interior Dept's Slide Rule Interpretation of 160-Acre Law.

Jan. 1, 1966: Calif., Arizona Won't Get Enough Water from Colorado.

Feb. 5, 1966: Udall wants to turn off the spigot in Imperial . . . while he ladles water to large leaseholders in Arizona.

Mar. 5, 1966: Big Government Doesn't Want Big Farms.

May 21, 1966: Imperial Valley's Costly Land Dilemma.

Feb. 20, 1966: Weird Crew Tries to Knife Westlands Water Contract.

California *Farmer-Consumer Reporter* (740 Hilmar St., Santa Clara, $3 a year)

Jan., 1966: Excess-Land Owners Seek State Aid in Evading 160-Acre Limit.

Feb., 1966: State Board Defers Action on 160-Acre Limit.

Aug., 1965: Corporations and Speculators bid for DiGiorgio Land.

Nov., 1965: Anti-Social Features of the Pacific Southwest Water Plan.

Mar., 1964: "Strengthen the Family Farm" says Pres. Johnson.

May, 1964: State Board Discusses Family Farm Studies: Family Farm Workshop, Fresno State College, May 23rd.

April, 1964: Evasions of Reclamation Law, letter.

Dec., 1964: Districts Sue to Nullify 160-Acre Limit.

1963: The Family Farm in California by Richard Sasuly, 58 pp.

March 1961: Anniversary Issue, 32 pp.

RECENT NEWS ITEMS BY SOURCE

Quinn, J. B. Master, Time for Reflection, Editorial, *California Grange News*, May 10, 1964, Westlands Contract.

An extensive collection of clippings is on file at the Bancroft Library, U.C. Berkeley.

Di Giorgio Land Sale Dec. 2, 1964, various news items.

Di Giorgio Corp. being Reshaped, News items, Nov. 20, 21, 1965.

Fresno Bee, 8-C, Sept. 18, 1963, U.S. Drafts Plans for Sale of Excess Acreage in CVP.

Dickson, Edward H., Westlands Contract Opponents Appear to be Losing Battle, *Fresno Bee*, July 9, 1964, p. 1.

Los Angeles Times Editorial, February 28, 1960.

Monterey Peninsula Herald, Jan. 28, 1963, California Land Frauds by Fred W. Workman.

Blair, Wm. M., Coast Water Pact called 'Rustling,' Senators hear plan would enrich big land owners, *N.Y. Times*, July 9, 1964, p. 60M, *Fresno Bee*, p. 13-A.

Sacramento Bee, Oct. 29, 1953, p. 36, col. 5.

Drew Pearson, Water Windfall Stirs Reaction, *Sacramento Union*, Aug. 5, 1964.

San Francisco Chronicle, Dec. 31, 1961, p. 10, col. 3.

San Francisco Chronicle Editorial, Two Kinds of San Luis Water, Jan. 3, 1962.

San Francisco Chronicle, Jan. 2, 1962, p. 6, col. 3.

Bess, Donovan, Joaquin Drain Issue, Waste Disposal, Bay Study Asked (by State Water Quality Control Board), *San Francisco Chronicle*, Feb. 25, 1965.

San Francisco Examiner, Editorial, Dec. 4, 1961, Trouble at San Luis.

San Francisco News, Dec. 18, 1946, The Water Council asked for, "State control . . . and exemption of CVP . . . from the 160 acre limitation law."

Letter from Harold L. Ickes to Frank Clarvoe, editor, *San Francisco News*, Oct. 31, 1945.

San Jose Mercury, July 9, 1964, The Greatest Water Rustling Operation.

San Jose Mercury, 2-17-65, 4-County Board Proposed for San Luis Importation.

San Jose News, Farmers may escape 160-acre limit, 12-30-1963.

State Federal Weekly Newsletter, CVP—Burial ground of Reclamation Policy?, Calif. State Fed. Weekly newsletter, p. 2-4, Dec. 24, 1952.

Brown water policy intentions, Calif. Labor Fed. *weekly newsletter*, V1, p. 1-2, Jan. 22, 1960.

San Luis—Calif. Fed. Lab. AFL-CIO, Who Killed Cock Robin?, *Weekly News Letter*, 2:1+, April 15, 1960.

Pitts, Thomas L. (Sec.-Treas. Calif. AFL-CIO), Pitts urges Congress to Double-Check $159 Million Water Pact for Loopholes, May 15, 1964, Vol. 6, #20.

Windfall for Monopoly, Editorial, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, June 15, 1964; In the Name of Decency, June 6, 1966.

Johnson Land Reform, Subdivide Tulare Lake, Digiorgio; *Valley Labor Citizen*, April 3, 1964.

Sisk (Congressman), Sisk says 160 acre limitation will be applied at San Luis, *Valley Labor Citizen*, May 1, 1964.

Sisk, Cong. Bernie—Sisk says 160 acre pacts now in San Luis are "ridiculous, impractical and illegal," *Valley Labor Citizen*, June 12, 1964.

Sargenti, Lawrence, Machinists District Lodge 87, Business Agent; Unfair gifts to west side will wipe out east side farmers, *Valley Labor Citizen*, 6-24-64.

Editorial, *Valley Labor Citizen*, July 9, 1965.

Washington Post, March 4, 1962, California Water Dispute, Debate between Walter E. Packard and Senator Thomas H. Kuchel.

U.S. Supreme Court decision, *Western Water News*, V 10:3-6, July 1958.

MISCELLANEOUS ARTICLES BY AUTHOR (ALPHABETICAL)

Adams, Francis L., "Federal Power Development in Western States," in *Am. Planning & Civic Annual*, pp. 104-116, 1943, American Planning & Civic Assoc.

Agric. Econ. Report No. 49, "Our 100,000 Biggest Farms, Their relative position in American Agriculture," USDA, Farm Production Economics Division, Economic Research Service, Feb. 1964, 28 pp.

Agr. Experiment Station, Berkeley, "The California farm real estate situation," 24 pp., 1944, Conf. Sept. 7, 1943.

Alsop, Joseph, "The Rich Get Richer," column, *S.F. Examiner*, Nov. 20, 1964 (report of a Budget Bureau study of subsidy programs).

Anderson, Ken, "Central Valley Social & Economic Problems" in Notes on *California Pl. & Dev.*, pp. 29-35, 1952, U.C. Dept. of Political Science.

Ballis, George, "Water-Power monopoly," *Frontier*, V. 10, pp. 7-9, April, 1959.

Banks, Harvey O. and Krieger, James H., "Ground Water Basin Management," *Proc. ASCE*, J. Irri. Div., Dec. 1961, pp. 27-40.

Bauer, Clayton, "Doc Yellen—Giant Killer," *Henry George News*, Vol. 28, No. 12, Dec. 1965. (50 E. 69th St., N.Y., N.Y. 10021.)

Berry, William L., Calif. Water Problem, *Proc. Ann. Conf.*, State Assoc. of County Assessors of California, V. 48:13-20, 1950.

Bertsch, Howard, Adm. FHA, Address to Family Farm Workshop, Calif. Farm Res. & Leg. Comm., Fresno State College, May 23, 1964, "Can We Save the Family Farm?" 18 pp.

Bierwag, G. O., "Land Reform Schemes: An Application of Linear Programming," Regional Science Assoc. Western Sec., *Papers 1963*, pp. 112-121, Univ. of Penna., Philadelphia 4, Pa., $5.00 each.

Blote, Martin H., Consulting Engineer, 401 Calif. Fruit Bldg., 4th & J Streets, Sacramento 14, Calif., 447-8169, Letter to Sec. Udall, Jan. 30, 1964, 6 pp.

Blythe, Stuart O., Central Valley Project, *Calif.* 27 15-17, 46-50, May 1937.

Boke, R. L., "Citizens Guide to Central Valley," *The Nation* spec. water supp., pp. 13-17, Sept. 21, 1946.

Bookman, Max, "Growing Need for Water in So. Calif.," *Western City* 29—41-44, 64, Oct. 1953.

Address by Governor Edmund G. Brown, Calif. Water Program, NBC, Jan. 20, 1960.

Brewer, M. F. and Hirsch, W. Z., Economic issues in Reg. Water Dev., *Pacific Southwest Water Planning Conference*, June 4, 1964, 16 pp., U.C.L.A., Inst. of Govt. & Pub. Aff.

Burke, J. M., "Change in Water Law of California," *Calif. J. of Dev.*, V. 25, p. 8, 22-23, March 1935.

Bush, M., Water bibliography, *American Fortune*, 65:44+ 0 59.

Calif. Retain Control Central Valley Project, *California* 35:1-3, Oct. 1945.

California League of Women Voters, *Bulletin* (2), Nov. 1933, CVP Water.

California State Irrigation Assoc., *Marshall Plan*, March 16, 1919, 11 pp.

California Taxpayers Assoc., "Your Water and Money Threatened," *Bulletin #226*, April 15, 1955.

California Water Project Authority, "Excess Land Provision of Fed. Rec. Law to C.V.P.," 50 pp., Oct. 1945.

Campbell, Vernon, Letter to Joseph Jensen, Pres. Metropolitan Water District, 7-26-61.

Carpenter, G. Alvin, U.S. Bur. Agric. Econ., *Farm Size in California*, 43 pp., Oct. 1940.

Central Valley Reg. Pl. Conference, *Proceedings* 1, Dec. 1956; 2, May 1957.

Chilson, Hatfield, "Water Law Conflicts Between States and Federal Government," pp. 193-202, *Resources Deveolpment*, 1960, University of Colorado.

Christenson, R. P., and Aines, R. O., *Agric. Economic Report No. 18*, USDA, Economic Research Service, Farm Economics Division, Economic Effects of Acreage Control Program in the 1950's, 50 pages, Oct. 1962.

Ciriacy-Wantrup, S. V., The "New Competition for Land and Some Implications for Public Policy," *Natural Resources Journal*, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 252-267, Oct. 1964, Univ. of New Mexico School of Law.

———, *Projections of Water Requirements*, U.C. College of Agriculture, Giannini Foundation, 25 pp. 1960, No. 193.

———, "Utilizing Ground Water," *Report No. 0*, pp. 77-78, Dec. 1951, Western Agric. Econ. Res. Council.

Clark, Frank W., State-Fed. Meeting, *Highways & Public Works*, 18:1-2, Aug. 1940.

Clawson, Marion, "Toward a Permanent Farm Policy," address to 2nd *National Congress on Environmental Health*, June 6-8, 1961, Ann Arbor Michigan, 15 pp.

———, "Land and Water Pol. in Central Valley," *Land Pol. Rev.*, V. 8, pp. 23-26, Spring 1945.

———, U.S.D.A. Proposals to Waive Acreage Limitation, sent to Sen. Sheridan Downey, April 7, 1944, 21 pp.

Commonwealth Club of California, *Transactions*, 26:52-78, 89-91, June 2, 1931.

Conference of Agricultural Workers, Agr. Labor Res. Bureau, 10 pp., 1938.

Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, "Water No. 1 Problem in Conservation," V. 28: 1979-1983, Dec. 23, 1960.

Domini, Floyd E., "The Over-all Importance of Irrigation and Drainage Both Nationally and Internationally," Journal Irri. & Drainage *Proc.* ASCE, Dec. 1964.

Davis, E. G., and Gould, M. L., U.S.D.A., "Drainage of Agricultural Land—Bibliography," *Misc. Pub. No. 713*, 1956, 200 pp.

Durbrow, R. T., "State Control of C.V.P.," *California Water News*, V. 1, p. 3, 1-15-49.

Erlich, Harry, U.C. Inst. Engr. Research, "Economic and Financial Aspects of Water Development," address to *American Society Agri. Engrs.*, April 14, 1960, 29 pp.

Engle, Sen. Clair, "Amendment on 160-acre Law," *Press Release* July 12, 1965, 1 page.

Farm Bureau, Fed., *Water Rights Question in Central Valley Project*, 80 pp., Mar. 11, '48.

———, *Basic Questions on Water Rights and 160 acre Limitation*, 6 pp., 1948.

Fauver, James R., *National Reclamation Assoc.*, "Some Problems of C.V.P.," address, 13th Annual Meeting, Nov. 1944, 16 pp.

Fortune, "The Company Twice as Big as Rhode Island," Vol. 63, No. 3, pp. 138+, March 1961 (The Kern County Land Co.).

Fox, Irving, "Reason in Water Management," Resources for the Future, 1775 Massachusetts Ave, N.W., Washington 6, D.C., Reprint No. 33, Feb. 1962.

Freeman, Sec. Orville L., U.S. Dept. of Agric., Nov. 12, 1963, speech to National Grange in Portland, Oregon, "The Family Farm in American Agriculture," report of the *National Agric. Advisory Commission*, 21 pp., attach.

Friant-San Joaquin River Litigation, *Proc. ASCE, Irri.* Div., Dec. 1961, pp. 27-40.

Goodall, Merril Randall, *Administration of C.V.P.*, M.A. Thesis, U. C., Berkeley, 194 pp. 1942.

Grader, Wm., and Dunlap, John, "Water and Power," 2nd Ann. *Issues Conf.*, CDC, pt. 7, Feb., 1960, 39 pp.

Gray, Horace M., *Control of Public Opinion* as a Factor in the Concentration of Economic Power, speech before MidWest Econ. Assoc., April 26, 1963, reprinted, Calif. Power

Users Assoc., 773 Cragmont, Berkeley, Calif. 94708.

Groh, Robert S., "Central Valley Episode" in *Notes on California Planning and Development*, pp. 36–43, 1952, U.C. Dept. of Political Science.

Gross, Leonard, "Water—The Problem that Needn't Be," *Look*, July 19, 1960, p. 25.

Haren, C. C., and Glasglow, R. B., *Median Family Income*, Stat. Bulletin No. 339, Resource Development Economics Division, Economic Research Service, USDA, Feb. 1964.

Hosmer, Helen, "Imperial Valley Background," *American West*, Feb. 1966.

Kefauver, Sen. Estes, with Irene Till, *In a Few Hands: Monopoly in America*, Pantheon, 1965, 239 pp.

Kennedy, Harp;d W., *Federal Claims against California's Unappropriated Water*, as reported by the *County Counsel* of Los Angeles County, May 5, 1960 (mimeo).

Kern County Land Co., *Annual Report May 1965*, Excerpts, Water subsidies, Farm Labor, Dirksen Amendment.

Knight, Harold V., "Fight on the farm: 160 acre policy," *Frontier*, 4:12–13, July 1953.

Kuchel, Senator, *Press Release*, Federal aid to small reclamation projects raises ceiling of loans to 7½ million.

Law and Contemporary Problems, Water Resources, V. 22, p. 323–537, Summer 1957.

L.W.V. of U.S., *All about water*, 24 pages, May 1963, Current review No. 5.

Lepawsky, Albert, "Water Resources and American Federalism," *American Political Science Review*, 44:631–649, Sept. 1950.

Lof, Geo. O. G., "Toward greater availability potential applications of new water technology," *Western Res. Papers*, 39–48, 1959.

Simon J. Lubin Society of Calif., *Report to President's Comm. on Farm Tenancy*, 12 pp. mimeo, Jan. 12, 1937.

Maas, Arthur, and Hufschmidt, Maynard M., "Toward better river system planning: Report on the Harvard program of research in water resources development," *Western Resources Papers*, 133–180, 1959.

Maas, Arthur A., "Congress and Water Resources," *American Political Science Review*, 44:576–593, Sept. 1950.

McCarty, John F., *Irrigation District Movement in Calif.*, BPA UC, 62 pp., Jan. 1955 (Assembly Int. Com. 1953–55, V. 13, No. 5).

McCay, Chas. Russell, Investigation of the *Multiple-use concept* of the Federal Water resources policy of the U.S., Thesis, 113 pp., 1953.

McDonald, Angus, "160 Acres of Water," Public Affairs Inst. 1958.

McGanbey, P. H., and Erlich, Harry, *Economic Evaluation of Water*, 237 pp., Dec. 1957, U.C. Water Res. Center.

McKay, Douglas, *Partnership in Water Development*, address October 24, 1955, 11 pp. mimeo.

Morton, Walter A., *Creative Regulation* in Land Economics, Nov., 1963, pp. 367–374 (Sterling Hall, Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison 6, Wisc.).

Murray, Keith, "You lost a Round," *The Liberal Democrat*, March 1962.

Murray, Keith, "Urban Power," *Pacific Scene*, May 1965.

Netzer, "The Property Tax and Alternatives in Urban Development," *Reg. Sci. Assoc. Proc.*, Vol. 9, 1962, pp. 191–200.

Neuberger, Richard L., Senator, article, *Survey Graphic*, 28:517–21, 555–57, Sept. 1939.

New Republic, "Minor miracle; San Luis bill, 142:5–6, May 30, 1960.

Olson, Culbert L., *CVP and Transportation*, address to Pacific Transportation Assoc., Jan. 21, 1941, 14 pp.

Ostram, Vincent, "State Adm. of Natural Resources in the West," *American Political Science Review*, 47:478–493, June 1953.

Packard, Walter E., *Can Migrants be placed on CVP land?* U.S. House—Select Comm. to Investigate Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens; 68 pp., 1940.

Pafford, Robert J., Jr., Regional Director, Bur. of Reclamation, *Water Development in the SW: A look into the Future*, address to SW Conf. of American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers, San Francisco, April 8, 1965.

Pinkett, H. T., "Archival product of a century of federal assistance to agriculture," *American Hist. R.*, 69:689–706, April 1964.

Reich, William, "Dust Over California," *The Land*, Vol. VII, #3, Autumn, 1949.

———, Report to Calif. Farm Res. & Leg. Comm. Dec. 8, Fresno, 14 pages: *Central Valley and State Contracts* in Relation to Protecting Rural Democracy and Family Agriculture.

———, "Problems of Waste Collection and Disposal in the S.F. Bay and Delta Systems," *Statement* to Calif. Water Commission March 5, 1965, 3 pp.

River, Robert B., "Solution of Calif. Water and Power Problems," *Statement* to Calif. Water and Power Users Assoc., Oct. 7, 1955.

Rohrer, Margaret, and Decker, Kenneth, *Water Resource Problems in California*, BPA, U.C., May 1949, 47 pp.

Rural Observer, V. 3, p. 1, Oct. 15, 1940; Bank of America foreclosure on Louis Silver stops crusading of Sam J. Lubin Society.

San Luis Project, *Progress Report* by Westland Water District, Jan. 1, 1959.

Sasuly, Richard, *The Family Farm in California*, Calif. Farm Res. & Leg. Comm., 58 pp. 1963.

Saturday Review, "The Crisis in Water: Its Sources, Pollution & Depletion," articles by Stewart Udall, Wallace Stegner, Gladwin Hill, and John Lear.

Sax, Joseph L., "Selling Reclamation Water Rights: A Case Study in Federal Subsidy Policy," *Michigan Law Review*, Vol. 64, p. 13, Nov. 1965.

Segerstrom, Charles H., "Acreage Limitation," *Calif. Magazine of the Pacific*, 35:38–39, Sept. 1944.

Shultis, Arthur, Agricultural Experiment Station, *Farming in California*, 22 pp., 1944.

Sisk, Cong. Bernie, 2 page *letter* to Thos. L. Pitts, June 2, 1964.

Smith, Stephen C., "Political and Administrative Strategy of Future River Basin Development," speech, *West. Political Science Assoc.*, March 23, 1962, 4 pp.

———, *Public Districts in Management of California Ground Water*, U.C. College of Agriculture, 1960, 13 pp.

Stanford Research Institute, *Economic Considerations* in the formulation and repayment of California Water Plan Projects Menlo Park, 1958.

Stocker, Joseph, "Saying No to Three Cents an Acre," School land leasing in Arizona, *Survey*, Sept. 1949, Vol. 85, #9, pp. 465–469.

Stout, Marilyn, "The Great Water Steal" in *California Homeowner*, Dec. 1965 (1571 N. Gower St., Los Angeles, Calif. 90028).

Straus, Michael, "The California Public Power Scandal," II *Frontier*, June 1959, p. 5.

———, "How to meet the west's needs for water and power," *Public Affairs Inst.*, 1962, 72 pp.

———, "Skill and Will," address, *Western Governors Conference*, Dec. 8, 1952, 6 pp., U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

Thomas, Harold E., "Essentials for optimum use of ground-water resources," *Western Resources Papers*, University of Colorado Press, 1959, pp. 181–192.

Thompkins, Dorothy Campbell, *Water Plans for California*, Bur. Pub. Adm., U.C., 1961, $4.50, 180 pp.

Timmons, John F., *Policy aspects of water resources development* in Report #2, pp. 53–68, June 28–30, 1954, Western Agr. Econ. Res. Council.

Tolley, G. S., "Future economics research on western water resources in California," *Natural Resources Journal*, 5:259,285, Oct. 1965.

Urban Land, "Water Problems in U.S., V. 10:1, 3–4, Oct. 1951.

U.S. Bureau of Census, *Agriculture 1959*, Final Report, Vol. 1, part 48, 1961.

U.S.D.A., Changes in *Farm Production and Efficiency*, a summary report, Statistical Bull. #233, Rev. July 1960, 48 pp.

U.S. Geological Survey, *Quality of Surface Waters*, Western U.S., 1953, 203 pp.; water supply paper #1380, 1957; water supply paper #1485, 1960.

U.S. Resettlement Adm. Bib., "Compensation as a means of improving farm tenancy," *Land use planning pub. #14*, 1937, 109 pp.

Vial, Donald, Labor and Calif. Water and Power Dev. *stat.* to California Water and Power Users Assoc. 2nd Annual Conference, Oct. 28, 1955, 9 pp.

Vizzard, J. L. Fr., "Agriculture Looks Ahead," *America*, 106:562–3, Jan. 27, 1962.

Warring, P. Alston, "A water policy for the U.S.A.," *Survey*, 87:167–171, April 1951.

Waterman, Patricia, *Central Valley Project bibliography*, Oct. 26, 1945, 4 pp.

White, Gilbert F., "National Executive Organization for Water Resources," *American Political Science Review*, 44:593–607, Sept. 1950.

White, Lee C. (Assoc. Counsel to the Pres.), *Letter* dated Sept. 22, 1964.

Wiser, Ray B., Calif. Farm Bur. Fed., *Debate* with Geo. Sehlmeyer, Master Calif. State Grange, March 17, 1948, 11 pp.

Wohlman, Abel, "Wanted—a national water Policy," *State Government*, 19:215–217, 239, Sept. 1946.

Wood, Samuel E., *Proceedings*, Central Valley Project Conference, Dec. 7, 1945, 6 pp.

Yellen, Dr. Ben, M.D., *Newsletter* May 4, 1964, Comments on War on Property proposal to buy land for family farms, Brawley, Calif. (One of a numerous series on acreage limitation)

MEMOIRS OF J. RUPERT MASON, BANCROFT LIBRARY, U.C. LIBRARY, BERKELEY, CALIF.

Mason, James Rupert (1886–1959) CD 4021, *Single Tax, Irrigation District, and Municipal Bankruptcy.*

California Comm. on Immigration and Housing, Report of Large Landholdings in So. Calif.

Alper, Noah D., pamphlet, "Why the LVT Cannot be Shifted."

Fuchs, Judge, *"Constructive Taxation for Free Enterprise."*

Debates—Teddy Roosevelt and Henry Geo.

Record, George L., "How to Abolish Poverty."

Geo. H. McKing vs. Provident Irrigation District.

Bibliography—Cases, Federal Municipal Bankruptcy Act, p. 350.

Schmidt, Dr., "Land Reclamation in Fascist Italy," *Political Science Review*, Sept. 1937.

Raker Act, p. 327 JRM.

Puerto Rico Acreage Limitation, 53 RR 741, 750 (1938) 309 US 543 (1940).

160 acre limitation, J. R. Mason, p. 297.

Swing-Johnson Boulder Canyon Bill, House Comm. on Irrig. & Rec., S4123, Dec. 11 and 12, 1930.

Clough vs. Compton—Delevan Irrigation District.

Land Assessments vs. Water Tolls, J. Rupert Mason, p. 119.

Council of Foreign Bondholders, London, Repudiation of bonds.

Commonwealth Club Report, 1911, "Marketing Irrig. Dist. Bonds."

Dennett, L.L. (State Senator), Modesto. Attorney—many cases. "Briefs are classics."

Statutes 1909, p. 461, exempt all improvements.

Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District v. Klukkert.

13 Cal (2) 191.

2 Cal (2) 485.

31 Cal App (2) 619.

Kountze Bros—Bond sellers N.Y., only bond house to sell L.A. bonds.

Bankruptcy of Irrigation Districts, Bank of America, p. 131, J. Rupert Mason.

McHenry Public Library, Modesto, Papers on conflict between landed interests and irrigation districts.

Irrigation District Act (from Memoirs of JRMason)

164 US 112.
164 US 179.
88 Cal 334.
185 US 1.
123 Cal App 81.
140 Cal App 171.
3 Cal (2) 357.
12 Cal (2) 365 & 38.
13 Cal (2) 191.
34 Cal (2) 125.

RETIREMENT TEST LIBERALIZATIONS IN THE SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1972

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, during the discussion of the conference report on H.R. 1 and the changes which were made in the retirement test as a result of the conference agreement, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable CHARLES A. VANIK, requested that certain information illustrative in nature concerning the operation of this provision be placed in the RECORD. I assured him that while it would take a few days to work out the data which he had in mind, we would be pleased to include it as soon as it was available. We now have developed the information which was requested, and I am pleased to include it in the RECORD at this point.

RETIREMENT TEST LIBERALIZATIONS IN THE SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1972

The Social Security Amendments of 1972 have considerably liberalized those provisions of the social security law that are designed to help determine whether a worker is substantially retired and therefore eligible for retirement benefits. Beginning in 1973, the annual exempt amount—that is, the amount a beneficiary may earn and still receive the full amount of his benefits each month—will be raised from $1,680 to $2,100.

If his annual earnings exceed $2,100, only $1 in benefits will be withheld for each $2 of earnings above $2,100 regardless of how high his earnings are so that there will be no point at which $1 in benefits will be withheld for each $1 of earnings as occurred under prior law with respect to earnings over $2,880. Under prior law at certain earnings levels over $2,880 a beneficiary may have had less spendable income (that is, social security benefits plus earnings after taxes) than he would have if he had limited his earnings to a smaller amount. This acted as a deterrent to beneficiaries to increase their employment. The new provision assure that the more a beneficiary works and earns the more spendable income he will have.

Regardless of his annual earnings benefits will not be withheld for any month in which a beneficiary does not earn wages of more than $175 and does not render substantial services in self-employment.

It will be possible under the new provisions for persons to have fairly substantial earnings and still receive some of their benefits. Persons who earn the same amounts they did under the prior provisions will have considerably less withheld from their benefits. The following table illustrates several examples of the increased benefits which will be payable.*

*The first example is based on an award of maximum benefits payable in January 1973 ($266.10 PIA), the second example on an award of intermediate level benefits ($174.80 PIA), the third example on an award of minimum benefits ($84.50 PIA). Amounts have been rounded to nearest dollar.

	Social security benefits awarded	Worker's annual earnings	Annual social security benefits payable		Total earnings and benefits under new law
			Under law in effect in 1972	Under law effective in 1973	
Worker alone	$3,193	$7,000	None	$743	$7,743
Worker and wife	4,790	7,000	$70	2,340	9,340
Worker alone	2,098	5,000	None	648	5,648
Worker and wife	3,146	5,000	426	1,696	6,696
Worker alone	1,014	3,000	294	564	3,564
Worker and wife	1,522	3,000	802	1,072	4,072

Another significant improvement under the new legislation is that the annual exempt amount (and the monthly exemption) will be automatically increased in the future to keep pace with increases in the wage levels. During some periods in the past the annual exempt amount has not been increased frequently enough to reflect increases in the earnings levels. The delays had the effect of deliberalizing the test for beneficiaries and often caused hardships. Now beneficiaries can count on the exempt amount being kept up to date.

Finally, the new law contains a provision that in the year in which a beneficiary reaches age 72 his earnings beginning with the month in which he attains age 72 would be disregarded in computing annual earnings for retirement test purposes. This should alleviate the public misunderstanding and hardship that resulted in some cases under the prior provision because earnings after age 72 could affect the benefits to which an individual was entitled before he became 72.

Under these new retirement test provisions about 1.2 million people will get more social security benefits than under prior law; about 450,000 persons will be paid monthly benefits who were not receiving any benefits under the prior retirement test provision. It is estimated that in 1974, the first full year of operation of the new retirement test, $856 million in additional benefits will be paid.

COMPARISON OF AMOUNTS OF EARNINGS AT WHICH ALL BENEFITS ARE WITHHELD UNDER THE RETIREMENT TEST PROVISIONS IN LAW IN EFFECT THROUGH 1972 AND UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1972

Average annual earnings	Annual benefits [1]	Amount of earnings at which all benefits are withheld	
		In effect in 1972 [2]	Effective 1973 [3]
Worker without dependents:			
$1,200	$1,305.60	$3,585	$4,711
$2,400	1,852.80	4,132	5,805
$3,600	2,317.20	4,597	6,734
$4,800	2,799.60	5,079	7,699
$5,856 [4]	3,193.20	5,473	8,486
$6,000	3,236.40	5,516	8,572
$7,200	3,717.60	5,997	9,535
$8,400	4,110.00	6,390	10,320
$9,000	4,254.00	6,534	10,608
Worker with wife getting benefits:			
$1,200	$1,958.40	$4,238	$6,016
$2,400	2,779.20	5,059	7,658
$3,600	3,476.40	5,756	9,052
$4,800	4,200.00	6,480	10,500
$5,856 [4]	4,790.40	7,070	11,680
$6,000	4,855.20	7,135	11,810
$7,200	5,576.40	7,856	13,252
$8,400	6,165.60	8,445	14,431
$9,000	6,381.60	8,661	14,863

[1] Assumes benefits start at age 65 for worker and for wife.
[2] $1,680 annual exempt amount, with $1 in benefits withheld for each $2 of earnings between $1,680 and $2,880, and $1 in benefits withheld for each $1 of earnings above $2,880.
[3] $2,100 annual exempt amount with $1 in benefits withheld for each $2 of earnings above $2,100.
[4] Highest average of earnings possible for man retiring at age 65 in 1973.

HOW EARNINGS OF OVER $2,100 IN A YEAR AFFECT SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1972

Total earnings for the year	$2,100	$2,500	$3,000	$4,000	$5,000	$6,000	$7,000	$8,000	$9,000	$10,000	$11,000
	Amount of benefits payable per year										
Monthly benefits awarded:											
$75	$900	$700	$450	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
100	1,200	1,000	750	250	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
125	1,500	1,300	1,050	550	50	0	0	0	0	0	0
150	1,800	1,600	1,350	850	350	0	0	0	0	0	0
175	2,100	1,900	1,650	1,150	650	150	0	0	0	0	0
200	2,400	2,200	1,950	1,450	950	450	0	0	0	0	0
225	2,700	2,500	2,250	1,750	1,250	750	250	0	0	0	0
250	3,000	2,800	2,550	2,050	1,550	1,050	550	50	0	0	0
275	3,300	3,100	2,850	2,350	1,850	1,350	850	350	0	0	0
300	3,600	3,400	3,150	2,650	2,150	1,650	1,150	650	150	0	0
325	3,900	3,700	3,450	2,950	2,450	1,950	1,450	950	450	0	0
350	4,200	4,000	3,750	3,250	2,750	2,250	1,750	1,250	750	250	0
375	4,500	4,300	4,050	3,550	3,050	2,550	2,050	1,550	1,050	550	50
400	4,800	4,600	4,350	3,850	3,350	2,850	2,350	1,850	1,350	850	350

FOREIGN TRADE AND INVESTMENT ACT OF 1972

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Hartke Foreign Trade and Investment Act has touched off a nationwide debate on foreign economic policy. The steadily mounting trade deficit and a continuing high rate of unemployment have added an extra sense of urgency to the widespread reconsideration of America's position in world trade.

Forbes magazine recently presented a four-cornered dialog on the Hartke approach. Marred by an editorial attempt to equate the Hartke approach with the Smoot-Hawley tariff, the Forbes article, nonetheless, brings to public view four important viewpoints on America's foreign trade crisis.

Mr. President, in the interest of well-informed debate, I ask unanimous consent that the Forbes article be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

WHERE HAVE ALL THE JOBS GONE?

The Smoot-Hawley Act, which passed Congress in 1930, was backed by a strange coalition of businessmen and labor unions. The Act produced the highest tariff walls in U.S. history and touched off a wave of retaliation by foreign countries. It probably deepened the Great Depression and was instrumental in creating the conditions that spawned World War II.

The spirit of Smoot-Hawley is again abroad in the land, albeit in different form. This time it's called the Burke-Hartke Bill, after sponsors Representative James Burke (Dem., Mass.) and Senator Vance Hartke (Dem., Ind.).

PELL-MELL RUSH?

"Stop the flow of imports! Save American jobs!" The chant went up in Washington, D.C. on June 29 as more than 1,000 members of the International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers paraded down Constitution Avenue. They fanned out into congressional offices to deliver their message in person: Support Burke-Hartke or labor won't support you.

Conceived by AFL-CIO economists and lawyers, the bill has as its goal "to restrict the present pell-mell rush by companies to go abroad for profits while weakening America's production, tax base, jobs and standard of living." To achieve this, it proposes to limit imports, regulate the outflow of U.S. capital and technology, increase taxes on foreign earnings and expedite relief for industries laid low by imports. In short, to drop the curtain on an era of free trade.

Hasn't the lesson of Smoot-Hawley been sufficient to discourage new protectionism? Apparently not. This time the tariff advocates have a new villain in addition to the old one of cheap foreign labor. The new one: the multinational corporation. In just a decade, American companies, led by the multinationals, more than doubled their direct foreign investment: $32 billion in 1960, $78 billion at the end of 1970. Is this *bad?* Or is it *good?* It depends on your outlook.

Because the multinational companies are such a recent phenomenon, the stubborn fact is that their real effects on both the host country and domestic employment are a big unknown.

In October 1971 the AFL–CIO published a study by Stanley Ruttenberg, a former Assistant Secretary of Labor. Ruttenberg concluded that foreign trade cost U.S. workers a net loss of 500,000 jobs between 1966 and 1969. A month later this figure was revised upward to 700,000; the most recent estimate made by the AFL–CIO's chief economist Nathaniel Goldfinger, in July 1972, indicated 900,000 lost jobs.

The multinationals have worked up figures of their own in rebuttal. (So many people are now working as lobbyists or researchers on either side of the fence that, according to a current quip, the Burke-Hartke Bill has already solved the unemployment problem.) The multinationals claim that their own domestic employment has been increasing almost twice as fast as that of companies that operate exclusively in the U.S.; thus, their foreign investments have *increased,* not decreased their payrolls at home. Supporting their case, Andrew F. Brimmer, a governor of the Federal Reserve Board, puts the net number of jobs created by foreign trade at 650,000 and adds another 360,000 jobs supported by the increased purchasing power made possible by low-priced imports.

Who is right, labor or the multinationals? You can pick your own expert. Senator Abraham Ribicoff (Dem., Conn.), chairman of the Subcommittee on International Trade, said after requesting a study of his own from the Tariff Commission: "Statistics in this area are either dated, obscure or unavailable."

But actions won't wait for precise figures or for scholarly studies. What should the U.S. *do?* Now. There is no simple answer. To help our readers make up their own minds, Forbes' Patricia Dreyfus and James Flanigan interviewed four key figures, two from labor, two from management; each represents a somewhat different viewpoint—from belligerently protectionist to stubbornly laissez-faire. The interviews are summarized on the following pages.

Even more is at stake in this debate than jobs and the availability of imported goods. Its outcome will help shape the kind of world we and our children will inhabit for many decades.

AFL–CIO's NATHANIEL GOLDFINGER: "WE'RE UNDERMINING OUR INDUSTRIAL BASE"

(NOTE.—To the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations foreign imports may be sinful, but multinational corporations are the devil incarnate. Speaking for the AFL–CIO is its chief economist, Nathaniel Goldfinger. Nat Goldfinger, 56, grew up in the 1930's, graduated from City College of New York in 1938. Goldfinger sees the multinational spread of U.S. industry as part of a continuing process in American history. But he sees it from the other side, the side of the regulators who curbed the trusts, and of the New Deal with its regulatory legislation that was the hallmark of that time, the time of Nat Goldfinger's youth.)

Businessmen see foreign investment differently than you do. They say that because of cost differentials, tariffs and other considerations the U.S. company would lose the foreign market were it not producing on the scene.

GOLDFINGER. Oh, there may be some elements of truth to that, depending upon the product and the country involved. But you see, there is an extremely important point here, and that is that what may be a rational decision for a private corporation such as a Ford Motor Co. or an IBM may not be a rational decision for the American economy and for American society. In fact, a decision made by the management of a private multinational corporation may work out to the advantage of that private corporation, but it may well result in the displacement of American labor, in the export of American technology, and it probably will result in the export of American capital. Moreover, such a decision may well undermine the industrial base of the country.

That's what organized labor and other supporters of the protectionist Burke-Hartke Bill worry about when they hear the bankers and academics talk of the U.S. moving toward a "post-industrial," no-growth society.

GOLDFINGER. If we continue to get more and more emphasis on investment in foreign production by U.S. companies, we are going to lose our industrial base. We are beginning to lose some of our service jobs related to production, and not too far down the road we will be losing some, if not much of our re-

search and development because R&D always tends to follow production. The talk of those people who speak glibly of a service economy is the talk of those who unfortunately have not given much thought to the nature of our economy. Service jobs, most of them, are low-wage, menial jobs. It's not all surgeons and research chemists, by any means. You know, it's generally forgotten that the American consumer is an American worker, and the fact that the American market is a lucrative market is based upon the wages of the American worker. As we continue to get more and more emphasis on investment in foreign production by U..S companies, the labor share of income will go down, whereas the profit share will rise. Professor Peggy Musgrave (of Northeastern University and one of the few academics in labor good graces) says it well: "Foreign investment may enhance the private profitability of U.S. capital, but it is likely to reduce the real wage to U.S. labor as well as the Government's tax share in the profits."

But the prime responsibility of corporate management is supposed to be to seek out the geratest profit. In theory, everybody benefits from this greater return on invested capital. Is labor introducing a new criterion for corporate management? That it should invest with an eye not only to the greatest profit, but the greatest domestic employment as well?

GOLDFINGER. Well, we think they should have that in *consideration*. But that is *not* our primary drive. What we are saying is that all through American history, and particularly in the past 100 years, we have had the development internally in the U.S. of various types of regulations and restraints on private corporations and corporate operations. I mean this dates back into the late 1870s and certainly came to the fore in the 1930s. We have a whole series of regulations as part of American law and the American system. And yet when you look at the international economic area, you find that there is no regulation and the Government operates on the basis of the mythology of laissez-faire.

And you would propose a bill such as Burke-Hartke to counter laissez-faire. How do you see the effects of such a bill?

GOLDFINGER. One benefit would be in maintaining a diversified economy. The way things are going, we are undermining our industrial base. The adoption of Burke-Hartke with the restraint and regulations on imports and on the outflow of technology and the outflow of capital would help to maintain a more diversified type of economy.

Why do we need such drastic medicine as Burke-Hartke? Wouldn't market-disruption quotas do the job?

GOLDFINGER. The U.S. position in international trade has been deteriorating in composition as well as in total volume. During the 1960s, imports of manufactured goods approximately tripled, but exports of such goods merely doubled. We're now affected not simply in about three or four old industries, we're affected across the board. Even in the sophisticated new industries.

Would a return to a trade surplus assuage labor's anxiety and blunt the passion for Burke-Hartke?

GOLDFINGER. I doubt it, because there are so many parts of the country seriously hurt by imports. Anyhow, improvement in the trade balance by itself is not the solution for the problem we're talking about. What's involved in the future is a whole improvement in the relationship of our exports and our imports.

So you want a big fence to keep capital at home and foreign goods out. This would certainly protect U.S. labor and its wage rates from foreign competition. However, if we need, as the AFL–CIO says, the regulation of international profit-seeking by corporations, do we not need controls on labor's demands in the wage and work rules area? Controls for the goose and controls for the gander.

GOLDFINGER. Well, you see, in the international economic area, the issue is this: Capital is mobile, labor is not mobile. This is one of the crucial issues involved in this whole matter. That capital can move relatively easily out of one business into another or from one part of the country to another, or from the U.S. to Mexico or to Taiwan. However, people cannot move very easily and communities cannot move at all. So that what you have here are people and whole communities that are being sacrificed.

Supporters of multinational corporations cite capital flows that show the U.S. benefiting from repatriated earnings from foreign investment. These arguments make no impression on labor. They feel the profits come at the expense of labor's share of the national income.

GOLDFINGER. I'll give you some examples, small examples, but they add up. In March 1970 *The Wall Street Journal* reported that Zenith Radio, which was in the process of completing a large plant in Taiwan, announced that it would reduce its work force by about 3,000 jobs [*for Zenith's version, see p. 22*]. Joseph S. Wright said that in addition probably another 4,000 layoffs would occur in 1971. Paul Jennings, president of the International Union of Electrical Workers, reported to the Joint Economic Committee in July 1970 that Westinghouse closed its Edison, N.J., TV plant and transferred the production to one of its Canadian affiliates as well as to Japanese firms. Emerson Radio & Phonograph, a division of National Union Electric, discontinued production of TV sets, closing down its Jersey City, N.J. plant and transferring production to Admiral which in turn transferred production of major TV product lines to Taiwan. Warwick Electronics transferred production from its Illinois and Arkansas plants to its Mexican facility. Bendix left Elmira and Long Island, N.Y. to produce in Mexico. I could go on and on.

Okay, but maybe U.S. labor just can't compete in these fields. U.S. labor's productivity is not what it used to be, some people say, and the real problem in U.S. wages growing faster than U.S. productivity.

GOLDFINGER. The American worker operates the machinery and equipment that is provided by the company. Now, when the company provides the same kind of machinery and equipment and knowhow in its foreign plants, then it is increasing, very substantially increasing, the productivity and technology levels of that foreign plant. And it is making it possible to have the same or similar productivity levels as in the U.S. at much lower wages and at much lower labor standards frequently. Also often with lower tax rates and other kinds of advantages. So that we lose exports to the country where such a foreign subsidiary is operating, and then we lose out in third-country markets because of the competition from these foreign subsidiaries.

These countries you speak of with much lower wage rates and labor standards are obviously not European, but developing countries such as Mexico and Taiwan. These countries need foreign investment if they are to bring their people into the modern industrial world. How do you reconcile this problem?

GOLDFINGER. Those developing countries need viable economies. But frequently, foreign investment distorts the economy of the developing country by siphoning off labor into production for exports. Here the bankers and academics in the U.S. and some of the people in the developing countries have placed an utterly undue emphasis on trade as the answer to their problems. The answer to their problems is not trade in itself, but the development of viable economies, which to a great extent depends upon internal domestic markets. We get back once again to this issue that what is rational for the firm may be harmful to the country.

So basically, what you're asking is that regulation be imposed upon corporations to prevent them seeking the greatest return on investment in instances where that greater return is located outside the United States.

GOLDFINGER. We're saying there's a country here, and there are people here, working people and consumers. There are communities with a tax base, there is a Federal Government with its tax base, and this country should not permit itself to be undermined by its own policies. Regulation is necessary. Just as it was necessary to regulate the stock market and the large corporations, so it is necessary to regulate these international economic relationships, and it is particularly necessary to regulate the outflow of technology and of capital.

UAW's LEONARD WOODCOCK: "TARIFFS AND QUOTAS DEMAND RETALIATION"

(NOTE.—Leonard Woodcock, 61, has been president of the United Auto Workers since Walter Reuther's fatal accident in May 1970. He is a calm, reflective man, very different from the stereotype of a labor leader. His 1.4-million-member union is unusual, too. It is composed of three major industries: automobiles, aerospace and farm equipment. While the first sector has seen 15% of the U.S. market won away by foreign imports, the other two are heavily dependent on exports. As a result, the UAW does not share the AFL–CIO's protectionist ideas. In October Woodcock will travel to Japan to try to encourage automakers there to set up U.S. assembly plants.)

Can you explain how the UAW differs from the AFL-CIO on foreign trade? Do you support the Burke-Hartke Bill?

WOODCOCK. No, we do not. Our chief objection is the emphasis on tariffs and mandated quotas which will demand retaliation by other countries. This would lead to a substantial slackening of world trade, and this could have very drastic consequences for all of us.

Does that mean you support a free trade policy?

WOODCOCK. We support the general notion of free trade, but we have never been free traders period, because we live in a real world. We believe there *should* be licensing for export of capital, after a Presidentially appointed board decides this is in the nation's interest.

Let's go back to the time when Kennedy was President and Ford over here was going to buy up the remaining piece of Ford of Britain. This was at a time when the dollar was in difficulty, and the President publicly asked the Ford Motor Co. not to do it, and Mr. Ford said he was going to do it for the good of Ford. I think that sort of thing is wrong. The president of a private company shouldn't be able to say that his decision is superior to the recommendation of the President of the United States.

What about an agreement like the U.S.-Canadian auto pact? Hasn't this meant a loss of American jobs?

WOODCOCK. When the auto agreement first went into effect in 1965, our balance of trade in vehicles and parts was running $600 million per year in our favor. Now it has swung to a negative balance of over $100 million.

I'm not sure this could have been prevented, actually, because I don't know whether Canada could have sustained the drain that it had before the pact. The alternative would have been to have the Canadian market entirely sealed off, in which event there would probably have been fewer jobs on *both* sides of the border.

So you would agree that it is necessary to have plants abroad to serve foreign markets?

WOODCOCK. I don't disagree with that. Caterpillar Tractor is an excellent example because in every situation where they have placed a plant in a country, their exports from the U.S. to that country have shot up. They build parts in Japan, for example, which they bring here; they also build components here for the Japanese market, so you get a two-way flow. But the flow in each direction has substantially increased.

What about the argument that high American labor costs price U.S. companies out of the market? Do you think there is any basis for this claim?

WOODCOCK. I don't think so. If you take the decade of the Sixties, the last half was pretty bad. Productivity was bad, inflation was bad and our relative position in the international scheme of things worsened. During the first five years, it was the reverse. Our unit labor costs went down steadily. Except for Canada, we had the best record of any country—better than Japan, Italy, Western Europe.

Why did things change?

WOODCOCK. Because of the Vietnam war. Johnson and the Congress didn't have the courage to increase taxes in 1966 to balance the thing out. As the inflation problem increased, labor began to fight to make up for its lost position. When it did this, labor became part of the problem. No question about it.

Let's talk about productivity. Some industry leaders say that the solution to unemployment in America is getting people to want to work.

WOODCOCK. Well, if that thesis is correct and everybody suddenly started working twice as hard, the problem would get even worse—there'd be half as many jobs! But there *is* an attitudinal problem. Look at absenteeism. They used to control this by the terror of discipline. It doesn't work anymore. There's the apocryphal story about the guy who was always working only four days a week. Finally the plant manager asks him: "How come you only work four days?" Because I can't live on three," he says.

But if he's making enough in four days, isn't he getting too much money?

WOODCOCK. If his expectancies are less. You know, the counterculture is having a pervasive effect.

Do you really notice your members wanting to live in smaller houses with fewer TV sets?

WOODCOCK. I think it's possible. Then, too, you have a higher level of education. You take a second shift: They work from 3:30 to midnight. I think they could think of some better things to do on a Friday night than go into that damn plant. On Saturday, when they get time and a half, the absenteeism is sometimes greater than on regular workdays.

What can be done about it?

WOODCOCK. The solution may be, particularly if we have the chronic unemployment we seem to, to shorten the workweck, but use the plant all week round. I can see one crew working four days and another working three, including Saturday and Sunday, but the second might get paid as much as the first because they've got those two undesirable days.

But what does industry get for that besides the job that used to be done anyway? What is labor giving?

WOODCOCK. We'd get the work done.

GOODYEAR'S RUSSELL DEYOUNG: "AMERICA HAS GOT TO GO BACK TO WORK"

NOTE.—With plants in 24 countries and one-third of net income from overseas operations, the $3.6-billion Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. is almost an archetype of the multinational corporation. It was also one of the first to become seriously concerned about the AFL–CIO's protectionist stance.

(Forbes' interview with Chairman Russell DeYoung took place in Goodyear's Akron headquarters. After the interview ended, DeYoung led an energetic march through part of Goodyear's production line. Gruff asides ("See 'em loafing there?") gave way to hearty bearhugs whenever the 63-year-old executive met a co-worker from his own days on the production line.)

Proponents of the Burke-Hartke Bill claim that building plants abroad steals jobs from American workers. What about Goodyear?

DEYOUNG. Starting from 1962 we've increased our foreign jobs by 12,000 and our domestic by 21,000. In other words, our growth in the U.S. has been 75% faster than our growth in foreign countries.

Can you actually say that those foreign factories create American jobs?

DEYOUNG. Definitely. First, since we own those factories, we manufacture a lot of the machinery and molds for them. A lot of our research and development depends on those resources. We figure that 11% of our Akron employment is directly related to our foreign operations.

Wouldn't there be more jobs here if you didn't have overseas factories?

DEYOUNG. We wouldn't have the business. When we didn't have a factory in France, we didn't export tires to France. You've got tariffs, and productivity costs, and national pride.

If your foreign factories haven't adversely affected U.S. employment, how do you explain the United Rubber Workers' president claiming that since 1961 Akron has lost 10,000 jobs in rubber-related industries?

DEYOUNG. He's probably counting shoe products, and he's probably right there. We don't make shoe products. What I think he means, though, is that the stuff's moving out of Akron to other parts of the U.S. That's more of a problem than the foreign operations. We've built big plants in Union City, Tenn., in Gadsden, Ala., Fayetteville, N.C. Akron used to be the center of everything; now it's getting to be one of our smallest plants.

Why?

DEYOUNG. People don't want to work. It's as simple as that.

So you would say that the solution to unemployment would be for labor to stress productivity?

DEYOUNG. I think the great thing to increase employment is people going to work. You've got to keep in mind that labor costs have two bases—not only the rate, but the willingness to produce. We don't mind paying a guy a good wage, but we want him to work. We've had cases abroad where the union says: "These men are not producing; why don't you get rid of them for us?" Here, if they *start* producing, that's when the union may want us to get rid of them! I'm not picking on labor, but I think America has got to go back to work.

How do you do this?

DEYOUNG. I don't know. You try to indicate that you think people ought to go back to work, and labor puts their hands up and says: "Oh, you mean sweatshops again!" Nobody's talking about things like that. But people have got to start producing. We talk to the union about potential loss of jobs in Akron, and you know what they tell the workers? "The company's kidding you." The only time they believe you is when the operation is dead. We had to move foam padding out of Akron. We lost *$3 million* a year on one little department. We moved it down South. And I told the union—I had 'em sitting around that table. "We want to help you in every way we can," they said, "but we're not going to give up our hard-won gains." How do you get it across?

Should there be more government programs to relieve unemployment?

DEYOUNG. I think Abe Lincoln was a great guy when he said: The Government should never do for the people what they can and should do for themselves. Just like your parents. They can coddle you, and if you're not making good they can give you more money. But that doesn't help you any. Let you get hungry a few times, then you'll start scratching around. What the leaders of labor ought to start saying is: "We want a fair day's work for a day's pay." And some of the things labor stands for are good. I mean, you've got to have a good pension system. I think that when a guy gets laid off, he should be carried for a time until he gets back. Those things are good. But when I was going to school if I didn't work part time, I didn't eat. We've made it too easy on ourselves.

ZENITH'S JOSEPH WRIGHT: "WE DON'T LIKE TO HAVE PRODUCTION IN A FOREIGN COUNTRY"

NOTE.—Electronics has been hard hit by import competition. In the last five years overall employment has declined by some 219,000 jobs. One after another, U.S. electronics manufacturers have shifted production offshore—to Singapore, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Mexico. Paul Jennings, president of the International Union of Electrical Workers, estimates 121,000 jobs have been exported by such decisions. In 1970 the Chicago-based Zenith Radio Corp. laid off almost 3,000 workers and began building black-and-white TV sets in Taiwan. The move was followed by an announcement that the company would have to lay off another 4,000 by moving its small-screen color production out of the U.S. It did not, however, make that move. All color-TV production is still here. Moreover, in the first quarter of 1972, profits rose by 28% on a sales increase of 22%. Forbes asked Chairman Joseph S. Wright how Zenith did it.)

WRIGHT. Let me tell you something straight off. Despite our wage rates in this country, which are substantially higher than in Japan and many times what they are in Taiwan and Mexico, our mass-production operation here is as efficient as anywhere else in the world. We have lines here in Chicago that operate at 120%–130% of efficiency. There's no way you can ask people to work any harder than that.

Then why has the electronics industry suffered such a serious decline?

WRIGHT. Our problem basically came from the fact that Japan had a closed home market in which it maintained prices at levels far above their prices in the U.S. Then, too, Japan's currency evaluation was an absolutely artificial barrier to our ability to compete fairly. That 360–1 relationship of the yen and the dollar, formulated at a time when Japan was devastated, was largely what made the difference between 75 cents an hour in Japan and $3.50 an hour here. When the yen was revalued, this immediately readjusted wages between the U.S. and Japan almost 20%.

How were you able to keep color produc-

tion in the U.S. when you had to go to Taiwan for some of your black-and-white sets?

WRIGHT. When we set that plant up in Taiwan, we were assuming that our Government was going to go on with its policy of more than 30 years of really not appearing to give a damn about matters of trade and the economy. We had the State Department in complete control of all our foreign policy; you just got the feeling that those people couldn't care less about the nitty gritty of our affairs. Now, if we had to decide again on whether to put up a plant in Taiwan to produce black-and-white sets, it would be a much more marginal decision.

Did labor make any concessions to enable you to keep color production in the U.S.?

WRIGHT. I don't think there was ever any *quid pro quo*. I will say that our unions, while they've been tough bargainers, haven't just shut us down like some of the transportation and construction unions. Some industries have had to fight like the dickens to put in automated programs that increase efficiency. We haven't had that problem; knock wood we never do. And we do pay our people. We have them on incentive pay wherever we can. If they can work at 120% of efficiency, they get at least 20% extra pay. Anyone who slows that line up, so everyone starts to lose efficiency pay, gets pretty unpopular.

Do you have any other incentive programs?

WRIGHT. Since the early Fifties we've had a profit-sharing plan where 20% of our pretax profits—after 6% on invested capital—goes into a fund for the benefit of the employees. After 30 years, someone who has worked here at an hourly job can leave with $80,000 to $100,000 in cash money.

What percent of sales are exports?

WRIGHT. Not more than 5% overall. One reason is that most countries absolutely prevent us from shipping our goods into that market. If we set up a factory over there, it can cost three times as much to make, say, 10,000 sets as it would be to add a line to one of our plants here. Let me give you an example. We have a plant in Mexico, where we're required to buy components locally. The bill for materials—just the parts, in boxes—came to more than the wholesale U.S. price for a finished comparable set.

Aren't there any advantages to offshore production?

WRIGHT. We don't like to have production in a foreign country if we can possibly avoid it. We'll actually pay a premium to have it here in the U.S. First of all, when you build a plant abroad to serve that market, you're subject to much less stable political situations. Second, you have the problem of logistics: getting everything in and being able to handle the flow of materials efficiently. This means duplicating overheads like quality control and advanced engineering. Third, when you're ready to get your finished product in here, you're subject to dock strikes on the West Coast.

So if unfair practices like dumping didn't exist, you could keep all your production here in the U.S.?

WRIGHT. Exactly right. It would be a challenge, but we think we can do it.

What would have happened if you hadn't moved to Taiwan?

WRIGHT. We would have had to drop that end of the business. It was impossible for us to compete under conditions as they then were. Look, from 1968 to 1971 our employment went from a peak of around 25,000 to 18,000. If everything had kept on going the way it was, my estimate was that our work force in this country would have shrunk to around 10,000 or 12,000 by 1975. Now I feel much more sanguine that we're going to grow. In fact, we've got a building program for some new engineering facilities right here in this complex.

GETTING TO KNOW THE WILD BURROS OF DEATH VALLEY

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that all of my colleagues are well familiar with my work during the 92d Congress on the subject of wild horses and burros in the West. Fortunately, the Congress did approve legislation protecting these animals where they are found on public lands.

I have recently had the opportunity to meet and discuss the subject of wild burros with Ms. Patricia Moehlman, a fascinating woman who is conducting detailed studies of the wild burro in the Death Valley National Monument.

The National Geographic has done a story on Ms. Moehlman and her work which I would like to share with my colleagues, for their information on another potential problem faced by these animals. The text of that article follows:

GETTING TO KNOW THE WILD BURROS OF DEATH VALLEY

(By Patricia Des Roses Moehlman)

Mothering a four-legged orphan was the last thing I expected to do when I began my study of Death Valley's wild burro population. I had planned to keep my distance from my subjects, to affect their behavior as little as possible, and to protect my objectivity as an observer. But, as far as Sweet Pea was concerned, my resolve went out the window.

I was returning to my study area in Death Valley National Monument after a trip east and stopped at Wildrose Ranger Station to see if I had any mail. My knock brought Anne Farabee, wife of Ranger Charles (Butch) Farabee, to the door. Behind her stood a small fuzzy animal with big ears and a sign around his neck that said "Merry Christmas, Patti." He had the softest coat I have ever touched.

"We rescued him from a coyote near the water tank," Anne said. "We couldn't find his mother, so we tried to get a group of burros to accept him. They wouldn't, so we brought him home and gave him a name."

That night, as I led Sweet Pea to my winter quarters in a cabin at the ranger station, I realized what a rare and rewarding companion I had acquired. The monument's rules prohibit pets for residents, but Sweet Pea officially became a research animal, and he proved invaluable for the insights he gave me into burro behavior.

Sweet Pea joined me when I was about halfway through an 18-month study of the wild burros of Death Valley's Panamint Range (map, below). Despite increasing public attention to the fate of these animals, I discovered that relatively little was known about their behavior and place in the life system.

Our Western States contain more than 10,000 wild descendants of those sturdy symbols of the Old West, the pack animals of Spanish padres and grizzled prospectors. Today perhaps 700 inhabit the southern Panamint Range on the western flank of 140-mile-long Death Valley. They need fear no predator of consequence, except man.

BURROS PROVOKE OPPOSING VIEWS

Now men debate whether the burro fits into Death Valley's ecosystem. Critics say it pollutes water holes and eats away vegetation that holds the soil and sustains insects, bird life, and mammals as large as desert bighorn sheep. Defenders maintain that burros are not numerous enough to cause appreciable damage. A key to this question is numbers: How many burros will the land support?

The responsibility for deciding, as well as for devising a management program, rests with the National Park Service. Its guiding policy calls for restoration and maintenance of the land and its life-forms as they were before the white man came. There are those within the park system who see the burro as exotic—that is, non-native—and advocate total removal from the monument. Others would keep small herds in areas accessible to tourists, in deference to the animal's place in frontier history.

Another viewpoint—and one that I share, based on my observations—favors a management program that would retain the burros at a level the area would comfortably support. We might remember that *Equus*, the genus to which all asses, horses, and zebras belong, originally evolved on this continent and had a niche in the ecosystem perhaps as recently as 8,000 years ago.

In any event, before the Park Service makes a final decision on Death Valley's wild burros, other interested Governmental agencies and the public will have a chance to comment, under procedures set up by the National Environmental Policy Act. I hope my research will prove helpful in the formulation of a humane policy.

My study area covered about a third of Death Valley's Emigrant District, a 300-square-mile section in the Panamint Range. The region includes 11,049-foot Telescope Peak, highest point in the monument.

Topographic maps in hand, I set out to learn the terrain soon after arriving. I observed burros along both slopes of the mountains and down into Death Valley to the east and Panamint Valley to the west.

I identified 211 burros in my area, perhaps a sixth of all those within the boundaries of the monument. My group included 110 adult males, 51 adult females, and 50 adolescents and foals.

MATING URGE TURNS JACK JEALOUS

The eight-square-mile tract of high desert called Wildrose Basin provided my best observation area. There, abundant plants and water attracted the burros in the spring and early summer. Learning to recognize most individuals, I assigned each a number and name—until I ran out of names.

One was Brown Stud, a small hairy animal that dominated a quarter of a square mile of territory. He permitted other males to cross on their way to water, and even to mingle with females there. But if a jenny came into heat, Brown Stud becomes inhospitable. An intruding male had only to approach the female, and Brown Stud would lay back his ears and stand ready for combat. This threatening gesture usually discouraged the male. When it didn't, a fight erupted.

Braying, grunting, and growling, two burros in combat create pandemonium in a cloud of dust. Feet pound the ground. Teeth flash fiercely. But I noted that there's always more bluff than blows, more braying than blood.

In late May I moved from the cabin to a clearing on Piñon Mesa, about five miles to clearing on Piñon Mesa, about five miles southeast of the Wildrose Ranger Station.

From this 6,500-foot height, I could look west across the Argus Range and far, far away to the snow-topped Sierra Nevada—a cooling sight during the hot months. For shelter and sleep I had a tent.

Burros sleep and browse with apparent indifference to rain and snow, thunder and lightning—and most of all to summer's mercilessly hot sunshine.

In winter, snow sometimes blankets the mountains down to about 6,000 feet. Though it snowed at 4,000 to 5,000 feet, where I spent much of the winter, the flakes rarely remained long on the ground. Nevertheless, the cold often numbed my glove-clad fingers and night temperatures in the 20's were common.

In summer, when the temperature crept into the 90's—and that was some 30 degrees cooler than the floor of Death Valley—I donned a lightweight shirt, shorts, sandals, and floppy cotton hat. I carried a canteen everywhere, and sometimes emptied it over my head to avert a sun-induced headache.

My faculty adviser, Dr. John T. Emlen of the University of Wisconsin's Department of Zoology, arrived in June to see how my project was progressing. We set up our tents in the Wildrose Campground and made daily treks into burro areas. Dr. Emlen's powers of observation, developed by years of experience, soon proved useful.

One morning, as we watched several burros that were browsing sporadically, Dr. Emlen pointed out something I had missed. One burro seemed to find a single plant engrossing. His nose remained deep in the tufts.

Finally the burro moved away, and Dr. Emlen and I examined the plant, a barrel cactus. The tough, sharp spines (opposite) that discourage most browsers had been neatly plucked out, and the inside pulp eaten. A human would need pliers to remove those spines, but not a burro. Wild burros find sustenance in some of Death Valley's prickliest plants, primarily spiny hopsage, desert-thorn, blackbrush, and horse brush.

BURRO NO HELP IN THE KITCHEN

Sweet Pea started on a less thorny diet. I bottle-fed him on a milk substitute. It was always an accomplishment to get it mixed and into the bottle without mishap as he nudged my hands impatiently. My plans to have him spend his nights outside were reversed when coyotes began to draw near the ranger station after sunset. Soon he was the nightly occupant of the cabin's spare room.

Once a week I stood on a scale with Sweet Pea in my arms, his spindly legs kicking the air. Deducting my weight. I determined his. In only three months he weighed a hefty 88 pounds. That was the last time I lifted him. At about four years of age, he will reach full growth, perhaps 400 pounds and 11 or 12 hands—44 to 48 inches—at the withers.

Sweet Pea readily accepted me as his new mother. When Anne Farabee and I took him for a stroll, he trotted between us, kicking out to discourage Anne from walking too near me. A foal acts the same toward an older sibling when walking with its mother.

In the loose social organization of burros, the only stable unit consists of a mother and her offspring. Similar behavior is found among African chimps, I had learned while assisting Dr. Jane van Lawick-Goodall at Tanzania's Gombe Stream chimpanzee research station in 1967.

With a 12-month gestation period, a mature female burro can drop a foal—and occasionally twins—every year. She may come into heat again within six or nine days of giving birth, although my observations showed that only 5 of the 51 jennies had two foals within a two-year period.

Still, if the life-span of wild burros approaches that of domestic donkeys—about 25 years—the animals have a potentially high rate of multiplying, and this has raised the specter of burro population explosions.

Among the females I observed, however, only about 30 percent had new foals. Adult males, apparently because of dispersal to other areas, decreased by 45 percent, and the total population declined from 211 to 201. Of course my study was limited in territory. A comprehensive investigation of population growth and dispersal patterns is needed to determine the animals' long-range impact on the whole area.

One evening in early summer, the season when most foals are born, I was invited to dine with Ranger Earle Curran and his wife Rachel at Emigrant Ranger Station. They asked about new foals.

"I've counted six, including a brown-and-white female paint," I replied. "That makes four spotted burros in this district.

MOTHER WANTS NO VISITORS

The mother of the paint was Boldface, a brown burro with a white stripe down her nose (below). Although normally tolerant of my presence, Boldface would not let me come too close for the first five days, and I had to do my watching through a telescope. If I got within 50 yards of her foal, she gave a warning snort and trotted off, with her baby following close behind.

The foal spent a great deal of time lying down or sleeping, but at intervals at 15 to 20 minutes she would walk up to Boldface to nurse. After five days Boldface refused to allow her offspring to nurse that often, and the little burro began eating spiny plants.

Apart from eating and sleeping, burros spend time grooming themselves and each other. Standing parallel to a grooming partner, a burro will use its teeth as a back scratcher, while the partner reciprocates. Often the males just stand and bray in response to vocal blasts from burros miles away.

Both young and old alternately sleep and browse around the clock. Older animals sleep on their feet, but may lie down in winter months to keep warm. Foals sleep on the ground, and sometimes rest by leaning—eyes closed, head down, ears drooping—against their mothers.

When my fieldwork neared an end, I faced the question of Sweet Pea's future. Burro social organization being so fluid, I knew that Sweet Pea probably could join a bachelor or nursery group. One female, I noticed, had three or four yearlings in tow. I was concerned, however, about the possibility of a burro reduction program, and decided that Sweet Pea would be safer near my parents' home in Texas.

About then, the dreaded Venezuelan equine encephalitis virus crossed the Rio Grande. It had killed thousands of horses and donkeys as it spread northward. Before moving Sweet Pea to Texas, I made a 300-mile round trip to a clinic near Los Angeles to have him vaccinated. Sweet Pea now grazes peacefully near Austin on a grassy 425-acre plain he shares with two horses.

At this stage in my research, I see no ecological basis for elimination of Death Valley's burros. Contrary to widely held belief, the burros I observed did not strip the land, foul water holes, or endanger other animals.

Although heavy browsing occurred within a mile of water, my first appraisal of vegetation data indicates that plants on which burros feed do not suffer severely.

I noted that burros, rather than frightening other animals away, share the watering area with small rodents and birds. I do not deny that bighorn sheep might be affected by burro overpopulation, but to condemn the burro is to oversimplify a complex question, one that involves such things as climatic cycles and human population pressures. What we need is a program of burro management based upon systematic factual knowledge of the animals' role in the environment, so that we can say with certainty at just what point burro numbers start to take a toll.

SWEET PEA PROMPTS SWEET MEMORIES

I am in Texas now, analyzing my findings, and I visit Sweet Pea whenever I can. Watching him trot in the field, I recall the sights and sounds I remember best of Death Valley: the humor and furry charm of the long-eared foals, the fierceness and bluff of the adult males, the gentle, no-nonsense attitude of the proud jennies. How much longer, I wonder, will Death Valley's burros enjoy their free-ranging state? How long will others be able to see them as I have?

For many, many years, I hope.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN McMILLAN

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, in my nearly 25 years in Congress, I have made many friendships which I shall long cherish. A number of my closest associates during these years will, like myself, be leaving at the end of the year.

One of these is our good friend Representative JOHN MCMILLAN, with whom I have been closely associated during my entire service in the House. JOHNNY and I have worked together closely on the House Agriculture Committee and particularly on the Tobacco Subcommittee and since the opening of the Rayburn House Office Building, our offices have been side by side.

Congressman MCMILLAN is a "southern gentleman" in the truest sense of the term and typifies all of the good qualities of a true public servant. He has ably served the people of his district and has contributed immeasurably to the development of much legislation before this body during the 17 terms in which he has served. JOHNNY came to the House on January 3, 1939, and is one of our most highly respected and well-liked Members. As chairman of the House District Committee, he has served with distinction and has taken a real interest in the problems of the District of Columbia. As second ranking member of the House Agriculture Committee he has made an outstanding contribution to legislation of concern not only to rural America but to the Nation's consumers in the cities as well.

I highly commend him on his long and faithful service and wish him well in the years to come. Whatever he undertakes, he will do with distinction and wherever he goes, he will be respected for his integrity and devotion to duty.

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF THE EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN—XXVI

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin on my voting and attendance record for the second session of the 92d Congress.

The furnishing of this report continues a service I began in the first session of the 80th Congress. This is the 26th and—since I will be retiring from Congress at the end of this year—the final report of my voting and attendance record.

These 26 reports show how I voted on 4,221 questions in the House of Representatives. Based on quorum calls and record votes, they also show an overall attendance record of 92.2 percent.

The purpose of these reports is to collect in one place and in concise form, information that is buried in thousands of pages, and millions of words, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is impossible to make an accurate check on how a Congressman voted on all of the issues from such an official source without hundreds of hours of painstaking research and considerable knowledge of legislation and congressional parliamentary rules.

I, therefore, began these reports in 1947 because I did not believe my constituents should be deprived, through the sheer difficulty of getting the facts, of an easy-to-read, complete record of my votes. I felt that it was my responsibility to provide that record.

The record which follows includes all the rollcall and recorded teller votes in the 1972 session. In addition to the votes shown in this report, there were 133 quorum calls in the House which are omitted to conserve space. This accounts for the nonconsecutive roll numbers. I was present for 111 quorum calls and I was absent for 22 quorum calls.

The descriptions of the bills and the amendments or motions in the report are for purposes of identification only. No attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. This caution is given because the descriptions used are often taken from the titles of the bills, which, unfortunately, do not always reflect the nature or true purpose of the legislation.

Upon request, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information on any bill as well as the reasons for my vote.

I hope that these reports over the years have been useful to my constituents in evaluating my stewardship. It has been a pleasure and a privilege to represent the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin in the U.S. House of Representatives for the past 28 years.

The material referred to follows:

92D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Roll No.	Date 1972	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 8787, providing that the territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands shall each be represented in Congress by a Delegate to the House of Representatives:	
2	Jan. 18	On passage. (Passed, 232 to 104)	Yea.
		S. 382, promoting fair practices in the conduct of election campaigns for Federal political offices:	
4	Jan. 19	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 334 to 20)	Yea.
		H. Res. 765, providing for consideration of conference report on S. 2819:	
5	Jan. 25	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 247 to 123)	Yea.
		S. 2819, authorizing foreign assistance for fiscal 1972:	
6	Jan. 25	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 204 to 179)	Nay.
		H.R. 6957, establishing the Sawtooth National Recreation Area in Idaho:	
8	Jan. 26	On passage. (Passed, 369 to 9)	Yea.
		H.R. 8085, authorizing maximum age limits for appointments to certain Federal jobs:	
10	Jan. 27	On passage. (Rejected, 81 to 249)	Nay.
		H.R. 10086, providing for increases in appropriation ceilings and boundary changes in certain units of the National Park System:	
12	Jan. 31	On passage. (Passed, 303 to 2)	Yea.
		H. Res. 786, providing for consideration of S. 2010:	
13	Feb. 1	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 335 to 30)	Not voting.[1]
		S. 748, authorizing U.S. contributions to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank:	
14	Feb. 1	On passage. (Passed, 285 to 102)	Not voting.[1]
		S. 749, authorizing U.S. contributions to the Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank:	
15	Feb. 1	On passage. (Passed, 256 to 132)	Not voting.[1]
		S. 2010, authorizing paying installments of U.S. share of the 3d replenishment of the International Development Association funds:	
16	Feb. 1	On amendment reducing U.S. contribution from proposed $960,000,000 to $480,000,000. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 165 to 191)	Not voting.[2]
17	Feb. 1	On passage. (Passed, 208 to 165)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 7987, providing for the striking of medals in commemoration of the bicentennial of the American Revolution:	
18	Feb. 2	On passage. (Passed, 388 to 1)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 11394, creating additional Federal district judgeships:	
20	Feb. 2	On amendment providing for 1 additional district judgeship for the northern district of Indiana. (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 217 to 168)	Not voting.[2]
		H.R. 12089, establishing a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention with the purpose of coordinating Federal drug abuse prevention programs:	
23	Feb. 3	On amendment exempting Veterans' Administration's drug programs from above authority. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 174 to 196)	Not voting.[2]
24	Feb. 3	On passage. (Passed, 380 to 0)	Not voting.[1]
		S. 1857, expanding the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission:	
26	Feb. 7	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 328 to 36)	Not voting.[1]
		S. 1163, authorizing grants to States to establish food programs for the elderly:	
27	Feb. 7	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 350 to 23)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 7088, establishing the Tinicum Environmental Center in Pennsylvania:	
28	Feb. 7	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 361 to 8)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 12186, increasing penalties for violations of the Bald Eagle Protection Act:	
29	Feb. 7	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 352 to 7)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 12741, extending the Federal Water Pollution Control Act through June 30, 1972:	
30	Feb. 7	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 339 to 7)	Not voting.[1]
		H. Res. 164, establishing a Select Committee on Privacy, Human Values, and Democratic Institutions:	
33	Feb. 8	On agreeing to resolution. (Rejected, 168 to 216)	Nay.
		H.R. 10243, establishing an Office of Technology Assessment for the Congress:	
34	Feb. 8	On passage. (Passed, 256 to 118)	Nay.
		H.R. 12910, providing for a temporary increase in the public debt limit:	
37	Feb. 9	On passage. (Passed, 247 to 147)	Yea.
		H. Res. 796, providing for consideration of H. J. Res. 1025:	
39	Feb. 9	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 203 to 170)	Yea.
		H. J. Res. 1025, providing that the West Coast dock strike be immediately ended and contract dispute be settled by compulsory arbitration:	
40	Feb. 9	On passage. (Passed, 214 to 139)	Yea.
		H.R. 12350, authorizing $5.3 billion for a 2-year extension of Office of Economic Opportunity programs and creating independent Legal Services Program:	
45	Feb. 17	On substitute amendment authorizing $4,168,000,000 for a straight two-year extension of present OEO programs. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 159 to 206)	Yea.
46	Feb. 17	On passage. (Passed, 234 to 127)	Nay.
		H.R. 12931, establishing a program to improve the economy and living conditions in rural areas:	
49	Feb. 23	On amendment forbidding pollution abatement grants to profit-making organizations or individuals. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 150 to 224)	Not voting.[2]
		H.R. 12067, appropriating funds for foreign aid for fiscal 1972:	
51	Feb. 24	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 213 to 167)	Not voting.[1]
52	Feb. 24	On motion to concur in Senate amendments allowing the President to waive a provision of the bill prohibiting aid to Ecuador if he decided that such aid was important to U.S. national interests. (Agreed to, 230 to 138).	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 11021, providing for controls over emission of noise detrimental to the human environment:	
55	Feb. 29	On passage. (Passed, 356 to 32)	Yea.
		H. Res. 849, providing funds for the Committee on Internal Security:	
57	Mar. 1	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 303 to 102)	Yea.
		H. Res. 847, providing funds for the Committee on Education and Labor:	
58	Mar. 1	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 319 to 78)	Yea.
		H.R. 11384, authorizing $315.2 million for high-speed ground transportation research and development:	
60	Mar. 2	On passage. (Passed, 361 to 14)	Yea.

[1] Absent, if present would have voted "yea."

[2] Absent, if present would have voted "nay."

Roll No.	Date 1972	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 2589, requiring questions of race and occupation to be answered on qualification forms for prospective Federal jurors for aid in enforcement of nondiscrimination in Federal jury selection:	
62	Mar. 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 317 to 27)	Yea.
		H.R. 12828, increasing the rates of vocational rehabilitation, educational assistance, and special training allowances paid to eligible veterans and their dependents:	
63	Mar. 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 358 to 0)	Yea.
		S. 659, Omnibus Education Amendments of 1972:	
65	Mar. 8	On motion to table motion to instruct conferees to insist on House-passed antibusing amendments. (Rejected, 139 to 270)	Nay.
66	Mar. 8	On motion to instruct conferees to insist on House-passed antibusing amendments. (Agreed to, 272 to 140)	Yea.
		H.R. 1746, providing enforcement powers for the Equal Employment Opportunities Enforcement Commission:	
67	Mar. 8	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 303 to 110)	Yea.
		H.R. 11624, authorizing additional funds for Transpo (72), an international transportation exposition:	
68	Mar. 8	On passage. (Passed, 278 to 109)	Yea.
		H.R. 10420, establishing a Marine Mammal Commission and imposing a 5-year moratorium on most killings of marine mammals:	
70	Mar. 9	On passage. (Passed, 361 to 10)	Yea.
		H.R. 12410, providing that prior inconsistent statements by witnesses may be used as evidence in court trials in the District of Columbia:	
72	Mar. 13	On passage. (Passed, 292 to 32)	Not voting.[1]
		H.J. Res. 1097, making certain urgent supplementary appropriations for fiscal 1972:	
73	Mar. 14	On passage. (Passed, 364 to 16)	Yea.
		H.R. 12910, providing for a temporary increase in the public debt limit:	
76	Mar. 15	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 238 to 150)	Yea.
		H.R. 11417, providing additional $170,000,000 for financial assistance to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak):	
77	Mar. 15	On amendment providing that salaries in excess of $60,000 could be paid to officers only out of unlikely net profits of the corporation. (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 235 to 136)	Nay.
78	Mar. 15	On passage. (Passed, 313 to 63)	Yea.
		S. 2097, establising a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention with the purpose of coordinating Federal drug abuse prevention programs:	
79	Mar. 16	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 366 to 0)	Yea.
		H.R. 8395, expanding and extending for 3 years programs to rehabilitate the physically, mentally or socially disabled:	
80	Mar. 20	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 327 to 0)	Yea.
		H.R. 11948, increasing from $25,000 to $50,000 the ceiling on annual U.S. contributions to the Hague Conference on Private International Law and the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law:	
81	Mar. 20	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 315 to 18)	Yea.
		H.R. 4174, allowing States split by time zone boundaries to exempt part of their States from daylight saving time:	
82	Mar. 20	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 333 to 7)	Yea.
		H.R. 13120, providing for a modification in the par value of the dollar:	
84	Mar. 21	On passage. (Passed, 343 to 43)	Yea.
		H.R. 13592, establishing a national program to fight sickle cell anemia:	
87	Mar. 22	On passage. (Passed, 392 to 0)	Yea.
		H.R. 13955, making appropriations for the legislative branch for fiscal 1973:	
89	Mar. 23	On passage. (Passed, 363 to 9)	Yea.
		H.R. 11896, authorizing $24,600,000,000 for a comprehensive water pollution control program:	
92	Mar. 28	On amendment requiring industry by 1981 to use the "best available" waste treatment technology. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 140 to 249)	Nay.
93	Mar. 28	On amendment requiring environmental impact statements for all activities covered by bill. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 125 to 268)	Nay.
94	Mar. 28	On amendment deleting provisions requiring industrial users of municipal treatment works to pay, in addition to user charges for maintenance, operation and expansion of the plant, a portion of the initial (federally funded) capital costs. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 66 to 337).	Yea.
95	Mar. 28	On amendment allowing the Environmental Protection Agency a 60-day period to review and veto a State effluent discharge permit, and for other purposes. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 154 to 251).	Nay.
97	Mar. 29	On amendment to change the bill's 3-year contract authorization of $18,400,000,000 for waste treatment grants to annual congressional authorization on a 1-year advance basis. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 161 to 232).	Yea.
98	Mar. 29	On amendment requiring public hearings in investigations of employee firings or layoffs resulting from pollution standards. (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 275 to 117)	Nay.
99	Mar. 29	On amendment directing EPA to encourage regional resource management that utilizes spray irrigation, recycling of wastes and integrated systems of area waste treatment management programs. (Record teller vote), (Agreed to, 251 to 130)	Yea.
100	Mar. 29	On amendment preserving the rights of States to prohibit the discharge of all sewage from vessels in State waters. (Record teller vote), (Agreed to, 210 to 173)	Yea.
101	Mar. 29	On passage. (Passed, 380 to 14)	Yea.
		H.R. 9552, amending the Merchant Marine Act, to permit U.S.-flag passenger ships receiving Government subsidies to engage in year-round cruise trades:	
103	Apr. 11	On passage. (Passed, 374 to 0)	Yea.
		H.R. 13324, authorizing $555,800,000 for Maritime Administration programs for fiscal 1973:	
104	Apr. 11	On passage. (Passed, 365 to 13)	Yea.
		H.R. 13188, authorizing $141,800,000 for vessel and aircraft procurement and construction of facilities for the Coast Guard:	
105	Apr. 11	On passage. (Passed, 373 to 1)	Yea.
		H.R. 13336, authorizing $22,000,000 for U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency activities in fiscal 1973 and 1974:	
106	Apr. 12	On passage. (Passed, 349 to 20)	Yea.
		H. Con. Res. 471, declaring it the sense of Congress that the President urge Russia to permit Soviet Jews to emigrate to Israel and to end religious discrimination:	
108	Apr. 17	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 360 to 2)	Yes.
		H.R. 13752, amending the National Environmental Policy Act to provide for the interim licensing of the operation of certain thermoelectric generating plants:	
109	Apr. 17	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 285 to 78)	Yes.
		H.R. 45, establishing an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice:	
112	Apr. 18	On motion to recommit. (Failed, 133 to 252)	Nay.
		H.R. 10488, authorizing construction, maintenance, financing, etc., of Federal buildings:	
114	Apr. 19	On amendment requiring a fair market value payment to Postal Service should New York City take over Morgan Annex site. (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 196 to 170).	Yea.
115	Apr. 19	On passage. (Passed, 331 to 40)	Yea.
		H.R. 14070, authorizing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1973:	
116	Apr. 20	On procedural motion to begin consideration of bill on floor. (Agreed to, 350 to 2)	Yea.
119	Apr. 20	On passage. (Passed, 277 to 60)	Yea.
		H.R. 14108, authorizing funds for the National Science Foundation for fiscal 1973:	
121	Apr. 25	On passage. (Passed, 329 to 16)	Yea.
		H. Res. 918, directing the President and the Secretary of Defense to furnish detailed information on U.S. military activities in Indochina:	
123	Apr. 26	On motion to table the resolution. (Agreed to, 270 to 113)	Yea.
		H.R. 14582, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1972:	
124	Apr. 26	On passage. (Passed, 344 to 16)	Yea.
		H.R. 12202, increasing the Government's share of Federal workers' health insurance premiums from 40 percent to an eventual 75 percent:	
127	Apr. 27	On amendment including U.S. Postal Service employees in the bill. (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 197 to 148)	Nay.
128	Apr. 27	On amendment to reduce the proposed Federal Government's contribution to a straight 50 percent. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 124 to 219)	Yea.
129	Apr. 27	On passage. (Passed, 239 to 110)	Nay.
		S. 2713, authorizing the Attorney General to provide care for narcotic addicts who are placed on probation, paroled, or mandatorily released from prison:	
130	May 1	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 325 to 0)	Yea.
		H.R. 12652, extending the Commission on Civil Rights for 5 years:	
131	May 1	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 264 to 66)	Yea.
		H.R. 9676, conveying certain U.S. lands to Tennessee for use by University of Tennessee:	
132	May 1	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 319 to 9)	Yea.
		H.R. 13334, establishing and fixing compensation for certain positions in the Treasury Department:	
133	May 1	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 271 to 56)	Yea.
		H.R. 13591, changing the name of the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases to the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases:	
134	May 3	On passage. (Passed, 358 to 10)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 13089, providing for acceleration of tree planting programs on national forest lands in need of reforestation:	
135	May 3	On passage. (Passed, 371 to 5)	Yea.
		H.J. Res. 1174, making appropriations for special payments to international financial institutions for 1972:	
136	May 4	On passage. (Passed, 291 to 62)	Yea.
		H.R. 14718, providing a subsidy to a private bus company in the District of Columbia:	
138	May 8	On passage. (Failed, 50 to 270)	Nay.
		H.J. Res. 55, authorizing erection of a memorial to the U.S. Navy Seabees:	
139	May 9	On passage. (Passed, 366 to 4)	Yea.
		H.R. 4383, authorizing establishment of a system governing the creation and operation of advisory committees in the executive branch of the Federal Government:	
140	May 9	On passage. (Passed, 357 to 9)	Yea.

[1] Absent, if present would have voted "yea."

[2] Absent, if present would have voted "nay."

92D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION—Continued

Roll No.	Date 1972	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 9212, extending Federal responsibility for payment of black-lung benefits and broadening eligibility:	
141	May 10	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 275 to 122)	Nay.
		H. Res. 968, providing for consideration of H.R. 7130, extending coverage and increasing the Federal minimum wage to $2 an hour; and for consideration of the Erlenborn amendment in the nature of a substitute bill providing no new coverage:	
142	May 10	On agreeing to resolution (Agreed to, 338 to 57)	Nay.
		S. 659, Omnibus Education Amendments of 1972:	
143	May 11	On motion to table the motion to instruct the conferees to insist on the House antibusing amendments. (Failed, 126 to 273)	Nay.
144	May 11	On motion to instruct the conferees to insist on the House antibusing amendments. (Agreed to, 275 to 124)	Yea.
		H.R. 7130, extending coverage and increasing the Federal minimum wage:	
145	May 11	On amendment to the Erlenborn substitute providing (instead of an immediate increase to $2 an hour) a two-step increase to $2 an hour for those covered prior to 1966 law and a three-step increase to $2 an hour for those covered by 1966 law. (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 216 to 187)	Yea.
146	May 11	On amendment to the Erlenborn substitute containing special provisions for certain overtime pay for transit employees. (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 185 to 208).	Nay.
147	May 11	On amendment to the Erlenborn substitute, deleting language permitting employment of youths at wages below adult minimum. (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 170 to 228).	Nay.
148	May 11	On the Erlenborn amendment in the nature of a substitute bill, as amended (see rollcall 145). (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 217 to 191)	Yea.
149	May 11	On passage, in the form of the Erlenborn substitute as amended, providing step increases—instead of an immediate increase—in Federal minimum wages and no new coverage. (Passed, 330 to 78).	Nay.
		H.R. 7378, establishing a Commission on Revision of the Judicial Circuits of the United States:	
151	May 15	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 319 to 25)	Yea.
		H.J. Res. 812, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the planning and design of a national memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt:	
152	May 15	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 331 to 8)	Yea.
		H.R. 14582, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1972:	
155	May 17	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 339 to 33)	Yea.
156	May 17	On motion to concur with Senate amendment to conference report providing $170,000,000 for Amtrak after authorizing legislation becomes law. (Agreed to, 300 to 70).	Yea.
		H.R. 14734, authorizing funds for the Department of State, USIA, Peace Corps, and U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for fiscal 1973:	
157	May 17	On passage. (Passed, 305 to 65)	Yea.
		H.R. 14989, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal 1973:	
159	May 18	On amendment restoring $25,100,000 for the United Nations and deleting a provision that limits the payment to the United Nations to 25 percent of the total annual assessment. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 156 to 202).	Yea.
160	May 18	On amendment adding $1,000,000 for the Bureau of Prisons. (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 178 to 165)	Nay.
161	May 18	On amendment adding $8,500,000 for support personnel of U.S. courts. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 142 to 199)	Nay.
162	May 18	On amendment deleting all funds for the Subversive Activities Control Board. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 106 to 206)	Nay.
163	May 18	On amendment prohibiting payment of salaries to Government employees covered by bill who refuse to testify before Congress. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 132 to 180).	Nay.
164	May 18	On amendment prohibiting use of funds for wiretaps on conversations of Members of Congress or the Federal Judiciary. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected 71 to 231).	Nay.
		H.R. 6788, establishing mining and mineral research centers:	
166	May 22	On passage. (Passed, 272 to 33)	Nay.
		H.R. 11627, requiring Federal standards for auto bumpers and establishing a consumer information program on auto repair costs:	
167	May 22	On passage. (Passed, 254 to 38)	Yea.
		H.R. 15093, making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, NASA, the Veterans' Administration, and various independent agencies for fiscal 1973:	
169	May 23	On passage. (Passed, 367 to 10)	Yea.
		H. Res. 991, providing for consideration of H.R. 15097:	
170	May 24	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 359 to 6)	Yea.
		H.R. 15097, making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for fiscal 1973:	
171	May 24	On passage. (Passed, 367 to 1)	Yea.
		H.R. 9669, specifying duties of the Subversive Activities Control Board and changing its name:	
173	May 30	On passage. (Passed, 226 to 105)	Yea.
		H.R. 13918, authorizing funds for the Public Broadcasting Corporation for fiscal years 1973 and 1974:	
177	June 1	On amendment prohibiting the Corporation from making grants and entering into contracts with any corporation or institution paying their officers, employees, or performers over $42,500 per year. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 163 to 182).	Nay.
178	June 1	On amendment reducing fiscal 1973 authorization from $65,000,000 to $40,000,000 and deleting fiscal 1974 authorization. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 166 to 183).	Yea.
179	June 1	On amendment prohibiting the Corporation from conducting voter polls or public opinion surveys pertaining to Federal, State, or local elections. (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 203 to 135).	Yea.
180	June 1	On amendment prohibiting the authorization of any funds after fiscal 1973 until the General Accounting Office audits funds through fiscal 1972. (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 169 to 165).	Yea.
181	June 1	On above amendment on which a separate vote was demanded. (Rejected, 166 to 170)	Yea.
182	June 1	On passage. (Passed, 256 to 69)	Yea.
		H. Res. 965, authorizing the Speaker to appoint four Congressmen to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva, Switzerland:	
183	June 1	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 192 to 81)	Nay.
		S. 1736, authorizing construction, maintenance, financing, etc., of Federal buildings:	
185	June 5	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 278 to 40)	Yea.
		H.R. 12674, establishing a National Cemetery System within the Veterans' Administration:	
186	June 5	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 312 to 4)	Yea.
		H.R. 10310, establishing the Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge in California:	
187	June 5	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 314 to 0)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 14731, providing for enforcement of the law prohibiting shooting at birds, fish, or other animal from aircraft:	
188	June 5	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 312 to 5)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 14106, authorizing an additional $3,500,000 annually for water resources planning:	
189	June 5	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 318 to 0)	Yea.
		H.R. 15259, making appropriations for the District of Columbia for fiscal 1973:	
192	June 7	On passage. (Passed, 302 to 67)	Yea.
		H.R. 14990, authorizing $2,600,000,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal 1973:	
193	June 7	On passage. (Passed, 367 to 2)	Yea.
		S. 659, Omnibus Education Amendments of 1972:	
195	June 8	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 218 to 180)	Nay.
		H. Res. 995, providing for consideration of H.R. 12846:	
196	June 12	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 303 to 0)	Yea.
		H.R. 10792, increasing the ceiling on certain Small Business Administration loans:	
197	June 12	On passage. (Passed, 320 to 0)	Yea.
		H.R. 12846, authorizing a treatment and rehabilitation program for drug dependent members of the Armed Forces:	
198	June 12	On passage. (Passed, 322 to 1)	Yea.
		H.R. 15418, making appropriations of $2,500,000,000 for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal 1973:	
200	June 13	On passage. (Passed, 367 to 3)	Yea.
		H.R. 15417, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare; and related agencies for fiscal 1973:	
201	June 14	On procedural motion to begin consideration of bill on floor. (Agreed to, 368 to 0)	Yea.
203	June 14	On amendment deleting $20,000,000 for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 160 to 206)	Yea.
204	June 15	On amendment exempting firms employing 25 or fewer persons from compliance with the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 213 to 154).	Yea.
205	June 15	On amendment adding $364,000,000 for various education programs. (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 212 to 163)	Nay.
206	June 15	On amendment adding $15,000,000 for bilingual educational programs. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 143 to 205)	Not voting.[2]
207	June 15	On motion to recommit with instructions that bill be reduced by 5 percent. (Failed, 138 to 208)	Not voting.[1]
208	June 15	On passage of amended bill making appropriations of $28,600,000,000. (Passed, 277 to 60)	Not voting.[2]
		H.R. 13694, authorizing $6,700,000 for the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission for fiscal 1973:	
210	June 19	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed, 174 to 165, a ⅔ majority being required.)	Nay.
		S. 3343, increasing the maximum amount of the grant payable for specially adapted housing for disabled veterans:	
211	June 19	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 341 to 0	Yea.
		H. Res. 996, providing for consideration of H.R. 14370:	
214	June 21	On ordering previous question, (ending debate and precluding amendments.) (Ordered, 223 to 185)	Nay.
		H.R. 14370, providing payments of $29,600,000,000 to State and local governments (Revenue Sharing):	
219	June 22	On Byrnes' motion to recommit with instructions to delete retroactive payment of $2,650,000,000 for fiscal 1972. (Failed, 157 to 241)	Yea.
220	June 22	On passage. (Passed, 275 to 122)	Nay.

[1] Absent, if present would have voted "yea."

[2] Absent, if present would have voted "nay."

Roll No.	Date 1972	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 15585, making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and various independent agencies for fiscal 1973:	
222	June 22	On amendment reducing by $2,000,000 funds for Office of Telecommunications Policy. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 148 to 188)	Nay.
223	June 22	On amendment deleting $100,000 for the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 135 to 196)	Nay.
224	June 22	On amendment reducing personnel, salary expenses and higher paid jobs in the Executive Office of the President. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 122 to 210)	Nay.
225	June 22	On amendment prohibiting the purchase or lease of certain limousines. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 121 to 205)	Nay.
226	June 22	On passage. (Passed 322 to 11)	Yea.
		H.R. 15507, providing a Federal guarantee of $1,200,000,000 in bonds for construction of mass transit system in Washington, D.C., area:	
228	June 26	On passage. (Passed, 282 to 75)	Yea.
		H.R. 15586, making appropriations of $5,400,000,000 for public works, Atomic Energy Commission, and related agencies for fiscal 1973:	
229	June 26	On passage. (Passed, 346 to 17)	Yea.
		H.R. 15495, authorizing $21,300,000,000 for procurement, research, and development of military weapons systems:	
231	June 27	On amendment to cut $350,000,000 for the Safeguard antiballistic missile system. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 116 to 258)	Nay.
232	June 27	On amendment deleting entire $445,000,000 for further development of B–1 bomber. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 94 to 279)	Nay.
233	June 27	On amendment prohibiting the building of an ABM site in Washington, D.C., area. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 128 to 261)	Nay.
234	June 27	On amendment cutting off funding of U.S. military activity in Indo China after September 1, 1972. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 152 to 244)	Nay.
235	June 27	On passage. (Passed, 334 to 59)	Yes.
		H. Res. 1021, providing for consideration of H.R. 15390:	
236	June 27	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Ordered, 206 to 180)	Yea.
		H.R. 15390, extending temporary national debt limit:	
237	June 27	On passage. (Passed, 211 to 168)	Yea.
		H.R. 13955, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for fiscal 1973:	
239	June 28	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 382 to 8)	Yea.
240	June 28	On motion to table (kill) a motion to allow preparation of final plans for extension of the west front of the U.S. Capitol. (Failed, 186 to 206)	Nay.
241	June 28	On motion to allow preparation of final plans for extension of west front of the U.S. Capitol. (Record Teller Vote), (Failed, 181 to 197)	Yea.
		H.R. 14734, authorizing $1,000,000,000 for the State Department, USIA, Peace Corps, etc.:	
242	June 28	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 314 to 77)	Yea.
		H.R. 15587, extending the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act for six months:	
243	June 28	On passage. (Passed, 275 to 108)	Nay.
		H.R. 15690, making appropriations of $12,900,000,000 for Department of Agriculture, Environmental Protection Agency, consumer protection programs and rural development for fiscal 1973:	
246	June 29	On amendment cutting from $55,000 to $20,000 the annual amount one individual could receive in crop subsidies, excluding sugar and wool. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 189 to 193).	Nay.
247	June 29	On amendment prohibiting issuance of food stamps to strikers. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 180 to 199)	Yea.
248	June 29	On passage. (Passed, 346 to 33)	Yea.
		H. Res. 1019, providing for consideration of and waiving points of order against H.R. 14163, indemnifying farmers and ranchers who lose livestock to predatory animals:	
249	June 29	On agreeing to resolution. (Rejected, 102 to 260)	Nay.
		H. Res. 1030, providing for consideration of and waiving points of order against H.R. 15692:	
251	June 29	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 348 to 6)	Yea.
		H.R. 15692, reducing interest rates on Small Business Administration disaster loans:	
252	June 29	On procedural motion to begin consideration of bill on floor. (Agreed to, 341 to 1)	Yea.
253	June 29	On amendment to change the retroactive date in bill from July 1, 1971, to July 1, 1972. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 161 to 163)	Yea.
254	June 29	On passage. (Record Teller Vote), (Passed, 325 to 9)	Yea.
		H.R. 15585, making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President and various independent agencies for fiscal 1973:	
256	June 30	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 341 to 3)	Yea.
		H.J. Res. 1238, making a supplemental appropriation of $200,000,000 for emergency disaster relief for damage resulting from Hurricane Agnes:	
257	June 30	On passage. (Passed, 356 to 1)	Yea.
		H.R. 15390, extending temporary national debt limit (conference report):	
259	June 30	On Byrnes' motion to concur with Senate amendment but modifying it to provide for a 10% instead of a 20% increase in Social Security benefits. (Failed, 83 to 253).	Yea.
260	June 30	On motion to agree with Senate amendment increasing Social Security benefits by 20% and increasing Social Security taxes. (Agreed to, 302 to 35)	Nay.
		H.R. 15635, extending programs aimed at preventing juvenile delinquency:	
262	July 17	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 338 to 12)	Yea.
		H.R. 15657, amending and extending Older Americans Act:	
263	July 17	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 351 to 3)	Yea.
		H.R. 13152, authorizing federal aid to the states for control of predatory animals and curtailing use of toxic chemicals in such control:	
264	July 17	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 279 to 73)	Not voting.[1]
		H. Res. 1012, providing for consideration of H.R. 14424:	
265	July 18	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 374 to 4)	Yea.
		H.R. 15081, authorizing $1,290,000,000 through fiscal 1975 for programs to combat heart, lung and blood diseases:	
266	July 18	On passage. (Passed, 380 to 10)	Yea.
		H.R. 14455, authorizing $270,000,000 for communicable disease control programs:	
267	July 18	On passage. (Passed, 388 to 2)	Yea.
		H.R. 14424, establishing a National Institute of Aging:	
268	July 18	On passage. (Passed, 380 to 10)	Yea.
		H. Res. 1018, providing for consideration of H.R. 13853:	
269	July 19	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 259 to 122)	Nay.
		H.R. 13853, authorizing $5,000,000,000 in "emergency" grants for public works and community facilities:	
271	July 19	On amendment forbidding grants during any year when the projected federal budget deficit exceeds $20,000,000,000. (Record Teller Vote) (Agreed to, 197 to 194)	Yea.
272	July 19	On above amendment on which a separate vote was demanded. (Agreed to, 205 to 192)	Yea.
273	July 19	On passage. (Failed, 189 to 207)	Nay.
		H.R. 15641, authorizing $2,576,000,000 for military facilities and housing in fiscal 1973:	
275	July 20	On passage. (Passed, 372 to 17)	Yea.
		H.R. 15580, providing pay increases for District of Columbia police and firemen:	
276	July 20	On motion to recommit with instructions that increases be made retroactive to Mar. 1, 1972. (Failed, 164 to 201)	Nay.
		H. Res. 1024, providing for consideration of H.R. 13366:	
278	July 24	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 270 to 77)	Yea.
		H.R. 13366, authorizing payment for losses due to the cyclamate ban:	
279	July 24	On passage. (Passed, 177 to 170)	Yea.
		H.R. 14542, extending for 4 years certain officer promotion policies in the Air Force:	
281	July 25	On passage. (Passed, 268 to 128)	Yea.
		H.R. 12807, establishing a Federal policy concerning Government architectural-engineering contracts:	
283	July 26	On amendment requiring certain factors to be taken into account. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 114 to 276)	Nay.
		H. Res. 1057, providing for consideration of, and waiving points of order against, H.R. 12931:	
285	July 27	On ordering, previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Ordered, 214 to 162)	Nay.
		H.R. 12931, establishing a program to improve the economy and living conditions in rural areas:	
286	July 27	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 340 to 36)	Yea.
		H.R. 5741, authorizing transfer of surplus Liberty ships to States for use as artificial reefs in marine life conservation programs:	
287	July 31	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 325 to 2)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 11300, increasing Federal ship mortgage insurance for certain vessels:	
288	July 31	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 332 to 1)	Yea.
		S. 2227, authorizing the library of the highest appellate court in each State to be designated a depository library:	
289	July 31	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 333 to 1)	Yea.
		H.R. 7130, extending coverage and increasing the Federal minimum wage:	
290	Aug. 1	On motion to disagree to Senate amendments and request a conference with Senate. (Failed, 190 to 198)	Nay.
		H.R. 15474, authorizing $8,000,000 for research, treatment, etc. programs on the disease called Cooley's anemia:	
291	Aug. 1	On passage. (Passed, 377 to 11)	Yea.
		H.R. 15418, making appropriations of $2,500,000,000 for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal 1973:	
292	Aug. 2	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 378 to 9)	Yea.
		H.R. 14146, establishing a national program for the management and use of coastal zones:	
293	Aug. 2	On amendment authorizing the Secretary of Interior, instead of the Secretary of Commerce, to administer the program. (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 261 to 112).	Not voting.[1]
294	Aug. 2	On amendment providing that nothing in bill could be construed as prohibiting free and unlimited access to all public beaches. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected 190 to 191).	Not voting.[2]
295	Aug. 2	On passage. (Passed, 376 to 6)	Yea.

[1] Absent, if present would have voted "yea."

[2] Absent, if present would have voted "nay."

92D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION—Continued

Roll No.	Date 1972	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H. Res. 1071, providing for consideration of H.R. 15989:	
296	Aug. 3	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 372 to 3)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 15989, extending export control authority and establishing Council on International Economic Policy:	
297	Aug. 3	On amendment limiting statutory life of Council to 1 year. (A later voice vote deleted entire section establishing Council.) (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 192 to 174)	Not voting.[2]
298	Aug. 3	On amendment ending export controls on cattle hides, and requiring the Secretary of Commerce to obtain the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture before limiting exports of agricultural commodities. (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 177 to 158)	Not voting.[2]
		H.R. 12101, increasing annuities for widows of Supreme Court justices:	
300	Aug. 7	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 281 to 97)	Yea.
		H.R. 15883, providing Federal penalties for harming foreign officials serving in the United States:	
301	Aug. 7	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 380 to 2)	Yea.
		S. 3645, authorizing $38,500,000 for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty for fiscal 1973:	
302	Aug. 7	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 376 to 7)	Yea.
		S. 1819, extending Uniform Relocation Assistance Act:	
303	Aug. 7	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 373 to 10)	Yea.
		H.R. 11357, extending National Labor Relations Act coverage to nonprofit hospital employees:	
304	Aug. 7	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 285 to 95)	Nay.
		H.R. 15376, revising the method of computing wages of people employed under government service contracts:	
305	Aug. 7	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 274 to 103)	Nay.
		H.R. 15690, making appropriations for Department of Agriculture, Environmental Protection Agency, consumer protection programs and rural development for fiscal 1973:	
308	Aug. 9	On agreeing to conference report, making appropriations of $13,400,000,000. (Agreed to, 317 to 80)	Nay.
		H.R. 15417, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare, and related agencies, for fiscal 1973:	
309	Aug. 9	On agreeing to conference report making appropriations of $30,500,000,000. (Agreed to, 240 to 167)	Nay.
310	Aug. 9	On motion to agree with Senate amendments, with a compromise of $45,000,000 for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. (Agreed to, 373 to 27)	Yea.
		H.R. 15927, providing a temporary 20 percent increase in Railroad Retirement benefits:	
311	Aug. 9	On amendment increasing employer and employee contributions to the railroad retirement fund. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 104 to 289)	Yea.
312	Aug. 9	On passage. (Passed, 399 to 4)	Yea.
		H.R. 16029, authorizing $2,100,000 for foreign military aid and Bangladesh relief for fiscal 1973:	
314	Aug. 10	On amendment suspending aid to Brazil, until it can be determined that Brazil is not torturing political prisoners. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 65 to 325)	Nay.
315	Aug. 10	On amendment postponing the effective date of provision terminating U.S. involvement in Indochina from October 1, 1972 to December 31, 1972. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 109 to 304).	Nay.
316	Aug. 10	On amendment deleting provision terminating U.S. involvement in the Indochina war by Oct. 1, 1972, subject to POW release, MIA accounting and a partial cease fire. (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 229 to 177).	Yea.
317	Aug. 10	On amendment deleting provision to restore broader Presidential authority to ban Rhodesian chrome imports. (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 253 to 140)	Yea.
318	Aug. 10	On passage. (Passed, 221 to 172)	Yea.
		S. 2956 requiring Presidential reports to Congress on commitment of U.S. troops to combat, sending of combat-equipped troops abroad, or substantially enlarging the number of troops overseas:	
319	Aug. 14	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 345 to 13)	Yea.
		H.R. 6957, establishing the Sawtooth National Recreation Area in Idaho:	
320	Aug. 14	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 363 to 0)	Yea.
		H.R. 15692, reducing interest rates on Small Business Administration disaster loans:	
321	Aug. 14	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 360 to 1)	Yea.
		H.R. 16254, making supplemental appropriations of $1,600,000 for disaster relief for fiscal 1973:	
325	Aug. 15	On passage. (Passed, 392 to 0)	Yea.
		H.J. Res. 1278, continuing appropriations for certain Federal agencies through Sept. 30, 1972, or adjournment in cases where final action had not yet taken place on their regular fiscal 1973 appropriations:	
326	Aug. 15	On passage. (Passed, 381 to 8)	Yea.
		S. 3824, authorizing $70,000,000 for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and for public broadcasting facility grants:	
327	Aug. 15	On passage. (Passed, 377 to 8)	Not voting.[1]
		H. Res. 1094, providing that for the balance of the week conference reports may be considered on the same day as reported:	
329	Aug. 16	On agreeing to resolution. (Rejected, 159 to 223)	Yea.
		H.R. 16071, extending and expanding the Public Works and Economic Development Act:	
330	Aug. 16	On substitute amendment to amendment providing extra unemployment benefits to workers affected by Federal environmental regulations. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 162 to 209)	Yea.
331	Aug. 16	On amendment deleting provisions providing special Federal aid to employees affected by Federal environmental regulations. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 161 to 201)	Yea.
332	Aug. 16	On passage. (Passed, 285 to 92)	Nay.
		H.R. 15417, making appropriations of $30,500,000,000 for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for fiscal 1973:	
333	Aug. 16	On passage over the President's veto. (Failed, 203 to 171, a ⅔ vote being required)	Nay.
		H. Res. 1090, providing for consideration of H.R. 13915:	
336	Aug. 17	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 318 to 72)	Yea.
		H. R. 13915, limiting the use of busing to end segregated schools:	
338	Aug. 17	On amendment stating the neighborhood is "the" (instead of "an") appropriate basis for determining public school assignments. (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 254 to 131).	Yea.
339	Aug. 17	On amendment authorizing $1,500,000,000 annually for basic education programs instead of earmarking $500,000,000 already authorized. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 129 to 252).	Nay.
340	Aug. 17	On amendment deleting "or next closest" from an amendment (later agreed to) banning busing of any child except to the school closest or next closest to his home. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 174 to 211).	Nay.
341	Aug. 17	On amendment allowing courts to reopen past cases to insure that desegregation orders were in compliance with this bill. (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 245 to 141).	Yea.
342	Aug. 17	On amendment providing that the bill's restrictions on busing would not preclude court remedies for denial of equal protection of the laws. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 154 to 223).	Yea.
343	Aug. 17	On amendment allowing a student to transfer to a school where his race, color, or national origin is a majority. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 123 to 255)	Nay.
344	Aug. 17	On amendment stating that nothing in the act was intended to be unconstitutional. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 178 to 197)	Nay.
345	Aug. 17	On passage, as amended. (Passed, 283 to 102)	Yea.
		H.J. Res. 1227, authorizing approval of 5-year U.S.-Soviet (SALT) agreement limiting offensive nuclear weapons:	
346	Aug. 18	On passage. (Passed, 330 to 7)	Yea.
		H. Res. 1102, providing for consideration of the conference report on S. 3726:	
347	Aug. 18	On agreeing to resolution. (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 194 to 111)	Yea.
		S. 3726, extending export control authority and establishing Council on International Economic Policy:	
348	Aug. 18	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 183 to 124)	Yea.
		H. Res. 1095, providing for consideration of H.R. 14847, establishing moratorium on State and local air passenger fees:	
349	Aug. 18	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 215 to 23)	Yea.
		H.R. 13089, providing for acceleration of tree planting programs on national forest lands in need of reforestation:	
350	Sept. 5	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 303 to 1)	Yea.
		H.R. 12350, extending Office of Economic Opportunity programs for 2 years:	
351	Sept. 5	On agreeing to conference report authorizing $4,750,000,000 for programs including existing Legal Services Corporation within Office of Economic Opportunity. (Agreed to, 223 to 97).	Yea.
		H. Res. 1106, expressing sympathy of the House to Israel and families of members of Israeli Olympic team who were killed:	
352	Sept. 6	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 346 to 0)	Yea.
		H.R. 13514, establishing a wheat promotion program:	
353	Sept. 6	On passage. (Failed, 122 to 234)	Nay.
		H.R. 2, establishing a military medical school and scholarship program:	
355	Sept. 7	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 310 to 13)	Not voting.[2]
		H.R. 15550, authorizing transfer of certain Federal land to city of Alexandria, Va.:	
357	Sept. 11	On motion to recommit. (Agreed to, 213 to 38)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 16188, amending immigration laws to make it illegal to knowingly hire aliens not admitted for permanent residence:	
359	Sept. 12	On motion to recommit. (Failed, 53 to 297)	Nay.
		H. Res. 1115, providing for consideration of and waiving points of order against H.R. 15495:	
360	Sept. 13	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 347, 23)	Yea.

[1] Absent, if present would have voted "yea."

[2] Absent, if present would have voted "nay."

Roll No.	Date 1972	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 15495, authorizing $20,900,000,000 for military procurement:	
361	Sept. 13	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 335 to 44)	Yea.
		H.R. 14896, amending and extending national school lunch program:	
362	Sept. 13	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 380 to 0)	Yea.
		H. Res. 1114, providing for consideration of and waiving points of order against H.R. 16593:	
363	Sept. 13	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 342 to 34)	Yea.
		H.R. 16593, making appropriations of $74,600,000,000 for the Department of Defense for fiscal 1973:	
365	Sept. 14	On amendment adding $100,000,000 in transfer fund authority to replace military personnel with civilians in kitchen duties (KP). (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 265 to 116).	Not voting.[2]
366	Sept. 14	On amendment cutting off funding of U.S. military activities in Indochina 4 months after enactment. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 160 to 208)	Not voting.[2]
367	Sept. 14	On amendment reducing funds in bill by 5 percent. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 98 to 256)	Not voting.[2]
368	Sept. 14	On passage. (Passed, 322 to 41)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 16654, making appropriations for Departments of Labor, and Health, Education and Welfare, and related agencies:	
370	Sept. 19	On amendment exempting firms employing 15 or fewer persons from the Occupational Safety and Health Act. (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 191 to 182)	Yea.
371	Sept. 19	On amendment adding $15,000,000 to the $60,000,000 for bilingual education programs. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 162 to 207)	Not voting.[2]
372	Sept. 19	On passage. (Passed, 324 to 51)	Not voting.[2]
		S. 3419, establishing an independent consumer product safety commission:	
375	Sept. 20	On passage. (Passed, 319 to 50)	Not voting.[1]
		H. Res. 1122, providing for consideration of and waiving points of order against H.R. 16705:	
376	Sept. 20	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 240 to 98)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 16705, making appropriations of $4,200,000,000 for foreign economic and military aid and related international programs for fiscal 1973:	
380	Sept. 21	On amendment preventing the Overseas Private Investment Corporation from insuring new overseas investments. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 141 to 167).	Not voting.[2]
381	Sept. 21	On passage. (Passed, 169 to 141)	Not voting.[1]
		H. Res. 1132, providing for consideration of and waiving points of order against H.R. 16754:	
382	Sept. 25	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 276 to15)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 16754, making appropriations of $2,300,000,000 for military construction:	
383	Sept. 25	On passage. (Passed, 292 to 13)	Not voting.[1]
		H. Res. 1133, concurring with Senate amendments to H.J. Res. 1227, authorizing approval of 5-year United States-Soviet (SALT) agreement limiting offensive nuclear weapons:	
384	Sept. 25	On agreeing to resolution (H. Res. 1133). (Agreed to, 308 to 4)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 1121, establishing the Gateway Recreation Area in New York and New Jersey:	
386	Sept. 26	On passage. (Passed, 350 to 4)	Not voting.[1]
		H.J. Res. 1306, continuing, through Oct. 14 or adjournment, funding at existing levels for those Federal agencies whose fiscal 1973 appropriations have not yet been approved:	
387	Sept. 27	On passage. (Passed, 353 to 4)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 16012, authorizing 4 reclamation projects:	
388	Sept. 27	On passage. (Passed, 293 to 64)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 13694, authorizing funds for the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission:	
390	Sept. 28	On amendment specifying that all decisions be made by full commission except those delegated to its director. (Rejected, 145 to 182)	Not voting.[2]
391	Sept. 28	On passage. (Passed, 300 to 19)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 16742, authorizing President to prohibit travel to countries in armed conflict with the United States:	
395	Oct. 2	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed, 230 to 140, a ⅔ majority being required)	Yea.
		H.R. 15276, modifying restrictions against political activity by corporations and labor organizations having Government contracts:	
396	Oct. 2	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 249 to 124)	Yea.
		H.R. 16191, providing for measures to combat aircraft hijacking:	
397	Oct. 2	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Record Teller Vote) (Passed, 354 to 2)	Yea.
		H.R. 15859, authorizing $255,000,000 for emergency medical services:	
398	Oct. 2	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 244 to 122)	Nay.
		H.R. 16645, providing for construction of a civic center in Washington, D.C., and for other purposes:	
401	Oct. 3	On amendment deleting civic center provision. (Record Teller Vote) (Rejected, 183 to 199)	Nay.
402	Oct. 3	On amendment prohibiting construction of civic center unless approved by Senate and House Committees on District of Columbia and Appropriations. (Record Teller Vote) (Agreed to, 250 to 137).	Yea.
403	Oct. 3	On passage. (Record Teller Vote) (Passed, 212 to 169)	Yea.
		H.R. 7130, extending coverage and increasing the Federal minimum wage:	
404	Oct. 3	On motion to disagree to Senate amendments and request a conference with Senate. (Failed, 189 to 196)	Nay.
		H. Res. 1142, waiving certain rules for considering bills from October 10 to end of week:	
406	Oct. 4	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Ordered, 214 to 171)	Nay.
		H.R. 15927, providing a temporary 20 percent increase in Railroad Retirement benefits:	
407	Oct. 4	On passage over the President's veto. (Passed, 353 to 29)	Nay.
		S. 2770, authorizing $24,700,000,000 for a comprehensive water pollution control program:	
408	Oct. 4	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 366 to 11)	Yea.
		S. 1316, increasing Federal share of State meat and poultry inspection programs to 80 percent:	
409	Oct. 4	On amendment requiring Federal inspection reports to be given State agencies. (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 188 to 149)	Yea.
410	Oct. 4	On motion that the Committee of the Whole House recommend that enacting clause be stricken (killing the bill). (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 172 to 170)	Yea.
411	Oct. 4	On recommendation (above) that the enacting clause be stricken (killing the bill). (Agreed to, 173 to 169)	Yea.
		H. Res. 1145, providing for consideration of H.R. 16656:	
414	Oct. 5	On ordering previous question on resolution (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Ordered, 200 to 168)	Yea.
		H.R. 16656, authorizing $16,500,000,000 for Federal-aid highway programs for fiscal 1974–75:	
415	Oct. 5	On amendment deleting provision prohibiting judicial review of administrative actions regarding a Washington, D.C. bridge. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 125 to 173).	Yea.
416	Oct. 5	On passage. (Passed, 264 to 30)	Yea.
		H. Res. 1149, providing for consideration of H.R. 16810:	
418	Oct. 10	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 309 to 65)	Yea.
		H.R. 16810, increasing the temporary national debt limit to $465,000,000,000 and authorizing President to limit Federal spending to $250,000,000,000 for fiscal 1973:	
420	Oct. 10	On amendment providing that the President may only recommend that Congress make certain spending cuts. (Record Teller Vote), (Rejected, 167 to 216)	Nay.
421	Oct. 10	On passage. (Passed, 221 to 163)	Yea.
		H. Res. 1156, providing for consideration of H.R. 17034, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1973:	
422	Oct. 11	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 345 to 19)	Yea.
		H.R. 16654, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for fiscal 1973:	
423	Oct. 11	On motion to table (kill) a motion to instruct House conferees to insist on House language exempting firms of under 15 employees from OSHA. (Agreed to, 197 to 167).	Nay.
		H.R. 17034, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1973:	
424	Oct. 11	On passage. (Passed, 362 to 11)	Yea.
		H.R. 16924, providing certain pay incentives for Armed Forces servicemen with special skills:	
425	Oct. 11	On passage. (Passed, 337 to 35)	Yea.
		H.R. 16724, providing for public acquisition of private bus companies in Washington, D.C. area:	
427	Oct. 11	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed, 226 to 129, a ⅔ majority being required)	Yea.
		H.R. 6482, providing for certain regulation of strip coal mining:	
428	Oct. 11	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 265 to 75)	Not voting.[2]
		S.J. Res. 247, extending duration of copyright protection in certain cases:	
429	Oct. 11	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 208 to 92)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 16987, authorizing $175,000,000 in supplemental appropriations for the Maritime Administration for fiscal 1973:	
431	Oct. 12	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 351 to 3)	Yea.
		H.R. 14370, providing funds to State and local governments (Revenue Sharing):	
432	Oct. 12	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 266 to 110)	Nay.
433	Oct. 12	On agreeing to Senate amendment with an amendment limiting existing Federal matching grants for State and local social service programs to $2,500,000,000 annually (Agreed to, 281 to 86)	Yea.
		H.R. 16593, making appropriations for Department of Defense for fiscal 1973:	
434	Oct. 12	On agreeing to conference report appropriating $74,400,000,000. (Agreed to, 316 to 42)	Yea.
		H.R. 16754, making appropriations of $2,300,000,000 for military construction:	
435	Oct. 12	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 333 to 10)	Yea.
		H.R. 14989, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary and related agencies for fiscal 1973:	
436	Oct. 12	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 333 to 3)	Not voting.[1]

[1] Absent, if present would have voted "yea." [2] Absent, if present would have voted "nay."

92D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION—Continued

Roll No.	Date 1972	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 10729, Pesticide Act:	
437	Oct. 12	On agreeing to conference report. (Record Teller Vote), (Agreed to, 198 to 99)	Not voting.[1]
		H. Res. 1153, changing certain rules of the House of Representatives effective Jan. 3, 1973:	
439	Oct. 13	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 281 to 57)	Yea.
		H.R. 16654, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for fiscal 1973:	
440	Oct. 13	On motion to agree to Senate amendment with an amendment, authorizing the President to reduce bill to $29,300,000,000 but limiting individual item cuts to 13 percent. (Agreed to, 289 to 41)	Yea.
		S. 1478, regulating certain chemical substances:	
442	Oct. 13	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 240 to 61)	Nay.
		H.R. 7287, prohibiting trading in Irish potato futures on commodity exchanges:	
443	Oct. 13	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Record Teller Vote), (Failed, 116 to 150)	Nay.
		The Journal of the proceedings of Oct. 13:	
444	Oct. 14	On approval. (Approved, 248 to 3)	Yea.
		H.R. 17034, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1973:	
445	Oct. 14	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 250 to 15)	Yea.
		H.R. 12006, amending the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act:	
447	Oct. 14	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 198 to 71)	Yea.
		H. Res. 1147, authorizing overseas travel by the Committee on Public Works:	
448	Oct. 14	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 202 to 46)	Nay.
		S. 4062, providing for public acquisition of private bus companies in Washington, D.C., area:	
449	Oct. 14	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 184 to 60)	Yea.
		H.J. Res. 1331, making further continuing appropriations for fiscal 1973:	
451	Oct. 14	On passage. (Passed, 163 to 73)	Yea.
		H. Res. 1166, revising a Senate amendment to H.R. 16071, extending and expanding the Public Works and Economic Development Act, and providing for agreement thereto:	
452	Oct. 14	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 155 to 64)	Nay.
		H.R. 1, Social Security Amendments of 1972:	
455	Oct. 17	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 305 to 1)	Yea.
		H.R. 16810, increasing the temporary national debt limit to $465,000,000,000 and authorizing the President to limit Federal spending to $250,000,000,000 for fiscal 1973:	
456	Oct. 17	On agreeing to conference report with limits on President's discretion in making spending cuts. (Agreed to, 166 to 137)	Yea.
		H.J. Res. 1331, making further continuing appropriations for fiscal 1973:	
457	Oct. 17	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to, 188 to 80)	Yea.
		S. 2770, authorizing $24,700,000,000 for a comprehensive water pollution control program:	
459	Oct. 18	On passage over the President's veto. (Passed, 247 to 23)	Nay.
		H. Con. Res. 726, providing for the adjournment of the 92d Congress:	
460	Oct. 18	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to, 240 to 21)	Yea.

[1] Absent, if present would have voted "yea."

[2] Absent, if present would have voted "nay."

AN EXPLANATION OF TERMS

Of necessity, the report contains parliamentary terms with which the reader may not be familiar. An explanation of some of these terms may, therefore, be helpful:

A. A *quorum call* consists of a calling of the roll of Members to determine whether or not a quorum—a majority of Members—is present. No business may be conducted when it is found that a quorum is not present.

B. *Recommittal:* Generally, on all important bills, a motion to recommit the bill to a committee, with or without instructions, is voted upon by the House before it votes upon passage of the bill. If such a motion is adopted, it means that the bill will be changed, delayed, or even killed. However, when a motion to recommit is accompanied by instructions, the vote generally indicates whether the Member is in favor of or opposed to the change in the legislation proposed by the instructions and does not necessarily indicate his position on the bill as a whole. A motion to recommit with instructions, if adopted, does not kill the bill.

C. *Rule:* Important bills, after approval of the committee concerned, go to the House Committee on Rules where a rule, in the form of a House resolution (H. Res.) is granted covering the time allowed for debate, consideration of amendments, and other parliamentary questions.

D. *Conference Report:* Representatives from both Houses of Congress meet in conference to work out differences existing in the legislation as passed by the two bodies. Upon conclusion of their conference, a report is submitted to each House setting forth the agreements reached. Each House then must act by way of adopting or rejecting the conference report in whole or in part.

E. *Previous question:* A motion which, if adopted, shuts off further debate on the question before the House and prevents further amendments to such proposition.

F. *Laying on the table:* A motion to lay a bill on the table, if adopted, kills the bill.

G. The type of bill can be determined by the letters which precede its number. All bills that originate in the House are designated by an "H," those that originate in the Senate by an "S." There are four main types:

(1) *H.R.* (*S.*) designates a bill which, when passed by both Houses in identical form and signed by the President, becomes law.

(2) *H.J. Res.* (*S.J. Res.*) designates a joint resolution which must pass both Houses and be signed by the President before becoming law. It is generally used for continuing the life of an existing law, or in submitting to the States a constitutional amendment, in which case it does not require the signature of the President but must be passed by a two-thirds majority of both Houses.

(3) *H. Con. Res.* (*S. Con. Res.*) designates a concurrent resolution. To become effective it must be passed by both the House and Senate but does not require the President's signature. It is used to take joint action which is purely within the jurisdiction of Congress. Many emergency laws carry the provision that they may be terminated by concurrent resolution, thus eliminating the possibility of a Presidential veto.

(4) *H. Res.* (*S. Res.*) designates a simple resolution of either body. It does not require approval by the other body nor the signature of the President. It is used to deal with matters that concern one House only, such as changing rules, creating special committees, and so forth.

Record teller vote occurs when requested by one-fifth of a quorum. As Members file past appointed "tellers" their names and votes are recorded.

Rollcall vote occurs when requested by one-fifth of those present. Members indicate their votes by responding "Aye" or "No" when their names are called in alphabetical order.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD A. GARMATZ

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in extending best wishes to our distinguished Member from Maryland, EDWARD A. GARMATZ, upon his retirement.

It has been my privilege to serve with EDWARD GARMATZ on the Merchant Marine Committee while he was chairman. Under his capable and intelligent leadership, Congress found a new concern for our maritime industry, our ecology, and our marine and wildlife.

The record of legislation produced by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee while chaired by Mr. GARMATZ has been high in quantity and quality. I am proud to have been a part of that record and to have had the opportunity to work with Chairman GARMATZ, whom I consider one of the most capable committee chairmen in the House.

I know the people of his district and State will miss him after 24 years of service. The Nation loses a great legislator and dedicated public servant with his retirement. The chairman's long record of accomplishments as a Member of this body will continue to contribute to the Nation and endure as a lasting tribute to him.

I wish him the very best of success and happiness in the future.

VOTING RECORD

HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an account of my voting and attendance record for both sessions of the 92d Congress.

This report includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The format that I

have used includes a brief description of each bill. This was done for the purpose of identification since limited space prevents the inclusion of a detailed explanation of every measure or an account of every issue involved.

I will provide a copy of this voting record to any of my constituents who request it. If more detailed information concerning any particular bill is desired, I will be very happy to furnish it.

My voting record follows:

92D CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

1971	Measure, question and result	Vote
Jan. 21	Call by States	Present.
Jan. 21	Election of Speaker of the House	Gerald Ford.
Jan. 21	Call of the House	Present.
Jan. 21	Call of the House	Present.
Jan. 22	Call of the House	Present.
Jan. 22	Call of the House	Present.
Jan. 22	H. Res. 5—A resolution relative to the adoption of the Rules of the House of Representatives for the 92d Congress (on ordering the previous question) (failed 134–254)	No.
Jan. 22	H. Res. 5—A resolution relative to adoption of the Rules of the House of Representatives for the 92d Congress. On ordering the previous question on the Sisk of California amendment (to strike all language from the resolution regarding the 21-day rule adopted in the Democratic caucus) and on the resolution (passed 213–174).	No.
Jan. 22	H. Res. 5—On the Sisk of California amendment to the resolution (passed 234–153)	Yes.
Jan. 22	H. Res. 5—On the resolution (passed 226–156, present 1)	No.
Feb. 2	Call of the House	Absent.
Feb. 4	Call of the House	Present.
Feb. 4	H. Res. 193—A resolution relative to election of Members to standing committees. On ordering the previous question (passed 259–32, present 42)	Yes.
Mar. 2	H. Res. 264—A resolution to authorize the production of certain documents and information and the testimony or depositions of House employees. On agreeing to the resolution (passed 292–63).	Yes.
Mar. 3	Call of the House	Present.
Mar. 3	H.R. 4690—A bill to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act and for other purposes. On passage (passed 228–162)	No.
Mar. 10	Call of the House	Present.
Mar. 10	H.R. 4246—A bill to extend until Mar. 31, 1973, certain provisions of the law relating to interest rates, mortgage credit controls, and cost-of-living stabilization on passage (passed 382–19).	Yes.
Mar. 10	H.R. 5432—A bill to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax and for other purposes. On passage. (Passed 393–5)	Yes.
Mar. 16	H.R. 4690—A bill to increase the public debt limit set forth in Section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act and for other purposes. On agreeing to the Conference Report (passed 360–3, present 1).	Not Voting.
Mar. 16	H.J. Res. 465—A joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1971 for the Department of Labor and for other purposes. On passage (passed 355–0).	Not voting.
Mar. 17	Call of the House	Present.
Mar. 17	Call of the House	Present.
Mar. 18	Call of the House	Present.
Mar. 18	H.J. Res. 468—A joint resolution making certain further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1971. On Yates amendment to eliminate appropriation for development of SST prototypes from Department of Transportation fiscal year 1971 continuing appropriations (passed 216–203, present 1).	No.
Mar. 23	Call of the House	Present.
Mar. 23	H.J. Res. 223—Extend right to vote to 18-year-olds. On agreeing to the joint resolution (passed 401–19)	Yes.
Mar. 24	H. Res. 339—A resolution providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 7 to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to provide an additional source of financing for the rural telephone program. On agreeing to the resolution (passed 366–26).	Yes.
Mar. 24	H.R. 7—To amend the Rural Electrification Act to provide an additional source of financing for the rural telephone program. On agreeing to the resolution (passed 269–127).	Yes.
Mar. 3	H.R. 4690—a bill to increase the public debt limit. Recorded teller vote on Patman Amendment. (Failed 180–212)	Yes.
Mar. 18	H.J. Res. 468—joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for Fiscal Year 1971—Yates Amendment to the resolution eliminates the appropriation for development of SST prototypes from Department of Transportation's FY 1971 continuing appropriations. (Passed 217–204).	No.
Mar. 29	H. Res. 349—a resolution providing for consideration of S.J. Res. 55, a joint resolution to provide a temporary extension of certain provisions of law relating to interest rates and cost-of-living stabilization. (Passed 324–6).	Yes.
Mar. 29	Call in Committee	Present.
Mar. 29	S.J. Res. 55—on Reuss Amendment. (Failed 143–183)	No.
Mar. 30	Call in Committee	Absent.
Mar. 31	Call of the House	Present.
Mar. 31	H.R. 6531—to amend military Selective Service Act Recorded teller vote on Harrington Amendment to terminate the draft by June 30, 1971. (Failed 62–331)	No.
Mar. 31	H.R. 6531—On the Whalen Amendment to restrict the draft to a 1 year instead of a 2 year extension. (Failed 198–200)	Yes.
Apr. 1	Call of the House	Absent.
Apr. 1	Call in Committee	Present.
Apr. 1	H.R. 6531—Dennis Amendment to provide that conscientious objectors serve in public service for two years in lieu of three and would delete language that calls for automatic induction of conscientious objectors who served unsatisfactorily in public service. (Failed 132–242).	No.
Apr. 1	H.R. 6531—Fraser Amendment to provide that no person who is inducted after December 31, 1971 may be required to serve on duty in Indochina. (Failed 122–260)	Not voting.
Apr. 1	H.R. 6531—Gibbons Amendment to provide that no person inducted after June 30, 1971 may be used in combat zone unless armed attack has been made or is imminent upon the U.S. (Failed 96–278).	No.
Apr. 1	H.R. 6531—Carney Amendment to extend draft for 18 months instead of 2 years. (Failed 170–200, present 1)	No.
Apr. 1	H.R. 6531—To amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967; to increase military pay; to authorize military active duty strengths of Fiscal Year 1972 and for other purposes. On passage (passed 293–99, present 2).	Yes.
Apr. 6	Call of the House	Present.
Apr. 6	Call in Committee	Present.
Apr. 6	H. Res. 356—A resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 5981—to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish feed grain bases, wheat domestic allotments and upland cotton base acreage allotments for certain groups of sugar beets. On agreeing to the resolution (Passed 182–177).	No.
Apr. 6	Call in Committee	Present.
Apr. 6	H.R. 5981—On preferential motion that the committee rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out. (Passed 193–115).	Yes.
Apr. 7	Call in Committee	Present.
Apr. 7	H.R. 7016—Office of Education appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1972—vote on Hathaway amendment to increase funding for 26 separate educational programs totaling $728.9 million. (Failed 188–191, present 1).	No.
Apr. 7	H.R. 7016—Conte amendment to strike section 309 which provides that no funds of this act may be used to force any desegregated school to take action to force the busing of children or to force the transfer of children. (Failed 149–206).	No.
Apr. 7	H.R. 7016—A bill making appropriations for the Office of Education for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1972. On passage. (Passed 355–7)	Yes.
Apr. 19	H.R. 1535—To amend Section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. On motion to suspend the rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 192–84)	Not voting.
Apr. 20	Call of the House	Present.
Apr. 20	Call in Committee	Present.
Apr. 20	H.R. 4724—To authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce. On passage. (Passed 360–11)	Yes.
Apr. 21	Call of the House	Present.
Apr. 21	Call of the House	Present.
Apr. 21	Call of the House	Present.
Apr. 21	Call of the House	Present.
Apr. 21	Call of the House	Present.
Apr. 21	Call in Committee	Present.
Apr. 22	Call of the House	Present.
Apr. 11	H.R. 5376—To extend the Public Works Acceleration Act, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Failed 128–261).	No.
Apr. 22	H.R. 5376—On passage. (Passed 319–68)	Yes.
Apr. 27	Call of the House	Present.
Apr. 27	H.R. 2598—A bill to authorize the acquisition, training and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia. On motion to recommit (Failed 76–303).	No.
Apr. 27	H.R. 6417—To reduce the number of Class A retailers' licenses issued under the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act. On passage. (Failed 178–200)	No.
Apr. 28	Call of the House	Present.
Apr. 28	H.R. 6444—To amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 10 percent increase in annuities. On passage. (Passed 379–0)	Yes.
Apr. 29	Call of the House	Present.
Apr. 29	H. Res. 274—A resolution relative to funding the Internal Security Committee. Hays Amendment—Strike $450,000 in line 6 and insert $570,000. (Passed 257–129)	Yes.
Apr. 29	H. Res. 274—On motion to recommit. (Failed 104–275)	No.
Apr. 29	H. Res. 274—On agreeing to the resolution (Passed 300–75)	Yes.
May 3	Call of the House	Absent.
May 3	H.R. 6283—To extend period within which the President may transmit to Congress reorganization plans concerning agencies of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government. On motion to suspend the rules and pass (two-thirds required). Passed 301–20).	Not Voting.

1971	Measure, question and result	Vote
May 4	S. 531—To authorize U.S. Postal Service to receive $2 for execution of application for passport. On passage (Passed 241–124)	No.
May 5	H. Res. 422—A resolution honoring Harry S. Truman on his 87th Birthday. On agreeing to the resolution (Passed 380–0, present 1)	Yes.
May 5	H. Res. 423—A resolution providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 4604 to amend the Small Business Act on agreeing to the resolution. (Passed 381–0)	Yes.
May 5	H.R. 4604—To amend the Small Business Act—On passage (Passed 383–0)	Yes.
May 6	Call of the House	Present.
May 6	H. Res. 412—A resolution to authorize additional investigative authority to the Education and Labor Committee on agreeing to the resolution. (Failed 156–172)	No.
May 10	H.R. 5638—To extend penalty for assault on a police officer in District of Columbia to assaults on firemen. On passage (Passed 312–0)	Yes.
May 11	Call of the House	Present.
May 11	H.R. 8190—Supplemental appropriations for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1971. Giaimo Amendment—additional amount for loans to District of Columbia. (Failed 170–219).	No.
May 12	Call of the House	Present.
May 12	H.R. 8190—Boland Amendment to provide additional amount for development of a civil supersonic aircraft including the construction of two prototype aircraft of the same design. (Passed 201–195, present 2).	Yes.
May 12	H.R. 8190—Boland Amendment. (Passed 201–197, present 6)	Yes.
May 17	H.R. 7271—To authorize appropriations for commission on civil rights. On motion to suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 262–67)	Not voting.
May 17	H.R. 5257—To amend National School Lunch Act to provide funds to the Department of Agriculture for purposes of providing free or reduced price meals to needy children. On motion to suspend the rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 332–0).	Yes.
May 17	H.R. 56—To amend National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide for a national environmental data system on motion to suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 305–18).	Yes.
May 17	H.R. 5060—Criminal penalty for shooting of certain wildlife from aircraft suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 307–8)	Yes.
May 17	H.R. 2587—To establish the National Advisory Committee on the Oceans and Atmosphere. On motion to suspend the rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 293–10).	Yes.
May 18	Call of the House	Absent.
May 18	Call of the House	Absent.
May 18	H. Res. 437—Resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 3613 to provide during times of high unemployment for programs of public service employment on ordering the previous question. (Failed 182–210).	No.
May 18	H. Res. 437—Smith of California Amendment to insert "It shall also be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the text of bill H.R. 8141 as a substitute for the said committee amendment." (Passed 210–177).	Yes.
May 18	H. Res. 437—On agreeing to the resolution (Passed 350–34)	Yes.
May 18	Call of the House	Present.
May 18	S.J. Res. 100—A joint resolution to provide extension of Section 10 of Railway Labor Act with respect to current railway labor-management dispute on ordering the third reading. (Passed 265–93).	Yes.
May 19	Call of the House	Present.
May 20	H.R. 8190—To make supplemental appropriations for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1971. On agreeing to Conference Report. (Passed 264–28)	Yes.
May 20	H.R. 8190—To concur with Senate Amendment that provides for termination of civil supersonic aircraft program and refund of amounts contributed by airlines toward research and development of program. (Failed 118–156, present 1).	No.
May 24	H. Res. 415—To authorize Post Office and Civil Service Committee to conduct studies and investigations within its jurisdiction. On agreeing to the resolution. (Passed 201–88).	Not voting.
May 25	Call of the House	Present.
May 25	H. Res. 411—Resolution disapproving reorganization plan No. 1 of 1971 which would create a new agency called ACTION which would reorganize and coordinate several volunteer programs (i.e. Vista, Foster Grandparents, etc.). (Failed 131–224).	No.
May 26	Call of the House	Present.
May 26	H. Res. 155—Resolution creating a select committee of the House to conduct a full and complete investigation of all aspects of U.S. energy resources. (Failed 128–218)	No.
June 1	Call in Committee	Absent.
June 2	Call of the House	Present.
June 2	H.R. 3613—To provide during times of high unemployment for programs of public service employment for unemployed persons—Each amendment in the nature of a substitute to provide for both public service employment and reformation of the existing manpower programs stressing local control. (Failed 182–204).	Yes.
June 2	H.R. 3613—Motion to recommit. (Failed 184–202)	Yes.
June 2	H.R. 3613—On passage. (Passed 245–141, present 1).	
June 3	H. Res. 452—A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7960 to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation on agreeing to the resolution. (Passed 357–4).	Yes.
June 3	H.R. 7109—Appropriations for NASA. On passage. (Passed 303–64)	Yes.
June 4	Call in Committee	Present.
June 4	H.R. 8825—Appropriations for legislative branch for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1972 on passage. (Passed 259–26, present 3)	Yes.
June 7	H.R. 8011—To amend the Wagner-O'Day Act to extend its provisions relating to government procurement of commodities produced by the blind to commodities produced by other severely handicapped individuals. Suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 309–0).	Not voting.
June 7	H.R. 1161—To amend Agricultural Trade and Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to remove certain restrictions against domestic wine. Suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 298–13).	Not voting.
June 7	H.R. 7960—National Science Foundation appropriations (Passed 319–8)	Not voting.
June 8	Call of the House	Absent.
June 8	H. Res. 465—Providing for consideration of H.R. 8293 to continue until Sept. 30, 1973 to International Coffee Agreement Act of 1968. On agreeing to the resolution. (Passed 336–41).	Not voting.
June 9	Call of the House	Absent.
June 9	H.J. Res. 617—To authorize contribution to certain inhabitants of trust territory of Pacific Islands who suffered damages during World War II and to establish Micronesian claims commission. Motion to recommit. (Failed 166–215).	Yes.
June 9	H.J. Res. 617—On passage (Passed 225–158)	No.
June 10	Call of the House	Present.
June 10	H. Res. 471—For consideration of H.R. 8866 to amend and extend provisions of Sugar Act of 1948 on ordering the previous question to allow a limited rule specifically aimed at eliminating the quota for the continuation of the sugar subsidy for South Africa. (Passed 213–166)	Yes.
June 10	H.R. 8866—On passage. (Passed 229–128)	Yes.
June 14	H.R. 8794—To provide payment for cost of health care for members and retired and disabled members of D.C. Police and Fire Departments, Park Police, Executive Protective Service, Secret Service. On passage. (Passed 311–1).	Yes.
June 15	Call of the House	Present.
June 15	Call of the House	Present.
June 15	S. 575—Authorize funds for Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. On agreeing to Conference Report. (Passed 275–104)	Yes.
June 16	Call in Committee	Present.
June 16	Call in Committee	Present.
June 16	H.R. 8687—Fiscal Year 1972 appropriations for military procurement Leggett Amendment to add that no funds shall be used for safeguard ABM system except for deployment of Safeguard ABM System at Grand Forks, North Dakota and/or Malmstrom, Montana. On amendment. (Failed 129–267).	No.
June 16	H.R. 8687—Pike Amendment to provide no funds for development of the B–1 aircraft. (Failed 91–307)	No.
June 16	H.R. 8687—Stafford Amendment to Pike Amendment to seek to reduce research, development and evaluation funds to Fiscal Year 1971 levels as per Pike Amendment—with the additional provision of a 5 percent increase over Fiscal Year 1971 levels for inflation on amendment. (Failed 135–258).	No.
June 16	H.R. 8687—Aspin Amendment to prevent defense spending from rising above Fiscal Year 1971 level on amendment. (Failed 118–278)	No.
June 17	On motion to adjourn (Failed 30–369, present 2)	No.
June 17	H.R. 7016—Office of Education appropriations for Fiscal Year 1972—preferential motion to lay on table the Hathaway motion that House Conferees agree to Senate amendments (Passed 228–182, present 1).	Yes.
June 17	H.R. 8687—Mink substitute amendment that no funds appropriated may be expended after December 31, 1971 to support U.S. military operations in S. Vietnam, N. Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos. (Failed 82–327).	No.
June 17	H.R. 8687—Nedzi-Whalen Amendment—no funds expended after December 31, 1971 to support military personnel in S. Vietnam, N. Vietnam, Cambodia or Laos. President can recommend change in this date if it hinders U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam and return of American POW's. (Failed 158–255).	No.
June 17	H.R. 8687—Pepper Amendment. No funds expended after June 1, 1972 to support U.S. military operations in Indochina but shall not affect safe withdrawal of troops (Failed 147–237).	No.
June 17	H.R. 8687—military procurement appropriations for Fiscal Year 1972 on passage. (Passed 331–58, present 1)	Yes.
June 18	H. Res. 434—resolution to authorize additional investigative authority to Education and Labor Committee. On agreeing to the resolution. (Passed 183–119)	Yes.
June 18	H.R. 7736—Amend Public Health Service Act to extend for one year the student loan and scholarship provisions of Titles VII and VIII of such act. On passage. (Passed 299–0).	Yes.
June 21	H.R. 5237—Carry into effect a provision of the Convention of Paris for the protection of industrial property, as revised at Stockholm, Sweden on July 14, 1967. On passage (Passed 340–8).	Not voting.
June 21	S. 1538—To amend joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, as amended suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required) (Passed 336–24).	Yes.
June 21	H.R. 3146—To authorize Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the states and subdivisions in the enforcement of state and local rules within National Forest System suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required) (Passed 361–2).	Yes.
June 21	H. Res. 487—Resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 1, Social Security Amendments. On ordering the previous question. (Passed 200–172, present 2)	Yes.
June 22	Call in Committee	Absent.
June 22	Call in Committee	Present.
June 22	Call in Committee	Absent.
June 22	H.R. 1—Ullman Amendment to strike Title IV, which provides for establishment of opportunities for families program and family assistance plan. (Failed 187–234)	No.

1971	Measure, question and result	Vote
June 22	H.R. 1—Social Security amendments. On passage. (Passed 288–132)	Yes.
June 23	Call of the House	Present.
June 23	H.R. 9270—Agriculture appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. Conte amendment to provide that none of these funds shall be used to formulate any single 1972 crop-year price support program, other than for sugar and wool, under which the total amount of payments to a person under such program would be in excess of $20,000. (Passed 214–198).	Yes.
June 23	H.R. 9270—Reuss amendment that no appropriated funds shall be used for engineering or construction of any stream channelization measure under any program administered by Secretary of Agriculture unless such channelization is in a project a part of which was in the construction stage before July 1, 1971. (Failed 129–278).	No.
June 23	H.R. 9270—Michel amendment that none of these funds shall be used to make food stamps available to household that needs assistance because any member of the household is on strike. (Failed 172–225).	Yes.
June 24	Call in Committee	Present.
June 24	H.R. 9272—Appropriations for State, Commerce, Justice Departments for fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. Yates amendment—to restore funds for payment of U.S. dues to the International Labor Organization. (Failed 147–227.)	No.
June 24	H.R. 9272—Gonzalez amendment to cut funds for the community relations services. (Failed 127–233)	Yes.
June 24	H.R. 9272—On passage. (Passed 337–10)	No.
June 28	Call of the House	Present.
June 28	H.R. 6531—To amend Selective Service Act of 1967 and to increase military pay preferential motion to lay on the table the Whalen motion that House conferees be instructed to agree with the Senate on the Mansfield amendment for termination of hostilities in Indochina. (Passed 219–175.)	Yes.
June 28	Call in Committee	Present.
June 28	H.R. 9271—Treasury Department appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. On passage. (Passed 380–6.)	Yes.
June 29	Call of the House	Present.
June 29	H.R. 9417—Department of Interior appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. On passage. (Passed 400–5)	Yes.
June 30	H. Res. 489—Motion to table the resolution requesting the President to furnish the text of the study entitled "United States—Vietnam Relations, 1945–1967." (Passed 272–113).	Yes.
June 30	H.R. 7016—Office of Education appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. On agreeing to Conference Report. (Passed 376–15)	Yes.
June 30	H.R. 9382—HUD, Veterans appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. Clawson Amendment to strike out section dealing with counseling services. (Failed 164–217).	Yes.
July 1	S. 31—To provide during high times of unemployment for programs of public service employment for unemployed persons. On agreeing to Conference Report. (Passed 343–14).	Not voting.
July 1	H.R. 8629—To amend Title VII of the Public Health Service Act to provide increased manpower for the health professions. On passage. (Passed 343–3)	Not voting.
July 1	H.R. 8630—To amend Title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to provide for training of increased numbers of nurses. On passage. (Passed 324–0, present 1)	Not voting.
July 7	H. Res. 492—Motion to table a resolution directing Secretary of State to provide House with information regarding U.S. operations in Laos. (Passed 261–118)	Yes.
July 7	H.R. 8805—To exclude from the mails as a special category of nonmailable matter, certain materials offered for sale to minors; to define obscene mail. On passage. (Passed 356–25).	Yes.
July 8	Call of the House	Present.
July 8	Call in Committee	Present.
July 8	H.R. 8181—To require Federal Reserve Banks to discount certain commercial paper used to finance the export of U.S. commodities. Wylie Amendment—to retain in the law the prohibition against the Export-Import Bank financing trade loans with any nation which furnishes military assistance to any country with whom we are engaged in armed conflict. (Passed 207–153).	Yes.
July 8	H.R. 8181—Vanik Amendment—to strike provision which would exempt and remove the borrowing of the Export-Import Bank from the debt ceiling and the combined budget. (Failed 112–249).	No.
July 8	H.R. 9093—Expand and extend the desalting program being conducted by the Secretary of the Interior. On passage. (Passed 325–0)	Yes.
July 12	H.R. 8407—To authorize the District of Columbia to enter into the interstate agreement on qualification of educational personnel. (Passed 324–4)	Not voting.
July 13	Call of the House	Present.
July 13	H.R. 8699—To provide an administrative assistant to the Chief Justice of United States. On passage. (Passed 263–139)	Yes.
July 13	H. Res. 534—To direct Speaker of the House to certify a report of Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia. Motion to recommit. (Passed 226–181, present 2).	No.
July 14	Call of the House	Present.
July 14	H.R. 9667—Department of Transportation appropriations for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1972. On passage. (Passed 401–12)	Yes.
July 15	Call of the House	Present.
July 15	H.R. 9388—Atomic Energy Commission appropriations Skubitz Amendment—strike lines 9 and 10 on page 3. (Failed 162–207)	No.
July 19	H.R. 9265—Drug treatment program for servicemen, veterans and ex-servicemen. Suspend rules and pass (⅔ required). (Passed 379–0)	Not voting.
July 19	H.J. Res. 748—To authorize Administrator of VA to provide assistance in establishment of new State medical schools. Suspend rules and pass (⅔ required). (Passed 371–2).	Not voting.
July 19	S.J. Res. 111—To extend for 2 years the existing authority for the erection in D.C. of a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune. On motion to suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 288–90).	Yes.
July 20	Call of the House	Present.
July 20	H. Res. 424—A resolution providing for the consideration of the joint resolution H.J. Res. 3, to establish the Joint Committee on the Environment on agreeing to the resolution. (Passed 372–18).	Yes.
July 21	Call of the House	Present.
July 21	H. Res. 457—Expenditures from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives for certain allowances to members, officers and standing committees. (On agreeing to the resolution). (Passed 233–167)	No.
July 21	H.R. 4354—Increase width limitations for motor buses on the interstate system. On motion to recommit. (Failed 178–213, present 2)	No.
July 22	Call of the House	Present.
July 22	H. Res. 533—Additional compensation for officers and employees of the Office of Speaker of the House. On motion that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with. (Passed 371–5).	Yes.
July 22	H.R. 9844—Military Construction Authorization of 1972. On passage. (Passed 359–31)	Yes.
July 27	H.R. 9270—Agricultural appropriations. On agreeing to Conference Report. (Passed 230–162)	No.
July 27	H.R. 9272—State, Justice and Commerce Department appropriations. On preferential motion to table Edwards motion that House Conferees agree with Senate amendment dealing with the subversive activities control board. (Passed 246–141).	Yes.
July 27	Call in Committee	Present.
July 27	H.R. 10061—Labor-HEW appropriations. Yates Amendment to add $200 million for several health programs. (Failed 169–215)	No.
July 27	H.R. 10061—Giaimo Amendment—to add $82 million for several vocational rehabilitation programs. (Passed 236–153)	No.
July 27	H.R. 10061—Burke Amendment—to add $64 million for child welfare services. (Failed 185–201)	No.
July 27	H.R. 10061—Labor-HEW appropriations. On passage. (Passed 372–25)	Yes.
Jnly 27	Call of the House	Present.
July 28	H.R. 9092—To provide equitable system for fixing and adjusting rates to pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government—Gross Amendment—which eliminates nonappropriated fund employees and employees of VA canteen service from inclusion. (Failed 147–232).	No.
July 28	H.R. 9922—To extend Public Works and Economic Development Act and the Appalachian Regional Development Act. On passage. (Passed 376–27)	Yes.
July 29	Call of the House	Present.
July 29	H.R. 9382—HUD, Veterans Appropriations, on agreeing to the Conference Report. (Passed. 363–30, present 1)	No.
July 29	H.R. 9667—Department of Transportation appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. On agreeing to conference report. (Passed 393–15)	Yes.
July 29	H.R. 9667—To concur with Senate Amendment No. 5 (Civil Supersonic Aircraft Development Termination. (Passed 307–99, present 1)	Yes.
July 29	Call of the House	Present.
July 29	H.R. 10090—Public Works Appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. Mink Amendment—no funds used for testing nuclear bomb on Amchitka. (Failed 108-275).	No.
July 29	H.R. 10090—Clark Amendment to eliminate construction planning funds for the Dickey-Lincoln project (passed 199–181, present 1)	Yes.
July 29	H.R. 10090—Public Works Appropriations for fiscal year 1972. On passage. (Passed 386–4)	Yes.
July 30	Call of the House	Present.
July 30	On approval of the Journal (Passed 374–10)	Yes.
July 30	H. Con. Res. 384—Providing for adjournment. On agreeing to the resolution (Passed 334–41)	Yes.
July 30	H. Res. 566—Provide for consideration of H.R. 8432 to authorize emergency loans to major business enterprises (Lockheed). (Passed 325–68)	Yes.
July 30	H.R. 8432—Colmer Amendment to reduce government guarantee to 90 percent thereby causing private lending institutions to guarantee the remaining 10 percent. (Failed 176–205).	No.
July 30	H.R. 8432—On passage. To provide an emergency loan guarantee of $250 million to Lockheed. (Passed 192–189, present 1)	Yes.
Aug. 2	H.R. 9272—Justice, State, and Commerce appropriations for fiscal year 1972. On agreeing to Conference Report. (Passed 337–35)	Not voting.
Aug. 2	H. Res. 539—Motion to discharge resolution to direct HEW Secretary to furnish certain documents to the House of Representatives (Passed 252–129)	Yes.
Aug. 2	H. Res. 539—Resolution to direct HEW Secretary to furnish certain documents to the House of Representatives. On agreeing to the resolution. (Passed 351–36)	Yes.
Aug. 2	H.R. 3628—To provide equality of treatment for married women Federal employees. Suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 377–11)	Yes.
Aug. 2	H. Con. Res. 370—To express the sense of congress relative to certain activities of PHS hospitals, outpatient clinics, and clinical research centers. Suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 370–4).	Yes.
Aug. 2	H.J. Res. 829—Continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1972 (Passed 350–6)	Yes.
Aug. 3	Call of the House	Present.
Aug. 3	H.R. 9910—To amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (Foreign aid). On passage. (Passed 202–192)	No.
Aug. 4	H. Res. 578—Resolution providing for immediate consideration of conference report on H.R. 6531 (draft extension) and waiving all points of order against the conference report. (Passed 250–150).	Yes.
Aug. 4	H.R. 6531—Motion to recommit conference report on H.R. 6531 to the conference committee. (Failed 131–273)	No.
Aug. 4	H.R. 6531—On agreeing to the conference report. (Passed 298–108)	Yes.

92D CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

1971	Measure, question and result	Vote
Aug. 4	Call in Committee	Present.
Aug. 4	H.J. Res. 833—A Labor Dept. appropriations for fiscal year 1972 (Emergency Employment) Smith Amendment—formula for distributing funds shall be based solely on the proportion total unemployment in each state as bears to total unemployment in United States. (Failed 172–213).	Yes.
Aug. 4	H.J. Res. 833—Ford Amendment that would forbid funds to pay any State or local government which may be itself an eligible applicant. (Failed 171–219)	Yes.
Aug. 4	H.J. Res. 833—Making appropriations to the Dept. of Labor for funding of Emergency Employment Act. On Passage. (Passed 321–76)	Yes.
Aug. 5	Call of the House	Present.
Aug. 5	Call of the House	Present.
Aug. 5	Call of the House	Present.
Aug. 5	S. 581—Export Expansion Act of 1971. On agreeing to the conference report. (Passed 219–140)	No.
Aug. 5	H.R. 10061—Labor-HEW appropriations for fiscal year 1972. On agreeing to the conference report. (Passed 280–56)	No.
Sept. 8	Call of the House	Present.
Sept. 8	Call in Committee	Present.
Sept. 9	Call in Committee	Present.
Sept. 9	H.R. 9727—Bill to regulate ocean dumping. On passage. (Passed 305–3)	Yes.
Sept. 13	H. Res. 483—Resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 234 to prohibit the establishment of emergency detention camps. (Passed 345–1)	Yes.
Sept. 13	Call in Committee	Absent.
Sept. 14	Call of the House	Present.
Sept. 14	H.R. 234—Ichord Amendment to strike language that forbade imprisonment of citizens except pursuant to an act of Congress. (Failed 124–272)	No.
Sept. 14	H.R. 234—Judiciary Committee amendment which reads "no citizen shall be imprisoned or otherwise detained by the U.S. except pursuant to the act of Congress." (Passed 290–111)	Yes.
Sept. 14	H.R. 234—to prohibit detention camps. On passage. (Passed 356–49)	Yes.
Sept. 15	Call of the House	Present.
Sept. 15	Call in Committee	Present.
Sept. 16	Call in Committee	Present.
Sept. 16	H.R. 1746—Equal Employment opportunities for American workers. Erlenborn Amendment to provide court enforcement powers in lieu of "cease and desist" authority and does not broaden EEOC's jurisdiction or transfer the OFCC. (Passed 200–195)	Yes.
Sept. 16	H.R. 1746—Erlenborn Amendment. (Passed 202–197)	Yes.
Sept. 16	H.R. 1746—Motion to recommit. (Failed 130–270)	No.
Sept. 16	H.R. 1746—On passage. (Passed 285–106)	Yes.
Sept. 22	H.R. 10090—Public Works Appropriations for fiscal year 1972. On agreeing to the conference report. (Passed 377–9)	Yes.
Sept. 23	Call of the House	Present.
Sept. 23	H.R. 9166—To amend the Peace Corps Act. Gross Amendment to cut the authorization by $27 million. (Failed 113–232)	No.
Sept. 28	Call of the House	Present.
Sept. 29	Call of the House	Absent.
Sept. 30	Call in Committee	Present.
Sept. 30	H.R. 10351—to provide for continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Perkins Amendment to Brademus Amendment which reduced population requirements from 100,000 to 10,000 to qualify as a prime sponsor for benefits under the comprehensive child development provisions. (Passed 226–158)	No.
Sept. 30	H.R. 10351—Erlenborn Amendment to coordinate child development programs with other Federal day care programs by reducing the level under which a family of four would be entitled to free day care service from $6,960 to $4,320. (Failed 187–189).	Yes.
Sept. 30	H.R. 10351—Brademus Amendment to include the comprehensive child development program into H.R. 10351. (Passed 203–181)	No.
Sept. 30	H.R. 10351—Cordova Amendment to strike the automatic 4 percent set-aside for Puerto Rico of OEO funds for Headstart and other programs and placed Puerto Rico and the trust territories in the same position as the States. (Passed 202–161).	Yes.
Sept. 30	H.R. 10351—Devine Amendment to strike out the Legal Services Corporation title. (Failed 152–210)	Yes.
Sept. 30	H.R. 10351—Brademus Amendment to include comprehensive child development program into the bill. (Passed 186–183)	No.
Sept. 30	H.R. 10351—Motion to recommit with instructions to report it back with an amendment which would conform day care provisions in the bill with day care provisions contained in H.R. 1. (Passed 191–180)	Yes.
Sept. 30	H.R. 10351—To provide for continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. On passage. (Passed 351–115)	No.
Oct. 1	Call of the House	Absent.
Oct. 4	Call in Committee	Present.
Oct. 4	H. Res. 596—resolution disapproving the alternate pay plan, dated August 31, 1971, for pay adjustments for Federal employees under statutory pay systems. On motion that Committee of the Whole rise. (Failed 175–198).	No.
Oct. 4	H. Res. 596—disapproving the alternate Federal pay plan. On agreeding to the resolution. (Failed 174–207, present 1)	No.
Oct. 4	H. Con. Res. 374—calling for humane treatment of POW's. To suspend the rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 371–0)	Yes.
Oct. 4	H.R. 9961—To provide temporary insurance for members accounts of certain Federal credit unions. To suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Failed 197–122)	No.
Oct. 4	H.R. 8083—To provide for maximum entrance and retention ages, training and early retirement for air traffic controllers suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 294–0).	Yes.
Oct. 4	Call of the House	Present.
Oct. 4	H.R. 8866—To amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948. On agreeing to the Conference Report. (Passed 194–29)	Yes.
Oct. 5	Call of the House	Present.
Oct. 6	H.J. Res. 915—Supplemental appropriations for Department of Labor for fiscal year 1972. (Passed 394–9)	Yes.
Oct. 6	H.J. Res. 916—Continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1972. (Passed 387–12)	Yes.
Oct. 12	Call of the House	Present.
Oct. 12	H.J. Res. 208—Equal Rights for Men and Women Amendment. Wiggins Amendment—sought to clarify that the rights referred to in the bill were that of people, including both citizens and non-citizens. (Failed 104–254).	Yes.
Oct. 12	H.J. Res. 208—Wiggins Amendment—Sought to retain congressional authority to exempt women from the draft and retain laws as "reasonably promoting the health and safety of the people." (Failed 87–265).	Yes.
Oct. 12	H.J. Res. 208—Equal Rights for Men and Women Amendment. On passage (two-thirds required). (Passed 354–24)	No.
Oct. 13	Call of the House	Present.
Oct. 13	Call in Committee	Present.
Oct. 14	Call of the House	Present.
Oct. 14	H.R. 10835—to establish an office of consumer affairs and a consumer protection agency—Fuqua Amendment that would limit CPA's intervention in agency and court proceedings to an advisory status. (Failed 149–240).	Yes.
Oct. 14	H.R. 10835—Moorhead amendment that sought to extend the Consumer Protection Agency to participation in informal proceedings and in adjudication seeking primarily to impose a fine or penalty (failed 160–218).	No.
Oct. 14	H.R. 10835—To establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President and a Consumer Protection Agency. On passage (passed 345–44)	Yes.
Oct. 18	Call of the House	Absent.
Oct. 18	H.R. 9212—The Black Lungs Benefit bill. Motion to suspend the rules and pass (two-thirds required) (failed 227–124)	Not voting.
Oct. 18	H.J. Res. 923—The School Lunch program for needy children. Motion to suspend the rules and pass (two-thirds required) (passed 354–0)	Yes.
Oct. 18	H.R. 10458—To provide for cooperative animal disease control with Western Hemisphere countries. Suspend the rules and pass (two-thirds required) (passed 342–0)	Yes.
Oct. 18	H.R. 8140—Ports and Waterways Safety Act. Motion to suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required) (passed 336–1)	Yes.
Oct. 19	Call of the House	Present.
Oct. 19	H.R. 8687—Military Procurement Appropriations for fiscal year 1972. On ordering the previous question on motion to instruct conferees (passed 215–193, present 2)	Yes.
Oct. 19	H.R. 8687—Amends motion to instruct conferees not to accept nongermane amendments by Senate to H.R. 8687, the military procurement bill (failed 192–216, present 2)	Yes.
Oct. 19	Call in committee	Present.
Oct. 20	Call of the House	Present.
Oct. 20	H.R. 9844—Military Construction Authorization. On agreeing to the Conference Report (passed 371–26)	Yes.
Oct. 20	H.R. 10367—Alaska Land Claims Settlement. Udall amendment to provide comprehensive land planning for Alaska in addition to settlement for Natives (failed 178–217).	Yes.
Oct. 20	H.R. 10367—Alaska Land Claims Settlement. On passage (passed 334–63)	Yes.
Oct. 21	Call of the House	Present.
Oct. 21	Call in committee	Present.
Oct. 21	H.R. 10670—To establish a survivor benefit plan for military retirees. On passage (passed 372–0, present 1)	Yes.
Oct. 21	Call of the House	Present.
Oct. 21	H. Res. 624—Providing for consideration of H.R. 8787, a bill to provide Guam and the Virgin Islands with a nonvoting delegate to the House. On ordering the previous question. (Passed 280–62).	No.
Oct. 27	Call of the House	Absent.
Oct. 27	Call in Committee	Absent.
Oct. 27	H.R. 11418—Military Construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1972. On passage. (Passed 354–32)	Not voting.
Oct. 27	H. Res. 661—Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7248, the Higher Education Act. On agreeing to the resolution. (Passed 371–7)	Yes.
Oct. 27	Call in Committee	Present.
Oct. 27	Call in Committee	Present.
Oct. 28	Call of the House	Present.
Oct. 28	H.R. 7248—Higher Education Act. Quie Amendment to revise the distribution of education opportunity grants. (Failed 117–257)	No.
Oct. 28	H.R. 7248—Fraser Amendment to alter the formula for funds paid to States under educational opportunity grants. (Failed 108–220)	Yes.
Nov. 1	Call of the House	Absent.

1971	Measure, question and result	Vote
Nov. 1	H.R. 2266—Emergency School Aid Act. On motion to suspend the rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Failed 135–222)	Not voting.
Nov. 1	H.R. 9961—Credit Union share insurance amendments. On motion to suspend the rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 350–0)	Not voting.
Nov. 1	H.R. 8389—Providing narcotic treatment in correctional institutions. Motion to suspend the rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 350–2)	Not voting.
Nov. 1	H.R. 9180—To provide for the temporary assignment of a U.S. magistrate from one judicial district to another. On motion to suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 344–10).	Yes.
Nov. 1	H.R. 9323—To amend the Narcotics Rehabilitation Act. Motion to suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 346–7)	Yes.
Nov. 1	Call of the House	Present.
Nov. 1	H.R. 7854—To amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956. Motion to suspend the rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 346–7)	Yes.
Nov. 1	H.R. 11232—Farm Credit Act. Motion to suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 331–19)	Yes.
Nov. 1	Call of the House	Present.
Nov. 1	On Motion to adjourn. (Failed 51–255, present 1)	Yes.
Nov. 2	Call of the House	Absent.
Nov. 2	Call of the House	Absent.
Nov. 2	On Motion to adjourn. (Failed 8–285)	Not voting.
Nov. 3	H.R. 2—To establish a uniformed services university of health sciences. Sebelius Amendment to strike language providing that the University be located within 25 miles of D.C. (Failed 148–215)	Yes.
Nov. 3	H.R. 2—To establish a Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences. On passage. (Passed 352–31)	Yes.
Nov. 3	H.R. 7248—Higher Education Act. Erlenborn Amendment to strike Title VIII which contained general institutional aid to institutions of higher education. (Failed 83–310)	Yes.
Nov. 3	H.R. 7248—Hawkins Amendment to provide that the maintenance of effort requirement be the responsibility of the educational institutions and not the States. (Passed 210–181)	No.
Nov. 3	H.R. 7248—Quie Amendment to provide termination of funds to any institution or class of institutions after a final determination that the institution is in violation of the U.S. Constitution. (Failed 119–264)	Yes.
Nov. 3	H.R. 7248—White Amendment to strike Title IX containing the interns for political leadership program. (Passed 229–149)	Yes.
Nov. 4	Call of the House	Present.
Nov. 4	H.R. 7248—Higher Education Act. Erlenborn Amendment which allows single sex undergraduate schools, but not graduate, dental, or law schools as in the bill. (Passed 194–189)	Yes.
Nov. 4	H.R. 7248—Matsunaga Amendment. Extending benefits of land-grant colleges to the Virgin Islands and Guam. (Passed 219–158)	No.
Nov. 4	H.R. 7248—Brademas Amendment. Creating a National Institute of Education. (Passed 210–153)	No.
Nov. 4	H.R. 7248—Gross Amendment to strike out the Ethnic heritage studies title. (Passed 200–159)	Yes.
Nov. 4	H.R. 7248—Pickle Amendment. Calling for a comprehensive study of youth camp safety before implementation of federal youth camp standards. (Passed 184–166)	Yes.
Nov. 4	H.R. 7248—Broomfield Amendment. Designed to postpone any U.S. District Court order to force busing to achieve racial balance until such time as the Supreme Court has had opportunity to act on any appeal. (Passed 235–125).	Yes.
Nov. 4	H.R. 7248—Green Amendment to Ashbrook Amendment that adds language that forbids any officer or employee of HEW or the Office of Education or any other Federal agency to force States to expend state or local funds for purposes for which Federal funds cannot be expended. (Passed 231–126).	Yes.
Nov. 4	H.R. 7248—Esch Amendment to Ashbrook Amendment that would exclude local education agencies who are carrying out a plan of racial desegregation of its schools pursuant to the order of a court of competent jurisdiction. (Failed 146–216).	No.
Nov. 4	H.R. 7248—Ashbrook Amendment that prohibits the use of funds for busing of students or teachers to overcome racial imbalance or for the purchase of equipment for such transportation. (Passed 234–124).	Yes.
Nov. 4	H.R. 7248—William D. Ford Amendment that would direct the Commissioner of Education to make a full and complete report on the needs incident to carrying out plans for the elimination of racial segregation in elementary and secondary schools; to be completed on or before July 1, 1972. (Failed 92–269).	No.
Nov. 4	H.R. 7248—Pucinski amendment that adds a new title to the bill. It contains the provision of H.R. 2266 which assisted school districts to meet special problems incident to desegregation. The legal fees language was omitted and antibusing and neighborhood school amendments were added. (Passed 211–159.)	Yes.
Nov. 4	H.R. 7248—Erlenborn amendment that allows single sex undergraduate schools but not graduate or dental or law schools as in the bill. (Passed 186–181.)	Yes.
Nov. 4	H.R. 7248—Higher Education Act of 1971. On passage. (Passed 332–38.)	Yes.
Nov. 5	Call of the House	Present.
Nov. 5	H.R. 8293—International Coffee Agreement Act of 1968. On passage. (Passed 200–99.)	Yes.
Nov. 8	Call of the House	Present.
Nov. 8	H.J. Res. 191—For motion to discharge the Judiciary Committee from further consideration of H.J. Res. 191. (Passed 242–156.)	Yes.
Nov. 8	H.J. Res. 191—A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit voluntary prayer in public buildings. On passage: two-thirds required. (Failed 240–163.) Resolution failed because it fell 28 votes short of the required two-thirds required (two-thirds majority).	Yes.
Nov. 9	Call of the House	Present.
Nov. 9	Call in Committee	Present.
Nov. 9	H.R. 10729—Federal Pesticide Act of 1971. Dow amendment to Kyl amendment to eliminate waiver of essentiality for new chemicals. (Failed 152–221.)	No.
Nov. 9	H.R. 10729—Dow amendment to Kyl amendment to specify who could take the administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to court. (Failed 167–209.)	No.
Nov. 9	H.R. 10729—Eckhardt amendment to disallow recovery of funds by producers of pesticides removed from the market, unless they could show that adverse environmental effects were unknown. (Failed 168–403.)	No.
Nov. 9	H.R. 10729—Pesticide Act of 1971. On passage. (Passed 288–91)	Yes.
Nov. 10	Call of the House	Absent.
Nov. 10	Call in Committee	Present.
Nov. 10	H.R. 9212—Black Lungs Benefit Bill. Byrnes Amendment to alter disability payments under social security to black lung miners. (Failed 158–225)	Not Voting.
Nov. 10	H.R. 9212—Erlenborn Amendment to strike language that would extend for two years Federal participation in the black lung program. (Failed 133–246)	Yes.
Nov. 10	H.R. 9212—Black Lung Benefits Bill. On passage. (Passed 311–79)	Yes.
Nov. 10	H.J. Res. 946—Continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1972. Seiberling Amendment that would cut off all funds to the Defense Department by Nov. 15. (Failed 10–356)	No.
Nov. 10	H.J. Res. 946—Continuing appropriations. Resolution passed by voice vote	
Nov. 10	H.R. 8687—Military Procurement Appropriations for fiscal year 1972. Agree to language of conference report on H.R. 8687 contained in section 503 disregarding the United Nations embargo on chrome from Rhodesia. (Passed 251–100).	Yes
Nov. 10	Conference Report on H.R. 8687, the Military Procurement Bill. Passed by voice vote	
Nov. 11	H. Res. 698—Resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 11341 to provide additional revenue for District of Columbia. On agreeing to the resolution. (Passed 359–8)	Not voting.
Nov. 11	Call in Committee	Present.
Nov. 11	H.R. 11341—Additional revenue for the District of Columbia. Gross Amendment to eliminate the $44 million increase in authorization. (Failed 79–263)	No.
Nov. 11	H.R. 11341—Scherle Amendment to cut the authorization to a $25 million increase instead of $44 million. (Failed 119–210)	Yes.
Nov. 11	H.R. 11341—Jacobs Amendment to provide coverage under the District of Columbia minimum wage act for overtime pay on work over 40 hours a week. (Failed 139–179).	No.
Nov. 11	H.R. 11341—To provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia. On passage. (Passed 248–50)	No.
Nov. 15	H.R. 11302—Conquest of cancer act. Motion to suspend the rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 350–5)	Not voting
Nov. 15	H.R. 11350—To increase limit on dues for U.S. membership in the international criminal police organization. On motion to suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required. (Passed 344–0 .	Not voting
Nov. 15	S.J. Res. 132—To extend the duration of copyright protection in certain cases. Motion to suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 300–49)	Not voting.
Nov. 15	H.R. 11651—Liberalizes provisions relating to payment of disability and death pensions. Motion to suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 351–0)	Yes.
Nov. 15	H.R. 11652—Liberalizes provisions relating to payment of dependency and indemnity compensation. Suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 350–0)	Yes.
Nov. 15	H.R. 11080—To provide tax treatment of just compensation received from the U.S. with respect to property taken under the Act of Congress which created the Redwood National Park. Suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Failed 148–203).	No.
Nov. 16	Call of the House	Present.
Nov. 16	Call in Committee	Present.
Nov. 16	Call in Committee	Present.
Nov. 16	H.R. 11731—Defense Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1972. Bingham Amendment to strike out $801,600,000 for procurement of the F–14 airplane. (Failed 76–311)	No.
Nov. 17	Call of the House	Present.
Nov. 17	Call in Committee	Present.
Nov. 17	H.R. 11731—Yates Amendment to limit funding for any additional active duty personnel over the number provided for in this bill that the President may deem necessary to a 60-day period. (Failed 183–210).	No.
Nov. 17	H.R. 11731—Boland Amendment to have all forces withdrawn from Indochina by June 1, 1972. (Failed 163–238)	No.
Nov. 17	H.R. 11731—Riegle Amendment to limit total net expenditures to 95 percent of the funds budgeted. (Failed 74–307)	No.
Nov. 17	H.R. 11731—Aspin Amendment to reduce total appropriation to the fiscal year 1971 level. (Failed 114–278)	No.
Nov. 17	H.R. 11731—Defense Appropriations for fiscal year 1972. On passage. (Passed 342–51)	Yes.
Nov. 18	Call of the House	Present.
Nov. 18	Call of the House	Present.
Nov. 18	Call of the House	Absent.
Nov. 18	H. Res. 710—Providing for taking the bills S. 2819 and S. 2820 from the Speaker's Table, amending both bills by striking out all after the enacting clauses and inserting in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 9910. (Passed 269–115)	Yes.
Nov. 18	H. Res. 711—Providing for consideration of a conference report on H.J. Res. 946, making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1972. (Passed 366–15)	Yes.
Nov. 18	H.J. Res. 946—Conference Report for continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1972. (Passed 344–36)	Yes.
Nov. 19	H. Res. 699—Providing for consideration of S. 18, providing for assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. (Passed 290–3)	Not voting.
Nov. 19	S. 18—To provide assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. (Passed 271–12)	Not voting.
Nov. 29	Call of the House	Absent.
Nov. 29	H.R. 11060—A bill to limit campaign expenditures by or on behalf of candidates for Federal elective office. Springer Amendment to MacDonald Amendment to eliminate section covering rates for political broadcasting, the comparable test for newspapers and that portion requiring newspapers to give equal access to all candidates. (Failed 145–219)	No.

92D CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

1971	Measure, question and result	Vote
Nov. 29	H.R. 11060—Pickle Amendment to MacDonald Amendment to permit broadcasting stations to charge comparable rates in lieu of lowest unit change. (Passed 219–150).	Yes.
Nov. 29	H.R. 11060—Frey Amendment to strike the Section 315 provision—equal time. (Failed 95–277)	No.
Nov. 30	Call of the House	Present.
Nov. 30	H.R. 11060—Hansen Amendment to the Harvey Amendment to clairify rules governing election activities of corporations and prevent unions from using involuntary dues payments of members for political activities. (Passed 233–147).	No.
Nov. 30	H.R. 11060—Danielson Amendment to the Harvey Amendment to require candidates to supply campaign statements with the Clerk of the U.S. District Court. (Passed 230–154).	Yes.
Nov. 30	H.R. 11060—To limit campaign expenditures by, or on behalf of, candidates for federal elective office; to provide for more stringent reporting requirements. On passage. (Passed 372–23).	Yes.
Dec. 1	Call of the House	Present.
Dec. 1	Call in Committee	Present.
Dec. 1	Call in Committee	Present.
Dec. 1	H.R. 11589—To authorize the foreign sale of passenger vessels. (Passed 253–139)	Yes.
Dec. 2	Call of the House	Absent.
Dec. 2	H.R. 11932—District of Columbia Appropriations for fiscal year 1972 to go into Gommittee of the Whole for consideration. (Passed 379–0)	Not voting.
Dec. 2	Call in Committee	Present.
Dec. 2	H.R. 11932—Giaimo Amendment—to restore $72,485,000 into the appropriation to provide for the District of Columbia's Fiscal 1971 share of the metro funds. (Passed 196–183).	No.
Dec. 2	H.R. 11932—Scherle Amendment to halt funding of metro until such time as metro has complied with Section 102(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act. (Failed 163–205).	Yes.
Dec. 2	H.R. 11932—Giaimo Amendment to add metro funds to the appropriation which was passed in the Committee of the Whole. (Passed 195–174)	No.
Dec. 2	The D.C. Appropriations bill passed by voice vote.	
Dec. 2	H. Res. 719—Providing for consideration of H.R. 11955 making supplemental appropriations for Fiscal Year 1972. (Passed 307–29)	Yes.
Dec. 2	H.R. 11955—Supplemental Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1972. (Passed 271–20)	Yes.
Dec. 2	Conference Report on S. 1116 to protect wild horses and burros. Passed by Voice Vote.	
Dec. 6	H.R. 9526—To authorize the loan of 16 naval vessels to foreign government. Suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 260–116).	Yes.
Dec. 6	H.R. 11624—Transpo 1972 authorization bill. Suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Failed 203–172)	Yes.
Dec. 6	H.R. 45—To establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice. Suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Failed 240–135)	Yes.
Dec. 6	S.J. Res. 176—Interim extension of certain Housing and Banking laws. Suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 357–4)	Yes.
Dec. 6	H.R. 11809—To maintain postal service property as government property for two years in federally impacted areas. Suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Passed 259–112).	No.
Dec. 6	H.R. 10420—Marine Mammal Protection Act. Suspend rules and pass (two-thirds required). (Failed 199–150)	Yes.
Dec. 7	Call of the House	Present.
Dec. 7	S. 2007—Conference report to the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1971. (Passed 211–187)	No.
Dec. 8	Call of the House	Absent.
Dec. 8	H.R. 12067—Foreign Aid Appropriations Bill. Fraser Amendment to provide $50 million for U.S. contribution to the U.N. Development program. (Failed 119–268)	No.
Dec. 8	H.R. 12067—Foreign Aid Appropriation bill for Fiscal Year 1972. On passage. (Passed 214–179)	No.
Dec. 8	Call of the House	Present.
Dec. 8	H. Res. 728—To provide for consideration of H.R. 1163, the Strategic Storable Agricultural Commodities Act. (Passed 204–164)	No.
Dec. 8	H.R. 1163—Substitute amendment for committee amendment that sought to provide for storage of grains in producer-owned storage facilities as far as practical. (Failed 147–179).	Yes.
Dec. 8	H.R. 1163—Quie Amendment to strike the increase of 25 percent of the price support loan on wheat. (Failed 128–222)	Yes.
Dec. 8	H.R. 1163—Price amendment to offer reserve commodites for sale at 100 percent of parity. (Failed 145–201)	Yes.
Dec. 8	H.R. 1163—Jacobs Amendment that would authorize the Secretary to store grain purchased under this Act in the homes of hungry Americans who are unable to afford sufficient food. (Failed 17–271).	No.
Dec. 8	H.R. 1163—Strategic Storable Agricultural Commodities Act. On passage. (Passed 182–170)	No.
Dec. 9	Call of the House	Present.
Dec. 9	H.R. 10947—Conference report on bill to provide a job development investment credit, to reduce individual income taxes, to reduce certain excise taxes. (Passed 321–75).	Yes.
Dec. 9	H. Res. 729—Resolution providing for consideration of conference reports the same day reported during the remainder of the First Session of the 92d Congress. (Passed 342–48).	Yes.
Dec. 9	Call of the House	Present.
Dec. 9	H.R. 11955—Conference report to supplemental appropriations bill. (Passed 302–73)	Yes.
Dec. 10	Call in committee	Present.
Dec. 10	H.R. 11309—Economic Stabilization Act. Stephens Amendment as amended by the Pike Amendment and the Latta Amendment which alters retroactive pay section, includes as a prerequisite that prices have been advanced, taxes have been raised, appropriations have been made, or funds have otherwise been raised or provided for in order to cover such increases. (Passed 209–151).	Yes.
Dec. 10	H.R. 11309—Badillo Amendment to provide for public disclosure of information which policies, regulations and controls are predicated. (Failed 73–275)	Not voting.
Dec. 10	H.R. 11309—Landgrebe Amendment to allow the President determination to review pension and other retirement plans which qualify for special tax treatment under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. (Failed 170–184)	Yes.
Dec. 10	H.R. 11309—Economic Stabilization Act of 1971. On passage. (Passed 326–33)	Yes.
Dec. 10	H.R. 11341—Conference report to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia. (Passed 242–93)	Yes.
Dec. 13	Call of the House	Present.
Dec. 13	H.R. 11628—To authorize grants and loan guarantees for construction or modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities in the District of Columbia. On passage. (Failed 160–200)	No.
Dec. 14	Call of the House	Present.
Dec. 14	Call of the House	Present.
Dec. 14	Call of the House	Present.
Dec. 14	H.R. 10367—Conference Report to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. (Passed 307–60)	Yes.
Dec. 15	H.R. 11731—Conference Report to the Defense Department appropriations bill for fiscal year 1972. (Passed 293–39)	Yes.
Dec. 15	H.R. 11932—Conference Report to the District of Columbia appropriations bill for fiscal year 1972. (Passed 260–79)	Yes.
Dec. 15	Call of the House	Present.
Dec. 15	H.R. 6065—Conference Report to the Unemployment Compensation Act. (Passed 194–149)	No.
Dec. 15	H.J. Res. 1005—Continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1972. (Passed 234–86)	Not voting.
Dec. 16	Call of the House	Absent.
Dec. 16	S. 2819—To provide Foreign military and related assistance authorizations for fiscal year 1972. Morgan motion to table Ryan motion instructing house conferees to accept the Mansfield Amendment which set a policy of withdrawal of U.S. forces from Indochina within six months. Vote on the motion to table. (Passed 130–101)	Not voting.

92D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

1972	Measure, question and result	Vote
Jan. 18	Call of the House	Present.
Jan. 18	H.R. 8787—To provide that the territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands be represented by a Delegate in the House of Representatives. (Passed 232–104.)	No.
Jan. 19	Call of the House	Present.
Jan. 19	S. 382—Conference report to the election campaign reform bill. (Passed 334–20)	Yes.
Jan. 25	H. Res. 765—To provide for consideration of the conference report to S. 2819, the foreign aid authorization bill. (Passed 247–123.)	No.
Jan. 25	S. 2819—Conference report to the foreign aid authorization bill. (Passed 204–179)	No.
Jan. 26	Call of the House	Present.
Jan. 26	H.R. 6957—To establish Sawtooth National Recreation Area in the State of Idaho. (Passed 369–9)	Yes.
Jan. 27	Call of the House	Present.
Jan. 27	H.R. 8085—Relating to age requirements for appointments to positions in executive agencies and in the competitive service. (Failed 81–249.)	No.
Jan. 31	Call of the House	Present.
Jan. 31	H.R. 10086—Increases in appropriation ceiling and boundary changes in certain units of the national park system. (Passed 303–2.)	Yes.
Feb. 1	H. Res. 786—Providing for consideration of S. 2010 to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association. (Passed 335–30.)	Yes.
Feb. 1	S. 748—To authorize payment and appropriation of the second and third installments of U.S. contributions to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank. (Passed 285–102.)	No.
Feb. 1	S. 749—To authorize U.S. contributions to the special funds of the Asian Development Bank. (Passed 256–132.)	Yes.
Feb. 1	S. 2010—To provide for increased U.S. participation in the International Development Association; Archer amendment to reduce annual U.S. contribution by $480 million. (Failed 165–191.)	Yes.
Feb. 1	S. 2010—To provide for increased U.S. participation in the International Development Association. (Passed 208–165.)	No.

1972	Measure, question and result	Vote
Feb. 2	H.R. 7987—To provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the Bicentennial of the American Revolution. (Passed 388–1)	Yes.
Feb. 2	Call in committee	Present.
Feb. 2	H.R. 11394—To create an additional judicial district in the State of Louisiana to provide for the appointment of additional district judgeships; Dennis amendment to strike one judgeship for Indiana. (Passed 217–168).	No.
Feb. 3	Call of the House	Present.
Feb. 3	Call of the House	Present.
Feb. 3	H.R. 12089—To establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention. Teague of Texas amendment to prevent the Director of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention from any authority over the VA. (Failed 174–196).	Yes.
Feb. 3	H.R. 12089—To establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention. (Passed 380–0)	Yes.
Feb. 7	Call of the House	Absent.
Feb. 7	S. 1857—To amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. (Passed 328–36)	Not Voting.
Feb. 7	S. 1163—To amend Older Americans Act to provide grants to States for the establishment, maintenance, operation and expansion of low-cost meal projects, nutrition training and education projects. (Passed 350–23).	Yes.
Feb. 7	H.R. 7088—To provide for establishment of Tinicum Environmental Center in Pennsylvania. (Passed 361–8)	Yes.
Feb. 7	H.R. 12186—To strengthen penalties imposed for violation of the Bald Eagle Protection Act. (Passed 352–7)	Yes.
Feb. 7	H.R. 12741—To extend Federal Water Pollution Control Act through June 30, 1972. (Passed 340–7)	Yes.
Feb. 8	Call of the House	Present.
Feb. 8	Call of the House	Present.
Feb. 8	H. Res. 164—To establish a Select Committee on Privacy, Human Values and Democratic Institutions. (Failed 168–216)	No.
Feb. 8	H.R. 10243—To establish Office of Technology Assessment for Congress as an aid in identification and consideration of existing and probable impacts of technological application. (Passed 256–118).	No.
Feb. 9	Call of the House	Present.
Feb. 9	Call in Committee	Present.
Feb. 9	H.R. 12910—$20 billion increase in national debt ceiling. (Passed 247–147)	No.
Feb. 9	Call of the House	Present.
Feb. 9	H. Res. 796—To provide for consideration of H.J. Res. 1025 to provide a procedure for settlement of dispute of dock strike on the Pacific Coast and Hawaii. (Passed 203–170).	Yes.
Feb. 9	H.J. Res. 1025—Settlement of Pacific Coast and Hawaii dock strike. (Passed 214–139)	Yes.
Feb. 16	Call of the House	Present.
Feb. 16	Call in Committee	Present.
Feb. 17	Call of the House	Present.
Feb. 17	Call in Committee	Present.
Feb. 17	H.R. 12350—Continuation of programs authorized under Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; Quie Amendment to provide a straight two year extension of present OEO programs. (Failed 159–206)	Yes.
Feb. 17	H.R. 12350—Continuation of programs authorized under Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. (Passed 234–127)	No.
Feb. 22	Call of the House	Absent.
Feb. 23	Call of the House	Present.
Feb. 23	H.R. 12931—To provide for improving the economy and living conditions in rural America. Dow Amendment to restrict grants to public bodies to prevent profit-making polluters from receiving subsidies. (Failed 150–224)	No.
Feb. 24	Call of the House	Present.
Feb. 24	H.R. 12067—Conference Report to Foreign Assistance Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1972. (Passed 213–167)	No.
Feb. 24	H.R. 12067—Passman motion that House recede and concur with Senate Amendments to the bill. (Passed 230–138)	No.
Feb. 29	Call of the House	Present.
Feb. 29	Call in Committee	Present.
Feb. 29	H.R. 11021—Noise Control Act of 1972. (Passed 356–32)	Yes.
Mar. 1	Call of the House	Absent.
Mar. 1	H. Res. 849—Funds for Internal Security Committee. (Passed 303–102)	Yes.
Mar. 1	H. Res. 847—Funds for Education and Labor Committee. (Passed 319–78)	No.
Mar. 2	Call of the House	Present.
Mar. 2	H.R. 11384—To extend Act of September 30, 1965 relating to highway speed ground transportation by enlarging the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to undertake research and development. (Passed 361–14).	Yes.
Mar. 6	Call of the House	Absent.
Mar. 6	H.R. 2589—To require prospective jurors in Federal courts to state their race and occupation on the qualification form. (Passed 317–27)	Yes.
Mar. 6	H.R. 12828—Veterans Education and Training Amendments of 1972. (Passed 359–0)	Yes.
Mar. 8	Call of the House	Absent.
Mar. 8	S. 659—Higher Education Act Amendments of 1972 motion to table the motion to instruct conferees as to the busing amendments to S. 659. (Failed 139–270)	No.
Mar. 8	S. 659—Motion to instruct conferees to adhere to the busing amendments in S. 659. (Passed 272–140)	Yes.
Mar. 8	H.R. 1746—Conference Report on the Equal Employment Opportuntiy Act. (Passed 303–110)	Yes.
Mar. 8	H.R. 11624—To authorize funds for Transpo '72. (Passed 278–109)	Yes.
Mar. 9	Call of the House	Present.
Mar. 9	H.R. 10420—Marine Mammal Protection Act. (Passed 361–10)	Yes.
Mar. 13	Call of the House	Present.
Mar. 13	H.R. 12410—To provide evidentiary use of prior inconsistent statements by witnesses in trials in the District of Columbia. (Passed 292–32)	Yes.
Mar. 14	H.J. Res. 1097—Making certain urgent supplemental appropriations for Fiscal Year 1972. (Passed 365–16)	Yes.
Mar. 15	Call of the House	Present.
Mar. 15	Call of the House	Present.
Mar. 15	H.R. 12910—Conference Report to provide a temporary increase in the public debt limit. (Passed 238–150)	No.
Mar. 15	H.R. 11417—National Railway Passenger Act Schmitz Amendment to require all officers paid in excess of $60,000 be paid only from net profits of the corporation. (Passed 235–136)	Yes.
Mar. 15	H.R. 11417—National Railway Passenger Act. (Passed 313–63)	Yes.
Mar. 16	S. 2097—To approve Conference Report on Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act. (Passed 366–0)	Yes.
Mar. 20	H.R. 8395—To amend the Vocational Rehabiliation Act. (Passed 327–0)	No Voting.
Mar. 20	H.R. 11948—Authorizing appropriations for participation by U.S. in Hague Conference on Private International Law. (Passed 315–18)	Not Voting.
Mar. 20	H.R. 4174—To amend the Uniform Time Act. (Passed 333–7)	Yes.
Mar. 21	Call of the House	Present.
Mar. 21	H.R. 13120—To provide modification of the par value of the dollar. (Passed 343–43)	Yes.
Mar. 22	Call of the House	Present.
Mar. 22	Call in Committee	Present.
Mar. 22	H.R. 13592—To amend Public Health Service Act to provide for prevention of sickle cell anemia. (Passed 392–0)	Yes.
Mar. 23	Call of the House	Present.
Mar. 23	H.R. 13955—Legislative appropriations for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1972. (Passed 363–9)	Yes.
Mar. 27	Call of the House	Present.
Mar. 28	Call of the House	Present.
Mar. 28	H.R. 11896—Federal Water Pollution Control Act; Reuss Amendment to require industry to use by 1981 the best available waste treatment technology. (Failed 140–249)	No.
Mar. 28	H.R. 11896—Abzug Amendment to empower the Environmental Protection Agency to review and veto individual discharge permits issued by the States. (Failed: 125–268)	No.
Mar. 28	H.R. 11896—McDonald Amendment to delete the provision requiring industrial users of municipal treatment works to pay a portion of the initial Federal capital investment. (Failed 66–337).	No.
Mar. 28	H.R. 11896—Reuss Amendment to require standards regarding toxic pollutants and pretreatment be established before EPA turns the permit program over to the States. (Failed 154–251).	No.
Mar. 29	Call of the House	Absent.
Mar. 29	H.R. 11896—Mahon Amendment to retain three-year authorization but provided for annual funding in lieu of three-year contract authorization. (Failed 161–232)	Not voting.
Mar. 29	H.R. 11896—William D. Ford Amendment that provides public hearings to be held for employees who lose their employment in the case of an industry moving to meet the alleged results from any effluent limitation or order under this Act. (Passed 275–117).	Not voting.
Mar. 29	H.R. 11896—VanderJagt Amendment to direct EPA to encourage regional resource management that utilizes spray irrigation and recycling of wastes. (Passed 251–130)	Not voting.
Mar. 29	H.R. 11896—William D. Ford Amendment to preserve the rights of states to control discharges from vessels. (Passed 210–173)	Not voting.
Mar. 29	H.R. 11896—Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972. (Passed 380–14)	Yes.
April 11	Call of the House	Present.
April 11	H.R. 9552—To amend cruise legislation of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. (Passed 374–0)	Yes.
April 11	H.R. 13324—Appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce for Fiscal Year 1973. (Passed 365–13)	Yes.
April 11	H.R. 13188—Coast Guard Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1973. (Passed 373–1)	Yes.
April 12	H.R. 13336—To amend Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to extend the authorization for appropriation. (Passed 349–20)	Yes.
April 17	Call of the House	Present.
April 17	H. Con. Res. 471—To seek relief from restrictions on Soviet Jews. (Passed 360–2)	Yes.
Apr. 17	H.R. 13752—To amend the National Environmental Policy Act to provide for interim licensing of operation of certain thermoelectric generating plants. (Passed 285–78)	No.
Apr. 17	Call of the House	Present.
Apr. 18	Call of the House	Present.
Apr. 18	H.R. 45—To establish Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice. (Failed 133–252)	No.

1972	Measure, question and result	Vote
Apr. 19	Call of the House	Present.
Apr. 19	H.R. 10488—Public Buildings Act Amendments, Gross Amendment to the Udall Amendment to provide for payment at fair market value for the Morgan Annex site to the Postal Service. (Failed 196–170).	Yes.
Apr. 19	H.R. 10488—Public Buildings Act Amendments (Passed 331–40)	Yes.
Apr. 20	H.R. 14070—Providing for consideration of appropriations for NASA. (Passed 350–2)	Yes.
Apr. 20	Call in Committee	Present.
Apr. 20	Call in Committee	Present.
Apr. 20	H.R. 14070—Appropriations for NASA. (Passed 277–60)	Yes.
Apr. 25	Call of the House	Present.
Apr. 25	H.R. 14108—To authorize appropriations for National Science Foundation. (Passed 329–16)	Yes.
Apr. 26	Call of the House	Absent.
Apr. 26	H. Res. 918—To require the President to provide all information concerning military activities in Southeast Asia. On motion to table. (Passed 270–113)	Yes.
Apr. 26	H.R. 14582—Supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1972. (Passed 344–16)	Yes.
Apr. 27	Call in Committee	Absent.
Apr. 27	Call in Committee	Present.
Apr. 27	H.R. 12202—To increase contribution of Federal Government to costs of health benefits, Waldie Amendment to include postal workers in the bill. (Passed 197–148)	No.
Apr. 27	H.R. 12202—Scott Amendment to make government contribution a straight 50 percent instead of 55 percent with a 5 percent increment each year until the government contribution is 75 percent. (Failed 124–219).	No.
Apr. 27	H.R. 12202—To increase the contribution of the Federal Government to the costs of health benefits. (Passed 239–110)	Yes.
May 1	S. 2713—To provide care for narcotic addicts who are placed on probation, released on parole, or mandatorily released. (Passed 325–0)	Not voting.
May 1	H.R. 12652—To extend Civil Rights Commission for five years. (Passed 265–66)	Not voting.
May 1	H.R. 9676—Conveying lands of United States to the University of Tennessee. (Passed 319–9)	Yes.
May 1	H.R. 13334—To establish certain positions in the Department of the Treasury	No.
May 1	H.R. 13591—To designate National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases as National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases. (Passed 358–10)	Yes.
May 3	H.R. 13089—To provide for acceleration of programs for planting of trees in national forest lands in need of reforestation. (Passed 371–5)	Yes.
May 4	H.J. Res. 1174—Appropriation for special payments to international financial institutions for fiscal year 1972. (Passed 291–62)	Yes.
May 8	Call of the House	Present.
May 8	H.R. 14718—To provide public assistance to mass transit bus companies in the District of Columbia. (Failed 50–270)	No.
May 9	H.J. Res. 55—Proposing erection of a memorial on D.C. grounds in honor of Navy Seabees. (Passed 366–4)	Yes.
May 9	H.R. 4383—To authorize the Office of Management and Budget to establish a system governing the creation and operation of advisory committees. (Passed 357–9)	Yes.
May 10	H.R. 9212—Conference Report to Black Lung Benefits Bill. (Passed 275–122)	Yes.
May 10	H.J. Res. 968—Providing for consideration of H.R. 7130, the minimum wage bill. (Passed 338–57)	Yes.
May 11	S. 659—Higher Education Amendments, Yates motion to table motion to instruct conferees on busing amendments. (Failed 126–273)	No.
May 11	S. 659—Waggoner motion to instruct conferees to insist upon antibusing amendments. (Passed 275–125)	Yes.
May 11	H.R. 7130—Minimum wage bill, Anderson of Illinois Amendment to "stretch out" increases in minimum wage rates for nonagricultural workers. (Passed 216–187)	Yes.
May 11	H.R. 7130—Randall Amendment to provide overtime pay for work over 44 hours a week and after January 1, 1974 overtime pay over 40 hours a week. (Failed 186–208)	No.
May 11	H.R. 7130—William D. Ford Amendment to strike language establishing subminimum wage rates for employees under 18 years of age. (Failed 170–228)	No.
May 11	H.R. 7130—Erlenborn Amendment in the nature of a substitute. (Passed 217–191)	Yes.
May 11	H.R. 7130—Minimum wage bill as amended by the Erlenborn substitute. (Passed 330–78)	Yes.
May 15	Call of the House	Absent.
May 15	H.R. 7378—To establish a commission on revision of judiciary circuits. (Passed 319–25)	Yes.
May 15	H.J. Res. 812—authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to participate in planning and design of national memorial to Franklin D. Roosevelt. (Passed 332–8)	Yes.
May 16	Call of the House	Present.
May 16	Call in Committee	Present.
May 17	H.R. 14582—Conference Report making supplemental appropriations for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1972. (Passed 339–33)	Yes.
May 17	H.R. 14582—Mahon Amendment to recede and concur with a Senate Amendment. (Passed 300–70)	Yes.
May 17	H.R. 14734—To authorize appropriations for the State Department and USIA. (Passed 305–65)	Yes.
May 18	Call of the House	Present.
May 18	H.R. 14989—Appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and related agencies for Fiscal Year 1972; Derwinski Amendment to restore U.S. contribution to the United Nations to that of 31.5 percent from the bill's reduced contribution of 25 percent. (Failed 156–202).	No.
May 18	H.R. 14989—Railsback Amendment to restore funds requested for teaching positions in the Federal Prison System. (Passed 178–165)	No.
May 18	H.R. 14989—Mikva Amendment to restore requested funds for probations officer. (Failed 142–199)	Yes.
May 18	H.R. 14989—Yates Amendment to strike funds for the Subversive Activities Control Board. (Failed 106–206)	No.
May 18	H.R. 14989—Dingell Amendment to prohibit the payment of government employees salaries who refuse to testify before Congressional Committees. (Failed 132–180)	No.
May 18	H.R. 14989—Gonzalez Amendment to prohibit the use of funds for wiretaps on conversations of Members of Congress or the Federal Judiciary. (Failed 71–231)	No.
May 22	Call of the House	Present.
May 22	H.R. 6788—To establish mining and mineral research centers. (Passed 272–33)	Yes.
May 22	H.R. 11627—To promote competition among motor vehicle manufacturers in the design and production of safe motor vehicles having greater resistance to damage. (Passed 254–38).	Yes.
May 23	Call of the House	Absent.
May 23	H.R. 15093—HUD, Space, Science, and Veterans appropriations for Fiscal Year 1973. (Passed 367–10)	Yes.
May 24	H. Res. 991—To provide for consideration of H.R. 15097, Department of Transportation Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1973. (Passed 359–6)	Yes.
May 24	H.R. 15097—Department of Transportation appropriations for Fiscal Year 1973. (Passed 367–1)	Yes.
May 30	Call of the House	Absent.
May 30	H.R. 9669—To amend Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. (Passed 226–105)	Yes.
May 31	Call of the House	Absent.
May 31	Call of the House	Absent.
June 1	Call in Committee	Present.
June 1	H.R. 13918—To provide for improving financing for the Corporation of Public Broadcasting; Waggoner Amendment to prohibit the Corporation from making grants and entering into contracts with any corporation or institution who pay their officers, employees or performers over $42,500 per year. (Failed 163–182).	Yes.
June 1	H.R. 13918—Harvey Amendment to reduce authorization from 2 years to 1 year and reduce amount of the authorization from $65 million to $45 million. (Failed 166–183)	
June 1	H.R. 13918—Chappell Amendment to prohibit the corporation from conducting voter polls or public opinion surveys pertaining to Federal, State or local elections. (Passed 203–135)	Yes.
June 1	H.R. 13918—Heinz Amendment to prohibit authorization of any funds after Fiscal Year 1973 until GAO audits funds through Fiscal Year 1972. (Passed 169–165)	Yes.
June 1	H.R. 13918—Heinz Amendment. (Failed 166–170)	Yes.
June 1	H.R. 13918—To provide for improved financing for the Corporation of Public Broadcasting. (Passed 256–69)	No.
June 1	H. Res. 965—Authorizing Speaker of the House to appoint delegates and alternates to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva. (Passed 192–81)	Yes.
June 5	Call of the House	Present.
June 5	S. 1736—Conference Report to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959. (Passed 278–40)	Yes.
June 5	H.R. 12674—To establish a National Cemetery System within the Veterans Administration. (Passed 312–4)	Yes.
June 5	H.R. 10310—To establish Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge. (Passed 314–0)	Yes.
June 5	H.R. 14731—To prohibit shooting of certain birds, fish and other animals from aircraft. (Passed 312–5)	Yes.
June 5	H.R. 14106—To amend the Water Resources Act to authorize increased appropriations. (Passed 318–0)	Yes.
June 6	Call of the House	Absent.
June 7	Call in Committee	Present.
June 7	H.R. 15259—District of Columbia appropriations for Fiscal Year 1973. (Passed 302–67)	Yes.
June 7	H.R. 14990—Atomic Energy Commission Appropriations. (Passed 367–2)	Yes.
June 8	Call of the House	Present.
June 8	S. 659—On adoption of the Conference Report to the Higher Education Act. (Passed 218–180)	No.
June 12	H. Res. 995—To provide for consideration of H.R. 12846, Armed Forces Drug Treatment Program. (Passed 303–0)	Yes.
June 12	H.R. 10792—To increase Small Business Administration loan ceiling. (Passed 320–0)	Yes.
June 12	H.R. 12846—Armed Forces Drug Treatment Bill. (Passed 322–1)	Not Voting.
June 13	Call in Committee	Present.
June 13	H.R. 15418—Department of Interior Appropriations for fiscal year 1973. (Passed 367–3)	Yes.
June 14	H.R. 15417—Labor-HEW Appropriations for fiscal year 1973; on motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the bill. (Passed 368–0)	Not Voting.
June 14	Call in Committee	Absent.
June 15	H.R. 15417—Dennis Amendment to strike $20 million for necessary salaries for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. (Failed 160–206)	Yes.
June 15	H.R. 15417—Findley Amendment to give a year's moratorium to small business firms on Federal safety and health regulations. (Passed 213–154)	Yes.
June 15	H.R. 15417—Hathaway Amendment to add $368 million to Office of Education appropriations. (Passed 212–163)	No.
June 15	H.R. 15417—Badillo Amendment to increase amount of funding for bilingual education. (Failed 143–205)	No.
June 15	H.R. 15417—motion to recommit bill to the Appropriations Committee with instructions. (Failed 138–208)	Yes.
June 15	H.R. 15417—Labor-HEW appropriations bill for fiscal year 1973. (Passed 277–60)	No.
June 19	Call of the House	Present.
June 19	H.R. 13694—a bill to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission on motion to suspend the rules and pass. (Failed 174–165; two-thirds not having voted in favor of the measure.)	Yes.

1972	Measure, question and result	Vote
June 19	S. 3343—Veterans Compensation and Relief Act of 1972. (Passed 341–0.)	Yes.
June 20	Call of the House	Absent.
June 21	Call of the House	Present.
June 21	H. Res. 996—To provide consideration of H.R. 14370, the Revenue Sharing Bill (Passed 223–185)	No.
June 21	Call in Committee	Present.
June 21	Call in Committee	Present.
June 21	Call in Committee	Present.
June 22	Call of the House	Present.
June 22	H.R. 14370—motion to recommit the bill to the Ways and Means Committee with instructions (Failed 157–241)	Yes.
June 22	H.R. 14370—Revenue Sharing Bill (Passed 275–122)	No.
June 22	Call in Committee	Present.
June 22	H.R. 15585—Treasury, Postal Service, and Executive Office of the President Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1973; MacDonald Amendment to reduce funds for the Office of Communications Policy (Failed 148–188).	No.
June 22	H.R. 15585—Gross Amendment to strike section which provides $100,000 for salaries and expenses of the Commission on Executive, Legislative and Judiciary salaries (Failed 135–196).	No.
June 22	H.R. 15585—Udall Amendment to reduce the number of personnel paid more than $21,000 from 908 o 549. (Failed 122–210)	No.
June 22	H.R. 15585—Jacobs Amendment to limit chauffered limousines to the President (Failed 121–205)	No.
June 22	H.R. 15585—Treasury Department Postal Service and Executive Office of the President appropriations for Fiscal Year 1973. (Passed 322–11.)	Yes.
June 26	Call in Committee	Present.
June 26	H.R. 15507—To approve the National Capital Transportation Act of 1972. (Passed 282–75.)	
June 26	H.R. 15586—Appropriations for public works, Atomic Energy Commission, and related agencies for Fiscal Year 1972. (Passed 346–17.)	Yes.
June 27	Call in Committee	Present.
June 27	H.R. 15495—Military Procurement Authorization Bill; Leggett Amendment to delete $350,000,000 from the Safeguard Program. (Failed 116–258.)	No.
June 27	H.R. 15495—Pike Amendment to strike $445,000,000 authorized for further development of the B–1 bomber. (Failed 94–279.)	No.
June 27	H.R. 15495—Pike Amendment to prohibit building an ABM site in Washington, D.C. (Failed 129–261.)	No.
June 27	H.R. 15495—Harrington Amendment to set date to cut off funds for the War in Indochina by September 1972. (Failed 152–244.)	No.
June 27	H.R. 15495—Military Procurement Authorization Bill. (Passed 334–59.)	Yes.
June 27	H. Res. 1021—To provide for consideration of H.R. 15390, to provide for a 4-month extension of the present temporary level in the public debt limitation. (Passed 206–180.)	Yes.
June 27	H.R. 15390—To provide for a 4-month extension in the present temporary level in the public debt limitation. (Passed 211–168)	Yes.
June 28	Call of the House	Present.
June 28	H.R. 13955—Conference report for bill for legislative appropriations for fiscal year 1973. (Passed 382–8.)	Yes.
June 28	H.R. 13955—Motion to concur with Senate Amendment No. 36 (preferential motion would forbid funds for the extension of the West Front of the Capitol.) (Failed 186–206.)	No.
June 28	H.R. 13955—Casey motion to concur with Senate Amendment No. 36 (same as above). (Failed 181–197)	Yes.
June 28	H.R. 14734—Conference report to bill for State Department and USIA appropriations. (Passed 314–77)	Yes.
June 28	H.R. 15587—To provide a 6-month extension of the emergency unemployment compensation program. (Passed 275–108)	No.
June 29	Call of the House	Present.
June 29	Call in Committee	Present.
June 29	H.R. 15690—Agriculture appropriations for fiscal year 1973. Conte amendment to limit farm subsidies to $20,000. (Failed 189–193)	Yes.
June 29	H.R. 15690—Michel amendment to prohibit issuance of food stamps to strikers. (Failed 180–199)	Yes.
June 29	H.R. 15690—Agricultural appropriations for fiscal year 1973. (Passed 346–33)	Yes.
June 29	H. Res. 1019—To provide for consideration of H.R. 14163 to indemnify farmers and ranchers whose domestic animals are killed by predatory animals. (Failed 102–260)	No.
June 29	Call of the House	Present.
June 29	H. Res. 1030—To consider H.R. 15692 to reduce the interest rate on Small Business Administration disaster loans. (Passed 348–6)	Yes.
June 29	H.R. 15692—On motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House to consider the bill. (Passed 341–1)	Yes.
June 29	H.R. 15692—Stanton amendment to change the retroactive date. (Failed 161–163)	Yes.
June 29	H.R. 15692—To amend the Small Business Act to reduce interest rate on Small Business Administration disaster loans (Passed 325–9)	Yes.
June 30	Call of the House	Present.
June 30	H.R. 15585—Conference report to Treasury, Postal Service, Executive Office of the President. Appropriations bill. (Passed 341–3)	Yes.
June 30	H.J. Res. 1238—Supplemental appropriation for disaster relief. (Passed 356–1)	Yes.
June 30	Call of the House	Present.
June 30	H.R. 15390—To provide a 4-month extension of the temporary level in the public debt limitation; on motion to hold social security increase to 10 percent. (Failed 83–253).	No.
June 30	H.R. 15390—To concur with Senate amendment which provides for a 20 percent increase in social security benefits. (Passed 302–35)	Yes.
July 17	Call of the House	Present.
July 17	H.R. 15635—To extend for 2 years the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Control Act. (Passed 338–12)	Yes.
July 17	H.R. 15657—Comprehensive Older Americans Act of 1972. (Passed 351–3)	Yes.
July 17	H.R. 13152—Federal Animal Damage Control Act of 1972. (Passed 279–73)	Yes.
July 18	H. Res. 1012—To provide for consideration of H.R. 14424, to establish a National Institute of Aging. (Passed 374–4)	Yes.
July 18	H.R. 15081—To amend the Public Health Service Act to enlarge the authority of the National Heart and Lung Institute. (Passed 380–10)	Yes.
July 18	H.R. 14455—To extend and revise the program for the control and prevention of communicable diseases. (Passed 388–2)	Yes.
July 18	H.R. 14424—To establish a National Institute of Aging. (Passed 380–10)	Yes.
July 19	H. Res. 1018—To provide for consideration of H.R. 13853, the Emergency Community Facilities and Public Investment Act. (Passed 259–122)	No.
July 19	Call in Committee	Present.
July 19	H.R. 13853—Blackburn Amendment to provide that no funds be expended when Federal deficit is over $2 billion. (Passed 197–194)	Yes.
July 19	H.R. 13853—Blackburn Amendment. (Passed 205–192)	Yes.
July 19	H.R. 13853—Emergency Community Facilities and Public Investment Act. (Failed 189–207)	No.
July 20	Call of the House	Present.
July 20	H.R. 15641—To authorize certain construction at military installations. (Passed 372–17)	Yes.
July 20	H.R. 15580—Salary increases for police and firemen in the District of Columbia on motion to recommit to the District of Columbia Committee with instructions. (Failed 165–201)	Yes.
July 24	Call of the House	Absent.
July 24	H. Res. 1024—To provide for consideration of H.R. 13366, to provide consideration for losses as a result of the ban on cyclamates. (Passed 270–77)	Not Voting.
July 24	H.R. 13366—Compensation for losses as a result of the ban on cyclamates. (Passed 177–170)	Not Voting.
July 25	Call of the House	Present.
July 25	H.R. 14542—Air Force Officers authorized strength. (Passed 268–128)	Yes.
July 26	Call of the House	Present.
July 26	H.R. 12807—Architect and Engineers Selection Bill Eckhardt Amendment to require agency heads to solicit design proposals including life cycle costs and qualifications with 3 architect-engineer firms (Failed 114–276).	No.
July 27	Call of the House	Present.
July 27	H. Res. 1057—To provide for consideration of Conference Report to H.R. 12931, the Rural Development Act of 1972 (Passed 214–162)	No.
July 27	H.R. 12931—Conference Report to the Rural Development Act of 1972 (Passed 340–36)	Yes.
July 31	H.R. 5741—To transfer surplus Liberty ships to States for use in marine life conservation programs (Passed 325–2)	Not Voting.
July 31	H.R. 11300—Federal ship mortgage insurance for high-powered vessels (Passed 332–1)	Not Voting.
July 31	S. 2227—To authorize the Public Printer to designate the library of the highest appeallate court in each State as a depository library (Passed 333–1)	Yes.
Aug. 1	H.R. 7130—Minimum wage bill. On motion to send the bill to conference with Senate. (Failed 190–198)	Not Voting.
Aug. 1	H.R. 15474—National Cooley's Anemia Control Act. (Passed 377–1)	Yes.
Aug. 2	H.R. 15418—Conference Report to the Dept. of Interior Appropriations for FY 1973. (Passed 378–9)	Yes.
Aug. 2	H.R. 14146—Coastal Zone Management Bill. Kyl Amendment to change jurisdiction from Department of Commerce to Department of the Interior. (Passed 261–112)	Yes.
Aug. 2	H.R. 14146—Hanna Amendment to Gonzalez Amendment to guarantee free access to all beaches in coastal zone. (Failed 190–191)	No.
Aug. 2	H.R. 14146—Coastal Zone Management Bill. (Passed 376–6)	Yes.
Aug. 3	H. Res. 1071—To provide for consideration of H.R. 15989 to establish a Council on International Economic Policy. (Passed 372–3)	Yes.
Aug. 3	H.R. 15989—Culver Amendment to limit existence of the Council for one year. (Passed 192–174)	No.
Aug. 3	H.R. 15989—Gonzalez Amendment to remove President's authority to control the export of cattle hides. (Passed 177–158)	Yes.
Aug. 7	Call of the House	Present.
Aug. 7	H.R. 12101—Annuities of widows of Supreme Court Justices. (Passed 281–97)	
Aug. 7	H.R. 15883—Expanded protection of foreign officials. (Passed 380–2)	Yes.
Aug. 7	S. 3645—Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty authorization. (Passed 376–7)	Yes.
Aug. 7	S. 1819—Uniform Relocation Assistance. (Passed 373–10)	Yes.
Aug. 7	H.R. 11357—To extend coverage of nonprofit hospitals under the National Labor Relations Act. (Passed 285–95)	Yes.
Aug. 7	H.R. 15376—To revise the method of computing wage rates under the Service Contract Act of 1965. (Passed 274–103)	Yes.
Aug. 8	Call of the House	Present.
Aug. 8	Call in Committee	Present.
Aug. 9	H.R. 15690—Conference Report to Agricultural, Environmental and Consumer Protection Appropriations for fiscal year 1973. (Passed 317–80)	No.
Aug. 9	H.R. 15417—Conference Report to the Labor-Hew appropriations bill for fiscal year 1973. (Passed 240–167)	No.
Aug. 9	H.R. 15417—Motion to agree to the Senate amendment on payment to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in the Labor-Hew appropriations bill. (Passed 373–27)	Yes.

92D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

1972	Measure, question and result	Vote
Aug. 9	H.R. 15927—To amend Railroad Retirement Act to provide a temporary 20 percent increase in annuities. Springer Amendment to increase the percentage that is paid in the retirement fund by both employees and employers. (Failed 104–290).	Not Voting.
Aug. 9	H.R. 15927—To amend Railroad Retirement Act to provide a temporary 20 percent increase in annuities. On passage. (Passed 399–4)	Not Voting.
Aug. 10	Call of the House	Present.
Aug. 10	H.R. 16029—Foreign Assistance Act. Dellums Amendment to remove funds for Brazil. (Failed 65–325)	No.
Aug. 10	H.R. 16029—Whalen Amendment to change effective date of U.S. pull-out from Indochina to Dec. 31, 1972. (Failed 109–304)	No.
Aug. 10	H.R. 16029—Bolling Amendment to strike out language that calls for U.S. to withdraw from Indochina by October 1, 1972. (Passed 229–177)	Yes.
Aug. 10	H.R. 16029—Dent Amendment to strike language that restored President's authority to regulate Rhodesian chrome imports. (Passed 253–140)	Yes.
Aug. 10	H.R. 16029—Foreign Assistance Act. (Passed 221–172)	No.
Aug. 14	S. 2956—To make rules governing the use of the Armed Forces of the U.S. in the absence of a declaration of war by Congress. (Passed 345–13)	Yes.
Aug. 14	H.R. 6957—Conference Report to bill to establish Sawtooth National Recreation Area in Idaho. (Passed 363–0)	Yes.
Aug. 14	H.R. 15692—Conference Report to bill to amend Small Business Act to reduce the interest rate on Small Business Administration disaster loans. (Passed 360–1)	Yes.
Aug. 15	Call of the House	Present.
Aug. 15	Call of the House	Present.
Aug. 15	Call of the House	Present.
Aug. 15	H.R. 16254—To make certain disaster relief appropriations for fiscal year 1973. (Passed 392–0)	Yes.
Aug. 15	H.J. Res. 1278—Further continuing appropriations for Fiscal Year 1973. (Passed 381–8)	Yes.
Aug. 15	S. 3824—Authorize appropriations for Fiscal Year 1973 for the Corporation of Public Broadcasting and for making grants for construction of noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting facilities. (Passed 377–8).	Yes.
Aug. 16	Call of the House	Present.
Aug. 16	H. Res. 1094—To provide for consideration of conference reports on the same day reported (waive the three day requirement). (Failed 159–223)	Yes.
Aug. 16	H.R. 16071—To amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. Hammerschmidt Amendment to the Wright Amendment to reduce to time any employee may receive unemployment benefits from 78 weeks to 52 weeks. (Failed 162–209).	Yes.
Aug. 16	H.R. 16071—Snyder Amendment to delete Section 801 which provides unemployment compensation for those whose unemployment is caused by Federal environmental legislation. (Failed 161–201).	Yes.
Aug. 16	H.R. 16071—To amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. On passage. (Passed 285–92)	No.
Aug. 16	H.R. 15417—To override President's veto of Labor-HEW Appropriations bill (two-thirds required). (Failed 203–171; a ⅔ vote being necessary)	No.
Aug. 17	Call of the House	Present.
Aug. 17	Call of the House	Present.
Aug. 17	H. Res. 1090—To provide for consideration of H.R. 13915 to further the achievement of equal educational opportunities. (Passed 318–72)	Yes.
Aug. 17	Call in Committee	Present.
Aug. 17	H.R. 13915—Equal Education Opportunities Act. Ashbrook Amendment which qualifies the neighborhood as the appropriate basis for determining social assignments. (Passed 254–131).	Yes.
Aug. 17	H.R. 13915—Hawkins Amendment to increase authorization by $1.5 billion for Title I, assistance for educationally deprived students attending schools enrolling high concentrations of students from low-income families. (Failed 129–252).	No.
Aug. 17	H.R. 13915—O'Hara Amendment to strike language authorizing busing, except to school nearest student's residence. (Failed 174–211)	No.
Aug. 17	H.R. 13915—Green of Oregon Amendment to allow court orders and school desegregation plans already in effect under Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act to be reopened and modified to comply with the provisions of the bill. (Passed 245–141).	Yes.
Aug. 17	H.R. 13915—Mikva Amendment which states that "the limitations on student transportation contained in this section shall not preclude any court, department or agency of the United States from ordering an adequate remedy for denial of equal protection of the laws." (Failed 154–223).	No.
Aug. 17	H.R. 13915—Mizell Amendment to provide freedom of transfer, regardless of race, creed or color. (Failed 123–255)	Yes.
Aug. 17	H.R. 13915—Stokes Amendment that nothing in the bill was intended to violate any provision of the Constitution. (Failed 178–197)	No.
Aug. 17	H.R. 13915—Equal Educational Opportunities Bill. Final passage. (Passed 283–102)	Yes.
Aug. 18	H.J. Res. 1227—Approving acceptance by the President of the United States of the interim agreement between the U.S. and USSR on certain measures with respect to the limitation of strategic offensive arms. (Passed 330–7).	Yes.
Aug. 18	H. Res. 1102—To provide for consideration of S. 3726, Conference Report on bill to extend and amend Export Administration Act and to establish Council on International Economic Policy. (Passed 194–111).	Yes.
Aug. 18	S. 3726—Conference Report to bill to extend and amend Export Administration Act and to establish Council on International Economic Policy. (Passed 183–124)	Yes.
Aug. 18	H. Res. 1095—To provide for consideration of H.R. 14847, a bill relating to the levying and collection of charges on persons traveling by air. (Passed 215–23)	Yes.
Sept. 5	H.R. 13089—Conference Report to bill on Accelerated Reforestation of National Forests. (Passed 303–1)	Yes.
Sept. 5	H.R. 12350—Conference Report on Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1972. (Passed 223–97)	No.
Sept. 6	H. Res. 1106—Resolution expressing the sense of the House on the tragic killings of Israeli Olympic Team members at the 20th Olympiad at Munich. (Passed 346–0)	Yes.
Sept. 6	H.R. 13514—To enable wheat growers to establish, finance and administer a program of research and promotion to maintain and expand markets for wheat. (Failed 122–234).	No.
Sept. 7	Call of the House	Absent.
Sept. 7	H.R. 2—To approve the Conference Report on the bill to establish a Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences. (Passed 310–13)	Not voting.
Sept. 11	Call of the House	Present.
Sept. 11	H.R. 15550—To recommit bill to convey to the City of Alexandria, Virginia certain lands of the United States to the District of Columbia Committee. (Passed 213–33)	Yes.
Sept. 12	Call of the House	Present.
Sept. 12	H.R. 16188—Motion to recommit the bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act concerning illegal aliens to the Judiciary Committee. (Failed 53–297)	No.
Sept. 13	H. Res. 1115—Waiving points of order against the consideration of the Conference Report on the bill, H.R. 15495, Military Procurement Authorization. (Passed 347–23)	Yes.
Sept. 13	H.R. 15495—Conference Report on the Military Procurement Authorization (Passed 335–44)	Yes.
Sept. 13	H.R. 14896—Conference Report on the Child Nutrition and School Lunch Program bill. (Passed 380–0)	Yes.
Sept. 13	H. Res. 1114—For consideration of H.R. 16593, Department of Defense Appropriations. (Passed 342–34)	Yes.
Sept. 14	Call of the House	Present.
Sept. 14	H.R. 16593—Defense Department Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1973. Sikes Amendment to permit the civilianization of kitchen police duties in the military services to continue. (Passed 265–116).	No.
Sept. 14	H.R. 16593—Addabbo Amendment to terminate U.S. involvement in Vietnam within 4 months. (Failed 160–208)	No.
Sept. 14	H.R. 16593—Riegle Amendment to reduce appropriated amount by 5 percent. (Failed 98–256)	No.
Sept. 14	H.R. 16593—Department of Defense Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1973. On passage. (Passed 322–41)	Yes.
Sept. 19	Call of the House	Present.
Sept. 19	H.R. 16654—Labor-HEW appropriations bill. Fisher Amendment to exempt firms employing 15 persons or less from compliance with the Occupational Safety and Health Act. (Passed 191–182).	Yes.
Sept. 19	H.R. 16654—Badillo Amendment to add $13 million for bilingual education programs. (Failed 162–207)	No.
Sept. 19	H.R. 16654—Labor-HEW appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 1973. On passage. (Passed 324–51)	No.
Sept. 20	Call in Committee	Present.
Sept. 20	Call in Committee	Present.
Sept. 20	S. 3419—Consumer Product Safety Act. On passage. (Passed 319–50)	Yes.
Sept. 20	H. Res. 1122—To consider H.R. 16705, making appropriations for foreign assistance for Fiscal Year 1973. (Passed 240–98)	No.
Sept. 21	Call of the House	Present.
Sept. 21	Call in Committee	Present.
Sept. 21	Call in Committee	Present.
Sept. 21	H.R. 16705—Foreign Assistance Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1973. Gibbons Amendment to prohibit the use of funds to guarantee or insure future foreign investments. (Failed 141–167).	No.
Sept. 21	H.R. 16705—Foreign Assistance Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1973. On passage. (Passed 169–141)	No.
Sept. 25	H. Res. 1132—To provide for consideration of H.R. 16754, Military Construction Appropriations. (Passed 276–15)	Yes.
Sept. 25	H.R. 16754—Military Construction Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1973. On passage. (Passed 292–13)	Yes.
Sept. 25	H. Res. 1133—Providing the "rule" for consideration of H.J. Res. 1227, providing for agreeing to the Senate Amendment for approval of interim agreement between U.S. and U.S.S.R. with respect to limitation of strategic offensive arms. (Passed 308–4).	Yes.
Sept. 26	Call of the House	Present.
Sept. 26	H.R. 1121—To provide for the establishment of the Gateway National Seashore in the States of New York and New Jersey. (Passed 350–4)	Yes.
Sept. 27	H.J. Res. 1306—Continuing appropriations for Fiscal Year 1973. (Passed 353–4)	Yes.
Sept. 27	H.R. 16012—To authorize the Sec. of Interior to construct, operate and maintain various Federal reclamation projects. (Passed 293–94)	Yes.
Sept. 28	Call in Committee	Present.
Sept. 28	H.R. 13694—Amend the joint resolution to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. Williams Amendment to provide that all decisions would be made by Full Committee in lieu of an Executive Committee.	No.
Sept. 28	H.R. 13694—To amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. (Passed 300–19)	Yes.
Oct. 2	Call of the House	Present.
Oct. 2	Call of the House	Present.
Oct. 2	Call of the House	Present.
Oct. 2	H.R. 16742—To limit travel in hostile areas. Suspend rules and pass (two-thirds necessary). (Failed 230–140) a two-thirds vote being necessary	Yes.
Oct. 2	H.R. 15276—To exclude corporations and labor organizations from the scope of the prohibitions against government contractors in Section 211 of Title 18 of the U.S. Code. (Passed 249–124).	Yes.
Oct. 2	H.R. 16191—To allow the President to suspend air service to nations harboring skyjackers. (Passed 354–2)	Not Voting.
Oct. 2	H.R. 15859—Emergency Medical Services Act of 1972. (Passed 244–122)	Not Voting.
Oct. 3	Call of the House	Present.

1972	Measure, question and result	Vote
Oct. 3	Call in Committee	Present.
Oct. 3	H.R. 16645—To provide for the construction of a civic center in the District of Columbia. Snyder Amendement to delete Eisenhower Civic Center from the bill. (Failed 183–199).	No.
Oct. 3	H.R. 16645—Snyder Amendment to prohibit construction of civic center without approval by Senate and House Committees on the District of Columbia and appropriations. (Passed 250–137).	Yes.
Oct. 3	H.R. 16645—To provide for the construction of a civic center in the District of Columbia. (Passed 212–169)	Yes.
Oct. 3	H.R. 7130—On a motion to send the minimum wage bill to Conference. (Failed 189–196)	Yes.
Oct. 4	Call of the House	Present.
Oct. 4	H. Res. 1142—To allow the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend rules and waive the rule requiring a ⅔ vote for consideration of reports from the Committee on Rules on the same day reported during the period October 10, 1972. (Passed 214–171).	No.
Oct. 4	H.R. 15927—To override the President's veto of the bill to provide a 20 percent temporary increase in railroad retirement benefits. (Passed 353–29)	Yes.
Oct. 4	S. 2770—Conference Report on Water Pollution Control Amendments of 1972. (Passed 366–11)	Yes.
Oct. 4	S. 1316—Federal-State Meat and Poultry Inspection Bill. Kyl Amendment to provide for Federal Inspectors to report results of their inspections of State-regulated plants to the State administrative agency. (Passed 188–149).	Yes.
Oct. 4	S. 1316—Motion that the Committee of the Whole House "do now rise" and report the Federal-State Meat and Poultry Inspection Act back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out. (Passed 172–170).	Yes.
Oct. 4	S. 1316—On agreeing to the motion to strike the enacting clause from the Federal-State Meat and Poultry Inspection bill. (Passed 173–169)	Yes.
Oct. 5	Call of the House	Absent.
Oct. 5	Call of the House	Absent.
Oct. 5	H. Res. 1145—To provide for consideration of H.R. 16656, Federal Aid Highway Act of 1972 (Passed 200–168)	Not Voting.
Oct. 5	H.R. 16656—Federal Aid Highway Act of 1972. Abzug Amendment to strike language prohibiting judicial review of administrative actions relating to the construction of the Three Sisters Bridge. (Failed 125–173).	No.
Oct. 5	H.R. 16656—Federal Aid Highway Act of 1972. On passage. (Passed 264–30)	Yes.
Oct. 10	Call of the House	Present.
Oct. 10	H. Res. 1149—To provide for consideration of H.R. 16810 to provide a temporary increase in public debt limit and to limit expenditures for FY 1973. (Passed 304–65)	Yes.
Oct. 10	Call in Committee	Present.
Oct. 10	H.R. 16810—Mahon Amendment to force the President to come to Congress with recommendations for cuts in programs. (Failed 167–216)	No
Oct. 10	H.R. 16810—To provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit and to place a limitation on expenditures and net lending for FY 1973. On passage. (Passed 221–163).	Yes.
Oct. 11	H. Res. 1156—To provide for consideration of H.R. 17034 to make supplemental appropriations for FY 1973. (Passed 345–19)	Yes.
Oct. 11	H.R. 16654—Labor-HEW appropriations for FY 1973. Flood motion to table Findley motion instructing conferees to insist on the Housel anguage which forbids salaries for Federal employees who inspect firms employing 15 or less employees for compliance with the Occupational Safety and Health Act. (Passed 197–167).	No.
Oct. 11	H.R. 17034—Supplemental appropriations for FY 1973. (Passed 362–11)	Yes.
Oct. 11	H.R. 16924—Uniformed Services Special Pay Act. (Passed 337–35)	Yes.
Oct. 11	Call of the House	Present.
Oct. 11	H.R. 16724—To provide for acquisition by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority of the mass transit bus systems engaged in scheduled regular route operations in the National Capital area. Motion to suspend rules and pass (⅔ required). (Failed 226–19; ⅔ vote being necessary).	Not voting.
Oct. 11	H.R. 6482—Regulation of strip coal mining. (Passed 265–75)	Not voting.
Oct. 11	S.J. Res. 247—Extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases. (Passed 208–92)	Not voting.
Oct. 12	Call of the House	Present.
Oct. 12	H.R. 16987—To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1973 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce. (Passed 351–3)	Yes.
Oct. 12	H.R. 14370—Revenue Sharing bill Conference report. (Passed 266–110)	No.
Oct. 12	H.R. 14370—Mills motion to limit grants for social services to $2,500,000,000. (Passed 281–86)	Yes.
Oct. 12	H.R. 16593—Conference Report to Department of Defense appropriations for fiscal year 1973. (Passed 316–42)	Yes.
Oct. 12	H.R. 16754—Conference Report to Military Construction appropriations for fiscal year 1973. (Passed 333–10)	Yes.
Oct. 12	H.R. 14989—Conference Report to State, Commerce, Justice appropriations bill for fiscal year 1973. (Passed 333–3)	Yes.
Oct. 12	H.R. 10729—Conference Report to Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Bill. (Passed 198–99)	Yes.
Oct. 13	Call of the House	Present.
Oct. 13	H. Res. 1153—On adoption of the resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives with respect to House consideration of certain Senate amendments to provide for the delegates from Guam and the Virgin Islands. (Passed 281–57).	Yes.
Oct. 13	H.R. 16654—On motion to agree to the amendment of the Senate making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare. (Passed 289–41)	No.
Oct. 13	Call of the House	Absent.
Oct. 13	S. 1478—Toxic substances control act. (Passed 240–61.)	Not voting.
Oct. 13	H.R. 7287—To prohibit trading in Irish potato futures on commodity exchanges. (Failed 116–150.)	Not voting.
Oct. 14	On approval of the Journal of proceedings for Oct. 13, 1972. (Passed 248–3.)	Yes.
Oct. 14	H.R. 17034—Conference Report to bill on Supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1973. (Passed 250–15.)	Yes.
Oct. 14	Call of the House	Present.
Oct. 14	H.R. 12006—To amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. (Passed 198–71.)	Not voting.
Oct. 14	H. Res. 1147—Authorizing additional investigative authority to the Committee on Public Works. (Passed 202–46.)	Not voting.
Oct. 14	S. 4062—To provide for acquisition by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority of the mass transit bus systems engaged in scheduled regular route operations in the National Capital area. (Passed 184–60.).	Not voting.
Oct. 14	Call of the House	Absent.
Oct. 14	H.J. Res. 1331—Further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1973. (Passed 163–73.)	Not voting.
Oct. 14	H. Res. 1166—Resolution agreeing to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 16071, to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. (Passed 155–64.)	Not voting.
Oct. 14	Call of the House	Absent.
Oct. 17	Call of the House	Absent.
Oct. 17	H.R. 1—Conference Report on Social Security Amendments of 1972. (Passed 305–1.)	Yes.
Oct. 17	H.R. 16810—Conference Report on bill to provide a temporary increase in the public debt limitation and to place a limitation on expenditures and net lending for fiscal year 1973. (Passed 166–137.)	Yes.
Oct. 17	H.J. Res. 1331—Conference Report making further appropriations for fiscal year 1973. (Passed 188–80.)	No.
Oct. 18	Call of the House	Present.
Oct. 18	S. 2770—To override the President's veto of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (two-thirds vote required) (Passed 247–23)	Yes.
Oct. 18	H. Con. Res. 726—On adoption of the resolution providing for a sine die adjournment of the two Houses of Congress on Wednesday, Oct. 18, 1972. (Passed 240–21)	Yes.
Oct. 18	Call of the House	Present.
Oct. 18	Call of the House	Absent.

NATIONAL GROWTH POLICY PLANNING ACT

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in May of this year, I introduced in the Senate the Hartke National Growth Policy Planning Act of 1972, S. 3600. The act establishes a national growth policy to affectuate economic development, housing distribution, the use of natural resources, the protection of the environment, and the location of Government and private facilities in a manner and magnitude that will increase the odds that our Nation will continue to prosper.

The act also establishes a national growth planning board to help coordinate the efforts of Federal, regional, State, and local governments to control and manage growth. In effect, the act establishes a research, planning, and coordinating board on the national level while emphasizing State, local, and public participation. A program of Federal assistance to State and interstate agencies is established by the act to develop statewide and regional growth planning as elements of a national growth policy.

I have introduced such legislation, because I believe the Nation faces problems of such magnitude and complexity that a concerted national effort will be necessary to guarantee our very survival. The Nation's population continues to grow and concentrate in our urban areas.

The effects of pollution become more alarming. We continue to deplete our natural resources. Industry continues to proliferate uncontrollably and to stimulate excessive and artificial demands. If we do not perceive the prospect of ecological disaster and the need for an urgent and sufficient response, the social problems that we face today only portend of more enormous ones in the future.

The National Growth Policy Planning Act of 1972 develops a simple but comprehensive policy to manage and control growth in both our metropolitan and rural areas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following articles pertaining to national growth policy be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 2, 1972]

THINKING BIG: "CLUB OF ROME" MERGES WORLD'S WOES INTO ONE—AND TRIES TO SOLVE IT

(By Bowen Northrup)

ROME.—Exclusive club seeks wise, powerful men for membership. Prime qualification: Desire to save the world. Fees: None. Clubhouse: None. Meetings: Hardly ever. Applicants preferred from less-developed or Communist nations; Western positions largely filled. Politicians need not apply.

The Club of Rome doesn't advertise for members, but otherwise the above could be its prospectus. It is probably the loosest aggregation of individuals anywhere. Aurelio Peccei, the silver-haired, distinguished Italian who is its chief moving spirit, recoils from the usual bother of having a group.

"We don't want to be an organization," he says impatiently. "There are already too many organizations in the world. We have no budget, no structure. We are a detonator, no more than that. What we want to do is use the existing organizations as transmission belts."

What the club does have is membership of about 75 eminent men from some 25 nations, including scientists, and industrialists, economists, sociologists and educators. And it has an ambitious goal; to "detonate" an urgent debate on "the predicament of mankind," no less, with particular focus on what Mr. Peccei calls "the threat to the life-supporting capacity of the earth."

A "WORLD PROBLEMATIQUE"

Most of us find one problem or another more than enough at any given time, but the Club of Rome grandly merges all problems into a single "world problematique." In a few years it will be common to think globally," says Mr. Peccei.

"After all," he adds smilingly, "You Americans taught us to think big. If we understand that there is another, more intelligent way to manage the world, why not take it? There must be some earth-keeping, some earth-tending."

So the club has much more than a debate in mind; it wants action, stimulated by "the creation of a world forum where statesmen, policy makers and scientists can discuss the dangers and hopes for the future global system without the constraints of formal intergovernmental negotiations."

There has been a much-publicized debut for the Club of Rome: the publication in March of "The Limits of Growth," a 197-page paperback book costing about $2.50. It is a projection using computerized analysis of five major world trends: "Accelerating industrialization, rapid population growth, widespread malnutrition, depletion of nonrenewable resources and a deteriorating environment."

The conclusion: Unless urgent action is taken to move towards "equilibrium," at present and projected rates of growth, the world faces a situation of "collapse" by the middle of the next century.

UNRUFFLED AT UPBRAIDING

These aren't new ideas, of course. The club simply has thrust itself into the thick of the debate over zero economic growth and ecology, not without sharp rebuttals of its position. Wilfred Beckerman, professor of political economy at the University of London, has called the book "a brazen piece of impudence."

This kind of upbraiding leaves Mr. Peccei cheerfully unruffled. "The Club of Rome wants to have a dialogue," he says. "I happen to believe that this (pointing at the book) is the situation. I would be happy to have it disproved."

The dialogue is well under way. "Everywhere there is a brush fire," says Mr. Peccei. "There are hundreds and hundreds of seminars and conferences—this is what we want." The book, he says, has been published in 18 editions and soon will be available in 23 languages, including Serbo-Croat, Finnish and Thai. In Holland alone it has sold more than 200,000 copies.

"The Limits of Growth," according to Mr. Peccei, is "a first, faltering step" in the club's program. Three more research projects are in the offing. One, also using computer techniques, will survey the world from the vantage point of Latin America.

A second, to be jointly prepared by Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland and Hanover University of West Germany, will divide the world into eight different but linked regions, looking at the varying situations of developed and less-developed areas. A third will attempt to describe the needs of the world's population in a few decades.

PRESSURING POLICYMAKERS

"One thing is certain," says Mr. Peccei. "Barring an immense catastrophe, the population of the world will double within the next 30 to 40 years. How can we prepare to receive this supplementary batch of humans? They will need schools, houses, hospitals, airports—it is a construction job equal to all that we have done in the previous 2,000 years."

As the research program of the club grows, "Phase 2" will begin to materialize. Phase 2 is advocacy, putting pressure on policy makers and other men of influence to carry out the necessary action.

This the club is eminently equipped to do. Its membership includes many men who either are close to the levers of power or famous enough in their own right to command attention. The club shuns publicity for individual members—Mr. Peccei likes to call it an "invisible college"—but it includes the following:

Alexander King, scientific director of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD); Hugo Thiemann, head of the Battelle Institute in Geneva; Saburo Okita, head of the Japan Economic Research Center in Tokyo; Victor L. Urquidi, president of the College of Mexico in Mexico City; Thor Heyerdahl, the explorer; Alexander Goldberg, president of Technion-Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa; and John Platt of the Mental Health Research Institute at Ann Arbor, Mich.

Industrialists who are members include Antonie T. Knoppers, senior vice president of Merck and Co., Rahway, N.J.; Ronald S. Ritchie, vice president and director of Imperial Oil Ltd., Toronto; Pierre R. Gendron, president of the Pulp and Paper Institute of Canada; Robert Lattes, director general of SIA International, Paris; Daniel Janssen, deputy general manager of the Belgian Chemical Union, Brussels; and Koji Kobayashi, president of Nippon Electric Co., Tokyo.

Political officeholders generally are excluded from membership (though Sen. Claiborne Pell, the Rhode Island Democrat, is an exception), for the reason that they may be bound to a certain point of view. "Our members are free," says Mr. Peccei. "They don't represent anybody."

The emphasis now is on recruiting members from the black African nations and the Communist bloc. Mr. Peccei hopes for six to eight Communist members by the end of this year. The Chinese, for instance, may have great contributions to make to the club's thinking.

The club, says Mr. Peccei, "will offer alternative goals—we would like to change things." He believes that "a Copernican change of vision" is required. "People don't like to change their habits, especially when they are in a good situation."

Mr. Peccei, a widely traveled industrialist, consultant and expert on the development problems of underdeveloped nations, began to think in the mid-1960s that the world system was "a textbook case of mismanagement." In 1967 he went to the OECD's Mr. King with his idea for the club. An executive committee was formed, and the first meeting was held in Rome the next year at the Academy of the Lincei, an intellectual gathering place.

The Agnelli Foundation (Giovanni Agnelli is the chairman of Fiat) provided the funds for that gathering, and money has been forthcoming for each project since. The Volkswagen Foundation contributed about $366,000 for "The Limits of Growth." The International Development Research Council of Canada is helping to finance the Latin American study, and the West German government is contributing to the Case-Hanover project. . . .

So far the club has had a total of three meetings. However, says Mr. Peccei, "there is some correspondence among us." In his travels Mr. Peccei consults with other members and gives speeches on the club's goals. He has visited Budapest, Vienna, Stockholm, Milan, Paris, Geneva and Tokyo in recent months.

THE GLAMOROUS COMPUTER

But why all the furor about "The Limits of Growth?" After all, the "doomsday" school of Jeremiahs already is bursting at the seams. A United Nations conference devoted a million words to the ecology problem this summer in Stockholm.

Part of the interest, no doubt, stems from the exclusive membership of the Club of Rome. But there is another reason. "The Limits of Growth" project employed that most glamorous of instruments—the computer—in a study carried out at the prestigious Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Prof. Beckerman of the University of London scornfully contends that the book "attempts to blind the reader with science in the form of a pretentious array of computer printout diagrams and equations." It is this, says Prof. Beckerman, "which seems to have dazzled and impressed many people who, otherwise might have known better."

Other experts are more sanguine, however. Arthur Clarke, the well-known science fiction writer and futurist, gives the club "high marks for trying—they have done something about the problem, and hopefully they will stimulate some progress toward conclusions."

Dennis Gabor, the British physicist who won a Nobel prize last year (and is a member of the Club of Rome) expresses some reservations about "the blind confidence which the economists place in technology," but he said this of the club's study: "Whatever the details, the main conclusions are incontrovertible. We are on a catastrophic course." The club makes clear, however, that there is no pressure on individual members to agree with the conclusion of club projects.

"The Limits of Growth" used a computer model of the world developed by MIT Prof. Jay Forrester. It started with the premise that basic factors such as food production, populaiton growth and environmental pollution all are interrelated.

Each factor, it was decided, interacts constantly with the other factors—and with itself. For instance, a growing population increases the need for land to live on, thus diminishing the amount of land available for agriculture. At the same time, the demands for food from that diminishing farm land are growing.

The study points out that growth and the drain on resources take place at an exonential rate rather than an arithmetic one. For example, each time the population doubles the number of people added is twice the number added at the previous doubling, and the absolute population has quadrupled.

That is, two doubled is four, four doubled is eight and so on.

The result? A dizzying growth of demand for natural resources, land and food from burgeoning population that increasingly befoul its habitat. If present trends continue unchanged, the study warns, "the limits to growth on this planet will be reached sometime within the next one hundred years."

It decided also that "the process of economic growth as it is occurring today is inexorably widening the absolute gap between the rich and the poor nations of the world."

Evident throughout is an effort to convince scientists and other experts of the study's validity—and an equal effort to make the conclusions intelligible to the average man.

This creates problems. The experts aren't likely to be electrified by such assertions as "Every person in the world faces a series of pressures and problems that require his attention and action." On the other hand, Archie Bunker's attention is likely to wander when he is confronted by "a flow diagram in formal System Dynamics notation."

Underlying the study—and the club's decision to publish it before all the accompanying computer data were available—is the belief that the situation already is critical.

IN OTHER WORDS, NOW OR NEVER

"We are unanimously convinced that rapid, radical redressment of the present unbalanced and dangerously deteriorating world situation is the primary task facing humanity," the club's executive committee says in the conclusion to the book, adding, "This supreme effort is a challenge for our generation. It cannot be passed on to the next."

For Mr. Peccei, the Club of Rome is the most important project of a lifetime. He is a sturdy and well-tanned man of 64, pure white hair complemented by a white moustache. As an anti-Fascist militant during World War II, he was captured by the Fascists and severely tortured.

Later he went to South America for Fiat. In the 1960's he took the helm of Olivetti, the big business machines manufacturer, during a period of crisis and led it back to health. His current chief title is a head of Italconsult, a consulting firm established by private and public capital in Italy to aid the poorer nations in development.

For Mr. Peccei, thinking globally seems to come naturally. "We need to understand what happens in the world," he says. "We go very fast, and we don't know what is ahead. . . . Our world is totally different from that of our fathers. Our children will have another jump of similar magnitude. . . . The world is small. It is one system. And man must be the regulator."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 9, 1972]

GUARDING THE LAND: CALIFORNIA COURT RULING ON ECOLOGICAL IMPACT THROWS BUILDERS, LENDERS, UNIONS FOR A LOSS

(By Earl C. Gottschalk Jr.)

A land developer recently began construction of a mini-skyscraper apartment building on a tiny parcel of land in an area of single-family cabins in the High Sierras—and that was the last straw for a group of residents from Mammoth Lakes, Calif.

Led by Mrs. Andrea Mead Lawrence, a former Olympic skiing gold-medal winner, the residents sued to halt the project on the ground that, even though it was on private land, it harmed the surrounding environment.

The case worked its way up to the California supreme court—and in a surprising 6-to-1 decision on Sept. 28, the court ruled in favor of the residents. State and local government agencies now must complete environmental impact reports and make them public before they can approve private construction projects that may have a "significant" impact on the environment, the court declared. Presumably, thus forewarned, upset citizens could sue to stop any project that in their view an agency wrongly approved.

It's the first time that the idea of "environmental impact" has been directly applied to private developments, and other states are expected to follow California's lead. Conservationists are hailing the case as the most significant yet in their battle to halt what they consider the rape of the California environment. The decision means that citizens can sue to halt any "significant" private construction that doesn't have an environmental-impact study.

The housing and construction industries are in a state of shock—as are many leaders in construction unions and lending institutions. Indeed, in what one environmental-law expert has called "a hysterical over-reaction," such cities as San Francisco and Santa Barbara have stopped issuing building permits for fear they'd violate the new law.

OIL DRILLING AFFECTED

Mammoth County in the Sierra Nevada range has even stopped issuing permits for garage additions and sidewalks. The cities and counties claim they don't know how to make environmental impact studies, don't have the staffs or funds and don't know how to define what "significant" private construction is.

Los Angeles County supervisors have bounced 12 proposed zoning changes, from Malibu to Pomona, back to the county planning commission for reports on how private construction projects in these areas might affect the environment. The city of Los Angeles is still issuing building permits, but each permit includes "a disclaimer" agreement that in effect tells the builder he is proceeding at his own risk.

Also affected are Occidental Petroleum Corp.'s plans to slant drill for oil on one of Southern California's most popular beaches in the Pacific Palisades. The Los Angeles City Council has passed an ordinance giving Occidental drilling permission, but that ordinance now is in serious question.

Los Angeles Mayor Sam Yorty, back in town after one of his many overseas trips, railed against the court ruling, saying: "I have nothing against protecting the environment, but we can't carry it to extremes." The city is considering seeking a special session of the state legislature to clear up the confusion.

Several big land-development and housing companies are facing delays and postponements on their California projects. Michael Tenzer, president of the Larwin Group's housing division, says his company is postponing plans to develop 900 single-family and townhouse units in the San Gabriel Valley near Los Angeles and to develop 100 acres in the Antelope Valley, a desert area about 35 miles from downtown Los Angeles.

"A TRYING TIME"

But Mr. Tenzer says the postponements won't affect Larwin's earnings immediately; the projects would have come on stream in 1974. He says that, since Larwin is nationally diversified, the ruling will have a "relatively insignificant impact on total earnings, although we're not happy about it."

Ralph Wenger, president of Transamerica Development Co., a subsidiary of Transamerica Corp., reports that two of its large projects have been stalled. At Diamond Bar, a Transamerica community in the San Gabriel Valley that is 75% complete, zoning applications have been stalled, halting the project. Transamerica's controversial plans to develop coastline property on the Palos Verdes peninsula near Los Angeles into condominiums, townhouses and residential lots also have been stalled. Transamerica's Palos Verdes plans have long been contested by a group of angry, but now happy, residents. "This is a very trying tune for the builder," complains Mr. Wenger.

A spokesman for the parent company, Transamerica Corp. of San Francisco, says the delays "aren't going to have any substantial effect on earnings since the development subsidiary is a small piece of the total pie."

A few companies say they are so angry they are considering expanding their land-development activities in other states—and curtailing them in California. "We're at a standstill; we don't know which direction we'll go," says Carl Rudnick, president of Levitt United Multi-Housing Corp., a subsidiary of Levitt & Sons Inc., which handles housing for the 13 Western states. "Maybe we'll get to the point where we'll concentrate our operations out of California," says Mr. Rudnick. "Other states have established various restrictions, but no one has gone this far."

GLOOM AND DOOM

"I think they want to put the builders out of business," charges Gene Meyers, executive vice president of Levitt United.

Meyer Roth, vice president of Los Angeles-based Pardee Construction Co., a division of Weyerhaueser Co. of Tacoma, Wash., says his company is considering expanding its operations in the Las Vegas area rather than in California because of the new ruling.

As a combination of industry, union and banking officials have done in the past to combat various pieces of environmental legislation in California, some people now paint a grim portrait of jobs lost, housing ground to a standstill and lending institutions in trouble, all on account of the new environmental-impact ruling.

Conrad Jamison, urban economist at Security Pacific National Bank in Los Angeles, takes a less alarmist view than this but he says, "Obviously this will slow things up and make it more expensive for builders. Add this to what may happen in November with the Coastal Initiative (which calls for a state coastal protection agency to rule on all new private coastal developments), and it's a whole new ball game for the housing industry." Mr. Jamison, however, says there have been "tremendous land-development abuses in the past in California, and we need some sort of a program to insure more orderly appropriate development."

Not all big housing companies, however, take a "gloom and doom" approach to the new law. Barbara Sayre Casey, vice president of Kaufman & Broad Inc., Los Angeles, one of the biggest homebuilders in California, thinks the new ruling will be better for everyone—builders and home producers included—in the long run.

INCENSE AND COMMONSENSE

"Every builder will now be in the same position," explains Mrs. Casey. "Now, if you go in and do an environmentally sound job that will cost more, you are penalized. Someone can go in across the street and do a cheap job and undersell you." The new ruling "shouldn't hurt responsible housing producers," she maintains.

The attorney who represented the Mammoth residents, John McCarthy, of Pomona, Calif., is incensed that cities and counties have halted the granting of building permits. "Obviously, the law wasn't meant to apply to all building permits," he fumes.

Mr. McCarthy is unimpressed by claims by city and county officials that they don't know how to make environmental-impact studies or set up environmental guidelines. For two years a state act has been on the books requiring environmental-impact studies of all public works, he points out. (This law was modeled after a federal law that the Sierra Club cited recently to halt construction of an airport in Palmdale, Calif.) "If city and county officials had complied with state law,

they'd have public procedures all ready to apply to private projects," Mr. McCarthy says.

As to the question of how to tell when a private construction project has a "significant" environmental impact, he says: "All they have to do is to apply a little common sense." One test is citizen reaction, he says. "If responsible citizens in the community don't protest, then the development probably doesn't have a significant environmental impact and can proceed without an environmental-impact study. But if responsible citizens protest, the government body should order an environmental-impact study," he concludes.

STUNG SPECULATORS?

The California court decision is "the first time that any (U.S.) law has given citizens the right to participate directly in private-land-use decisions before they are made," argues Mr. McCarthy. He adds that he personally is "definitely not a conservationist or a proponent of no-growth." He says that for most of U.S. history, the land owner has made a single-party decision on what to do with his land and that that decision has been to develop it for maximum financial return—regardless of the consequences. "We're still living with many of these unfortunate decisions," he says. "The neon jungle of Lake Tahoe in Northern California and overdeveloped Waikiki Beach in Honolulu are examples."

In recent years, public officials have had official review of land use through zoning ordinances, he says, but these ordinances often have been violated and rendered ineffective by variances, changes of zoning and conditional use permits.

The new ruling could bring about an abrupt halt to the epidemic of land speculation in California, Mr. McCarthy figures, and should stop overdevelopment beyond a community's carrying capacity and local resources. It is hoped, he adds, that the ruling will result in statewide planning and the creation of new communities to disperse California's population—rather than stacking up people on top of Los Angeles and San Francisco.

Where does the new ruling go from here? California Attorney General Evelle Younger, who filed a friend of the court brief, along with the Sierra Club, supporting the Mammoth group's case, now is listening to complaints of builders, housing companies, city and county officials and unions. "We're trying to ease the transition," explains Nicholas Yost, a deputy attorney general who heads the attorney general's environmental-law section.

The California legislature reconvenes Nov. 8, and some observers speculate that the construction-housing-savings and loan lobby will attempt to get legislators to emasculate the ruling or at least call a moratorium on it. But one state official doubts that, in these ecologically aware times, legislators will vote to cut back environmental protection.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 7, 1972]

ECOLOGICAL RULING STUNS CALIFORNIA—BUILDING PERMITS STOP AFTER ACTION BY COURT

SAN FRANCISCO, October 7.—Most California communities have stopped issuing major building permits because of a State Supreme Court ruling that the effect of such projects on the environment must be investigated first.

Some others, including Los Angeles, are issuing permits with "environmental disclaimers." Several banks have said that they will not lend money on the basis of such permits.

Before the court acted, on Sept. 21, the state's 1970 Environmental Quality Act had been applied only to public works projects that were deemed to have a "significant impact" on the environment.

But the court, in a 6–1 decision, held that the law also applied to private construction for which a development permit of any kind must be obtained—if the project's effect on the environment would be "nontrivial."

It is the most important ruling on the environment in the state's history, according to spokesmen for development interests, conservationists and state and local government.

REAPPRAISAL EXPECTED

Many believe the decision will force a major reappraisal of the growth-oriented economy that in four decades has transformed California from a mostly rural farm area to the most populous state in the nation.

The court held that the Mono County Board of Supervisors erred last April 20 in issuing a conditional use permit to International Recreation, Ltd., of La Jolla, for a 184-unit second-home development.

The concern planned to build an eight-story tower at the Mammoth Lake ski resort area on the eastern slope of the southern Sierra Nevada Mountains. Eventually, it hoped to build five or six towers containing 350 to 400 condominium apartments, each selling for $35,000 to $70,000.

A suit was brought by Friends of Mammoth, a group of residents and homeowners in the sparsely populated region, who contended that the development would spawn problems with water, sewage, snow removal, and police protection.

LAW REQUIRES REPORT

The court ruling was based on a portion of the Environmental Quality Act requiring areas that have no adopted conservation element for their general plan "make an environmental impact report on any project they intend to carry out which may have a significant effect on the environment and shall submit it to the local planning agency . . ."

Mono County, and most other cities and counties in the state, have not yet adopted a conservation element. The Environmental Quality Act states that those states that have such an element must make certain that environmentally significant projects are "in accord with the conservation element."

The court ruling left considerable confusion over the definition of "significant impact," which the court explained as "nontrivial." There was also uncertainty over what constitutes a proper environmental impact statement and whether the decision would be retroactive to when the Environmental Quality Act took effect.

The resulting developments included the following:

San Francisco and San Jose, the state's third and fourth largest cities, on Wednesday placed a total freeze on new building permits. Two days later, San Francisco modified the freeze to allow permits for home construction and interior remodeling. San Jose, one of the nation's fastest growing cities, is expected to announce a similar modification.

County attorneys met in San Francisco yesterday with Nicholas C. Yost, the deputy State Attorney General, who represented California as a friend of the court on the side of Friends of Mammoth, to make an urgent demand for clarification of the ruling.

The California Chamber of Commerce called together 15 laywers from its members concerns and trade associations to discuss how to deal with the decision.

Many cities and counties wiped from their planning commission agendas all items except such nondevelopment issues as the renaming of roads.

Many planning directors began asking for staff increases to prepare the environmental impact statements.

Gov. Ronald Reagan has asked the Attorney General's Office to seek a delay in the decision's implementation. Unless challenged, the ruling will take effect Oct. 21.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE RUSSELL E. TRAIN, CHAIRMAN, COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY, BEFORE THE 97TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION AND NATIONAL TREE PLANTING CONFERENCE, NEW ORLEANS, LA., OCTOBER 23, 1972

I am delighted to have this opportunity to address the American Forestry Association this morning and to try and set a "Framework for the Future" for your discussions which follow these next few days.

Since 1968 we have asked a great many questions, and more than ever before, Americans have become environmentally aware. As the President has observed:

"At the heart of concern for the environment lies our concern for the human condition: for the welfare of man himself now and in the future. As we look ahead to the end of this new decade of heightened environmental awareness, therefore, we should set ourselves a higher goal than merely remedying the damage wrought in decades past. We should strive for an environment that not only sustains life but enriches life, harmonizing the works of man and nature for the good of all."

The issue I wish to raise with you this morning—and one which the AFA can help illuminate—is far broader than the traditional concerns of conservation, is being addressed around the U.S. and the world, and has implications that extend well into the future. It is the question whether, we as a people, should continue to regard growth—of population, the economy and natural resource use—as the primary measure of our progress.

Clearly, economic development is essential to the good life, and a sound economy is necessary to achieve solutions to many of the social and environmental goals of people everywhere. The President's policies are firmly committed to this goal and indeed he has moved not to abandon economic growth but to redirect it to human needs in the restoration and protection of our environment.

But there are many conventional assumptions about growth that must be examined anew, for they directly affect how well we can adjust to the needed reforms for bettering our environment.

In the United States we have conquered a great wilderness and built the largest industrial complex in the history of the world. We have greatly increased our wood utilization productivity, we have been responsible for technological miracles from computers to moon landings, and we have attained an unprecedented standard of living. In a sense, we are driven by our own prosperity.

But with all of the benefits from continued economic growth, as a people we are beginning to question whether more is really better:

Communities from coast to coast are increasingly willing to forego or to seriously question the desirability of new industries that may lead to the impairment of the local environment. Public debate in States such as California, Colorado, Oregon, Montana, Florida, and others has begun to question the desirability of unlimited growth. Delaware, a heavily industrialized eastern State, last year called a halt to heavy development of its coastal zone.

The President's Population Commission has recently reported that ". . . There is hardly any social problem confronting this Nation whose solution would be easier if our population were larger . . ." After two years of research, the Population Commission concluded that "no substantial benefits would result from continued growth of the Nation's population."

The Club of Rome, an international group

of scientists and industrialists, has recently sponsored a project at MIT on *The Limits of Growth*. That study predicts that current population, resource use and other trends will end in disaster in the next century.

One need not accept the dire hypotheses and methods underlying some of the more extreme predictions to acknowledge the fundamental validity of the questions these various groups are asking. They are questions which touch upon public policy choices in several fields, and most particularly upon environmental policy and the management of our natural resources. I would like to suggest several areas where reflection and leadership upon the part of the AFA members is very much needed.

First is the question of the size and distribution of our population. The President has referred to this issue as "one of the most serious challenges to human destiny in the last third of this century . . ." According to the Population Commission, in the year 2000 per capita income may be as much as 15 percent higher under the two-child per family than under the three-child growth rate.

Moreover, the anticipated distribution of future population makes clear that under even the lower population growth projections we may have to make substantial sacrifices in the quality of our lives to accommodate large numbers of people in our urban regions. While about 70 percent of the U.S. population is now concentrated in metropolitan areas, 85 percent is expected to reside there in the year 2000. In that year, more than six out of every ten Americans will live in cities of one million or more compared to four out of ten who now live there, and 50 percent will live in the huge urban agglomeration along the East Coast and adjoining the Great Lakes. Another fifteen percent will live in the area reaching from about San Francisco to Los Angeles. This distribution will demand that we change our lives, and perhaps our values, very significantly.

These projected settlement patterns will have serious consequences for land use and pollution. Industrial activity, transportation and housing will be highly concentrated in large metropolitan areas. Pollution control will be more difficult, and higher levels of abatement will be imperative. The encroachment of development on the countryside will make the preservation of areas of critical environmental concern such as wetlands, flood plains and sufficient private acreage for timber growth extremely difficult. The other consequence of this burgeoning suburban spread is the impact this exodus has on the vitality of our cities, the historic character, their economic stability. And so I think it is time to call upon every American to consider the implications of the future population growth and distribution that has been predicted for us as it affects his own choices and values.

The second question on which we must address ourselves is the limits of the carrying capacity of the earth itself. We must begin to ask ourselves whether food production will continue to be adequate for population increasing at exponential rates; whether we will in time deplete certain resources and thereby bring an end to increased industrial production; and whether we can depend on technology and the market structure to allocate resources and continue to meet high levels of productive endeavor? In Great Britain one group recently concluded that the British population is twice as large as it should be for sustained resources use.

I offer no conclusive answers to this question. Since the time of Malthus too few people have questioned the adequacy of resources to support growth and we should not be surprised if current efforts are somewhat primitive and unsophisticated. Nevertheless, a thoughtful society would be foolish to dismiss lightly the sufficiency of our natural resources to support continued economic and population growth. I suggest that we consider not only the adequacy of resources and the possible technological developments that may render productivity sustainable, but that we also inquire into the ability of our institutions to cope with change, to get food and fiber products to where people are, and to protect us from some of our own breakthroughs when, for example, a green revolution proves vulnerable to insects, or enhanced agricultural productivity causes farmers to inundate the cities in search of work.

The institutional questions are especially critical because all levels of government must anticipate change well before it occurs. For example, population tends to build on the previous generation so that the control of increases can not be effective until years later. If all U.S. families henceforth had only two children, population would not level off for 70 years. Persistent pollutants even if stopped now would continue through the ecosystem for years. Hence, our traditional response to problems, generally when they become acute, is inadequate when we have to deal with long lag times.

A third and related issue concerns resource use and the ability of the market to allocate resources in the future. Most of the earth's resources, although finite, are plentiful in total but their numbers are limited using current methods of extraction. As resources become scarce, their prices will go up and substitutes will be sought or new methods employed. Both of these will increase the costs, and at some point in time, the devotion of significant amounts of money to this end may lessen the overall productive capacity of our economy. We must ask whether the market allocates long-term needs in an effective manner or whether prices only rise as a resource is close to depletion. Instead of dismissing these matters with an ideological reflex, we must apply careful analysis for it is by no means clear that the marketplace and technology will solve all of our problems in an even-handed manner.

A fourth most troublesome issue concerns technology. Can we rely upon technology to continue to increase at the same rate as population, and if we can, what will be the side effects of technological progress? Acceleration of growth demands that new technology developments increase at least as rapidly as population growth. Yet we may create new problems as technologies are introduced without proper testing and analysis of their implications. These questions underscore the great need for technology assessment. The issue we face here is how to develop technology in such a way as to make use of its benefits while at the same time anticipating potentially harmful side effects and taking those actions which reduce the risk of developing technology. The problem is particularly severe in that the side effects are often second or third order, their anticipation difficult, and the development of adequate safeguards complex.

All of these questions suggest that we must improve our ability to understand the future. This means not only better projections of future trends, but a more profound understanding of the interrelationship among a wide variety of factors such as population, food, industrial growth, resources and pollution. We must begin to understand the options and opportunities before us—here in the United States and internationally.

Indeed, we must act as "one World" to ensure a unity of economic well-being and environmental protection. This is perhaps one of the most important insights to emerge from our international activities. At the end of the decade when we look back to the year 1972, it is my guess that two events—the conference in Stockholm and the U.S. bilateral agreement with the Soviet Union—will stand out as of enormous importance in the history of the environmental movement.

There were 113 nations in attendance at Stockholm. They did not agree on everything—nations never do. But by every measure the conference was a great success, particularly in taking some concrete first steps in institutionalizing international concerns and in coming to grips with several major substantive issues of worldwide concern.

Only some of these accomplishments need be mentioned—the establishment of a new permanent organization within the United Nations to coordinate international environmental activities, a UN environmental fund, and a 26-point declaration of environmental principles calling for commitments by countries to deal with environmental problems of international significance. Considering the diversity of goals, political systems and stages of development of these 113 nations, the success in reaching agreement on so many issues was truly significant.

The Soviet Agreement is of a slightly different character—for one thing it is bilateral between our two nations rather than multilateral—but in the long run it may affect all the nations of the world. This was certainly President Podgorny's view when he and I talked in Moscow, and reaffirmed by President Nixon when I subsequently reported to him.

The United States and the Soviet Union will soon begin on some thirty cooperative projects in eleven major areas of environmental concern, ranging from air and water pollution through urban development and agricultural production to the impact on climate and the health of man and other forms of life.

Who would have imagined four years ago that the world's two major powers—with different social and economic systems and different ideologies—would be agreeing in 1972 to cooperate on such a large number of joint environmental projects?

Obviously, none of us would have imagined it. Although cooperation with the Soviet Union was not necessarily unthinkable in 1968, only through the President's astute leadership have we been able to surmount almost a half century of poor communication. But four years ago the seriousness—and complexity—of the environmental challenge was only dimly perceived by the American public.

We are yet only beginning to understand man's relationship to his environment. We still know little of the impacts of pollution over long periods of time. We must measure changes in the environment, but we must first develop meaningful indices of its quality. Most importantly, absent a careful restructuring of our government institutions at all levels, our traditional reliance on research and programs to increase our resource base will be of little avail, nor long lasting.

But reform has not been wanting. The President has proposed in three major environmental messages numerous comprehensive initiatives to rescue our environment. Many of these proposals failed to get enacted and will be placed before the 93d Congress. Among those which will receive very high priority are those measures designed to strengthen the environmental requirements for the management and use of our nation's land resources—both public and private. We have come to realize that our land is a limited and irreplaceable resource and we must equip our institutions to carry out the responsibility implicit in this new outlook. This Administration has acted to create the framework necessary to assure wise land use and to stop haphazard, wasteful or environmentally damaging development.

The National Land Use Policy would provide Federal assistance to encourage the States, in cooperation with local governments, to protect lands which are of critical environmental concern and to control major developments.

The National Resource Land Management Act would strengthen the environmental requirements relating to the management and use of the Nation's vast acreage of Federal lands. This proposal would establish an overall management policy for these public lands, something which we have been without for too long.

Certainly, the passage of new laws is not the only solution to our environmental problems, for our society is beset by economic and environmental pressures which present a variety of conflicting policy choices. The use of materials in the United States is growing by five percent annually compared to population increase of only about one percent. As just one example, we need wood products to meet our increased housing goals and for other purposes, which means a healthy forest system capable of sustaining a reasonable yield. But concurrently with this demand, the public appetite for recreation appears unlimited as millions flock to our national and State forests in search of an important tie to nature. Whether the issue is clear-cutting or mining, the forests have been the subject of controversy and lawsuits—a conflict between the economic values and their aesthetic and recreation values, indeed their ecological stability. Our environmental objectives and our needs for lumber seek resolution. Above all, our key objective must be to care for the interests of our future generations and assure that the use of our forest resources is not wasteful.

Currently, we waste too much of the products from trees. For example, about 50 percent of our mixed municipal solid wastes are represented by wood and paper products. Nearly 75 percent of these wastes are disposed of in open dumps where environmental health and safety problems occur.

These resources can be recycled—either to produce more paper or as energy. While they represent a serious problem as waste, they represent a potentially great natural resource when recycled.

But recycling will not just happen—it needs marketplace reforms. The President has already taken the initiative. He has, for example, instituted a Federal procurement program by the General Services Administration which requires minimum percentages of wastes in Federal purchases. To make recycling more economical, the Internal Revenue Service has clarified the availability of tax-exempt industrial development bonds for recycling facilities. As we look ahead to the implications of growth, recycling will become a key element in any strategy to conserve our resources and protect environmental quality.

Obviously, another way to stretch our forest resources is to encourage a greater amount of reforestation. I especially want to encourage the members of the AFA in its efforts at this National Tree Planting Conference. The Administration fully supports the AFA's efforts. Federal expenditure on reforestation on public lands are in excess of $63.0 million in Fiscal Year 1972 and Fiscal Year 1973. In addition, the President very recently signed into law the "Supplemental National Forest Reforestation Fund," providing an authorization level of $65.0 million for the next 15 years. This provides additional authority to the Forest Service.

I also hope that you will promote tree planting in urban areas. Seventy percent of our population now lives in these areas and as I indicated, it will increase to 85 percent by the end of the century. Trees give beauty to our cities, buffer the ear from noise, and lend variety and diversity to our man-made urban environment. The chestnut trees along the Seine in Paris, the oaks of London's Hyde Park, the struggling Gingkoes of Washington's Lafayette Square all attest to the importance of the trees in our cities.

The planting of trees is a process that reaches culmination many years in the future. It is in a sense a commitment now for future benefits. So it is with this question of growth. I believe we as a society must broadly plan now and channel our growth if we are to avert a diminution of the quality of the environment and the possibility of some scarcity. I applaud the forward-looking theme of this year's AFA Conference. The new seedlings that will be planted as a result of this Conference are a symbol of renewal that is the principle of our environmental ethic.

REVENUE-SHARING BILL

HON. WALTER E. POWELL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of this legislative session the Congress passed the revenue-sharing bill which will provide $30 billion in Federal funds to State and local governments over the next 5 years.

As originally conceived, revenue sharing would allow both the flexibility and resources for State and local officials to exercise leadership in solving their problems and to achieve a better allocation of total public resources.

I support the revenue-sharing concept and believe that its implementation is long overdue. However, I opposed the revenue-sharing bill which became law because the distribution formula does not provide an equitable allocation of funds for the State of Ohio and its local governments.

To give you an understanding of how the formula works, let me review its development.

When the House considered the revenue-sharing bill, it devised a formula to distribute $1.8 billion to the State governments on an incentive basis—with $900 million designed to encourage tax effort generally and $900 million to stimulate greater use of the individual income taxes. General tax effort for the first portion was measured by comparing State and local tax collections to the personal income level in one State with similar revenue efforts made by the other States. Income tax encouragement in the second portion was provided by distribution of funds based on a percentage of a State's individual income tax collections.

Exactly how much money a State would receive was based one-third on population, one-third on urbanized population, and one-third on population weighted by inverse, relative income levels. The same factors also determined the distribution to local governments within a State.

When the formula was applied, Ohio ranked 43d among the 50 States in funds allotted to the State government, and 40th when funds for both State and local governments were combined.

In the Senate, the formula was changed to population times tax effort times inverse relative income levels. This resulted in a cutback of $92 million annually from Ohio's share of funds—the greatest percentage decrease of any State.

To resolve the differences between these two formulae, a joint House-Senate conference committee met to work out a compromise. After long debate and serious consideration by the committee, the conferees agreed to use the Senate formula for the distribution of funds. However, they stipulated that one-third of the total amount distributed to a State would remain with the State governments for their use, while the other two-thirds would go directly to county areas. This compromise version provided even less funds to the people and communities of Ohio than either of the separate House or Senate bills.

The following chart shows the distribution of funds for the communities in the new Eighth Congressional District as provided in the House, Senate and joint House-Senate conference report which became law:

REVENUE SHARING FIGURES

County	House	Senate	Joint Committee	Percent reduction in Joint Committee vs. House figures
Montgomery	$11,419,108	$9,227,542	$7,942,789	−30.5
Carlisle Village	91,807	13,255	11,410	−87.6
Germantown Village	83,243	12,307	10,594	−87.3
Miamisburg City	305,147	322,967	278,000	−9.0
Trotwood Village	133,013	21,065	10,132	−92.4
West Carrollton	216,744	32,357	27,852	−87.2
Mercer	406,070	525,282	452,146	+11.4
Warren	1,116,294	774,961	667,083	−40.3
Carlisle Village	54,170	10,347	8,907	−89.4
Franklin City	153,310	140,090	120,585	−21.4
Lebanon City	118,609	60,193	51,812	−57.7
Mason Village	84,834	123,909	106,657	+25.7
Monroe Village	793	386	332	−58.2
South Lebanon Village	49,929	46,757	40,247	−19.4
Springboro Village	$41,488	$8,427	$7,253	−82.5
Carlisle Village	60,222	10,347	8,907	−85.2
Preble	382,800	318,093	273,804	−28.5
Eaton City	41,021	34,087	29,341	−28.5
Darke	554,897	572,632	492,905	−11.2
Greenville City	84,688	97,748	84,138	−.7
Butler	3,927,002	3,605,010	3,103,083	−20.8
Hamilton City	1,212,423	1,214,445	1,045,357	−13.8
Fairfield City	243,139	131,319	113,036	−53.5
Middletown City	818,285	1,064,415	916,216	+12.0
Monroe Village	55,569	17,181	14,789	−73.4
New Miami Village	70,642	42,800	36,841	−48.0
Oxford Village	302,895	87,018	74,903	−75.6
Trenton Village	83,085	20,153	17,347	−79.2

As you can see from the chart, Mr. Speaker, all but three areas in the Eighth Congressional District will receive less money under the bill which became law than under the original House version, which was inequitable to begin with.

During my years of legislative service, I have acted on the premise that you cannot have good law by being willing to vote for bad law. This, of course, is not always good politics, but I believe it is good representation.

Mr. Speaker, the revenue-sharing bill as passed by Congress is bad law. It is unjust and inequitable. For these reasons, I could not in good conscience support it.

UNION CARBIDE MULTINATIONAL OPERATIONS ANALYZED

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on October 17, Union Carbide Corp., a multinational chemical company with headquarters in New York City, issued a study entitled "Benefit of Union Carbide's International Investment to the U.S. Economy." That study, covering the last 20 years, purports to analyze in detail the relationship between Union Carbide's foreign investment and the company's U.S. employment and exports from the United States.

The Union Carbide study contributes to the intensifying debate about the influence of the multinational corporation on domestic employment levels and international flows of capital and technology. Union Carbide is entitled to make its case and has presented substantial evidence on the issues.

Using company and Government data the study seeks to make the case for the beneficial "pull" effect of foreign investment on exports from the United States and, thus, increased jobs in the United States and to refute the charge that the multinational activities and commitments of U.S. corporations serve as a drain on domestic jobs and capital investment.

The scope of Union Carbide's international operations during the 20-year period of the study is said to be sufficiently large to yield a number of case studies under a variety of investment-export conditions. The study deals with specific product and subproduct groups, and each is analyzed on its own particular facts in each particular country of export investment.

This is one New York based company's story. It purports to be no more than the experience of a major U.S. multinational corporation. I would urge every business whose international operations necessarily affect domestic employment and capital investment to come forward with similar analyses if they have not already done so.

The section of the Union Carbide report entitled "Summary" follows:

SUMMARY

1. UCC OVERSEAS INVESTMENT POLICY

The fundamental principle, which cannot be emphasized too strongly, is that UCC as a matter of long-standing policy has never made a significant new foreign manufacturing investment until it became unfeasible economically, or otherwise, to supply and maintain the market through export from the U.S. Obviously, like most other American companies, UCC does not wish to risk investment and returns overseas if it can "do the job" through export without foreign investment.

UCC does have several overseas mining and processing plants for minerals which are not found in the U.S. Otherwise, as a matter of policy UCC does not build manufacturing plants in foreign countries for the purpose of exporting back to the U.S. There is one single exception involving only $250,000 of assembly investment which actually saved 150 jobs in the U.S.

2. AS FOREIGN INVESTMENT INCREASES SO TOO DO UCC'S EXPORTS

Over the years, as UCC was forced to install foreign plants to preserve share of market built up through successful export marketing effort and eventually threatened by local competition, it was expected that exports would decline in inverse correlation to affiliated overseas production.

To the contrary, this study shows that for UCC there has been a direct, positive correlation between the trends of affiliated overseas production and export volume from the U.S. This correlation can be seen from Chart No. 1 (not printed) for the period 1951–1970. Despite all of the competitive local manufacturing installations abroad, including our own, UCC total exports in 1970 were 6.7 times greater than in 1951, as compared with a 5.0 times increase in the sales value of total UCC foreign affiliated manufacturing. (All of these data exclude foreign mining operations.)

The comparison in Chart No. 1 is in terms of sales dollars and therefore "damps" the actual upward trend of exports in terms of physical volume. This is because our average selling prices in 1970 were 23% below the 1957–1959 average level.

On a volume basis, which cannot be calculated compatibly because of the variety of product, the growth rate for export would be considerably higher than indicated in the previous paragraph. To a certain degree the value of foreign manufacture would have been affected in the same way since average selling prices overseas have declined as well.

3 INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENTS "PULL" EXPORTS FROM THE UNITED STATES

Obviously, when UCC decides to install a foreign plant, any exports from the U.S. of the specific finished product involved must eventually be reduced. However, this reduction would have taken place anyway, because UCC makes such a foreign manufacturing investment only when elimination from the market is threatened by some other local installation. Where UCC has failed to make such an investment, experience shows that export of the entire finished product group is seriously cut, in some types to virtually nothing.

On the contrary, our analysis herein demonstrates that if UCC installs the foreign plant rather than a local competitor, there eventually develops a decided "pull" effect in the form of increased UCC exports from the U.S. of other allied, intermediate, or accessory products not being manufactured by this foreign plant. This is because of the presence of a strong local UCC organization which being "on the scene" can provide a broader, more effective overall marketing effort than is practicable from solely an export marketing organization.

This "pull" effect is indicated by the fact that 57% of our total exports in 1970 were to our foreign affiliated companies, a large majority in the countries in which UCC manufactures. Over the period 1951–1970, Chart No. 1 shows the effect of "pull" in the striking parallelism of upward trend between sales value of foreign production and exports.

Also, Section VIII–C–9 (page 29) of this study shows that our exports to foreign markets where UCC has manufacturing facilities generally tend to be at a higher level and have grown about as rapidly as exports to areas where there is no UCC manufacturing investment.

4. IN 1970 UCC'S EXPORTS WERE $90 MILLION HIGHER BECAUSE OF INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENTS

In 1970 UCC's exports totalled $253,000,000. Our study shows that if we had not expanded our foreign manufacturing between 1951 and 1970, as shown in Chart No. 1, thereby allowing local, foreign competition to take our place and thus foregoing the advantage of this "pull" effect, UCC's exports in 1970 would have been of the order of magnitude of $163,000,000, or $90,000,000 lower (See Section V–A, page 9).

Over the entire 1951–1970 period, calculated year by year, the cumulative differential totals $517,000,000 of exports which would otherwise have been lost if UCC had failed to expand its overseas production capability.

It should be emphasized at this point that the key assumptions of organized labor and others in this country concerning the relationship of American foreign investment and exports from the U.S. are based on unsound reasoning. It is totally fallacious to believe that if American manufacturing operations abroad were shut down, then these overseas markets would automatically be supplied by exports from the U.S. We believe the detailed analysis in this Report covering UCC's experience over a twenty year period dramatically demonstrates the fallacy contained in such an assumption, which to be sound would have to mean that the production and distribution cost of U.S. products in export are generally competitive around the world.

It seems obvious that if UCC were to shut down its foreign plants, the sales from these operations could never be replaced by exports from the U.S. Rather, virtually all this business would fall to foreign competitors.

5. EXPORT OF JOBS?

UCC's exports create 5,300 jobs, or 10% of our total domestic employment. Without foreign investment there would be only 3,400 export-related jobs.

Our analysis indicates that an estimated 1,900–2,000 domestic jobs have been created because of the "pull" effect on exports from the U.S. by our international investments. (This point is elaborated upon in the "Employment" section of this Report—Section V–B, page 9).

As can be seen by the growth of actual UCC exports from 1951–1970 in correlation with growth of foreign manufacture in comparison with probable export results assuming no foreign manufacture, all as set out on Chart No. 1, it is evident that our overseas investment could not have resulted in export of jobs, but rather contributed to the creation or preservation of jobs in UCC's domestic plants.

As a corollary to the above, if it were valid that foreign investment has caused an exportation of jobs, then as foreign investment increases over the years, exports from the U.S. should decrease. Our experience has shown exactly the opposite.

Finally, it should be emphasized that UCC has not laid off employees in the U.S. because of our foreign investments.

6. UCC'S POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION TO THE U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS—$805 MILLION FROM 1966–70

If funds flowing out of the U.S. from UCC for direct foreign investment, imports, and miscellaneous net payments are deducted from total funds flowing in from UCC exports, foreign dividends, service fees, and royalties, then it is found that UCC's positive or favorable contribution to the net balance of payments of the U.S. amounted for the single year 1970 to $236,000,000. Total 20-year figures are not available, but for the last five-year period 1966–70, the total contribution was $805,000,000.

Likewise, if two of the elements of the balance of payments equation—direct foreign investment outflow and inflow of dividend and other income from foreign affiliates—are compared, it is found that the latter exceeded investment funds sent overseas in 1970 by $19,900,000. For the period 1951–1970, this net positive contribution by UCC foreign investment to the U.S. balance of payments totaled $246,500,000.

7. INCOME TAX RATES PAID BY UCC'S INTERNATIONAL AFFILIATES AVERAGED 52.5 PERCENT DURING 1966–70

Between 1966 and 1970 UCC's share of the total income and withholding taxes paid to foreign governments by international affiliates amounted to $196,000,000. This was 52.5% of total combined before-tax earnings of such international affiliates, somewhat higher than the statutory U.S. rate. If UCC is in any way representative, it seems evident that the charge that the American multinational corporation makes foreign investments because it is more attractive taxwise, or to evade taxes is fallacious—why take the overseas risk if overall tax incidence is higher than at home?

Proposed legislation urges that undistributed foreign earnings be made subject to U.S. tax and credit against U.S. income tax for local income taxes paid by foreign affiliates be eliminated, all on the theory that foreign investment somehow is subsidized in the way of lower overall taxes. This proposal would of course produce double taxation contrary to international principles and treaties.

In the case of UCC this would have meant in 1970 that about 79% of all foreign income before tax would have been paid out as tax. Obviously, return on UCC overseas investment under these conditions would be far from commensurate with the risk. Certainly no new investment would be made by UCC under such tax conditions. Rather, divestiture would be indicated, with consequent adverse effect on exports and export-associated jobs as well as balance of payments of the U.S.

If these tax measures as proposed in the Hartke/Burke bill and other similar legislation pending before Congress had been in effect in 1970, UCC's tax burden would have been increased by $27,600,000. Enactment of this type of legislation would most certainly injure seriously UCC's entire international position, and would have a consequent adverse effect on our domestic investment capability, employment, exports, and earnings.

TRIBUTE TO HON. JOHN DOWDY

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to wish my friend and colleague, JOHN DOWDY, the very best in the years ahead as he reenters private life.

I have enjoyed my association and service with JOHN DOWDY in the legislative process and have known him as a very able and capable legislator.

He has served with distinction on the District Committee, and the Judiciary Committee.

I wish him well in his future as he returns to Texas at the close of this Congress.

CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM McCULLOCH

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have spoken on the House floor of my admiration for Congressman WILLIAM MCCULLOCH. I think by now it is clear that he has greatly inspired me. Certainly, I do not think that it can be denied that BILL MCCULLOCH is one of the most laudable men to have represented the State of Ohio in this U.S. House of Representatives.

It is particularly gratifying to realize that BILL's innumerable contributions have not gone unnoticed in his home State. He has received the Distinguished Alumni Award from the College of Wooster and from the Ohio State University College of Law. He also has been given the Ohio State University Achievement Award and the Congressional Distinguished Service Award of the American Political Science Association. All of these tributes and many more BILL certainly deserves for the exemplary service he has rendered during the last 24 years.

BILL, I wish you Godspeed. We indeed will miss you and your wise counsel in the years ahead.

AMERICAN VETERANS' COMMITTEE PLATFORM

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, at their annual convention in Kerhonkson, N.Y., on June 16–18, 1972, the American Veterans' Committee adopted a comprehensive platform dealing in three parts with veterans and Armed Forces affairs, national affairs, and international affairs. I believe my colleagues would be interested in the resolutions adopted at this convention and accordingly I ask unanimous consent to insert them into the RECORD.

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

PLATFORM OF THE AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE

VETERANS AND ARMED FORCES AFFAIRS

The American Veterans Committee has constantly reiterated, since its founding, its fundamental belief that rehabilitation and integration of veterans into the community is the proper scope and purpose of a veterans program. The achievement of economic security for veterans through sound economic planning for all citizens rather than through special grants or favors to veterans is basic AVC policy.

1. Compensation

For many years, AVC has pointed out the need for a thorough review and reappraisal of this Nation's policies on veterans as follows:

1. We oppose bonuses and general pensions as being class legislation and unrelated to the real needs of individual veterans and tending to set veterans apart from their fellow citizens.

In the matter of benefits, two basic standards should be applied.

a) For death or disability incurred in military service: Are the benefits sufficient to provide a decent standard of living for the veteran, his family or survivors?

b) For all veterans: Are the benefits so designed as to enable a readjustment from military service to civilian life with a minimum economic loss?

Since benefits are a Federal responsibility, uniform standards of administration and compensation should be applied nationally without regard to race, creed, color, sex, or national origin.

2. Draft

AVC recognizes the necessity for the United States to maintain adequate military forces in present world circumstances. It also recognizes the citizen's obligation to military service and recognizes a selective service system as an appropriate model of raising military manpower.

We recognize that the Selective Service System has been somewhat improved in recent years: The lottery system, increased minority draft board representation, more uniform quotas, lower quotas etc; AVC believes, however, that the System is far from equitable and calls for its continued improvement.

3. Reserve programs

The world we live in, with its emphasis on speed of operation and technical superiority, demands standing Armed Forces of sufficient size, training and equipment and organization to be effective immediately for defense and counter attack. It is apparent that the Regular Armed Forces must remain our first line of defense. They must be of sufficient size and mobility for deployment anywhere on the globe within a minimum of time so that we may continue to provide, when necessary, those forces needed for collective security under our international obligation in peripheral conflicts occurring in the strategic localities of the world.

AVC believes that the National Guard is ill-fitted to serve both roles which it is currently called upon to play. One role is that of assisting civil authorities in the United States in peace-time. Forces suited for that role should primarily consist of military police, possible infantry, with some supporting units (medical, signal, QM, etc.). The other role is that of forming a part of our highly complex and sophisticated Armed Forces with guided missiles, high mobility, heavy weapons and requirements for intensive technical training.

AVC regrets that the steps taken to integrate the National Guard have, so far, been far from adequate. While an office has been established in the National Guard Bureau to deal with equal opportunities, neither the staff nor the influence of that office are sufficient for the purpose.

Regrettably, while the percentage of minority group members in the regular Armed Forces is and remains relatively high, the percentage in the National Guard is low and has remained low despite certain recruiting efforts. We cannot afford to have a polarization within the Armed Forces as between

the National Guard on one hand and the Regulars on the other. While the domestic peace-time tasks which the National Guard is called upon to perform tend to involve minority group civilian populations, the troops involved should not present the appearance of an army of occupation.

While a National Guard remains a part of the structure of our Armed Forces, incentives should be provided so that a larger number of minority group personnel with active duty experience will choose to enter and remain in the National Guard.

AVC is opposed to any policy whereby the Armed Forces award discharges other than honorable to reserve personnel based upon the political or other activities in which these individuals may participate following separation from active service under the draft.

We believe that the conditions of discharge should be based solely upon the military activity and efficiency of the reservists.

4. Benefit dollar

AVC believes that provision should be made to maintain automatically the purchasing power of the benefit dollar and upward adjustments be made annually in accordance with the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Price Index.

5. Civil Service

AVC believes that veterans point preference in the civil service should be limited to the initial appointment only, and that no person should receive a position unless fully qualified to perform the duties involved.

We oppose the principle of granting absolute preference to veterans in state and local civil service.

6. GI Bill

AVC applauds the passage of a permanent G.I. Bill of Rights as a responsible means of enabling servicemen and women to return to civilian life with facility and ease at the end of their service and become useful and productive members of their communities. We also applaud the recent passage of legislation improving the benefits provided through the G.I. Bill of Rights.

However, we feel that benefits are not yet in line with the World War II and Korean War G.I. Bills and the current cost of living. Unfortunately, many existing programs remain unavailable to veterans because of the financial stress they now entail, or are available only at great sacrifice. This is particularly true in the area of educational programs.

AVC urges the Congress to further adjust benefits to match current costs of living and education.

The G.I. Bill of Rights should be administered in such manner as to guarantee the absence of discrimination.

7. VA hospitalization

AVC urges that treatment of nonservice-connected disabilities in VA hospitals be continued on a space-available basis, but that such treatment be charged at the full cost, if a patient has the means to pay for such service; certificates that a veteran is unable to pay should be investigated thoroughly to determine the true ability to meet the cost of hospitalization. Further that terms of coverage of all prepaid medical associations, plans and companies be amended by action of the legislatures, supervisory bodies or membership, so as to provide payment to VA hospitals for nonservice-connected treatment on the same basis as payment to private voluntary and public hospitals.

8. Unification

AVC notes with satisfaction that the process of unification of the Armed Forces has been making progress. AVC commends the actions hitherto taken in this regard and urges that the Department of Defense continue these efforts vigorously.

9. Discrimination—Foreign and domestic

We maintain that no assignment of any military personnel should be made whether within the United States or overseas, for consideration on grounds of color, religion, ancestry or national origin.

Our goal is to insure no member or employee of the Armed Forces, and no dependents of such person shall be subject to discriminatory treatment, on or off base within the United States or outside the United States, on the grounds of color, religion, ancestry or national origin, and that the power, including the economic power, of the United States be consciously used to further this objective.

10. Information service

We owe the men of our armed services the best possible training to equip them for the rigors of modern combat under the most adverse conditions of weather, terrain, supply and enemy action. We further believe that an orientation program be instituted in order to acquaint the prospective draftee, at the time of registration, with all the rights, privileges, benefits and special training he and his family will be entitled to if and when he is inducted into the Armed Services.

11. Jurisdiction over ex-servicemen and civilians accompanying the Armed Forces overseas

We believe that the ex-servicemen, military dependents, and civilians accompanying the armed forces abroad should not escape punishment for serious offenses committed while in such status, but should be tried before civilian courts. By serious offenses we mean crimes of the same degree of seriousness as felonies at common law.

12. Awards and benefits

All laws of the United States pertaining to the granting of military medals or decorations, military disability retirement or compensation, dependents and survivors benefits, veterans benefits (including benefits to dependents or survivors), or other special benefits to military personnel or their dependents on the basis of wartime service of such military personnel shall apply in like manner to service performed in such areas and during such periods as proclaimed by the President where combat or combat conditions exist and the United States forces to which such person is attached are either engaged in the combat, engaged in military operations designed to carry out any treaty or other international obligation of the United States.

13. Need subhead

AVC notes that legislation has been enacted which expedites the naturalization process of servicemen and exservicemen and which allows noncitizen widows of servicemen who die while on active duty to be naturalized without penalizing them for the death of their husbands.

The problem of aliens in the armed services being sent overseas before their naturalization is complete, even though no prior period of residence is required, persists. AVC urges that, *either*, following the precedent set in former Section 702 of the Nationality Act of 1940, provision be made for such persons to be naturalized while outside the United States, *or that the services adopt a ruling whereby service personnel in process of Naturalization, who are not themselves contributing to the delays involved, will not be sent overseas until the naturalization process is complete.*

Resolution on the Draft

AVC reaffirms its position on the draft as stated in our platform and which has been presented in detailed testimony to the House and Senate Armed Forces Committees, and in other public testimony, over the years.

AVC also continues to deplore the lack of Congressional action for specific reforms of the draft law which have received wide public support, and which were endorsed by AVC, which are urgently needed.

Further;

1. AVC reiterates its position against a mercenary army.

2. AVC supports provisions which will enable students who have begun their studies to delay their active duty until they have reached a reasonable point of completion of these studies, but which will *not exempt* them from service. In this connection, AVC suggests that consideration be given to an adaptation of the Enlisted Reserve Corps program used during World War II.

3. AVC reiterates the positions it has previously taken concerning the improvement of the legal rights of draftees, composition of draft boards, system of election, etc.

4. AVC agrees with the Supreme Court decision whereby total conscientious objection need not rest exclusively on a religious basis, but may instead be based on sincere philosophical or ethical views.

AVC asks for a uniform implementation of the new principles enunciated and urges that consideration be given to ways in which sincere selective conscientious objection can be recognized.

Resolution on Military Expenditures and Domestic Needs

It is well established that the needs of our domestic economy are so critical that they cannot be met at the existing level of federal expenditures. The problems of pollution, hunger, poverty, living conditions in our cities and rural areas, public safety, and other domestic needs, require massive infusion of federal funds not available in the present budget.

Our inflated military budget has taken badly needed public funds from our domestic programs. AVC believes that the present military establishment can be cut, especially our Forces stationed in Bases throughout the world, without sacrificing our National Security, and that the requirements of domestic programs should have at least as high a priority as our military requirements.

We therefore urge:

That the military budget be substantially cut and such funds be used in domestic programs.

That any savings from a cut-back in Vietnam expenditures be used for domestic rather than be transferred to other military purposes.

That we actively pursue the SALT talks and any savings resulting from an arms limitation treaty be diverted to domestic needs.

That a more effective scrutiny be given new and untried weapons systems which would put a heavy financial strain on the defense budget in future years, and that funds not be used to bail out defense contractors facing insolvency.

That significant cuts be made in the size of our armed forces and supporting civilian personnel especially in our forces stationed in bases throughout the world without impairing our national security.

Resolution on Military Justice

AVC favors revision of the Uniform Code of Military Justice to take the court-martial system out of the line of command. AVC generally favors such legislation.

Resolution on Administrative Discharges

AVC is gravely concerned for the thousands of ex-servicemen who have been, and who continue to be, returned to civilian life, stigmatized by discharges less than Honorable awarded by administrative decision.

The armed services currently provide by regulation that those facing administrative discharges rated "Undesirable" or lower have the right to a hearing, to advice—which is usually but not always provided by an at-

torney—to witness, and to other procedural safeguards. AVC is aware, however, of the pressures operating upon the individuals concerned, causing many to waive rights only half understood, or to place greater priority on release from service than upon the permanent damage being done to them.

Congress is currently considering legislation which would enshrine the present procedures in a statute, with somewhat greater emphasis on the rights of those involved.

AVC believes, however, that the problem requires far more profound study, including at least the following points:

1) The validity of the reason often cited by the military for its procedure: that those who have earned an Honorable discharge would resent the awarding of such a discharge to those being separated because of inaptness, unfitness or misconduct so mild as not to warrant a court-martial;

2) How to treat those who should not have been accepted for military service in the first instance, and whose inaptness or unsuitability manifests itself after only brief service: whether, for example, the individual's induction or enlistment could be voided retroactively rather than terminated by award of a discharge, and whether this could be done without stigmatizing such individuals:

3) Whether it would be possible to give the services only two alternatives: Honorable Discharge and lesser Discharge by Court-Martial only.

In the meantime, AVC calls for amendment both of the current regulations and of the proposed legislation, so as to classify the "General Discharge under Honorable Conditions" as the mildest form of punitive discharge, not to be awarded except after hearing, rather than as an alternative form of Honorable Discharge, within the discretion of the authority responsible for discharging the individual concerned. The Department of Defense's contention that the possession of a General Discharge does not handicap an individual has not been borne out by the facts.

Resolution on Legal Assistance Program for Military Personnel

Whereas the 1971 National Convention of the American Veterans Committee endorsed the Pilot Legal Assistance Program then being conducted by each of the armed services, and

Whereas the American Veterans Committee has, since that time, considered:

1) The Final Report of the Army Pilot Legal Assistance Program, dated 24 April 1972;

2) A memorandum from the Secretary of the Army to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower & Reserve Affairs) dated 10 May 1972, forwarding the Final Report, and recommending the continuing and expansion of the Legal Assistance Program, in an expanded test;

3) The review of the Legal Assistance Program conducted by the Standing Committee on Legal Assistance for Servicemen of the American Bar Association;

4) The resolutions passed by a number of state and local Bar Associations;

5) The information which the American Veterans Committee has itself received from other sources;

Now therefore, the 1972 Convention of the American Veterans Committee supports and endorses the recommendations for an expanded test program submitted by the Secretary of the Army, and similar expanded test programs to be conducted by the other services.

Resolution on "Atrocities, Private Wars and Silence"

As veterans of savage and bloody wars, we are shocked and ashamed at the reported atrocities committed by both sides in the war in Southeast Asia, as well as at the disclosure that General Lavelle and other high-ranking officers deliberately disregarded government policy to initiate a private air war against North Vietnam. We are convinced that incidents such as those in My Lai and the bombardment of North Vietnam could not have been prevented from coming to public attention, the first for over two years and the second for several months, if a considerable number of senior officers had not been determined to keep them secret. AVC calls for whatever action may be necessary to make sure that members of the Armed Forces who take it on themselves to report such incidents to the Congress and to the people are not only effectively protected from reprisals, but that their courage in making the reports be particularly recognized; and that "conspiracies of silence" be explicitly and severely punished, quite apart from the incidents themselves. AVC believes that a one-star demotion and retirement is far too lenient a sanction for General Lavelle and calls upon the Department of Defense to act affirmatively on the charges filed against the officer concerned by several members of the Armed Forces.

Resolution on Religious Freedom

AVC supports the principle of freedom of religion in the armed forces. Religious observance should be neither denied nor compelled, nor exploited for non-religious purposes.

AVC recognizes the propriety of providing chaplains and chapels, because military personnel who desire to worship may not otherwise have the opportunity to do so.

AVC, however, supports the law suit directed against the practice of requiring chapel attendance at the service academies, and opposes the use of chaplains to indoctrinate service personnel on military political, "moral" and religious matters.

Resolution on Civil Rights and Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces

The American Veterans Committee has a record unique among veterans organizations, of concern for racial justice and equal opportunity in the armed forces, a record which has extended from early support for President Truman's orders to integrate the regular Army in the late 1940's to early and public support for the use of the off-limits sanction against discriminating landlords.

AVC has watched, with growing concern, as racial polarization, reflected in the reports of the Render mission to Europe as well as in the report of the NAACP investigation, has apparently greatly increased in the past few years.

AVC is aware of the efforts which have been made by successive incumbents in the position of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Rights, aided by a small and overworked staff, to stem the tide, and to create a real equality of opportunity; AVC is also aware of the degree to which that office is understaffed, and of its relative lack of "clout."

AVC is also aware of the efforts which have recently been made by the Department of Defense, including the creation of a Race Relations Institute and increasing counseling efforts throughout the military services. AVC regrets that these efforts are not yet sufficiently well funded or effective.

AVC believes that the following portions of prior resolutions on this subject are still applicable today:

1. AVC reminds those concerned with military-related costs that the cost of racial friction (lost man-hours, reduced combat effectiveness, added cost of burdens on the military justice and military confinement systems, lower efficiency by those alienated) is many times greater than the cost of a Civil Rights staff large enough, well funded enough, and sufficiently well backed to do an effective job.

2. Urges the Secretary of Defense to strengthen the Office of Civil Rights, Department of Defense, in personnel and in funds to the point at which it will have a real impact.

3. Points out that among reserve and National Guard personnel with the obligation or the opportunity to serve short tours of active duty, are many with particular expertise in the civil rights area and urges that these skills be better utilized.

4. Recalls, that AVC has, throughout its history, worked closely with the Department of Defense in the civil rights area, on projects such as the tour of Southern military bases by AVC leaders in 1960 and the Audit of the National Guard undertaken in 1963.

5. Offers whatever services it can render in this area to the Department of Defense.

Resolution on Conference of Returning Veterans

The 1970 AVC National Convention took note of the severe problems facing returning veterans, and the 1971 AVC National Convention called for a National Conference on Returning Veterans.

On May 24–25, 1971, the American Veterans Committee hosted a Nationl Conference and played an active role in its developerans, held at the National 4–H Center in Chevy Chase. A number of national organizations joined in the planning of the Conference on Education and the Returning Vetment and execution.

The 1972 AVC National Convention, hereby goes on record:

1) Thanking the cooperating organizations and the numerous individual participants and resource persons for making the National Conference a success.

2) Authorizes and requests the AVC staff, together with such support as may be forthcoming from other organizations and foundations, to publisize the results of the National Conference, and to follow up on its recommendations.

Resolution on Advanced Allowance for Returning Veterans

Be it Resolved: In order that the disadvantaged Vietnam era veterans have an opportunity to attend a college or technical school without due hardship, he should be given his G.I. Educational Benefits Check in August, prior to the commencement of the school year, rather than receiving his check in November which is the current procedure. This forces many veterans into debt and hardship, and also keeps many veterans from applying for benefits which they have earned by their military service.

We strongly urge passage of legislation to provide advance payments to eligible veterans.

Resolution on Lists of Servicemen

The 1971 AVC National Convention deplored the fact that the Veterans Administration was furnishing lists of recently discharged military personnel only to certain hand-picked organizations, some of which have long histories of racial and ethnic discrimination.

The Vietnam Veterans Against the War have won a law suit to compel the Veterans Administration to make such lists—covering at least those military personnel who have served in Southeast Asia—available to them.

Despite this court decision, the Veterans Administration has not broadened the categories of organizations to receive the lists.

The 1972 AVC National Convention calls upon the Veterans Administration to make such lists available on an equitable basis to all veterans organizations which do not discriminate, and to other organizations, such as associations of colleges for any serious noncommercial purpose.

Resolution on Naming of VA Hospital

AVC supports the bill introduced by Congressman Bingham, H.R. 4197, to rename the VA Hospital in Jackson, Mississippi as the Medger Evers Hospital.

Resolution on Nondiscrimination in the Military Medicare Program

While AVC was greatly encouraged by the decision of June 10, 1968 of the Department of Defense to coordinate its efforts in achieving non-discrimination in the Military Medicare (CHAMPUS) Program with the Title VI enforcement effort in medical facilities being conducted by the Office of Civil Rights at HEW.

AVC regrets that the plans for coordination have not been implemented (except for barring CHAMPUS payments to some eight hospitals for so long as they had been cut off from Medicare programs because of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act), due to the failure of the Department of Defense to authorize a very minor item of reimbursement to HEW, and

Calls upon the Department of Defense to implement its policy and to launch coordination effort so long delayed.

We regret that, despite the passage of four years since the decision of 1968, the policy has not been implemented.

We call on the Secretary of Defense to inform us by when we can expect progress in this area.

Resolution on Abortion in Military Hospitals

AVC deplores President Nixon's order that therapeutic abortions in United States military hospitals be allowed or disallowed in accordance with the laws of the state in which the hospital is located. Such a policy discriminates against those who are domiciled in states with more restrictive laws by reason of the military service of the head of the family. It also denies women the right to control their own bodies and physicians' rights to practice medicine according to professional standards.

We endorse the principle that abortion should be a matter strictly between the woman patient and her physician. We urge that this principle be applied in military and all other government hospitals and clinics and become the basis of legislation in all states.

Resolution on Rationalization of VA and other Government Hospital Systems

The United States Government currently operates six separate hospital systems: Army, Navy and Air Force (operated by Department of Defense), Public Health Service and Indian (operated by DHEW) and the Veterans Administration.

AVC has a long history of favoring rationalization of government processes. AVC believes that federal decisions to build hospitals, to open and close its hospitals, and to set up specialized medical, surgical and psychiatric programs should not be made system-by-system. While we do not, at present, insist on unifying all hospital systems, there should be comprehensive planning, much more cross-utilization and rationalization.

In addition we ask that the secretaries responsible for these systems undertake studies on the feasibility of contracting with civilian hospitals for services to selected beneficiaries.

Resolution on the Military and the Equal Rights Amendment

AVC reminds the Department of Defense that the expected passage of the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution will require major changes in the customs, practices, attitudes and policies of the military services, and urges the Department to begin its forward planning at this time.

Congress and at least one half the requisite number of states have ratified the Amendment, and there appears to be little doubt of its passage. Changes in practices based upon legislative mandates will have to await the effective date of the Amendment; practices based on customs, regulations and policies, as well as those based on legislation where there is discretion in the application to the sexes, can and should be changed as soon as practicable.

Among the areas requiring attention are: Restrictions on assignment of female military personnel; entry and retention in service of personnel responsible for the care of minor children; and equality of treatment of family members of male and female military personnel.

Resolution on Veterans Benefits Amendments

AVC favors the following amendments to Veterans Benefit legislation:

1) An increase in education benefits to parity, in terms of 1972 cost-of-living and cost-of-education dollars, with the benefits given World War II veterans;

2) Permanent legislation providing for automatic cost-of-living and cost-of-education adjustments, with a formula similar to that which adjusts military and civil service retirement pay;

3) Strengthening the PREP program, and overcoming the particular hurdles faced by servicemen's participation therein;

4) Making it possible for veterans to attend college-preparatory or remedial programs without reducing the duration of their entitlement, and without requiring 25 clock hours a week;

5) Initiating a VA work-study program which would allow veterans to be hired at prevailing wages;

6) Tightening standards for approval of correspondence schools, including requiring equitable tuition refund policies;

7) Reducing clock-hour requirements for attendance at non-profit community and vocational schools;

8) Making NSLI Trust Funds available as a revolving fund to finance veterans educational loans;

9) Eliminating sex discrimination in educational benefit payments by treating the family members of male and of female veterans alike;

10) Expanding outreach programs on a contract basis, with adequate safeguards against boondoggles.

Resolution on Unemployment Compensation for Veterans

Whereas, the needs of Vietnam Veterans and the unemployment level of the nation both indicate that the amount of veterans unemployment compensation benefits is not now sufficient.

Whereas, the U.S. Congress has considered increasing unemployment compensation benefits not to exceed $75.00 per week.

Whereas, the legislation proposed preserves State requirements and regulations for veterans employment compensation benefits.

Resolved, that the AVC adopts the position that unemployment compensation benefits shall be increased in amount to $75.00.

Resolution on Younger Military Retirees

AVC is concerned about personnel retired from the armed forces after 20 years' service, but below age 60. After a score of years of service—active and reserve—such individuals are placed in limbo until they reach age of 60, at which time their pension begins, and they acquire the privileges which are usually associated with retired military status. AVC believes that the honorable completion of 20 years of service should entitle these younger retirees at least to an I.D. card which would authorize them the same 'fringe benefits' (PX, commissary, travel, etc.) at minimal expense to the government, as the older retirees.

Resolution on Drugs in the Military

AVC is concerned about the serious problem of drug abuse by servicemen and the veterans. Although the extent of the problem is not known with certainty (figures vary from 5.2% from military sources to 20% from some medical testimony), we cannot be sanguine about any amount of drug abuse. Drug use and abuse involves medical, psychiatric and social issues as well as issues of military management, morale, and discipline. A rational approach to the drug issue requires distinction between addiction and experimental or occasional use and intermediate degrees of drug abuse; distinction between hard and soft drug use; and determinations of need for separation and type of separation on an individual basis.

AVC favors treatment for servicemen using drugs while on active duty. In many cases, servicemen, if treated promptly, can be returned to useful service with their units. Those who are discharged with a drug problem should have medical help, both from the Veterans Administration and private agencies contracted for by the Veterans Administration.

AVC favors imaginative programs and research and the use of non-military and non-governmental agencies for treatment of veterans whenever needed.

AVC opposes automatic less-than-honorable dicharges for drug use. In each individual case, careful consideration should be given to the serviceman's actual contributions to his service versus his actions to the detriment of that service. Also, the discharge review process should determine whether adequate treatment and rehabilitation have been accomplished.

AVC opposes the use of information obtained from servicemen who have volunteered for treatment against those very servicemen.

AVC opposes misuse of medical records and unreasonable breach of medical confidentiality.

AVC believes the United States must insist on cooperation by foreign powers to control drug production, transport, and sale.

AVC supports pending legislation to increase available treatment sources, and urges passage of the Drug and Rehabilitation Act.

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

AVC stands for the Bill of Rights as a living force animating the political life of our Nation and as a firm limitation on the arbitrariness of government.

AVC stands for the Bill of Rights as a guarantee of our freedom to speak, to assemble, to believe, and to dissent without fear from the conformities of the day.

AVC stands for equality for all, regardless of race, color, ancestry, national origin, religion, sex or age, and for the constitutional guarantees of such equality.

AVC stands for just legislative representation of the people of the United States, the States and their subdivisions, without poll taxes or other property qualifications for voting, with equal weight for each vote, and on a geographically fair basis, within the framework of the Constitution of the United States.

AVC stands for a policy of gainful, full employment and security for all, as outlined in the Employment Act of 1946.

AVC stands for responsible, efficient, and honest government and for the merit system in government employment.

AVC stands for a government possessing and willing to exercise all powers necessary to bring about a solution of our national problems.

AVC supports the active intervention of government, primarily of the Federal Government, in the economy and the general welfare of our country to stimulate and provide employment to improve the physical condition of our cities and towns, of our housing and our schools, to bring all the greatest benefits from the development and conservation of our natural and industrial resources and to provide for the general welfare and health of our people.

AVC supports a tax policy based on ability to pay and opposes regressive sales and excise taxes.

AVC stands for the recognition of equal

rights for labor and management and for improved social benefits of employees.

AVC supports an educational system and a public health system which will give the American people, and America's youth in particular, the knowledge, skills, and training, and the physical and mental health and stamina, to continue their forward march toward America's democratic fulfillment.

Government and liberty

I. The Nation's Freedom—the Bill of Rights

1. We affirm the basic right of all Americans to due process of law, the right to counsel and to freedom from unlawful search and seizure. We oppose all efforts to suppress freedoms to believe, speak, write, assemble, criticize, and dissent.

2. A. We urge strong and consistent enforcement of existing laws and regulations which will insure to the citizens of the United States and of the several States the full measure of their privileges and immunities of due process of law and the equal protection of the laws guaranteed to them by the Constitution, regardless of race, color, ancestry, national origin, religion, sex, or age, and urge the national, state and local governments to enact such further laws, ordinances and regulations as may be needed further to insure these ends.

B. We believe in the principles of the separation of church and state.

C. We favor freedom from censorship of newspapers, magazines, radio, television, motion pictures and other media by the Post Office, Customs Bureau, police departments, and other units of government as well as by private pressure groups.

D. We oppose the use of wiretapping and electronic and other forms of eavesdropping devices whether by private individuals or Government officials, elected or appointed.

E. We urge protection by Federal law of all members of the Armed Forces from physical violence because of race, color, ancestry, national origin or religion.

F. We urge making lynching a Federal crime, as well as making provisions for compensation to the families of lynching victims.

G. We favor Federal legislation making it a crime to bomb or to conspire to bomb school, church and other public and quasi-public property.

3. A. The right against self-incrimination. No inference should be drawn in regard to guilt in any legal proceeding of any person solely because he exercises this right.

B. The right to travel. The right of an American citizen to travel abroad should not be arbitrarily abridged by the Federal Government.

II. The Nation's Government

1. Freedom of information. The right of the people to full knowledge of government affairs must not be bridged, except where disclosure would imperil the national security or where disclosure would, without substantial public benefit, encroach on the right of the individual to personal liberty or freedom.

2. Congress: We urge proper changes in the rules of the Congress of the United States which will make it possible for the majority of the members to vote cloture or closed debate on legislation after a reasonable period, and which will make merit, not tenure alone, the standard to be used in the selection of committee chairmen.

We urge changes in the House and Senate rules to require recorded votes on all actions; to facilitate this procedure, we urge that electronic voting machinery be provided.

3. Federal-State Relations: We favor strict Federal standard-setting and enforcement in all federal grants in aid. "Federal standards should be minimums and should allow for states to adopt stricter standards."

4. State and local government: We urge reapportionment within the States consistent with the principle "one man one vote."

5. The Federal civil service:

A. Apart from discharges based on reorganization of Government activities or reduction in force, Government employees should be discharged only for cause and through due process of law. The employees should be presented with a written statement of charges, have the right to a hearing before an impartial board. He should have the right to present evidence, be confronted with adverse witnesses, cross-examine witnesses, and receive a transcript of the hearing free of charge. Action toward his separation from the Government service should be taken only on the basis thus made.

B. The rights granted to veterans in the Veterans Preference Act in regard to discharged procedures and appeals should be extended to all Government employees except those in probationary status.

6. District of Columbia: We urge that the District of Columbia receive, by legislation or by constitutional amendment where the matter cannot be handled by legislation:

A. The right to local self-government and;

B. The right to elect Senators and Representatives in Congress:

C. An equitable annual Federal contribution in lieu of taxes.

Economic security

III. Basic Economic Policy

1. We continue to support the Employment Act of 1964 which states it is the policy of the Government to create and maintain "conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities including self-employment for those able, willing and seeking to work and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

2. To insure the interest of the consumer, we urge Congress to establish a Department of the Consumer, to be headed by a Secretary of Cabinet rank.

IV. Monetary Policy and Tax Policy

1. Monetary policy:

We urge the establishment of Federal capital budget for reimbursable public works appropriations and to improve the accounting and budgetary operations of the Government.

2. Tax policy:

A. We urge elimination of special provisions in the internal revenue laws which are discriminatory in nature. As blatant examples, we point to the favored tax treatment of the extractive industries, the restrictive stock options for corporate executives, the retirement income credit, the preferred tax treatment of profits on stock market transactions, and the dividend exclusion and credit provision.

B. We also call for an end to the abuse of the deductibility of business expenses to finance luxurious travel, vacations, and entertainment for business management, professional men and sales executives.

V. The Urban Crisis

AVC from its inception has been vitally concerned about the urban crisis, and we recognize the urgency of effective action to overcome the conditions which have caused it. These are manyfaceted, including a shortage of jobs, of homes, of services, of educational incentives, of recreational opportunities. They also include environmental pollution and the citizen's increasing inability to influence or even participate in city government by democratic means. Many of these evils are most concentrated in the slums.

The concept embodied in the Model Cities program, of strengthening local government and the people it serves to solve these problems, offers a sensible approach to solution of the urban crisis itself. AVC urges expansion of this demonstration program to all communities which may benefit from it, with adequate financing for both the development of local plans and the federal programs which are expected to contribute to their implementation. We intend to be vigilant, that the focus remains, under the new program guidelines, on the disadvantaged in the cities.

Citizen participation in the planning and administration, as provided for in Model Cities, Community Action and other programs, is the democratic means of assuring that resources intended to help the disadvantaged are not bargained away with the consent, or at least the understanding, of the poor themselves. We urge the Congress to retain its requirements for citizen participation and extend them to additional programs which the federal government supports. We urge also that provision be made and funds be allocated for independent planning staff and facilities for citizens' groups and commissions.

An important aspect of the urban crisis is housing. Physical reclamation of the slums requires the provision of housing for those who now inhabit the slums, at rents or prices which are fair and which they can afford to pay. To bring this about, we favor flexible use and adequate funding of the variety of programs now in use, including rent supplements, eased purchase credit, reduced interest costs. We also recognize that it will be some time before the private housing industry will be able to play a significant role in such low-return activities, and we therefore call for the widest variety of public investments in housing, such as traditional public housing, turnkey housing, direct interest-free loans and leased housing. And we need serious thought about new approaches.

Beyond the creation of the necessary housing, our government must assure that access to housing is assured regardless of the race, color, creed, national origin, age or size of family of the prospective user. We call for vigorous enforcement of the Fair Housing provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, which was a start toward elimination of the ghettos.

We also recognize that the urban crisis is affected by the rural crisis which has long been apparent but ignored. We therefore demand that the scantlyfunded rural counterpart program be revitalized and used toward stabilizing the life of our rural citizens in the countryside where they prefer to live instead of forcing them to migrate to the cities, often to be engulfed by the slums.

VI. Conservation and Development of Natural Resources

We accept as a cardinal principle of conservation policy that the natural resources of this land are given to us in trust for the people of this and subsequent generations. The benefits of these resources must be distributed widely and equitably and a share thereof must be preserved for future citizens.

Through comprehensive and coordinated national and regional planning and development, wise use, and enlightened conservation, this can be done. The very nature of the problem requires that Government play a major and controlling role in assuring that conservation.

1. Department of Natural Resources. We propose the organization of the Department of Natural Resources. Such a new department should provide for regionally decentralized opportunities for program formulation and execution, while clearly placing federal responsibility for resources development within the framework of a single agency. The regional multi-purpose concept may require that specific localities or projects be reserved or developed for one or more preferred use.

2. Water and Air Conservation:

A. We reaffirm our strong support of comprehensive multi-purpose river basin development and urge the accelerated application of this principle to our river basins.

B. We similarly favor regional planning by the States and metropolitan areas as well as area redevelopment.

C. We urge the Federal Government to undertake the planning and construction of multi-purpose water and power projects similar to the one provided in the Tennessee Valley. Their very scope requires government development and precludes the short-term, piecemeal operations of private interests.

D. The conservation and development of adequate fresh water supplies to meet expanding needs for domestic agricultural, industrial, wildlife and recreational uses, and the protection and improvement of water quality, especially in relation to accumulated pesticides and other contaminating matters, are of increasingly urgent concern.

3. Energy resources conservation. We call for:

A. The maximum feasible development of our only renewable energy resource hydroelectric power including Federal construction of multi-purpose power dams and other waterpower, irrigation, flood control and navigation works using standards of feasibility and repayment schedules for such projects based upon their reasonably expected service service life.

B. A continuation and acceleration of the Federal programs to develop and stimulate development of effective processes for the utilization of our immense reserves of oil, natural gas, shale and coal.

C. Removal of executive and legislative restrictions on the importation of crude petroleum and petroleum products.

D. A major increase in the scope and speed of air pollution measures.

E. Reduction in the rate of increase of energy consumption from all sources.

F. Development of more efficient and economical methods of using energy resources as regards both conversion of the resources to energy and capture of the energy for useful work.

G. The development of atomic energy (both fission and fusion types) for power and other peaceful purposes consistent with safety from excessive radiation and thermal emissions. In this regard, we urge intensive research and prompt publication of research findings.

4. Recreation and Wildlife:

The expansion in the demands for outdoor recreation opportunities requires that we add to our national park system and increase the recreational developments on our national forests, public lands, reservoirs and seashores.

We endorse legislation to control billboard erection in scenic areas. Urban planning and redevelopment should include provision for open spaces and outdoor recreation areas.

5. National Land Reserve.

We support the concept that our remaining public lands constitute a "National Land Reserve" to be administered for the benefit of the public with appropriate safeguards for future generations.

6. Pesticide Control.

We urge careful consideration and close supervision of pest control programs in recreational, farming, and urban areas.

VII. Agriculture

American agriculture is increasingly the victim of the owners of the new machines, themselves investors rather than farmers. Hired workers are displaced from jobs, and farm lands are being concentrated in fewer hands as farmers themselves are displaced.

AVC calls for a four-part approach to the resulting problems:

1. A reduction of subsidies to industrialized agriculture, those now being paid in proportion to production or for practices which, like some in other industries, are a normal part of the business;

2. New approaches to two problems of the sub-marginal farmer and the farm laborer, recognizing that their plight is closely related to that of the underemployed urban worker and is only in part agricultural.

3. Strengthening the economic family farm through greater attention to credit, service and marketing needs;

4. Providing for rural people the whole range of educational cultural, recreational, health and other opportunities already accessible to dwellers in metropolitan areas.

VIII. Labor

We urge:

1. Periodic updating of the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to insure the coverage of maximum numbers of categories of workers and a realistic and decent Federal minimum wage.

2. Enactment of laws for the full disclosure of the administration of pension and health and welfare plans, whether administered by unions or management or jointly by both. Federal law should follow existing Federal securities legislation and State laws such as that of the State of New York for the exemptions contained in the latter.

IX. Social Welfare

As veterans concerned with the social welfare of all citizens we urge:

1. Federal standards to increase unemployment insurance benefits, more realistic eligibility standards and lengthening of the period for which benefits are paid.

2. Development of a strong and unified child welfare program with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

3. Development of Federal services and grants-in-aid for the prevention and control of narcotics addiction, based on the premise that drug addiction is a disease to be treated.

X. Education

1. We recognize that "in the quality of education lies the fate of freedom itself." We urge the provision of educational opportunity for every American to the limits of his capacity, and the identification of the talented among us in order to challenge them to their highest achievement.

2. To improve and extend existing scholarship and loan programs for college and university students.

3. To extend scholarships and exchange programs for study by Americans abroad and by nationals of other countries in the United States.

4. To appropriate adequate Federal aid to communities impacted by Federal programs.

5. We oppose the use of public funds whether as grants or loans to non-public elementary and secondary schools.

XI. Public Health

We urge:

1. Increased Federal expenditures for research in the prevention and care of illness.

2. Expansion of medical insurance and group medical care plans, including a plan for national health insurance.

3. Expansion of public health facilities and services, hospitals and nursing homes, without regard to race, color, ancestry, national origin, religion or sex.

XII. Indian Rights

We oppose revocation of commitments entered into by treaty between the U.S. Government or the Government of any state and the various Indian tribes.

We support all efforts (1) to safeguard Indian lands and resources from exploitation and expropriation in violation of treaty rights and (2) to make the Indian tribes capable of supporting themselves from the proper development of their resources.

We support adequate health and educational services for the Indian tribes capable of supporting themselves from the proper development of their resources. We support adequate health and educational services for the Indian reservation as well as training in modern industrial and management skills to enhance the opportunities for better living and the ability of the Indian tribes to manage their own affairs.

We also support social services to those Indians who desire to live outside their tribal reservations so as to assist them in adapting themselves especially to urban living and to protect them against discrimination and hostility in their new environment.

Resolution on opening the suburbs to low- and middle-income housing

AVC notes with dismay the increasing isolation of two societies—the black inner city and the white suburbs. This has resulted from continued racial discrimination in suburban jurisdictions and the action of such jurisdictions to deny low and middle income housing through zoning restrictions. The effect of this action has been to increase polarization between black and white and rich and poor; to deny black and low income workers job opportunities in the suburbs, accelerate the physical blight and economic decline of our cities and negate federal programs designed to provide low and middle income housing.

AVC therefore urges that the Department of Housing and Urban Development deny federal grants to suburban and other jurisdictions unless such jurisdictions establish affirmative action programs to provide and permit low and middle income housing commensurate with the needs of the residents in the metropolitan region.

Resolution for a national health security system for the United States

The escalating expense of Health Care, the lack of sufficiently trained medical personnel and facilities, the unmet medical needs in the treatment and prevention of disease for all segments of our society, the special medical problems of the poor and the aged, and the inefficiencies and excessive costs of the present patch-work system of public and private financing of medical aid urgently require the adoption of a nationally administered actuarially sound, and federally financed Health Security System which adequately benefits all members of our society in the most efficient and least costly way. The proposals contained in the jointly sponsored National Health Security Acts, S. 3 in the Senate proposed by Senators Kennedy, Cooper, Saxbe, and others, and H.R. 22 introduced by Representatives Griffiths, Corman, Reid, and Mosher, among others and in S. 934, although lacking adequate provision for dental and psychiatric care and prescription drugs and being deficient in dealing with the delivery of health services evenly throughout the society, do present a comprehensive reform program of federal health insurance with a broad range of medical services designed to cover the bulk of unmet medical personnel, the cost of which will be provided to the extent of 50% from General Revenues and the remainder by Health and Security Taxes on employers and employees. It is superior to the other Health proposals made to Congress, none of which rely largely on costly private insurance funding, and only partially meet the needs and fail to solve many of the basic problems of the present system.

We recognize the shortcomings of S. 3. We believe that it should be improved and broadened to remove the deficiencies noted herein; it will then provide an excellent, major betterment to our present Health System. The fact that the funds will be collected and administered through the Social Security System implies greater efficiency than privately funded plans can offer.

Resolution on welfare reform

AVC urges action in this session of Congress to create a new system of income maintenance which will meet the basic needs of all individuals and families who are unable to work, whose earnings are inadequate and for whom jobs are not available. Such legislation should be based on the following principles:

1. A unified and largely federally financed program of assistance to assure equitable and efficient treatment and administration.

2. Benefits should be available to everyone in need—those in low paying jobs as well as the unemployed, those without families as well as dependent children and their parents.

3. Assistance grants should provide all Americans with an income adequate to sustain them in a state of health and minimal decency. If fiscal consideration precludes such immediate grant levels, then provisions should be placed in the legislation for orderly steps at time intervals to reach standards of adequacy for health and decency as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics with flexibility of grant levels to meet realistic variations in costs of living.

4. Incentives and realistic aids should be employed to encourage those eligible for public assistance to move into job training and full employment. No recipient should be required to take a job at less than the minimum federal wage to prevailing area wage, whichever is higher. Recipients should have the right to keep enough earned income to make working more attractive rather than relying solely on public assistance. Further, public service jobs should be provided where there is a shortage of private or other public service jobs.

5. A declaration of need should be accepted as *prima facie* evidence of eligibility. Spot check can be used to determine accuracy of eligibility and payment such as those used in the Social Security and Income Tax programs.

6. Rearing children should be recognized as important and meaningful employment. Mothers of pre-school age children should not be forced to accept work or training against their will.

7. Adequate child care facilities are necessary if working mothers are to take advantage of work and training programs. Provisions should be made for national standards for child care services. Child care should be not merely custodial but should be designed to meet the educational, nutrition and health needs of the children. Care should be provided for elementary school children after school. The poor should be trained and employed as child care center workers. No family should be required to pay a fee for child care unless it has income sufficient to meet its need with minimal decency.

Resolution on price and income policy

In spite of the trauma of three years of recession and unemployment rates at or above 6% overall and estimated at 8–15% for veterans and as high as 25% for minority veterans, the rate of inflation and cost-of-living increases continue at an unacceptable pace. The wage and price controls and structures established by the Nixon administration are neither working adequately to control inflation nor fair to all segments of the economy. Major changes are needed to remove the gross inequities of the present system, and a just and fair means must be established to stabilize prices, wages, and profits.

AVC once again calls for prompt and effective steps under the Employment Act of 1964. Effective new programs for greatly increasing employment must be found and implemented.

Resolution and revenue sharing and Federal aid

AVC supports the principle of federal financial assistance to state and local governments because of the far superior revenue-raising capacity of the federal government through the progressive rates of federal income and estate taxes, etc.

However, we are opposed to the "nostrings" revenue sharing proposal of the Nixon Administration known as "general" and "special" revenue sharing. The "general" revenue sharing proposal contemplates grants to states starting at $5 billion a year totally unrestricted as to use, purpose or level of local revenue raising efforts. The "special" revenue sharing proposal would give no "new money" to the states and localities but would merely combine into broad subject area "block grants," such as health, housing, education, etc., the funds now going to specific project and categorical grant programs, and would end or endanger many constructive and creative programs such as Model Cities and the multi-state Appalachian Regional Commission. It would also eliminate almost all of the federal conditions (or strings) necessary to see that the funds are distributed on a non-discriminatory non-boondoggling basis.

We favor the continuance of the present method of making categorical grants for specific purposes and projects, on a matching and grant-in-aid basis. With respect to the allocation of these funds by statutory formulas, however, we demand that all federal agencies strictly observe the conditions attached by Congress to the grants.

We believe the Federal Highway Trust Fund should be ended by 1975, upon the completion of the presently allowed mileage in the Interstate System, and that all taxes now earmarked for it to go to the General Treasury where they would help provide funds for mass transit, housing, education, health, etc.

We also wish to encourage those State and Local governments which make a significant effort to raise their own funds through progressive rate taxes such as the income tax rather than regressive sales and real property taxes—to this end we favor a tax credit for a significant portion (say 80%) of local income taxes paid instead of merely a tax deduction for them.

We are sympathetic to the great needs of our American cities—because of the high-cost, in many areas beyond mere welfare, necessitated by the large concentration of our poorest citizens in urban areas. Therefore, we will be interested to examine the recent proposal of Rep. Wilbur Mills for federal tax-sharing aid going directly to the cities when it is fully developed and announced.

Resolution on public service employment

AVC has long stood for forceful implementation of the Employment Act of 1964, calling for full employment. In particular, we have from time to time specifically called the attention of the federal government to the need for it to act as "employer of last resort." That is, we have been willing to allow free enterprise to provide the jobs that are needed for those who want to work with government to take up the slack when necessary.

On this 25th Anniversary of the Full Employment Act, we veterans for whose benefit the Act was passed; Call attention to:

1. Record levels of unemployment (Including veterans)

2. Rising demands for people to go to work

3. Increasing effective demand for public services and

4. Declining ability or willingness of local and state government to provide services.

Legislation to enable the federal government to take action to deal with these related problems has now been passed by both houses of Congress *for the second time*. Last year, the President vetoed a Public Service Employment Act; this year, two versions must go to conference.

We agree with the President that "leaf-raking" jobs solve no problems. For the reason, we *support* Public Services Employment legislation, so that local governments can provide jobs in health, education, parks and public safety.

We urge that the conferees adopt the present House version and that the President approve either version that the Congress may send to him.

Resolution on the Office of Ombudsman

The growing complexity of state, county and local governmental agencies is frequently bewildering and disillusioning to citizens seeking redress of their grievances with these agencies.

Efforts are currently underway in some states to make local and state government more accountable to its citizens by providing for an "Office of Ombudsman" whose prime responsibility would be to receive and investigate citizens' complaints against governmental agencies and recommend corrective action. Under the proposal, the "ombudsman" would also be empowered to make recommendations to the state legislature that could eliminate duplication, waste, and inefficiency in these agencies.

Be it resolved that AVC endorses the concept of the "Office of Ombudsman" in state and local governments and work to support efforts in various states to make the concept law.

Resolution on national volunteer service

Whereas, the zeal of our youth the build a better society has never been clearer than it is now. Yet opportunities to work constructively for a better society are limited. Compared to national needs, relatively few jobs in the service fields are available to young men and women.

Whereas, such service is vitally needed by society—in such fields as education, health, conservation and municipal services. Many of these needs could be met by young people, those who are asking for relevance in education, for a chance to meet their service responsibility outside the armed forces, and for first-hand experience with problems whose outcomes will determine the kind of world to be passed on to their children.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that in order to meet many of our most pressing needs and to permit young men and women to become engaged in the building of a better society, the American Veterans Committee endorses a program of national volunteer service, which would have these basic features:

1. Service opportunities would be available to all young people. The main criterion for admission would be willingness to serve.

2. Each participant would serve and learn. Learning would range from development of specific skills to growth in self-knowledge, problem-solving, and working with people.

3. Service activities would be directed and financed at the local level to the extent permitted by available resources, and would include projects organized and directed by young people. Thus, maximum local initiative would be encouraged.

4. The basic reason for national volunteer service is the need society has for the service of youth. Main areas are tutoring, health and mental health, as well as conservation and beautification, the cleaning up of our rivers, lakes and seashores, our cities and our forests, and various kinds of community and family service. By serving in these fields, young people would be able to test themselves through service to society and would receive valuable experience for their careers.

5. Young people who seem poorly qualified by conventional standards could serve effectively. High school dropouts are today serving as tutors, and doing a good job; others are receiving specialized training for responsible hospital positions. Each participant would be given the training and supervision needed for the assignment.

6. There would be a transition phase. Growth of national volunteer service would be constrained by identification of useful tasks, finding enough trainers and supervisors, and obtaining sufficient funds. The transition phase would permit experimentation with various techniques and activities on a pilot program basis.

7. Participation would be by means of contract, voluntarily entered into by all parties. The contract would spell out the responsibility of the participant, the sponsoring agency and the funding agency.

8. Duration of service would range from a minimum of one year to a maximum of four years. The normal contract period would be one or two years, renewable.

9. Participation in national volunteer service would be viewed as fulfillment of a person's service obligation. Thus, satisfactory completion of national volunteer service—for at least the same period of time as needed to complete one's military service obligation—would place participants in the same draft category as veterans of military service. Also as armed forces manpower requirements are likely soon to be met solely by volunteers in view of large increases in service pay and diminishing manpower needs for Viet Nam there may be no need to relate civilian service to military service since both would be manned by volunteers.

Resolution on child development and family services legislation

AVC believes that every child should have the opportunity to develop fully his physical, intellectual and social potential as a human being.

But, the American Veterans Committee recognizes that there are millions of children of working mothers in the country, and that many mothers who would wish to work are unable to do so because of the lack of adequate child-care facilities.

AVC therefore supports federal and state legislation to provide quality family-oriented child development programs for children whose mothers are working or who have no mothers or who because of poverty are denied adequate health care, nutrition or educational opportunity. Such legislation should embody the following principles:

1) The programs should be of high quality, not merely custodial but developmental in approach.

2) The parents should be directly involved in policy decisions affecting their children.

3) The programs should be adequately controlled and flexible enough to meet individual community needs.

4) Children of a variety of socioeconomic backgrounds should be included at a charge commensurate with ability to pay, and the needs of minority group children and disadvantaged children should be assured.

5) A substantial commitment of new public funds should be made to meet the compelling and immediate need for those services.

AVC supports S. 3617, the Comprehensive Headstart, Child development and family Services Act of 1972. We urge its enactment by Congress and further urge President Nixon to sign such legislation as vital to our children.

Resolution on medicare part B financing

AVC resolves that the Part B premium, now imposed on older enrollees in Medicare under the Social Security System, should be eliminated altogether. First, this would provide an immediate measure of badly needed financial relief for the aged population that is already smarting severely under the intensifying pressures of inflation (estimated at $1.5 billion). Second, elimination of premiums would remove any future monetary barriers which would serve to deter an older person from obtaining the protection afforded by the supplementary program.

AVC further urges, in view of the fact the people's circumstances change over time, removal of the three-year limitation of Part B enrollment.

Resolution on citizen participation in Federal rulemaking and regulation

AVC endorses the recommendations of the Administrative Conference of the US relating to public participation in rulemaking and regulatory activities of federal agencies which are charged with protecting the public's interests.

These recommendations propose improving the work of these agencies through increasing the public's ability to bring its views before the agencies in a timely and effective manner. Among the techniques proposed are improved public notice procedures, greater availability of information in the files of the agencies, reduction in the numbers of copies of documents to be submitted, and broader recognition of the standing of citizens and public interest groups to intervene in agency proceedings.

Resolution on expediting court appeals in desegregation cases

Congress has recently passed the Higher Education Amendments of 1972. These include provisions staying implementation of court desegregation orders involving student *transfers* (*not* just those involving busing) for eighteen months OR until the appellate process has been completed.

The result of these provisions will be to continue situation which the District Courts have found to be unconstitutional for years, while the matters slowly wind their way through the appellate process. Eighteen years after *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, AVC, as the only veterans organization among the *amici curiae* in that case, finds this intolerable.

AVC urges Congress to enact legislation requiring appeals in desegregation cases to be given expedited hearings and decisions that the legal soundness of District Court decisions may be quickly tested, and the decisions, if valid may be quickly implemented.

Resolution on no-fault insurance

AVC, having followed the recent discussion of automobile insurance, including that in the United States Senate and in various states, now urges enactment of a national program of the "no-fault" type.

We believe the evidence on the failures of the present system speaks clearly for reform: insurance companies are receiving large premiums but paying small benefits; injured persons are forced to wait long periods for the settlements needed to pay for their care; a third and more of payments going to lawyers rather than to injured parties; discrimination in the sale of insurance; and so on. Limited experience and considerable research suggest that no-fault insurance can reduce or eliminate these abuses.

Resolution on minimum wage

We support the Senate version of the pending minimum wage bill that would establish a $2.20 per hour floor, extend coverage to a number of farm workers, and regulate child labor in farm work.

Resolution on national standards for voting

Many American citizens are being deprived of their right to vote because of archaic, unduly complex and inconsistent state voting qualification and registration laws, as well as cumbersome and in some cases, undemocratic administrative procedures with respect thereto.

We favor federal legislation, to the extent feasible and constitutionally allowable, which will establish consistent and fair voting qualification standards and administrative procedures, and also uniform state codes to the same end.

Resolution on addictive drugs

All appropriate steps should be taken by the federal government to solve the great problems caused by the use of addictive drugs, including cooperation with other countries to reduce or prevent the production and exportation of such drugs, improved education as to the dangers involved in their use, better police enforcement procedures to prevent sale, further research into the treatment and prevention of addiction, etc.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

We the members of the American Veterans Committee, believe that in international affairs the objective of the United States is the maintenance of peace. All else aside, the world must avoid the holocaust of nuclear war. Within that framework our foreign policy, like our domestic policy, must be oriented to enhance the welfare of the individual, be he black, white, brown, or yellow, so that he may eat and sleep in safety, live his life under government of his choice and realize to the fullest extent possible the measure of his aspirations.

I. The United Nations and world government

The United Nations continues to be man's best hope for peace. American support to the United Nations must be an essential part of our foreign policy. The authority of the United Nations must be progressively strengthened in a process which sees the selective yielding of the prerogatives of national sovereignty in a manner that will enhance the fundamental freedoms and the well-being of all the peoples of the world.

Recognition of the rule of law principle in international relations is an essential of action in reinforcing the United Nations role in the maintenance of peace and security. Appropriate means must be found to widen the area of internationally accepted standards and American compliance therewith. Prompt repeal of the Connally reservation by the United States Senate would be a step in this direction.

We believe that there must be an acceleration of progress in the ratification of existing international human rights conventions by the United States. Where necessary, enabling national legislation should be enacted to bring our laws into conformity with these conventions. United States action in this respect has been grossly inadequate and has hindered a greater assertion of American leadership which is required.

We regard the integrity and independence of the Secretary General's office as expressed in the Charter crucial to the existence and growth of the United Nations. We shall oppose any attempt which seeks to weaken the powers of this office.

We favor encouragement and aid to the formation of supranational authorities of a regional nature consistent with the U.N. Charter and of treaty arrangements which limit the sovereignty of the participating nations in order to secure mutual advantages, such as the European Common Market, Euratom and others. The United States should further encourage and support European initiatives through the European Economic Community, Euratom, the Council of Europe, or otherwise to create, consolidate and strengthen institutions which may lead to a politically stable and prosperous European entity.

We fully support the enlargement of the peace-keeping function of the United Nations. The use of peace-keeping forces by the United Nations should be supported financially on an obligatory basis by all members of the United Nations. The allocation of military forces on a standby basis should be encouraged and established systematically

through the creation of a permanent mechanism in the United States.

We favor the ultimate establishment of democratic world government.

II. World veterans federation

We point with pride, and pledge our continued support to the World Veterans Federation, a world-wide organization of former fighting men whose activities are a remarkable example of the kind of private international co-operation on which lasting world peace and justice can be built.

III. Nuclear testing and disarmament

Complete elimination of nuclear weapons testing and establishment of international controls on this most dangerous weapons technology should be the goal of American foreign policy. Our world finds itself in the unique and unenviable position where one generation can make life on earth unlivable for another generation.

The adoption by the United Nations of a non-proliferation Agreement is a significant advance despite the reservations of some member states. The United States as the foremost nuclear power, must move forward in this regard by ratifying the Agreement as rapidly as possible.

The new initiatives by the United States and the USSR to begin negotiations toward the limitation of offensive and defensive nuclear ballistic missile systems is an important next step. United Nations action to convoke meetings of the five nuclear powers—Britain, France, the Soviet Union, China and the United States is further movement toward the desirable goal of creating controls of these awesome weapons. Only by showing their good faith can the nuclear powers induce other states to forego development in this most dangerous area, lower international tension, and avoid the allocation of needed resources to essentially destructive and wasteful ends.

Complete and total disarmament is the ultimate summum bonum, but this is an objective remote in time and immediate achievement is not feasible. Efforts toward that goal, nonetheless should be made by the United States and should be encouraged in other nations. Mankind can never reach its true destiny if it must continue to allocate so high a percentage of its recourses to forge the weapons of war.

IV. The United States and its allies

Inevitably differences will arise between the United States and its Allies, but there are differences which can be resolved around the conference table. In its negotiations the United States should seek no more than the rights and privileges of a willing partner.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was formed in a world considerably different from the world of today. It is time for the NATO Nations to reassess the objectives and reformulate the NATO role. Its continued organization and operation should reflect its changing purpose.

In Latin America, the United States has uneasy allies, but allies nonetheless. We must bend every effort to erase the image of the United States as a prosperous, patronizing, and paternalistic benefactor. It should be the objective of the United States foreign policy to create instead an image of a United States that wants to be a good partner, as well as a good neighbor, in helping the peoples of Latin America work out their own destinies.

The United States should, at every turn, encourage the United Nations or the Organization of American States to be the forum in which to resolve differences and disagreements among or with our Latin American neighbors. We must show by word and deed that we have no desire to impose our own form of government or way of life upon any country of Latin America. At the same time we must make it clear that we will honor a call for help by any Latin American country whose existence and destiny is being threatened by external foreign directed activity.

V. The United States and the world

The twentieth century is the era of the developing nations of Latin America, Africa, and of Asia. The United States must stand ready to help these nations and peoples, if they seek our help, to establish their way of life and direct their own destinies.

The forum of the United Nations must be held open to them in their efforts to develop responsible independence, and the services of the specialized agencies should be placed at their behest.

Our era is characterized by an ever-widening gap between the social and economic bases of the developed countries and those of the developing countries. This decline in the relative position of the developing countries, accompanied as it is by a population explosion, can lead to dangerous world tensions which could threaten world peace because of increased violence and disorder. New means must be found to close this gap through mobilization of efforts on a world-wide basis, including increased economic assistance from developed countries and greater self-help from must be prepared to make greater contributions to the United Nations' efforts in this field, through other multilateral arrangements, and through bilateral aid. The goal of alloting 1% of the gross national product to this end as set by the United Nations is not unreasonable and well within the means of the United States.

United States foreign aid to developing countries should be utilized at points of greatest potential. In providing bilateral aid the United States should give priority to those countries which can make the most rational and productive use of such aid. In measuring the efficacy of United States aid, due weight should be given not only to economic considerations but also to the nation-building process including the strengthening of democratic institutions and the consolidation of efforts on a regional basis. The United States should use its financial and economic resources to help the people of weak and developing nations achieve self-government, and should, if requested, provide economic help to prevent them from engulfment or encroachment by foreign powers seeking to impose their own ideologies, disciplines or governments.

Only when asked and only when it is clear that armed force is necessary to thwart a takeover by powers inimical to the welfare of a weak and developing nation should the United States furnish military assistance. In these circumstances the United States should stand ready to give military aid to such a country to oppose imposition of an external power, and should make it clear that its military effort is directed toward that objective alone.

VI. Soviet Union and Chinese Peoples Republic

AVC welcomes the new initiatives taken to improve relations between the United States and the Chinese Peoples Republic and the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The years have shown that coexistence with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Chinese Peoples Republic is not only possible, but is also a necessity if the world is to remain at peace. This should be our modus vivendi for the foreseeable future. Every step should be taken to enhance, improve and expand the spheres of coexistence, whether by more frequent cultural exchanges, increased reciprocal tourist travel, extended trade etc. If we follow this policy and practice we may find the areas of agreement becoming wider and the differences narrower. The desired result, where people meet people, is that the governments of the USSR and the CPR may no longer be able to insulate their peoples from the ways of the free world and disregard the yearnings of their citizens—which we believe to be the same as ours—for a world at peace and for good will to other peoples of the earth.

VII. World trade

The path to world peace through world trade is long, tortuous, and not always clearly marked. The United States should take the lead in, where possible, and encourage, where not, the movement toward freer trade among nations. Countries must export as well as import and stabilizing adjustments will have to be made. Where hardships are visited upon domestic industries, some form of temporary relief should be provided. AVC endorses the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and urges its continued implementation by negotiations and agreements.

VII. The example of America

Events beginning with World War I and continuing in the post World War II world we live in have thrust upon the United States a position of power and responsibility it can neither avoid nor minimize. That position inevitably generates envy, jealousy, and hostility by less fortunate peoples of the earth. It is the difficult, but essential task of the United States to wear its mantle of world leadership gracefully, to use its power cautiously, and to exercise its responsibility wisely, striving to make the right decisions in order to preserve world peace and to enable the peoples of the world to work out their destinies in an atmosphere that accords the individual his basic human rights and permits him to achieve the fullest measure of self-expression.

Resolution on Southeast Asia

The toll of human and material destruction wrought by the continuing conflict in Vietnam is repugnant to all people who are determined to pursue humanitarian objectives and to stop the process of killing and destroying of property as avenues for settling disputes. The people of Vietnam have suffered severely for too long a time from controversies that had their genesis in colonialism and in ideological conflicts which most of this tortured people would surely prefer to solve through peaceful means.

The people of the United States have also suffered severely because of the war. Urgently needed domestic programs have either been reduced or postponed. In addition, our country has become divided and many of our people have lost faith in the viability of our democratic processes.

AVC therefore welcomed the initiation of the peace talks in Paris as a means of resolving the bloody conflict in Vietnam. The new initiatives undertaken by the U.S. Government to improve relations with the USSR and the CPR hold out the hope of new arrangements to bring peace and stability to Southeast Asia and restore a healthier social, political and economic climate at home.

In persuance of an honorable and just peace, AVC urges that the following objectives should be sought.

1. The deescalation of the Indochina war through great power agreement.

2. The withdrawal of all United States military personnel from Indochina.

3. The application of all international conventions relating to the treatment of POW's and MIA's and the negotiation of the immediate return of POW's.

4. The total cessation of hostilities throughout Indochina by means of a standstill cease-fire to permit peaceful negotiation of disputed political issues.

5. The application of the principle of Self-Determination through internationally monitored and supervised free elections.

6. The internationally guaranteed protection of minorities and dissident political factions.

7. The neutralization of all Indochina.

8. The establishment and support of a massive relief program for victims of the war and to restore the ravaged lands.

9. The further implementation of the comprehensive land reform program to give the Vietnam peasant a stake in the future of his country.

10. The adoption of a regional development plan for the utilization of the natural resources of the area, including the Mekong River.

11. The long range programs for the economic and social development of Vietnam to proceed under the auspice of the United Nations to which the United States should pledge economic aid and other support.

Resolution on the Arab-Israeli Conflict

Tensions in the Middle East are the product of great power conflict and the unresolved issues between the Arab States and Israel. To rid the world of the fear of a breakdown of the uneasy truce that prevails in the area and of new hostilities, AVC believes that four steps are necessary to ensure a peaceful solution that will be stable and lasting.

1. The United States and the Soviet Union must accompany the new detente in their relations with concrete steps to de-escalate the military situation in the Middle East.

2. Direct negotiations between the Arab States and Israel must take place.

3. Efforts to mediate by other states or the United Nations can only be useful to the extent that they operate on the basis that the principal belligerents formally recognize each others existence and agree to deal with each other.

4. The right of self-determination of the Palestine Arabs and territorial recognition thereof is a key element in the process of reaching a peaceful resolution.

Resolution on the Strategic Arms Limitations Agreements

AVC welcomes the agreement that has resulted from recent negotiations at the highest level between the U.S. and the USSR on limitations of both offensive and defensive nuclear weapons. AVC wishes to emphasize its belief in the significance of these agreements and hopes for prompt ratification by the United States Senate. Failure to ratify these agreements and to implement them can only heighten the balance of terror and increase the possibility of nuclear war. Failure to ratify these agreements would result in increased arms expenditure not only in our country but throughout the world at a time when resources are needed to combat poverty, hunger and pollution.

Resolution on Human Rights

The world celebrated Human Rights Year in 1968. But the "celebration" was less of an achievement than the urgency to commit ourselves even more strongly to the eradication of violations of the rights of men throughout the globe.

Despite the designation by the United Nations General Assembly of 1971 as International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, we point with special shame to the unending oppression of the black majorities of South Africa and Rhodesia by their white minorities; to the reprehensive antisemitism of the government of the Soviet Union which both limits the freedom of its Jewish citizens within that country and prevents them from emigrating; to the continuing repression of Jewish and other minorities in Arab countries; to the denial by the Czechoslovak government of the rights guaranteed in their Constitution to its citizens; to the growing oppression within a large number of countries that have but recently achieved statehood; and to the abandonment of free political debate in a growing number of countries.

Just as our government must continue to promote greater human freedom within our own country, so do we call on it to take dynamic leadership and specific action in encouraging and working for an end to the deprivation of human rights, racism and racial discrimination wherever they occur.

Resolution on Genocide Convention

It is inexplicable that for over 20 years the United States has failed to ratify the International Convention against genocide, originally promulgated by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights under the chairmanship of Eleanor Roosevelt, and which has been ratified by virtually all other nations in the world. Today, at least, this agreement, which has been supported by all administrations since its promulgation, should be ratified by the U.S. Senate without further delay.

Resolution on Human Existence

In view of the increasing threat to Man's continued existence on this planet, by reason of growing world-wide pollution and the population explosion, AVC calls for intensive international action through the United Nations for greater co-operation among nations for environmental preservation and population control.

In order to develop the ecological well being of all the peoples of the planet earth, we support the following principles, now under negotiation:

1. Effective and equitable treaties and international institutions to prevent pollution, to protect and conserve marine life, and to regulate fisheries for maximum sustained yield.

2. Protection of the interests of developing nations for whose economies or nutrition fishing is vital, or for whom important mineral income might be produced by ocean exploitation.

3. Consideration of plans to allow the international seabed resources authority to develop its own limited capacity to explore and exploit the seabed and the ocean floor.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, WILLIAM COLMER, WATKINS ABBITT, AND W. R. HULL

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join in the tribute that our colleagues are paying to retiring Members of this Congress. I speak of those two distinguished gentlemen from the State of Mississippi, the Honorable THOMAS G. ABERNETHY and the Honorable WILLIAM COLMER, and of the distinguished gentleman from the State of Virginia, the Honorable WATKINS ABBITT, and of that very fine gentleman from the State of Missouri, the Honorable W. R. HULL.

TOM ABERNETHY'S congressional career goes back a long way—all the way to 1942, and I extend to him best wishes for a full and happy retirement after all these long and devoted years spent working for the best interests of his district, his State, and his Nation. We shall all miss him.

BILL COLMER came to Washington in 1932, and now after these years of hard work and dedicated effort—much of it spent on the important and prestigious House Rules Committee—he will leave us for a well-earned, and we trust, bright and happy retirement. We have all benefited from the able judgment and wise counsel of BILL COLMER, and we will certainly miss his presence in these halls and on the floor of the House, where his experience has been a guideline for many who have sought directions amid the clash of ideas we call the legislative process.

WATKINS ABBITT, of the Fourth Congressional District of Virginia, won the special election of 1948, and, as one of the most influential members of the House Agriculture Committee and chairman of its Tobacco Subcommittee, he has never failed to be a powerful and effective spokesman for the people of his district. He has also consistently shown his interest in, and concern for, the broader affairs of both State and Nation. I wish him well in the coming years.

BILL HULL has represented the people of his Sixth Congressional District of Missouri for some 18 years now, and as a member of the very important and powerful House Appropriations Committee he has been a factor in making it the effective instrument it is today.

I extend to BILL HULL, as to all these distinguished gentlemen and colleagues of mine who are leaving the Congress at this time, my best wishes in the years ahead. Their's has been service of which all can be proud, and they have left their mark upon the Congress and the Nation.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the reputation of WAYNE ASPINALL had reached me long before I came to Congress. "Hard working, independent, fair-minded, thorough," are terms I learned were always associated with WAYNE. However, these glowing terms meant little to me until I came to the Congress and met and worked with the man, WAYNE ASPINALL, himself.

In Congress I discovered that these complimentary terms used to describe WAYNE were not only true, but also meant that bills coming from his committee enjoyed support from most of his colleagues. You could trust WAYNE and his committee to do a thorough, workmanlike job on tough issues. You had confidence that his committee work, faced and answered the most difficult

and controversial questions relating to bills he recommended to the House.

I also learned that, as busy as WAYNE was, he always found time to help others on matters ranging from personal affairs to congressional leadership.

WAYNE was a good balance wheel and adviser to me, even though we sometimes disagreed. In the legislative field of drafting bills, revising them in committee, and presenting them to the House, he was a Congressman's Congressman. He never ran away from or closed his eyes to difficult problems or difficult people. To him, they were always to be met squarely so that an answer could be found. His skill, thoroughness, and fairness usually provided the answer, and his bills usually passed by large majorities.

The House has been a better House, because of him.

JUDGE ASTOR HOGG

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the State of Kentucky lost a fine citizen and an able public official in the death of Judge Astor Hogg in August of this year. He served in many capacities in his native county of Letcher, then in Harlan County as circuit judge and later as judge of the Court of Appeals of Kentucky, the highest court of our State. He was not only a great lawyer and judge, but enjoyed the respect and affection of all political parties and all groups of people. I am happy that I had the opportunity to know him, his fine wife and his family.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Sunday State Journal of Frankfort, Ky. on August 6, 1972, and a eulogy by the Honorable H. Paul Haynes of McLean, Va. entitled "Eulogy to a Great Man: Judge Astor Hogg."

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

JUDGE ASTOR HOGG

Judge Astor Hogg, 70, of 200 Paul Sawyier Drive, died at his residence at 4:45 p.m. Saturday following a long illness.

Born in Roxana, Ky., on Nov. 13, 1901, he was the son of the late George and Mahala Combs Hogg and a member of the Immanuel Baptist Church. He was a 1924 graduate of the Kentucky law school.

Admitted to the Kentucky Bar Association in 1924, he practiced law in Whitesburg from 1924 until 1935. While in Whitesburg, he served as mayor from 1927–1928 and as County Attorney of Letcher County from 1930 to 1934.

He then moved to Washington, D.C., where he served as trial attorney for the Federal Trade Commission from 1935 to 1937 and as special assistant to the U.S. Attorney General from 1937 to 1939. He then returned to Harlan where he practiced law from 1941 to 1951. During this time he also served as the Commonwealth's Attorney for Kentucky's 26th Judicial District from 1942 to 1945.

He served as Circuit Judge of Harlan County from 1951 until 1955, when he became a judge of the Court of Appeals of Kentucky. He served on the Court of Appeals until 1958, at which time he took the position of Chief Counsel of the state Highway Department. In 1959, he became Administrative Director of the Courts, a position he held until his retirement in 1971.

His greatest accomplishment was in bringing order to a complex situation in Harlan County. As Circuit Judge there, he understood the mountain people and their way of life. Among other new ideas he was the first to insist that summoned jurors report to court. From this he established a jury and court system that all mountain people respected.

Survivors include his wife, Mrs. Gertrude Lewis Hogg; one daughter, Mrs. Janelle H. Pope, Frankfort; one son, Stanley R. Hogg, Ashland; one sister, Blanche Hogg, Roxana; three brothers, Ira Hogg Jr., Cumberland; Viron Hogg, Roxana, and Quinton Hogg, Frankfort, and three grandchildren.

EULOGY TO A GREAT MAN: JUDGE ASTOR HOGG

(By Hon. H. Paul Haynes)

Great men perform great deeds usually wrought at great risks such as bringing law and order and respect of justice to a restless and lawless community—Judge Astor Hogg was thus a great man.

Great men are remembered long after death as being full of life. Memories of their laughter and good cheer do not go with them to the grave—Judge Astor Hogg was thus a great man.

Great men live so their lives might serve as an example to those to whom the torch is passed. To have touched the life of a great man is an honor with a burden. It causes a commitment to the same high ideals and standards; a quest to obtain the same challenging improvements and results; and an undying endeavor to insure, as the Bible mandates:

"Ye shall not respect persons in judgment but ye shall hear the small as well as the great.

"Ye shall not be afraid of the face of man for the judgment is God's and the cause that is too hard for you, bring it unto me, and I will hear it."

Judge Astor Hogg was thus a great man.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, SEPTEMBER 1972

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I include a release highlighting the September 1972 civilian personnel report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures:

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, SEPTEMBER 1972

Total civilian employment in the Executive, Legislative and Judicial branches of the Federal Government in the month of September was 2,809,167 as compared with 2,847,586 in the preceding month of August. This was a net decrease of 38,419, due primarily to seasonal employment and summer employment under youth opportunity programs.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Civilian employment in the Executive branch in the month of September is compared with the preceding month of August and with September a year ago as follows:

	Full-time in permanent positions	Change	Temporary, part-time, etc.	Change	Total employment	Change
Change this month:						
August 1972	2,469,542		336,238		2,805,780	
September 1972	2,471,363	+1,821	296,509	−39,729	2,767,872	−37,908
12-month change:						
September 1971	2,527,518		317,021		2,844,539	
September 1972	2,471,363	−56,155	296,509	−20,512	2,767,872	−76,667

The decrease of 76,667 during the 12-month period since September 1971 reflects a reduction of 57,913 in Defense agencies and 39,010 in Postal Service, partially offset by a net increase of 20,256 in all other agencies. Full-time permanent employment over the 12-month period was reduced by 56,155 (reflecting a shift of about 30,000 Postal Service employees from temporary to full-time permanent status).

Executive branch employment in the month of September totaled 2,767,872, a net decrease of 37,908 as compared with the preceding month of July. Changes in total employment in August in civilian agencies of the Executive branch as compared with civilian employment in military agencies were as follows:

	September	August	Change
Civilian agencies	1,689,912	1,713,482	−23,570
Military agencies	1,077,960	1,092,298	−14,338
Total, civilian employment	2,767,872	2,805,780	−37,908

The civilian agencies of the Executive branch reporting the largest decreases in September were Agriculture with 7,183, Postal Service with 6,008, Interior with 4,398, Treasury with 1,947 and Transportation with 1,131. The largest increases were in HEW with 545 and Veterans with 502.

In the Department of Defense the largest decreases were reported by Army with 7,339, Navy with 3,583 and Air Force with 2,642.

Total Executive branch employment INSIDE the United States in September was 2,613,841, a decrease of 37,180 as compared with August. Total employment OUTSIDE the United States in September was 154,031, a decrease of 728 as compared with August.

LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES

Employment in the Legislative branch in September totaled 32,960, a decrease of 531

as compared with the preceding month of August. Employment in the Judicial branch in September totaled 8,335, an increase of 20 as compared with August.

DISADVANTAGED PERSONS

The total of 2,809,167 reported by the Committee for September includes 28,028 disadvantaged persons employed under Federal oportunity programs. This was a decrease of 20,882 from the preceding month of August, largely due to a reduction in the temporary summer youth program.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I include a tabulation, excerpted from the joint committee report, on personnel employed full time in permanent positions by executive branch agencies during September 1972, showing comparison with June 1971, June 1972, and the budget estimates for June 1973:

FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT[1]

Major agencies	June 1971	June 1972	September 1972	Estimated June 30, 1973[2]
Agriculture	84,252	82,511	81,521	83,400
Commerce	28,435	28,412	28,303	29,700
Defense:				
Civil functions	30,063	30,585	30,010	31,300
Military functions	1,062,741	1,009,548	995,175	1,005,800
Health, Education, and Welfare	104,283	105,764	106,705	99,500
Housing and Urban Development	16,030	15,200	15,294	16,000
Interior	57,570	56,892	56,381	56,900
Justice	42,662	45,446	45,621	46,300
Labor	11,352	12,339	12,306	12,600
State	23,398	22,699	22,602	22,800
Agency for International Development	13,477	11,719	11,333	11,800
Transportation	68,482	67,232	66,127	69,200
Treasury	90,135	95,728	96,428	99,200
Atomic Energy Commission	6,920	6,826	6,890	6,900
Civil Service Commission	5,324	5,260	5,251	6,000
Environmental Protection Agency	5,959	7,835	7,884	8,500
General Services Administration	38,076	36,002	35,840	39,400
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	29,478	27,428	27,232	26,800
Panama Canal	13,967	13,777	13,759	14,000
Selective Service System	5,569	5,791	5,720	6,100
Small Business Administration	4,004	3,916	3,838	4,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,612	14,001	14,081	14,000
U.S. Information Agency	9,773	9,255	9,295	9,400
Veterans Administration	158,635	163,179	166,241	174,100
All other agencies	31,333	33,499	33,423	34,600
Contingencies				5,000
Subtotal	1,955,530	1,910,854	1,897,260	1,933,300
U.S. Postal Service	564,782	594,834	574,103	618,500
Total[3]	2,520,312	2,505,688	2,471,363	2,551,800

[1] Included in total employment shown on table 1, beginning on p. 2.
[2] Source: As projected in 1973 budget document: figures rounded to nearest hundred.
[3] September figure excludes 3,023 disadvantaged persons in public service careers programs as compared with 3,115 in August. (See table 3, p. 11.)

TRIBUTE TO WALTER S. BARING

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, after nearly 24 years of service to his State, WALTER S. BARING is returning home to Nevada.

In his long years of tenure in the Congress, WALTER BARING has established a distinguished record of accomplishments and contributions to his State and Nation.

He has served with distinction as a member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Veterans Affairs Committee, and as chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee.

I have had the pleasure of knowing WALTER BARING for over 20 years. When I served as an assistant to Congressman John Bell Williams, our office was at one time located next to Congressman BARING. I have enjoyed my long association with this most capable legislator and fine gentleman.

The people of Nevada will sorely miss his dedicated service. I wish him the very best.

NATIONAL GROWTH POLICY PLANNING ACT OF 1972

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I have sought in recent months to rekindle debate among the Nation's leaders in the Congress, in the White House, and in private industry over the exigency of formulating a national growth policy.

One key element of such a policy must be a more enlightened housing policy. The Nation's present housing programs are primarily for the benefit, not of the needy, but of the Nation's builders, mortgage bankers, savings and loans associations, and wealthy investors in pursuit of tax shelters. The Nation's present housing policy does not efficiently guide growth in our urban and suburban areas but, instead, preserves the status quo of the black center city surrounded by a ring of white suburbs. A new housing policy must be created, not as suggested in the recent Housing and Urban Development Act of 1972 which failed to pass the Congress, but along the lines that will guarantee a greater Federal and, indeed, national commitment to adequate housing for all Americans in a manner that will most efficiently and judiciously guide the Nation's growth. The Federal Government cannot afford to delegate to the States its authority in the housing and urban development field as suggested by some. The Federal Government in its housing programs must make an effort to avoid redtape and bureaucratic inefficiency, but it must not abandon its duty to provide national and moral leadership in speeding integration of the Nation's suburbs through a policy of "democratic" national growth.

In May of this year, I proposed the Hartke National Growth Policy Planning Act of 1972 (S. 3600). In the next Congress, I will introduce an even more comprehensive bill that will include a "housing segment" as part of a national growth policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this time, an article concerning housing and national growth policy.

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

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AS "HOUSER OF LAST RESORT": A POLICY FOR DEMOCRATIC URBAN GROWTH

(By Herbert M. Franklin) *

"If efforts to reach the [national housing] goal through the full participation of private industry should fail, this committee of practical and experienced men [the Kaiser Committee] concluded 'we would foresee the need for massive federal intervention, with the federal government becoming the nation's houser of last resort.' I agreed and I continue to agree." [1]

With increasing frequency "national urban growth policy" has been used to describe various means by which the national government might affect the nature and pattern of human settlement in the United States.

The phrase appeared first in the Urban Growth and New Community Development Act of 1970,[2] which lays out a broad framework for a "national urban growth policy." The Act calls for the issuance of a biennial Presidential Report on Urban Growth and provides new incentives for the development of new communities and inner city areas.

The 1970 statute, in listing the ingredients of a national growth policy, illustrates the fragmentary way in which quite separate but related federal policies are now developed and implemented. Congress specified that urban growth policy should:

(1) Encourage wise and balanced use of physical and human resources in metropolitan and urban regions;

(2) Foster economic growth to reverse trends of migration which reinforce disparities among such regions;

(3) Treat comprehensively the problems of poverty and unemployment associated with disorderly urbanization and rural decline;

(4) Encourage good housing for all without racial discrimination;

(5) Revitalize existing communities and encourage planned, large-scale urban new community development;

(6) Strengthen the capacity of general gov-

Footnotes at end of article.

ernment institutions to contribute to balanced urban growth;

(7) Facilitate increased coordination in the administration of federal programs to encourage desirable patterns of urban growth; and

(8) Encourage the prudent use of natural resources and the protection of the physical environment.

After one year, the state and federal legislative and administrative initiatives which have addressed themselves to these ingredients comprise a veritable kaleidoscope whose mosaic may shift with each change in overall perspective. Such policies range from highway and mass transportation programs, increased authorization for TVA, and reform of landlord-tenant relations to housing and new community legislation. Even anti-crime legislation might be included in the mix, because insecurity has a marked impact on the economic decay of urban areas.

I. DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL GOVERNMENTAL POLICIES

It may be useful to divide existing national government policies into two streams for purposes of analyzing their impact on the distribution of resources and, inevitably, the pattern of human settlement. First is the *functional* stream of policies, by which resources are distributed according to economic functions that do not respect geographic boundaries within the national economy. For example, the President's controversial new economic programs comprise policies that profess neutrality in connection with the development of the inner city, the rural hinterland, or suburbia.

So it is with virtually every aspect of incomes policy, tax policy, monetary policy, and other functional programs. If the economy is to be stimulated by investment credits, such credits can be earned even by a plant expanding in an exclusionary suburb. The oil depletion allowance can be earned in Alaska as well as Texas. If social security benefits are increased, or veterans benefits augmented, the residence of the recipient is irrelevant. Indeed, the long-pending reform of the existing welfare program stems from a recognition that disparity in benefits because of residence is not an equitable or rational policy. There is a long agenda, exemplified by voting rights and criminal justice matters, where the different treatment of people resulting from their residence has become less and less tolerable even in a federal republic. The pathbreaking 1971 decision of the California Supreme Court also embraces as legally intolerable an intrastate system of school finance that penalizes children because they happen to reside in a jurisdiction with an inadequate real estate tax base.[3]

A quite separate stream might be called the *territorial or area development* policy stream. These policies distribute national resources by virtue of some territorial objective, usually involving cooperative action by other levels of government in the federal system. The policy goals in this stream are usually to enhance the economy of a given area or group of areas.

Generally, federal resources are transmitted in the second stream under an application system requiring affirmative action by another level of government requesting aid from the national agency that finances the eligible activity. Federal programs to improve the physical quality of urbanization operate principally in this manner.

The major urban growth problem facing the United States is the future of its metropolitan areas. By the year 2000 present trends will concentrate 70 per cent of our population in the twelve largest urban regions occupying one-tenth of our land area.[4] There are now 76 million Americans living in suburban areas, 64 million in central cities, and only 63 million outside metropolitan areas. Metropolitan areas accounted for more than four-fifths of total national growth in the past ten years, and they have grown more rapidly than the national average since 1900. Even were migration into such areas to be reduced below current levels, experts believe that the proportion of our population now living there—about two-thirds—would increase to 70 per cent by the year 2000, largely through natural increase (internal births).

II. DISCRIMINATION IN FEDERAL HOUSING POLICY

The thesis of this article is that federal housing policy discriminates against people because of residence, and income (and by extension, race); and the only way to correct this is to develop a "last resort" direct capability in the federal government to put housing in place.

If the rhetoric of urban growth policy is to have any meaning, surely it suggests that the national government must assess the impact of its functional policies on the nature of metropolitan growth and pursue a more conscious effort to design its area development policies with demographic trends in mind. It is fair to say that federal housing programs have generally been designed to stimulate the economy rather than to affect urban growth patterns.

Proportionally, blacks reside in metropolitan areas more than do whites (74% to 68%).[5] But the proportions of the races residing in central cities and suburbs is very disparate: 80 per cent of the metropolitan black population lives in central cities, compared to only 40 per cent of the whites. While there was an absolute increase of blacks in the suburbs, this remains a very small percentage in each metropolitan area. For cities over 500,000, the white population declined 1.9 million over the decade, while the black population increased by 2.2 million. Blacks as a proportion of central city population increased from 16 to 21 per cent during the 1960's.

The median income for white families residing in central cities and suburban rings has shown increasing economic disparity in the last decade.[6] In 1959 median white income in the suburban ring areas was somewhat higher than in the central cities: $8,486 to $7,881. Ten years later the gap widened: $11,155 to $9,797. Whereas Negro family media income in 1959 was higher in the central city than in the suburbs ($4,840 to $4,383), the economic ghettoization of the central city is now reflected in the figures for Negro families. Those in suburban rings had a median income in 1969 of $6,986, while Negro families in the central city had a median income of only $6,136. Thus, the central city is increasingly the primary haven of poor whites and blacks.

The transformation of our urban areas into black and poor central cities with largely white and affluent suburbs has serious implications for American society. It is bound to complicate efforts to desegregate public education, to overcome fiscal disparities in metropolitan areas, and to achieve necessary cooperation among different local jurisdictions and different levels of government.

Our metropolitan population will not only grow as a proportion of our total population, but its growth in absolute terms will be staggering under even conservative projections. It is estimated that to accommodate the anticipated urban population to the year 2000 would require building a city the size of Tulsa every month for the rest of the century.[7]

The level of anticipated growth will put a severe strain on the existing institutions that allocate our land, housing, and transportation resources, particularly in connection with growth regarded as fiscally burdensome, *i.e.*, most forms of residential development.

There is some evidence already that jurisdictions may be strengthening their existing land use controls and building regulations in an effort to thwart growth pressures that require municipal services such as new schools, sewers, and fire stations. The current concern with preserving or enhancing the ecological balance of the land may play into the hands of local preferences to avoid further development for fiscal rather than ecological reasons.

Environmental groups correctly allege that indiscriminate suburban sprawl has allowed land use and development that may degrade the environment. On the other hand, civil rights and development groups also correctly charge that suburban land use restrictions keep out lower income housing, maintain a "white noose" around the city, and hamper the achievement of national housing goals.

Potential conflicts have appeared in some instances. In one case involving local exclusion of nonprofit housing sponsored by a black group, the countervailing claims asserted to obstruct the proposed development were the desire for open space and avoidance of sewer overload.[8] In other instances the maintenance of scenic open space has been asserted to justify large-lot zoning,[9] refusals to rezone for higher density housing, or other exclusionary techniques.

Studies and census bureau data as well as casual observations indicate that the geographic expansion of metropolitan areas and the shift of popultion to the suburbs have been accompanied by a growth of industrial and business activities outside central cities. Economic decentralization has progressed at different rates in different metropolitan areas, but it is a firmly established national trend.

In ten metropolitan areas cited in the President's 1971 Manpower report, almost 80 per cent of the employment growth in manufacturing in the 1960's took place in suburbs, as did 78 per cent of retail trade employment growth, and 68 per cent of wholesale trade employment growth.[10] The report also noted that there are records of journeys to work involving reverse commuting in which disadvantaged workers spent up to five hours a day traveling by bus, with six transfers, to go to and from jobs paying $2.00 or less an hour. The exclusion of lower-income housing from the suburbs, and the suburban favoritism of mass transit schedules and routing, contribute to disparities that undermine national manpower policies.

On the other hand, at least one recent study indicates that a respectable absolute rate of job growth has been maintained in the central cities, with sufficient growth in semi-skilled and low-skilled jobs to accommodate the unemployed if, in fact, they had access to those jobs.[11]

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is reportedly considering a standard that would make action in conflict with an egalitarian urban growth policy a predicate for a violation of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act.[12] Pressures have built up to use federal facility location as an affirmative tool for shaping metropolitan growth; new policies adopted by HUD and the General Services Administration are intended to respond to these pressures.[13]

The extent to which national growth policies encourage a stable supply of cities for low- and moderate-income housing will determine the extent to which the production of such housing can fuel economic growth for peacetime purposes. Sites are limited by a number of factors, among them economic and racial discrimination against subsidized projects. Such projects are by law and administrative regulation open to minorities. This is generally recognized by the public, particularly neighbors of the proposed development.

As a consequence of the increased federal involvement in subsidized housing develop-

Footnotes at end of article.

ments, the concerns of civil rights forces, housing production interests, and urban growth analysts converge in the arena of national housing policy. Spurred by the courts, existing legislation, and public criticism, the federal government has proposed locational criteria for allocating its housing subsidies that for the first time purport to redress racial disparities in metropolitan areas.[14] This is being proposed, however, in the absence of comprehensive data on where housing subsidies are flowing within such areas, of the racial composition of housing managed by other than local public housing authorities, and of metropolitan housing plans. Few people, in or out of government, would now profess to know with precision the "formula" for dispersing housing opportunities in a metropolitan area.

What programs are included in the urban growth constellation vary with the observer, but certainly the federal housing programs must be considered a major element. What the goals of an urban growth policy might be is also a matter open to varying perspectives, but a major ingredient in any national goal must be the creation of metropolitan "open communities," and the avoidance of residential apartheid.

III. NATIONAL AND LOCAL HOUSING RESPONSIBILITIES

If one were to construct, *ab initio*, a national housing and land policy in a federal system, questions would immediately arise as to which level of government ought to perform what role in guiding private and public decisions toward appropriate goals. The provision of housing in the narrow sense—creating and maintaining shelter—is essentially a private sector decision although it is one of the most regulated of private industries. If we define housing in its broadest sense—the creation of a living environment—the decision becomes more mixed, and both public and private sectors play key roles. Public decisions on sewers, streets, or schools are the spine of community development.

Looking at housing in the narrow sense, quite separate resources of land, labor, and capital are put together by private mechanisms which must deal with the direct or indirect forms of public regulation. As we try to determine on what level public regulation should be organized, some questions and answers come more readily than others when we examine the present system.

A. Finance

The availability of construction financing and permanent financing is a result of monetary and fiscal decisions taken by national or central government instruments, such as the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or the Federal National Mortgage Association. The Treasury itself in selling bonds to finance the operations of the government profoundly affects the availability of long-term mortgage credit in the private pool into which it dips along with private corporations.

This home financing system is quite complicated, and these central banking mechanisms exert a pervasive and complex influence on it. In fiscal year 1970 the national government provided enough funds through this "system" to cover 58 per cent of all mortgage loans made in that period. One knowledgeable observer has predicted the eventual "federalization of the housing market." [15]

Current national housing goals call for a federal subsidy of about one quarter to one-third of housing starts (not including mobile homes). The direct cost to the U.S. taxpayer, based on subsidy payments already obligated by the federal government, is estimated at $30 billion over the next 30 to 40 years.[16] Assuming the completion of six million subsidized units for low- and moderate-income families by 1978, present estimates suggest $7.5 billion annually will be paid by that year.[17]

Clearly, the flow of money into housing is a function of decisions made in a national context; state or local governments play little or no part. Indeed, the major impediments to more efficient flow of capital across state lines are the vagaries of state and local laws as they affect mortgage instruments, building codes, and zoning.

Without passing judgment on the effectiveness of current national instruments, it is worth noting that no one is heard suggesting that other levels of government ought to, or can, perform the job of allocating capital for housing finance. We might sooner tolerate trade wars among the states.

The national government, through the Internal Revenue Code, also provides enormous stimulus to middle class homeownership at great loss to the Treasury. In 1970, the allowable deduction of interest on mortgages of owner-occupied homes was $2.8 billion a year; the deductibility of property taxes by this same group of taxpayers resulted in an estimated loss of an additional $2.9 billion, or a total of $5.7 billion per year.[18] Here again, the national government merely facilitates the flow of money into a form of property tenure which profoundly if only indirectly affects the shape and character of our metropolitan areas. In this respect it might be said that the norm for national policy is simply middle-class homeownership. Although this subsidized tenure tends to encourage or underwrite wasteful sprawl by driving up housing costs and raising the loss to the Treasury, it is currently of no apparent concern.

The Tax Reform Act of 1969,[19] however, introduced a new form of indirect subsidy to housing. It changed the rules regarding depreciation to divert investment from commercial and industrial real estate to stimulate the development of new residential rental projects in general and certain federally assisted low- and moderate-income projects in particular. The loss to the Treasury will undoubtely be quite small as compared to the homeownership figures previously cited. Here again, the effect on the character of the urban environment is significant, but the tax law is neutral as to whether the benefits accrue in the inner city or suburbia.

Aside from these macroeconomic policies, the federal government since 1969 has vastly increased its subsidization of housing for the non-poor in ways which work in tandem with essentially private mechanisms. FHA insurance and VA guarantees were the backbone of federal housing policy until 1969. In 1971 it is estimated that 250,000 units will be directly subsidized by the federal government in programs that were nonexistent until 1969, the FHA 236 and 235 programs. These units are sponsored by private entities. The home ownership assistance program, for example, subsidizes home buyers at $20 per month for up to five years on conventionally financed mortgages up to $25,000, as administered by the Federal Home Loan Bank and savings institutions. Under other programs, the federal government also tries to maintain the FHA–VA interest rate at 7 per cent on mortgages from $22,000 to $24,500, and in other circumstances, up to $33,000.[20]

The central point is that many housing subsidies flow through a *functional* stream that is totally unconcerned with the nature of urban patterns, and all these programs are intended to aid the non-poor. National government intervention in home finance for the non-poor is thus theoretically untrammeled by the "sovereignty" of other levels of government. In fact the national policy favoring low- and moderate-income housing, much of it multi-family, is colliding with local prejudices against such housing and its occupants even when the housing is developed by private sponsors.

B. Labor

Construction wages have risen more rapidly than manufacturing wages. The Nixon Administration claims that the continuation of recent construction wage settlements "probably would add $2,500 or more to the cost of constructing a new home" by 1973.[21]

Construction wage settlements are the product of collective agreements arrived at locally in federally-assisted construction, including most federally assisted housing. The Davis-Bacon Act represents a national policy to pay "prevailing" wages (i.e., union wages) in the local area as determined by the U.S. Department of Labor.

The President in February 1971 [22] suspended the operation of the Davis-Bacon Act in a vain effort to stem rising construction wages. This was a highly centralized decision aimed at one sector of the economy. That centralized intervention, now pale in comparison to the wage-price freeze announced six months later, was frustrated in large part by the "little Davis-Bacon Acts" of various states. They represented an interesting example of federal initiative blunted by a "residual federalism."

A similar example is the failure of "hometown" plans to ensure equal employment opportunity in the construction industry. One observer has reported that the vast majority of the voluntary plans are in "various stages of neglect, disrepair, failure or, where new, promise." As of August 1971, the Labor Department had ordered 73 cities to draw up voluntary local hiring plans and had approved voluntary plans for 36 cities, including St. Louis which joined five other major cities setting a federally-imposed minority hiring plan.[23]

The housing industry is thus beginning to see a far greater intervention by the national government in labor-management relations, particularly in the unionized sector. This may omit much single-family home building.

C. Land

The availability of land for housing is only indirectly affected by federal government action insofar as real estate changing hands may expose enhanced values to income taxation. The National Commission on Urban Problems suggested that in 1967, approximately $72 billion worth of real estate changed hands, involving $24 billion in capital gains, perhaps $15 to $20 billion attributable to land. Such transfers yielded small tax receipts, around $1 billion, according to the Commission.[24] There is an effective exemption even under the lower capital gains tax for the sale of most owner-occupied homes. The total impact of these policies probably encourages the speculative retention of land holding.

The federally assisted urban renewal program and a fledgling new towns program are the only other federal government programs helping to make available land for housing. In the case of urban renewal, critics have questioned whether its net effect has not been to remove needed housing from the national housing inventory. The federal highway program has also had a distinctly destructive effect on housing.

In any event, federal policies have had an indirectly neutral to negative effect on land development for residential use, especially for lower income people who have not had the advantage of the home-ownership income tax deductions for mortgage interest payments and local real estate taxes. As the President observed, "[T]he one major element in housing costs that federal policy has not addressed effectively to date is the cost of land." [25]

By contrast, state and local levels of government have exercised massive controls over the use of land and its taxation. Zoning, subdivision controls, bedroom-count limitations, and ad valorem real estate taxes are all criti-

Footnotes at end of article.

cal factors affecting the availability of land for social purposes over which the central government exercises little or no control. We do not have a national land use policy, and without it we cannot have a national urban growth policy.

The cost of land for socially necessary and desirable uses is rising at an alarming rate. The price per square foot of land used as sites for new houses purchased with FHA-insured mortgages has increased at an annual rate of almost 12 per cent from 1965 to 1970.[26] The only feasible way to deal with this problem is some form of land banking financed or operated in part by the federal government.[27] In the absence of a national policy it is likely that local and state governments will be unwilling or unable to act.

The absence of creative local action is not as damaging as local action which frustrates already established national policy. The impact of national housing goals on local policies of excluding minority groups, lower-income groups, or multi-family housing has been the source of concern to those interested in developing more efficient means of producing housing in the face of rising costs. Thus, the President observed in his 1969 housing goals report:

"The fact remains that it is difficult, if not impossible in many communities, to find sites for low- and moderate-income housing because the occupants will be poor, or will be members of a racial minority, or both. The consequence is that either no low or moderate income housing is built or that it is built only in the inner city, thus heightening the tendency for racial polarity in our society." [28]

This comment, which appeared under the "land" section of the second report, appeared nowhere in the third report.

The gap may be explained by contemporaneous work on a singular Presidential statement on June 11, 1971, on "Federal Policies Relative to Equal Housing Opportunity." [29] An incipient effort in 1970 by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to overcome local exclusionary land use controls by new central government authority, premised on a concern with the frustration of its efforts to promote industrialized housing,[30] was effectively quashed by the President in 1971.

The President's formal statement followed a series of blunt although somewhat unclear pronouncements opposing "forced integration of the suburbs." [31] His ultimate formal statement [32] explicitly denied any intention of increasing federal influence on local land policies and was at pains to explain the limited role of the national government in housing. A few excerpts will give this flavor of the statement:

"My purpose is not to announce new policies, but to define and explain the policies we have. . . . The federal government operates in important but limited ways and under limited authorities.

"In terms of site selection for a housing development, the federal role is one of agreeing or not agreeing to provide subsides for projects proposed by local authorities or other developers.

"A municipality that does not want federally assisted housing should not have it imposed from Washington by bureaucratic fiat; this is not a proper federal role.

"The federal program role—as the governing statutes make clear—is essentially one of responding to local or private initiatives rather than one of imposing its programs on state and local governments.

"In none of HUD's grant programs does the Department act directly. The Department builds no housing, develops no landuse plans, clears no slums and constructs no sewers. . . .

"This Administration will not attempt to impose federally assisted housing upon any community.

"[T]he kinds of land use questions involved in housing site selection are essentially local in nature—they represent the kind of basic choices about the future shape of a community, or of a metropolitan area, that should be chiefly for the people of that community or that area to determine. The challenge of how to provide fair, open and adequate housing is one that they must meet, and they must live with their success or failure.

"We are dealing here in a realm in which federal authority, while substantial in terms of enforcement, is very limited in terms of the choices that must be made in each community.

"There are some who assume that the federal government has the power to do anything it wants—or that they want. But we have maintained our freedom for nearly two centuries by insisting that the federal government's exercise of power not exceed its authority.

"I believe in that principle, and because the authority of the federal agencies is limited—quite properly I believe—with respect to the essentially local and individual choices involved in local community planning, their power will be used in only limited ways."

The quoted excerpts from the President's statement reflect a traditional resistance to any articulated national role in shaping metropolitan America. Returning to the earlier distinction between *functional* and *territorial* policies, the former have profound but usually unarticulated effects on patterns of urban growth whereas the controversy surrounding the latter policies will reflect articulations of conflicting or competing goals. Thus, it is common for national policymakers to eschew making choices in this difficult area, for when the federal writ on the patterns of metropolitan growth is made explicit, it is challenged as violating the "federal system."

Some observers believe that these contradictions should be avoided by converting our current housing construction subsidy programs, which stimulate supply, into a "housing allowance" system which "subsidizes people" who would then seek their shelter on the same basis as anyone else. Such an approach would supposedly absolve the national government of the responsibility to make any choice regarding metropolitan patterns of settlement, more or less as revenue sharing is supposed to do in other contexts.

This is not the place to analyze housing land use and building controls that inflate housing costs and otherwise frustrate the provision of an adequate supply will continue to exert the same negative influence with any likely housing allowance system.

IV. A NEW FEDERAL ROLE

The foregoing discussion has sketched the pervasive national influence over what might be described as the economic aspects of urban growth and its professed neutrality on the quality and character of urban growth. In the latter regard, the national government has been a facilitator of decisions made without reference to even a generalized notion of how we might better organize our urban environment. Perhaps only the urban renewal program might be a significant exception, since it was initially based on the political conviction that the vitality of the central city must be maintained. In this connection, it should be noted that the increasing concern with the program's destruction of low-income housing led to pressures on the national government to make low- and moderate-income housing a favored reuse of urban renewal land. This change, however slow and limited, would have taken far longer and been far less effective had local officials been the only pressure points for change.

Clearly the time has come to examine whether this professed neutrality or refusal to articulate refined goals of national policy helps us to think clearly and to act beneficially on urban growth issues.

Did the President correctly describe the *real* role of the federal government in housing? His statement may have been so "lawyerly" as to mislead us to what actually happens in the day to day interaction between federal officialdom and local officialdom and private citizens.

For example, the local HUD area office, which the President would describe as "essentially . . . responding to local or private initiatives . . . ." actually exercises influence over the location and design of housing sites, which sponsors will be favored, and which projects will suffer vexatious delay. Under policies announced by HUD in June 1971,[33] a proposed housing project, including public housing and FHA housing, would be rated "superior" if it is outside an area of minority concentration. If a project does not rate at least "adequate" on the nondiscriminatory location criteria, it would be disapproved. These criteria, although vague, and striving to make objective a process of judgment which remains subjective, nevertheless demonstrate the influence on sites which has always been exerted by officials who receive their pay on U.S. Treasury checks.

A U.S. Appeals Court, in *Gautreaux* v. *Romney*,[34] pointed out that the federal role in correcting the past discriminatory policy of the Chicago Housing Authority was as "equally important" as CHA's own role.

"Within the structure of the housing programs as funded, HUD retained a large amount of discretion to approve or reject both site selection and tenant assignment procedures of the local housing authority. HUD's 'annual contributions contract' contained detailed provisions concerning program operations and was accompanied by eight pages of regulations on the subject of site selection alone." [35]

The court's holding was based on its conclusion that HUD's past actions were racially discriminatory "in their own right" and not just on the theory of joint participation with the local agency.

In reality, and as recognized by courts if not by statutes, the federal government does play a direct and significant role in the financing and the location of subsidized housing in every locality where projects are located under the existing system. It is the locality where projects should be developed, but are not because of local inaction or obstructionism, that federal power has yet to reach. To deal with this situation the national government will need to become the "houser of last resort."

This idea, in some minds, may mean the revival of federal eminent domain and sponsorship powers which the federal government exercised under the National Industrial Recovery Act until a federal district court ruled such activity unconstitutional in *United States* v. *Certain Lands in Louiscille*.[36]

The National Commission on Urban Problems (The Douglas Commission), in recommending the idea in 1968, stated:

"If both a locality within a state, and the state itself, fail in their responsibilities to help meet the present crisis in the supply of housing for low-income Americans, the Commission believes that the Congress should authorize an emergency low-income housing program under which the Department of HUD would, as a direct federal operation equipped with the powers of eminent domain, build and have ready for occupancy such portion of 500,000 low-income units a year remains unmet by local and state action." [37]

A variant of this basic idea proposed by the President's Committee on Urban Housing [38] recommended direct federal acquisition of land, leases for the development of subsidized housing, and federal preemption of building and land use regulations on such sites as well as others which would not be

---

Footnotes at end of article.

federally acquired but on which housing was to be federally subsidized.

It is interesting to note that the *Louisville* decision recognized the implicit grant under the fifth amendment of eminent domain powers to the United States for "public use" of the property acquired. The court, however, declined to extend the "public use" concept to the public construction and operation of low-income housing. It rejected as untenable a conception of "public use" as meaning "public benefit, public advantage, [or] general welfare." [39] This is, of course, an old debate which has lost much of its vitality.

Charles Abrams has reminded us that only the legalisms of the *Louisville* decision destroyed the new political federalism implicit in the NIRA low-income housing program. The United States had set up TVA and a "greenbelt" new towns program as direct federal planning and development activities with the power of eminent domain, along with the NIRA housing program. None of these three federal ventures into formerly sanctified state prerogatives met significant political opposition even on the local scene. By 1936, under the umbrella of the general welfare clause, "a formula had been carved out of the necessities of the era under which the federal government had assumed the initiative and responsibility for rebuilding urban and suburban America," [40] only to be destroyed by judicial support of a stubborn landowner in Louisville.

This case, by frustrating the NIRA housing effort, led directly to the system established under the U.S. Housing Act of 1937,[41] under which the eminent domain power for low-income public housing is exercised by state agencies funded by the federal government. It is ironic that the eminent domain authority of such state agencies, actually local housing authorities, and later urban renewal agencies, was challenged under legal theories identical to those asserted against the United States in the *Louisville* case, except that the fourteenth amendment and the state constitutions were the basis of attack. All these attacks were unsuccessful. Thus, whatever claim to authority could have been asserted for the *Louisville* rationale has long since been eroded in the state courts.

The system we have inherited can be described as institutionalized discrimination against the poor. The transmission belt for federal housing assistance operates principally through an underwriting of the home finance system. The poor, however, are legatees of the *Louisville* rationale, and must depend on local affirmative public action to obtain federal housing assistance. Thus in the absence of strong national policy, localities can confine the poor and minority groups to the central city or refuse to aid those who are residents.

This can be illustrated by supposing oneself to be a suburban mayor who wishes to deny federal housing subsidies to poor, often black, residents, or potential residents, of his jurisdiction.

1. The first non-action would be to fail to create a local housing authority. Although such authorities are state agencies, they must be activated by local governing body action. The failure to create an authority, or to consent to the operation of a neighboring authority, effectively precludes the introduction of low-rent public housing into the jurisdiction. There is no federal authority to sponsor such housing directly.

2. If pressure to create an authority is too intense, or one has previously been created, a second defense would be appointing members of the authority who will see that it takes no action on local or regional housing problems. Two of the five members usually suffice to see that nothing happens, even in the unusual case where the authority staff wishes to act imaginatively and constructively.

3. Where, against all odds, the authority is willing and capable of moving affirmatively, the mayor and council can frustrate it by declining to approve a "cooperation agreement," which is a condition to federal financing. Such an agreement pledges the extension of municipal services to the completed project, and other actions necessary to permit completion.

4. Quite apart from actions by a local housing authority, local refusal to approve leased housing transactions or rent supplement contracts can stymie other public or private efforts to transmit federal housing subsidies to the poor.

5. When all else fails, or added potential for inaction is needed, put the provision of low-income housing to a referendum.

Under the existing system, an added bias against the poor results from the fact that, generally, low-income public housing is not subject to local real estate taxes. Such projects make payments in lieu of taxes which usually fall far short of what local government would expect from a privately-owned development of similar cost and design. By contrast, when the non-poor receive federal benefits to improve their housing, localities do not make a contribution to this benefit in the form of foregone tax receipts. All FHA subsidized housing is on the tax rolls (except in some high cost localities where a form of tax abatement is necessary for project feasibility). Thus, political difficulties for subsidizing housing generally are compounded in the cases of low-income public housing.

Were such projects to lose their tax-exempt status or were federal resources to defray the cost of full local real estate taxes, what would remain of the rationale of requiring a locality to approve public housing? [42] Such local governing body approval is required only for public housing and rent supplements in private housing, the only two federally-aided housing programs for the poor but financed in two different ways.[43]

This perverse symmetry illustrates the extent to which Congress has seen fit to fetter the basic functional financing mechanisms of FHA with a local public veto power only in the case where the poor might have something to gain from those functional policies. Consequently, the removal of this local public veto for rent supplement housing and public housing once it goes onto the tax rolls can be regarded as the first step to "freeing up" a functional approach to housing subsidies. It does fall far short, however, of placing national housing policy into the context of urban growth policy.

Shall we rely only on local initiatives to create local housing authorities, or to activate them? Shall we rely on this financing mechanism in any event? Should we depend on the private strategies or accidental opportunities of private (profit and nonprofit) groups to determine where and when subsidized housing will be located?

The Congress has just begun to ask some of these questions in evaluating Title V of the proposed Housing and Urban Development Act of 1971.[44] This title would encourage the creation of metropolitan housing agencies to program, but not develop, subsidized housing in metropolitan areas. The title is very complex; generally it would provide incentives to metropolitan housing plans and deny community development subsidies to localities that did not participate in the planning process. It is not clear if the title will do more than provide a metropolitan layer of consent to subsidized housing without adequately increasing the pressures on localities to give their consent to individual projects.

But it does move in the essential direction of stimulating a metropolitan planning process. It is interesting, and perhaps ironic, to note that although the Democratic Party tends to see the importance of national planning, Title V introduced under Democratic auspices places the responsibilities for metropolitan planning in a non-federal agency. By ironic contrast, the Republican Administration, despite a rhetoric of decentralization, has announced federal housing site location policies that suggest the focus of metropolitan planning responsibilities might be more appropriately placed, ultimately, in federal hands. So long as there is power in a national agency to approve and carry out such a plan, who draws it up is a subsidiary question.

Accordingly, the second major ingredient of a "last resort" mechanism must be some kind of metropolitan planning process to rationalize any national policy of directly placing housing in a recalcitrant community. If such a planning process does not exist, regardless of whether it is done under federal or non-federal auspices, the national government exercising "last resort" powers may be open to the charge of acting arbitrarily or simply aiding private opportunities to develop land in metropolitan areas.

If a metropolitan housing plan is drawn up, the national government ought to have the power to finance housing sponsored by others, carry out the plan, acquire land for this purpose, lease it to other sponsors, or develop the housing itself. All of these powers should be untrammeled by local land use and building regulations.

In summary, our current housing policies do not serve the most pressing urban growth objective of overcoming economic and racial disparities in metropolitan areas. They serve the non-poor through functional policies and the poor through area development policies that are not related to any urban growth policy. The major missing ingredients are the elimination of local veto over subsidized housing within a context of metropolitan planning and a strong national power to implement those plans when other levels of government or the private sector will not or cannot do so.

Undoubtedly the power of Congress to deal with the nation's racial problems in metropolitan areas is the rationale for federal power in the 1970's to confront directly what other levels of government choose to evade.

FOOTNOTES

*Vice President, National Urban Coalition, Washington, D.C.; B.A., Harvard, 1955; J. D., Harvard, 1958.

[1] LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, THE VANTAGE POINT 331–32 (1971).

[2] Title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, Pub. L. 91–609, 84 Stat. 1770 (1971).

[3] Serrano v. Priest, ——— Cal. 3d ———, 487 P. 2d 1241, 96 Cal. Rptr. 601 (1971).

[4] REPORT OF THE NATIONAL GOALS RESEARCH STAFF, TOWARD BALANCED GROWTH: QUANTITY WITH QUALITY 186 (1970).

[5] Statement of Dr. George H. Brown, Director, Bureau of the Census, before U.S. Comm. on Civil Rights, June 14, 1971.

[6] *Id.*

[7] See note 4 *supra* at 56.

[8] Kennedy Park Homes Ass'n. v. City of Lackawanna, 436 F.2d 108 (2d Cir. 1970).

[9] National Land & Investment Co. v. Kohn, 419 Pa. 504, 215 A.2d 597 (1965).

[10] U.S. DEP'T OF LABOR, MANPOWER REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT 89–90, 96 (1971).

[11] C. Fremon, The Occupational Patterns in Urban Employment Change 1965–1967, August 1970 (a paper published by The Urban Institute, 2100 M Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037).

[12] Memorandum, *Employment Discrimination by Re-location of Plant and Corporate Headquarters*, Equal Employment Opportunities Comm., July 7, 1971. *See also* Washington Post, August 27, 1971, at 1, col. 2.

[13] Memorandum of understanding between the Dep't of Housing and Urban Development and the General Services Administration concerning law and moderate income housing, June 11, 1971.

[14] Project Selection Criteria (Notice of Pro-

posed Rule Making), 36 Fed. Reg. 19316 (1971). These proposed criteria supplant those originally announced in 36 Fed. Reg. 12032 (1971).

[15] Wall Street Journal, January 5, 1971, at 1, col. 6. The prediction was attributed to Henry Kaufman, partner and economist in a New York investment house.

[16] PRESIDENT'S THIRD ANNUAL REPORT ON NATIONAL HOUSING GOALS, H.R. Doc. No. 92-136, 92d Cong., 1st Sess. 22 (1971).

[17] *Id.*

[18] *Cf.* Schorr, *National Community and Housing Policy*, 39 SOCIAL SERVICE REV. 433 (1965); GRUEN, GRUEN & ASSOCIATES, HOUSING POLICY AND CLASS INTEGRATION.

[19] INT. REV. CODE OF 1954 § 167.

[20] See note 16 at 1, 13.

[21] *Id.* at 18.

[22] *Id.*

[23] URBAN RESEARCH CORP., URBAN READ-OUT (Chicago, August 25, 1971).

[24] NATIONAL COMMISSION ON URBAN PROBLEMS, BUILDING THE AMERICAN CITY, H.R. Doc. 91-34, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. (1969).

[25] See note 16 at 19.

[26] *Id.*

[27] *See* Franklin, *Federal Power and Subsidized Housing*, 3 THE URBAN LAWYER 61 (1971).

[28] PRESIDENT'S SECOND ANNUAL REPORT ON NATIONAL HOUSING GOALS, H.R. Doc. No. 292, 91st Cong., 2d Sess. 42 (1970).

[29] Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, June 14, 1971, at 892.

[30] In 1970 George Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development proposed enactment of a federal law that would bar local governments from using zoning, building codes, and other powers to prevent construction of low-income housing in areas undergoing development. In testimony supporting the proposal, the Secretary stated, "Adoption of this provision is a necessary first step in ending the ominous trend toward startification of our society by race and by income." N.Y. Times, June 3, 1970, at 1, col. 5.

[31] Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, December 14, 1970 at 1653; *id.*, January 11, 1971, at 36; *id.*, February 22, 1971, at 239-240; *id.*, March 29, 1971, at 533. This biting edge of the President's personal attitude was honed down somewhat by his formal statement.

[32] See note 29 *supra*.

[33] See note 14 *supra*.

[34] 448 F.2d 731 (7th Cir. 1971).

[35] *Id.* at 739. On September 16, 1971, Senators Brooke and Mondale announced amendments to existing and proposed housing legislation which would express the intent of Congress that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development should act as houser of last resort in those areas of the country where a "housing emergency" exists. A "housing emergency" would be defined as a substantial number of low and moderate families residing or employed in an area where there are no sponsors (public or private) willing to provide housing to meet their needs. This section would further provide that the Secretary of HUD, by contract with private or public agencies or other entities may act as sponsor in such areas beginning two years after the enactment of this act. Further, Secretary of HUD would submit to Congress within one year his plans for implementing this section including his proposed criteria to identify such "emergency" housing areas. This concept is included in the 1970 Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act, 42 U.S.C. § 4601.

[36] 9 F. Supp. 137 (W.D. Ky.), *aff'd*, 78 F. 2d 684 (6th Cir. 1935), *cert. denied*, 294 U.S. 735 (1936).

[37] See note 24 *supra* at 192.

[38] PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON URBAN HOUSING, A DECENT HOME 25-26 (1968).

[39] 9 F. Supp. at 138.

[40] Abrams, *The Legal Basis for Reorganizing Metropolitan Areas in a Free Society*, 106 PROCEEDINGS OF AM. PHIL. SOC. 177 (1962). Governors and mayors welcomed PWA projects into their jurisdictions and many states and local authorities (who managed the projects after the federal agency developed them) filed Supreme Court *amicus* briefs in support of the federal program in the *Louisville* case. The "greenbelt" new towns program fared no better in the lower federal courts. After the decentralization of the program became a legislative fact, the Supreme Court upheld federally *aided* housing as a valid public purpose. City of Cleveland v. United States, 323 U.S. 329 (1945).

[41] Act of Sept. 1, 1937, ch. 896, § 1, 50 Stat. 888.

[42] The decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in James v. Valtierra, 402 U.S. 137 (1971), does not preclude the federal government from eliminating the local approval requirements for subsidized housing. Indeed, footnote 4 of the Court's opinion suggests that the rationale for the current requirement is the fact that public housing may not pay full real estate taxes. In rejecting the supremacy clause argument in the case, Justice Black observed for the 5 to 3 majority, "By the Housing Act of 1937 the Federal Government has offered aid to state and local governments for the creation of low-rent public housing. However, the federal legislation does not purport to require that local governments accept this or to outlaw local referendums on whether the aid should be accepted." *Id* at 140.

[43] For an analysis of litigation strategies to require local affirmative action on public housing *see* Roisman, *The Right to Public Housing*, 39 GEO. WASH. L. REV. 691 (1971).

[44] H.R. 9688, 92d Cong., 1st Sess. (1971).

TWO CONSUMER STALWARTS RETIRING FROM CONGRESS

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I want to take this opportunity to express my gratitude, and that of all consumers, for the contributions to the cause of consumerism made by two Members of Congress who have served with distinction on my subcommittee and who are retiring from Congress at the end of this term.

Both of them are Republican members who cast deciding votes or took courageous positions at critical moments in the development of extremely important consumer legislation. They are Congresswoman FLORENCE P. DWYER of New Jersey, ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and Congressman SEYMOUR "SY" HALPERN of New York, now on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but for many years a valued and effective member of the Committee on Banking and Currency and of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs.

REPRESENTATIVE HALPERN AND THE CONSUMER CREDIT PROTECTION ACT

Congressman HALPERN was one of the six subcommittee members who sponsored the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1963. The others who joined me in introducing the bill were Congressmen HENRY B. GONZALEZ of Texas, JOSEPH G. MINISH of New Jersey, FRANK ANNUNZIO of Illinois, and JONATHAN B. BINGHAM of New York. We put our names in 1967 to a bill which, at that time, was not accorded the whisper of a prayer of ever becoming law—a position which took political courage, because the measure went far beyond the weak and loophole-ridden truth-in-lending bill which had just passed the Senate by a vote of 92 to 0. The subcommittee divided 6 to 6 on proposals to gut the consumer credit protection bill and to substitute the Senate bill instead. Had we lost at that juncture, the final piece of legislation undoubtedly would have been far different from, and infinitely less effective than, the one which ultimately became law. Congressman HALPERN, the only Republican sponsor of the bill, was particularly instrumental in the preservation of the garnishment title of the bill, which, for the first time, provided Federal protections for workers against one of the worst abuses in the consumer credit field.

REPRESENTATIVE DWYER'S CONTRIBUTIONS AS A CONFEREE

Mrs. DWYER was one of the House conferees on this measure, and although she had opposed many of the features of the bill in subcommittee and in the full committee, she had nevertheless worked hard to improve some of its other provisions, particularly on regulation of the advertising of credit. In conference, she stood solidly with the Democratic conferees against efforts of the Senate conferees to water the bill down to the level of the Senate version. So, too, did Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey, ranking minority member of the Banking Committee, and former Congressman PAUL A. FINO, of New York, another minority member.

Two years later, however, Mrs. DWYER was the only Republican conferee to join with the House Democratic conferees on the bank secrecy bill in support of my motion to take up two "nongermane" Senate amendments which resulted in important new additions to the Consumer Credit Protection Act—in the form of the Fair Credit Reporting Act of 1970, and the 1970 amendment to truth-in-lending which outlawed the distribution of unsolicited credit cards and limited consumer liability to $50 for the unauthorized use of their credit cards. She was the only House Republican conferee to sign the conference report.

So, in two major consumer battles of the past 5 years, Congressman HALPERN and Congresswoman DWYER each played vital roles in assuring bipartisan approval of extremely controversial bills to aid consumers, through their membership on the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MRS. DWYER'S IMPORTANT ROLE ON INDEPENDENT CONSUMER PROTECTION AGENCY BILL

As ranking minority member of the House Committee on Government Operations, Mrs. DWYER had a tremendous part in the development and passage by the House of a bill, which unfortunately died in a Senate filibuster this month, to establish an independent consumer agency to monitor the activities of all other Government agencies with responsibilities in the consumer field.

The bill originally introduced by Mrs. DWYER, and which I cosponsored, formed the basic framework for the consumer agency measure subsequently reported by the Government Operations Committee and passed by the House. In her work on that legislation, Mrs. DWYER demonstrated typical courage and independence, despite tremendous pressures upon her from the White House to modify her stand and accept the much weaker administration version of this legislation. I salute her for her fortitude.

To both FLO DWYER and SY HALPERN, I express the best wishes of all consumers in this country as these two consumer stalwarts retire from this Chamber after long and devoted service in the consumer interest.

They have displayed unusual courage and independence of thought and action.

FOREIGN TRADE AND INVESTMENT ACT OF 1972

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in response to growing unemployment, endangered American industries and a disastrous deficit in our balance of trade, I introduced the Foreign Trade and Investment Act of 1972.

The Hartke approach to foreign trade and investment problems has been subjected to a harsh barrage of criticism from the multinational business community. The academic community has been relatively silent on the Hartke foreign trade package, since academic economists are well-known for their almost doctrinaire adherence to the principles of free trade.

Continuing trade deficits and the growing demands for some national policy on imports, cannot be ignored forever. As is so often the case, the best minds react first. Our first Noble Prize winning economist, Paul Samuelson, has recently raised some questions that should begin to trouble the rest of the university-based economic fraternity.

After presenting the optimist's view of our prospects for free trade, Samuelson points out a number of clouds on a once rosy horizon.

First. Samuelson notes that the American dollar may still be seriously overvalued. An overvalued dollar requires either further action or implies a continuing erosion of industrial employment.

Second. Samuelson acknowledges that the individual displaced by imports may not easily find other employment. Pension rights and other benefits can be lost forever.

Third. Samuelson explicitly recognizes that winners and losers in international trade are seldom compensated. Relying on repatriated profits from foreign investments rather than exports to pay for American purchasers of foreign goods will benefit the capital owner—not the working man.

Fourth. Finally, Samuelson recognizes the dangers of placing our industrial future in totally foreign hands. As much as all Americans yearn for an era of peace, nationalism is still the strongest world force. The impending energy crisis and our continuing need for foreign raw materials will steadily weaken our position of economic independence. Closing down our industrial plants can only make a difficult situation worse.

Samuelson does not end his piece in support of the Hartke Foreign Trade and Investment Act of 1972, but his clear presentation of a cloudy future is bound to stir other minds to thought.

Mr. President, because this article represents a watershed in the thinking on our foreign trade crisis, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Morgan Guaranty Survey, The Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, July 1972]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE FOR A RICH COUNTRY

(NOTE.—The following article was written by Professor Paul A. Samuelson of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The article is adapted from a lecture Dr. Samuelson gave before the Swedish-American Chamber of Commerce in New York City on May 10 of this year at a meeting commemorating his receipt of the 1970 Alfred Nobel Memorial Award in Economic Science.)

The topic I propose to think about today is the future of American international trade and finance, with special emphasis on how that future is likely to be conditioned by the fact that North Americans enjoy the highest per-capita standard of living on earth. The topic has an obvious interest for all of Western Europe and Australasia, since these continents are in second place and are rapidly closing the "real" wage gap with the United States. The far-seeing Japanese, who have the right to dream at night of that approaching date when their rapidly growing per-capita real wages will equal and surpass our own, also have a natural interest in the same subject.

For, as I never tire of preaching abroad, the American pattern of things has a vital interest—not because there is anything special about being American, but because what one fool will choose to do at a high real income level so will another. The Americanization of Europe has little to do with forced infection imported from America: it is simply that everybody who gets to a real income of two or three thousand dollars a year per family member will want a car, a telephone, automatic heat, a winter vacation, and all the things that Americans by accident happened to have the opportunity to enjoy first. Our economy, so to speak, is an analogue computer showing others the shadow of their own futures. For better or for worse, I must add.

As Samuel Butler said, there is always a certain lack of amiability about the go-getter. Admiration and fear aside, we tend to like an individual in inverse relation to his ability to survive in the struggle for success. If it is natural to expect a class struggle within a country based on differences in income and wealth, why is it not natural to expect international antagonisms based on the same economic disparities? If the class struggle had never existed, we should have had to invent it in order to explain the facts of modern life.

But what has all this to do with economics? In classical competitive equilibrium, there is precious little room for the sociology of class warfare. Impersonal supply and demand dictate the final equilibrium. If in any sense there is personal rivalry of brother against brother, the form it takes in a competitive market is the substitutability of one identical worker against the other. The class struggle is an intraclass struggle, labor against labor in depressing the market wage, capitalist against capitalist in raising the real wage, depressing commodity prices and the rate of profit.

When Ricardo laid the foundations for the theory of international trade, in the form of the famous doctrine of comparative costs or comparative advantage, there was no particular role played by the *relative affluences* of the trading regions. What about the brute fact of *size*, that the United States aside from having the highest per capita income also has been one of the economies of greatest land area and population? Herein we differ from Sweden or Switzerland, in the same way that half a century ago the huge areas of Brazil and Argentina differed from the affluent "Switzerland of Latin America," Uruguay.

Mere size does not mean per capita affluence. Indeed, as the teeming millions of India and China illustrate, large absolute numbers when not matched by commensurate magnitudes of resources make for low productivity and poverty. As Adam Smith and Bertil Ohlin have emphasized, mere size may indeed be beneficial to the extent that it permits industries or society to realize the economies of mass production and scale that characterize many industrial processes. Increasing the extent of the market has always been a powerful argument in the arsenal of the free trader. The Common Market is important to Western Europe in giving it the kinds of mass markets that the vast American continent has long enjoyed.

Nonetheless, once markets are large enough to afford competition among many efficient-scale producers, size ceases to be an important variable in the models of conventional international trade theorists. Thus, few of them would agree with the contention of Oxford's Lord Balogh that small economies are at a disadvantage trading with the large United States—provided that the collusive power of concerted governmental action is not pursued by America.*

In summary, as far as competitive international trade analysis is concerned, there is no reason why mutually profitable trade should not take place between affluent countries or regions like America, Sweden, Australia, Western Europe, among themselves, and between any of them and intermediate-income or underdeveloped nations—such as the countries of Latin America, Africa, Asia, and for that matter Eastern Europe (provided the latter group's control authorities agree to balanced trade and follow the principle of importing those goods that can less cheaply be produced at home).

There is not unanimous agreement with these doctrines of classical and post-Keynesian establishment economics. My purpose here today is to subject them to searching reevaluation. Let me confess that my bias in the effort is to see whether I cannot find some merit in the suspicions and apprehensions of those who doubt and criticize the conventional wisdom.

---

*Actually, in the comparative advantage theory of Ricardo and Mill, small Portugal stands to gain a larger share of the advantage from international specialization than large England. Indeed, if English consumers are so numerous that their needs for Portugal's export goods have to be filled in part from domestic English production, Portugal gets 100% of the gains from trade and England gets none. Under perfect competition smallness makes for rarity and advantage; largeness is a disadvantage.

To bring out the issues in the debate, let me state rather boldly and crudely an overly complacent, optimistic view of the world that might be taken by someone strongly enamored of the classical doctrine of international trade. Then, as fairly as I can, let me state what are some of the dire views and apprehensions of that larger fraction of the world who have not had a formal grounding in the theories of classical and neoclassical economics.

OPTIMISTIC CONVENTIONAL VIEWS

For brevity, here is a dogmatic list of the major points the optimist would stress:

1. In a very special sense, the dollar has been a *key* international currency. Just as a sovereign government can issue money *ad lib* within a country and have it be acceptable (although, to be sure, at the cost of raising all prices), so the United States had in a sense the privilege of a counterfeiter. Therefore, by definition, we were hardly capable of running an international deficit since these deficits would *automatically* be financed by foreigners' accepting whatever dollars were thrust upon them. The dollar was, so to speak, not merely as good as gold: it was better than gold, particularly if the U.S. showed its determination to get rid of gold as an element in the international monetary system by dumping our Fort Knox supply on the market for whatever price below the official price of $35 an ounce it would fetch from dentists, jewelers, and hoarders.

2. Although in the historic past America was a high-tariff country—as in the Smoot-Hawley 1930 Act—under four decades of Reciprocal Trade Programs our duties have been cut in half, cut again, and still again in half. As a result, though we are often regarded abroad as still being a protected market, this is only because of a recognition lag: *America has become one of the freest markets in the world*, which is to the advantage both of our workers and of workers abroad. The substantial penetration of the American market by Japanese imports in the last two decades would be proof of this basic fact. (It may be added that, until recently, the endemic protectionist ideology of the American public had gradually been succeeded by a freer-trade ideology.)

3. Within the framework of the beneficial free-trade regime of the Bretton Woods system, even some optimists would admit that *the American dollar had prior to August 1965 become somewhat "overvalued."* To a greater number, overvaluation is merely a consequence of the post-1965 acceleration of the Vietnam war with its subsequent demand-pull and cost-push inflations. (Parenthetically, I might just note that to me the overvaluation of the American dollar has been a longer-term phenomenon, related to the miraculous recovery of Western Europe and Japan after the 1949 devaluations, to foreign investment desires of our corporations, and to the expenditures and gifts of the United States in the Korean, Indochinese, and general cold-war efforts.)

4. Even if the dollar should turn out to be somewhat overvalued, this primarily *puts the onus on the surplus countries to appreciate their currencies unilaterally*—particularly the mark and the yen. Or else they should swallow our dollars of deficit without complaining. (Running contrary to this comfortable optimist's policy of "benign neglect," enunciated both by conservatives and liberals among American economists, was the recognition by some of us that the regime of swallowing dollars could not be expected to last; and that, therefore, putting off the day of disequilibrium correction would only exacerbate the inevitable process of needed readjustment.)

5. The true optimists held that *any overvaluation* of the dollar, even if it were fairly substantial, and more or less independently of its cause, *could be cured by the medicine of dollar depreciation or surplus-currency appreciation along the lines of the actual December 1971 Smithsonian Agreement in Washington*. Under the two-tier gold system, the free price of gold in the unofficial tier was of no importance; and within the official tier the only point in making a token upward revaluation of the dollar price of gold and SDRs was for the purpose of expediting agreement on new currency parities with lower dollar parities.

Since the dollar depreciation in December 1971 was substantial, averaging 12% relative to other currencies, these "elasticity optimists" think that the therapy agreed upon in Washington should be ample to restore equilibrium in the reasonably near future. Indeed, some believe that even slight reductions in our export prices relative to prices of exports abroad will trigger great improvement in our current credits and great improvement in our current debits; and these "elasticity superoptimists" have even been fearful that the dollar was depreciated too much in 1971 and will eventually prove to be an undervalued currency.

6. To such optimists as these, perhaps the whole August 15, 1971 crisis was unnecessary, being in the nature of an optical illusion, or being merely the self-fulfilling consequence of an irrational avalanche of speculation against the dollar. Likewise, they tend to view the war of nerves that has been going on in the first half year following the Washington Agreement of last December as an irrational movement likely to come soon to an end. Or, if irrationality should carry the day, that will be an unfortunate and basically unnecessary outcome.

7. The fatal flaw of the Bretton Woods set-up—its attempt to peg exchange rates—should be removed in favor of either (1) some kind of *gliding band*, in which parities can move up or down a few percentage points each year or (2) some scheme of relatively clean *floating* exchange rates, in which organized speculative markets will give exporters protection against fluctuating exchange risks and in which no deficits will ever again be possible.

8. Finally, with exchange rates flexible and with tariffs, import quotas, and other protective devices gradually removed, the American real wage will benefit in its rate of growth and the same will take place abroad, as everyone everywhere benefits from a more efficient international division of labor.

To be sure, in the ebb and flow of relative technological change and change in tastes, certain specialized workers within a country might find that their scarcity rents deteriorate when foreign competition takes away much of their advantage. And the same can happen to the rents enjoyed by capital and nonlabor resources situated in sectors no longer viable in the face of international competition. However, provided the country follows proper post-Keynesian fiscal and monetary policies, it should be able to ensure full-employment job opportunities for all. Displaced workers and machines will go into other lines of activity in which the country still has a comparative advantage, to the benefit of the real GNP and its broad factor-share claimants.

ECONOMIC SCARES

I've now stated the optimists' case. Listen to it and you will not think of economics as the dismal science. Quite the contrary. One of the functions of economic analysis has been to rid people of their economic scares. All that I can say is that there are plenty of scares in the present age, and economics has its work cut out for it if it is going to rid people of their fears. It was the Duke of Wellington who said: "I don't know whether my officers scare the enemy, but they sure as hell scare me." Well I am a sophisticated economist but I must confess to some apprehensions about the future of the American balance of payments and about the effects of future foreign trade developments on the average level of American real wages and living standards.

We live in the age of Freud. Now we know that often our anxieties are nameless dreads, and that if we can just get them out of our unconscious minds and viscera and lay them on the table for explicit and conscious examination in the light of economic principle, then we may be able to exorcise our fears and dreads. That is the purpose of this present investigation. And how much it is needed!

In every walk of American life, there is great uneasiness over foreign competition. The endogenous virus of protectionism which has infested all of American history from our earliest colonial days, and which still persisted in the years up to the 1929 crash, had indeed been laid to rest from, say, 1934 when the Roosevelt-Hull Reciprocal Trade Program began to lower American tariffs. By 1955, everyone in America—corporate managers, workers, union officials, editors, and so on—all seemed to have turned away from protectionism.

THE NEW PROTECTIONISM

Those days are gone forever. In the last dozen years of the overvalued American dollar, one of the most baleful heritages of our ostrich-like policy of benign neglect of the international deficit has been the mushrooming of protectionism. It is little exaggeration to say that everyone in America except a few academic economists has become a believer in protective tariffs, in mandatory or voluntary quotas. The few industrialists who still favor freer international trade either have a commercial reason to do so because of their export positions or I fear are right now hovering on the verge of a return to the protectionist fold. As an example, I offer you the automobile executives in Detroit. The workers there and their local unions have already turned protectionist, as you will verify if you go to any union meetings these days. Perhaps a few of the top executives, at least in their more public-spirited utterances, are still devotees of expanded international trade. But talk to the vice presidents in charge of domestic production and you will find a group of troubled men, who feel in their bones that in another decade North America may not turn out to be the place in which cars are to be viably built and sold in competitive markets. And, make no mistake about it, if it came to a choice between letting the auto business go abroad or protecting it here at home by quotas, these executives will come down on the side of protectionism. To them it is unthinkable that we should give up the auto industry. To do so would be criminally quixotic. And, in the view of all but the economics professors, the loss of basic industries like the auto industry would lower our real wage level and average standard of living.

To almost all Americans today it is an article of faith that using quotas on a wide scale—to save the textile, shoe, steel industries, and also the TV, electronics, auto, and tiddlywink industries—will be an important step in keeping real wages in America from deteriorating from their present all-time peak levels.

Theoretical economists may quote comparative-cost examples until they are blue in the face. But the man in the street will not believe the assertion that high-paid American workers can compete with imported goods made by low-paid foreign workers. Throughout our history one of the most powerful weapons in the arsenal of the protectionists has been the competitive threat from "cheap foreign labor."

Ironically at the same time that high-paid American workers have been frightened of

the competition of low-paid workers abroad, low-productivity countries have always been as frightened of the competition from the more affluent countries. *The American Challenge* by Servan-Schreiber illustrates in our own time how deep is the fear of the American colossus.

THEORY OF COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE

The classical theory of comparative advantage contends that, if even-handed competition prevails between many suppliers and many demanders, then international specialization and trade, as well as capital movements, will work to the advantage of both countries—the poorer country as well as the richer, the exporter of capital who receives his profit yield out of the enhanced real product of the capital-importing country, which now has its real wages increased by having each worker with more capital.

Let us bring American fears into the open. The textile industry is an easy case. How can our workers who must be paid more than two dollars an hour compete in standard textiles with the workers of Hong Kong, Singapore, India, and Bangladesh? Textile manufacture is apparently one of the first activities that a developing country can do well in. With wages only small fractions of those in America, even if the foreign textile equipment is not quite as advanced as our own, costs of production abroad tend to fall lower than ours at home.

The theorist of comparative advantage agrees American resources should move out of cheap textiles, and for that matter shoes, and go to more efficient lines of production where our productivity is a larger multiple of foreigners' productivity. Yet when I said this over the New England airwaves, I received a letter from a trade association official in the shoe industry that said: "Your words will go down in the infamy of history along with those of Marie Antoinette." More poignantly, what can my answer be to a letter from a 50-year-old woman textile worker, asking where at her age she can possibly find another job. Shall I reply with irrelevant contention that if immobile factors will let their wage fall flexibly far enough below the minimum wage, they may end up with a half a loaf of bread? At the least, the humane and politically savvy free trader must urge support for governmental financial assistance to those workers and capital facilities whose competitive rents fall victim to the dynamics of changing international specialization.

The task of the proponent of freer trade is not over. It has just begun. A great many industries are believed to be in the predicament of textiles. Without quotas, shoe imports may grow. The steel industry has thrown in the sponge and now lobbies shamelessly for voluntary and mandatory quotas. Cameras, tape recorders, desk calculators, and an increasing variety of electronic products come from Japan and Europe.

The simple truth is this: American public opinion generally is of the firm conviction that America lacks comparative advantage in anything! Perhaps the man in the street will allow, as a purely temporary exception, that the United States may still have a comparative advantage in the realm of aircraft and giant computers.

A LOGICAL IMPOSSIBILITY

The academic economist must be aghast at this turn of public opinion. From the very definition of comparative advantage—repeat *comparative*—the economist maintains it is a logical impossibility for any country to lack comparative advantage in anything. To be sure, by the definition of what economists mean by an overvalued currency, if the dollar is overvalued, then fewer and fewer of our industries will be commercially viable in the comparative-advantage sense. When that is the case the major premise of the free trader is denied: when workers are displaced from textiles, autos, you name it, it will not be because they've been sucked into a more efficient line of production, but rather that they are pushed into unemployment and onto the dole.

I must correct myself: in the age after Keynes we know how to expand fiscal deficits and monetary creation to keep purchasing power high even in the face of an overvalued currency. Displaced workers can be given jobs in public employment; or, as budget deficits lower over-all thrift, they can find jobs in expanded output of those few lines in which we do still have comparative advantage. But such a post-Keynesian solution only magnifies and perpetuates the other side of the coin of currency overevaluation. It means chronic deficits in our balance of payments, which require that nations abroad swallow a torrent of unwanted dollars.

Try as I may to be heretical, *my reason will not let me agree with the man in the street that there is no depreciation of the dollar relative to surplus currencies that will permit America to have full employment under free trade.*

The best econometric estimates that I have seen have been marshalled by Professor William Branson of Princeton University whom I am proud to count among MIT's former students. In the Brookings Papers on Economic Activity for mid-1972, Dr. Branson reviews the IMF, OECD, and Stephen Magee studies that generally suggest an improvement of $7 billion-$8 billion in America's current balance from the 12% depreciation of the dollar in the December 1971 Washington Currency Agreement. I shall not quarrel with this as a best single estimate. But I must emphasize the large variance that any estimate is subject to. A famous earlier econometric estimate by Brookings economists, which expected equilibrium in America's balance of payments by 1968, went astray because of the unexpected Vietnam war. Who knows what may vitiate these new estimates?

A SUMMING UP

In closing, this much I must grant to the apprehensions of the man in the street. Were time not so short, my assertions could be less dogmatic.

1. No one knows the true size of the disequilibrium gap in the U.S. balance of payments just prior to August 15. *It may have been much larger than the experts think.* And the differential trends of productivity abroad relative to those here at home, which after all primarily created that gap, in my view, may still be working strongly against us in the years following the Smithsonian Agreement.

2. Therefore, the equilibrium parity of the dollar *may* have to be substantially downward in this coming decade. If such dollar depreciation is required, let us pray that gliding bands, crawling pegs, dirty floating, or clean floating will permit this to happen in an efficient way that preserves the fruitful international division of labor.

3. At home, traditional patterns of resource use may turn out to be *very far* from that equilibrium pattern necessitated by the vast changes in comparative advantage that have taken place over the last two decades and which may continue in the next. Even with post-Keynesian high employment, we know that the vested interests never give up their historic rents gracefully. The concentrated harm to themselves they see clearly and can make the public see; only the impractical eye of the academic economist sees clearly the even greater benefit to the community at large from adaptation to dynamic comparative advantage.

4. Achieving equilibrium dollar parities and adapting to changing comparative advantage may only minimize America's loss of welfare from international trade. While the dollar was overvalued we enjoyed to a degree a higher standard of living from tangible goods imported in return for payment of mere dollar IOUs. Also our corporations acquired lucrative productive assets abroad partly in exchange for those American dollars that foreign central banks reluctantly had to swallow. Just as Germany or any country paying reparations suffers a primary burden from its unrequited payment, so will there be a *primary* burden upon America if we must replace our deficit by genuine export earnings. Beyond that, although a currency depreciation to restore equilibrium need not inevitably induce a deterioration of America's term of trade, there is a real possibility that we shall be experiencing a *secondary* burden in the form of higher import prices relative to export prices. Indeed as Western Europe and Japan close the gap between our over-all productivity and theirs, quite aside from the financial aspects of currency parities, there could be a plausible trend against us in terms of lessened consumers' surplus from international trade.

In summarizing this point, I must guard against alarmist quantification. As long as America remains a continental economy whose imports stay in the neighborhood of not much more than 5% of GNP, it is hard to see how even elasticity-pessimism can knock more than a few percentage points off the 50% growth in our real GNP that demography and productivity trends should bring in the coming decade.

5. Let me conclude with a possibility that has some ominous overtones for the share of labor, particularly the share in growing GNP of organized industries. Under modern trends of comparative advantage, American management know-how (and for that matter management know-how anywhere) and American mobile capital may find that their most efficient use is increasingly to employ foreign labor as a substitute for traditional American activities. Washington, New York City, Pittsburgh, and Denver are increasingly what Max Weber called *cathedral cities,* or in updated terminology, *headquarters cities. So under floating exchange rates and relatively free-trade equilibrium, the United States might in time become a headquarters economy. Our emphasis in employment shift to services and away from manufacturing.* It would become normal for us to enjoy an unfavorable balance of merchandise trade, reverting to the pre-1893 pattern in which the value of our merchandise imports exceeded the value of our exports. This trade deficit normally would be financed by our current invisible items of interest, dividends, repatriated profits, and royalties.

Though total American GNP would be the larger because of this free-trade equilibrium, it is possible that *the competitive share of property would rise at the expense of labor's wage share.* This would present a problem for our welfare state—to expand tax and transfer programs to secure a more equitable distribution of income.

6. Economics, alas, cannot be divorced from politics and from trends of ideologies hostile to absentee ownership. Suppose that economic equilibrium did dictate our becoming a service economy, living like any rentier on investment earnings from abroad. Let us grant that such an equilibrium, *if* permanent, could be optimal for the United States. But would it be safe for us to succumb to this natural pattern of specialization in a world of rising nationalism? Can one really believe that in the last three decades of the twentieth century the rest of the world can be confidently counted on to permit the continuing flow of dividends, repatriation of earnings, and royalties to large corporations owned here?

I do not think I am paranoid to raise a doubt in this matter. There is certainly a danger that, *after* the United States has moved resources out of manufacturing and

into the servicing-headquarter regime, it might then turn out that nationalism impairs the successful collecting of the fruits of our foreign investments. We should then not only find ourselves poorer than we had expected but also facing the costly task of redeploying our resources *back* into the fields earlier abandoned. To be sure, private corporations may in some degree already take into account this danger of expropriation and thereby prevent an unwarranted redeployment of resources from taking place; but it is doubtful that they can be counted on to exercise the proper degree of prevision, particularly since they may well know that they can depend on our government to compensate them when such contingencies arise. Hence, there are rational grounds for some apprehensions concerning this aspect of spontaneous foreign-trade development.

I have tried to walk the mile with those who are fearful about international trends. Yet reason and experience have kept me from walking the whole mile with this overly pessimistic view. Let me end with a solemn warning.

Even if the most dire pessimists are correct in their belief that much of existing American industry can be preserved in its present form only by universal protective quotas of the Burke-Hartke type, it is a pitiful delusion to believe that such measures will enhance rather than lower the real standard of living of the American people.

TRIBUTE TO HONORABLE WAYNE ASPINALL

HON. GORDON ALLOTT

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I sincerely regret the retirement of the member of the Colorado delegation who has the longest record of congressional service, WAYNE N. ASPINALL.

WAYNE ASPINALL, I know, has made invaluable contributions to our State of Colorado and all of the United States, as history will record.

In all respects, WAYNE ASPINALL has represented the citizens of his State and district to the utmost.

In particular WAYNE ASPINALL has worked diligently to provide proper management and protection for our Nation's natural resources of which Colorado is so abundantly blessed. His service as chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives evidences his vital concern in this respect, as well as many of his achievements.

In the years in which I have had the opportunity to know and observe WAYNE ASPINALL in Congress, he has not shirked his duty but to the contrary, has devoted more than the full measure of time and effort to his responsibilities.

I have been fortunate to have the opportunity of working with WAYNE ASPINALL from the Senate side of the Capitol for the last 18 years toward many common goals and can personally attest to his dedicated service. He has been a credit to the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, as WAYNE ASPINALL begins his retirement, he should know that he and his loved ones have our best wishes for abundant good health and happiness in the years ahead.

REVIEW OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE 92D CONGRESS

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, as the second session of the 92d Congress comes to a close I would like to take this opportunity to review some of the accomplishments and failures of the Congress.

I am deeply concerned about the direction I believe that this session of Congress has taken both in its action and inaction. And as I leave the Congress to return to Mississippi I express my satisfaction in those accomplishments which will directly benefit the people of Mississippi. My hope is that the new Congress will accept the challenge before them; reevaluate many of these programs, and seek a direction of promise and prosperity for the future.

Since I entered Congress I have been vitally concerned and interested in the spending policies and programs of our Government. I have opposed those programs that would severely burden taxpayers beyond our means. And I have supported legislation that would preserve and promote economic efficiency.

During the past session my concern has deepened as I believe we have seriously jeopardized the financial position of our Nation and the promise of our economic future. I wish this Congress had been more successful in its responsibility to the people. I deeply regret that the Congress has failed to demonstrate more foresight in many of its programs and I am certain that hindsight will be too late.

FEDERAL SPENDING AND THE NATIONAL DEBT

This session of Congress was marked with increased spending in many present programs, creation of new and expensive programs, and little regard for the Treasury or the American taxpayer.

The increased spending above the budget has meant additional pressure upon our national debt. Due to this irresponsible spending by the Congress, it has been necessary to increase the debt ceiling to $450 billion. With an expected $27 billion deficit in fiscal year 1973, and a deficit of $75.8 billion over the past 4 years, it is plain to see we are approaching the limit of our national debt and spending beyond our means.

Yet with this situation clearly in view the Congress continued to spend and to establish such new programs as the $30 billion revenue sharing and $24 billion water pollution program. But the Congress refused the President's request for a ceiling on spending of $250 billion this year. I supported the President in his desire to prevent increased inflation and prevent a tax increase. Even though the Congress rejected the President's plea for restraint, I was glad to see him veto a number of spending increases which I had also opposed on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I personally do not see how the financial integrity of our Nation can survive such a severe test as the spending spree that has been demonstrated by this session.

I have supported programs that I thought were needed, beneficial and that we could afford. I have viewed with concern and opposed these new programs and increased spending that threaten the financial security of our country.

The $30 billion revenue sharing program I opposed.

The $24 billion water pollution program I opposed.

The $30 billion appropriation for Labor-HEW I opposed.

The $3 billion foreign aid program I opposed.

The planners already have on the drawing board new and more expensive programs for the years to come.

National health insurance at a cost of up to $60 billion.

Federal day care centers at a cost of nearly $12 billion.

Equalization of education among the States at a cost of $9 billion.

Replacement of local property taxes at a cost of $12 billion.

The burden of these programs is borne not only by the taxpayer of today, but becomes a program of debt sharing that will befall and plague generations to come.

The policy of spend and spend more has become an answer to every question, but a solution to few problems.

REVENUE SHARING

This session the Congress approved President Nixon's ambitious revenue sharing program. The legislation will establish a 5-year program to share $30 billion in Federal revenue with the State and local governments. Although this legislation will provide over $103 million for our State of Mississippi, I opposed the creation of this program.

I believe we are setting a dangerous precedent that jeopardizes the very foundation of our federal system.

I also do not believe our Naiton has the financial resources at this time to maintain such a program. Contrary to what many would have us believe, this is not a great windfall of surplus money from Washington. Someone must foot the bill ultimately and that someone is the American taxpayer.

Like other Federal programs, I am certain it will proliferate in cost much beyond its original intent and purpose so as to become an unbearable burden to the Treasury and taxpayer. We cannot foresee our ability to meet the obligations of the program in the years to come.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The Congress has passed a far-reaching bill of significant benefit to the citizens of Mississippi in the Rural Development Act of 1972. I am proud to have participated in the support of this important legislation that will provide a comprehensive program of improved job opportunity and better the quality of life in rural areas. Authorized under this bill will be $500 million annually in Federal grants and loans for projects in rural communities. The legislation will provide

help for our rural housing, water quality management, pollution control and farm credit. I am hopeful that this concerted effort on the part of Congress will serve to bring the necessities of modern life to rural America and improve the attractiveness of rural living.

SCHOOL BUSING

The entire Nation has come under the grip of forced school busing much to the displeasure of the American people. The concern of citizens all across our Nation has called upon the Congress to act. During this session I strongly supported and advocated action that would have provided some needed relief.

The House of Representatives was successful after many months of debate to pass an antibusing measure with the education bill, although it had been watered down somewhat. Unfortunately, Senate liberals were able to filibuster and prevent a vote on the matter before the session ended.

I am disappointed that the Senate stalled this legislation and prevented a solution to the problem of forced busing that the American people have demanded. It is possible that because of the growing concern over this situation nationwide, a constitutional amendment or alternative measure might succeed in the coming session. I would hope the new Congress acts early.

GUN CONTROL

During this session of Congress a renewed push was made for more strict gun control. I have long opposed these measures that would severely restrain the personal and constitutional rights of American citizens.

Although the Senate passed a gun control bill, I was pleased that the Congress did not, in a spirit of great emotionalism, rush in and enact such legislation.

I share the concern, as we all do, with the rising crime rate, but I do not believe that gun control, which would restrict more law-abiding citizens than criminals, is the answer.

I have sponsored legislation that would remove some of the restriction that sportsmen and law-abiding citizens face under present gun control laws.

As the furor for gun control continues, I hope that reason will prevail.

CONSERVATION LEGISLATION

As a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I was certainly pleased with the passage of the Coastal Zone Management Act and the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act. I sponsored both laws.

The Coastal Zone Management Act establishes a national program for the management, use, protection and development of coastal areas of the United States. The legislation will provide and promote the most effective growth of our coastal area for our greatest benefit.

The Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act provides regulations for the dumping of materials in the ocean and coastal waters. This will serve to protect both marine life and the orderly use of our coastal water. The bill also creates marine life sanctuaries and research programs for future protection and development of coastal areas.

The passage of these two bills brought to a successful conclusion nearly 2 years of work. I am confident they will benefit the entire Nation, but I am particularly proud of the significant impact they will have on the Mississippi gulf coast in its growth and its important seafood industry.

"CAIRO" RESTORATION

After many years, Mississippians' dreams of restoration and display of the Civil War gunboat *Cairo* are about to become a reality.

The President has signed a compromise bill after months of work on the different House and Senate versions. The final bill will authorize funds for the restoration and display of part of the sunken ship and its artifacts in a permanent display building in the Vicksburg National Military Park.

I hope this bill, which I authored and the entire Mississippi congressional delegation cosponsored, will make the *Cairo* a historical attraction for future generations.

HOUSING

The House Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, worked for nearly 2 years on a comprehensive housing bill. I was hopeful that we might be able to get through some constructive changes in the inadequate and ill-administered housing programs. Unfortunately, we were unable to gain a rule to bring this legislation to the floor.

Congressman BOB STEPHENS of Georgia and I, along with other members of the committee, sponsored new housing legislation toward the end of the session. This legislation would have cleaned up some of the money problems that beset the Federal housing programs and their administration. I was disappointed that Congress failed to act on these reforms.

INCREASED ASSISTANCE FOR VETERANS

The 92d Congress increased the level of assistance available to veterans in many key areas and this has been a particular concern of mine.

On October 13 of this year, the Congress cleared a bill raising the monthly allowance for veterans attending school or participating in vocational training programs under the GI bill. The monthly payment for veterans enrolled in educational programs was increased by 25.7 percent and the payment for vocational training was raised by 48 percent.

The bill will have an important effect on the Mississippi job market by increasing the availability of qualified and skilled employees.

Disabled veteran benefits have also been increased by 10 percent. I believe it is important that we continue to aid these men and women who have served their country so well and have given so much.

SOCIAL SECURITY

For older Americans, this has been one of the greatest Congresses in history. In these days of rising prices and inflation, our senior citizens living on a fixed income are hit hard. I supported the legislation that increased social security benefits by 20 percent and I am pleased that we were successful. This legislation represents a lasting commitment of concern to every American over 65.

FRANCHISES

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, last year I introduced the Franchise Fair Disclosure Act (S. 2870) which would require franchisors to make certain disclosure to franchisees and to undertake certain registration procedures with the Federal Trade Commission. This legislation recognizes the fact that franchising is one of the fastest growing segments of our economy and that there have been significant abuses which have acted to the detriment of both franchisees and consumers.

Earlier this year, the Federal Trade Commission held hearings on a notice of proposed rulemaking which paralleled many of the provisions of my bill. During the hearings, testimony was presented by Mr. Harold Brown, Esquire, an expert and a prolific writer on the subject of franchises.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of Mr. Brown's remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TRANSCRIPT OF INFORMAL STATEMENT OF HAROLD BROWN

Mr. DIXON. Could we come to order, please.

We will continue now the public hearings dealing with the Commission's proposed trade regulation rule concerning franchising. Our first witness for this afternoon is Mr. Harold Brown, of Boston, Massachusetts.

Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you.

My name is Harold Brown, and I am an attorney practicing in Boston, Massachusetts. I have done a little work in franchising. I have written a little about it.

I hope that you will excuse my approach to this subject if I suggest to you that while you have a proposed trade regulation I see no reason why you cannot contemplate suggestions that may go beyond the trade regulation, may show its shortcomings and may also show its advantages. What I am going to suggest to you is that a merely verbal definition of franchising just is not sufficient. Given the sincerity of everyone who has addressed himself to you, academic, business, or otherwise, the differences are not merely ones of verbiage, deductive reasoning. May I suggest that they may be reflection of a fact that we are, indeed, in a new area.

Somewhat facetiously, I have noted the fact that Corpus Juris Secundum still defines "franchise" as the right to vote, and that certainly is not what we are talking about. I do suggest that the written presentation which I have submitted, and which is far more extensive than I originally intended, is in point of fact the inductive offering that is essential to an understanding of what we are talking about. It is an examination both of the socio-economic facts and the legal concepts that necessarily flow from them.

When I began this so-called crusade about three years ago, there were those who suggested that I was rather foolhardy in the effort, but I think that there has not only been a great deal of fun involved but the

thrill in watching the evolution of legal concepts as they come down the road.

For example, until we know whether or not a franchisee has a property right, a vested interest, and not merely a contractual license, it is difficult to describe the entity or to establish the rules that pertain to it. And yet in the only case of its sort, decided in December, 1971, the case of *Milsen & Co. v. Southland Corporation,* 5 C.C.H. (Trans. Binder) paragraph 73, 774, the 7th Circuit said, we grant this temporary injunction and recognize "the vested interest that the franchisee has in the business to which he has devoted so much time and effort." That is the nub of the franchisee's claim: that he has a vested property interest in his business.

Now, let's see what happens after you have established that. Comparably, a marriage has its inception in a contract, but I suggest that you do not tell your wives that they are operating under a contract, because they won't believe it. They, in fact, have a status, intangible though it may be. It is recognized by our society and in our civilization.

We have claimed all along that exactly as represented by the franchisor, the franchisee does obtain a "business of your own," the independent businessman concept; that is, in fact, precisely what the franchisor represented. You know, all we are doing is holding the franchisors responsible for what they have said.

Before I go too far, may I suggest to those who make presentations to you, that there is a five-year felony and a $5,000 fine and jail for offering to you any knowingly false statement. With that in mind, for example, I draw to your attention that Southland Corporation, in spite of this notorious report of a case that we must all take judicial notice of, *Milsen & Co.* v. *Southland Corporation,* fraudulently failed to disclose to the Multidistrict and Complex Litigation Panel that such a case existed. Since they will address you before this hearing is over, I suggest that you ask them if they know what the word "fraud" means.

Let me suggest to you in the broadest possible frame of reference that Government cannot abdicate its functions. Recently, we saw the Federal Communications Commission in despair give up its investigation of American Telephone & Telegraph. We also saw, I believe this morning, that the Defense Department—the Defense Department, the generals, have offered to continue with that investigation. These are raw examples of Government abdicating its essential functions, similarly for purely administrative expediency reasons, and none other, the State of California excluded from the definition of "franchise" those cases where the franchisor did not exact a franchise fee, though there is no conceivable economic, social, legal or logical reason for such an exclusion. At least, however, in California, they had some historical reason for exempting from the filing of information though not exempting from the delivery of it to franchisees, those franchisors who had at least $500,000 in equity or 25 franchisees for more than five years. Historically that came from the earlier opinion of the California Attorney General, based on the *Silver Hills Country Club* case, in which he established that certain franchises were, in fact, an investment contract or a "security," and therefore subject to the broad anti-fraud provisions of the state Blue Sky Laws as well as of SEC Rule 10(b)(5).

Unfortunately, the opinion of the Attorney General confused the question of proof with a question of principle. As a matter of proof, the company that has little or no capital assets is probably using its fees to raise venture capital. But I do not think that it really takes a great deal of effort to persuade you that all companies want to preserve their capital no matter how well established they may be; they prefer to let the other fellow put up the capital. I would suggest that the correct standard lies in the fact that the franchisor obtains equity capital by granting a capital asset to the franchisee. The "risk capital" theory merely proves such an act. Diners Club, listed on the New York Stock Exchange, fathered Diners Fugazy Travel franchisees through a wholly-owned subsidiary that had negative assets—negative assets. Now, is there any difference between that and the Silver Hill Country Club case in California?

Phillip Loomis, then General Counsel, now an SEC Commissioner, in April, 1970, addressed Senator Williams' Select Committee on Small Business. Purely for administrative expediency he stated, "We chose not to regard a franchise as an investment security." The basic reason for his statement was that the SEC was already over burdened. But his statement created damage through his then being quoted by the first district court case facing that issue. The court relied heavily on that legislative testimony of Phillip Loomis. We cannot operate government on the basis of such an abdication of responsibility because of a lack of funds or an over burdened staff. Now, of course, Phillip Loomis was wrong.

The fact is that an "investment contract" is not defined in the Securities Act. It depends entirely upon the interpretation of that phrase under the "Blue Sky" laws of the various states. In the last four State Supreme Court decisions namely in the states of Florida, Hawaii, Oregon, and Texas, the so-called restrictive rule of the Howey case was abandoned as mere dictum. Even in the U.S. Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Earl Warren, in the *Tcherepnin* case, declared, "We cannot define such a word as 'security', lest the ingenuity of man evade the definition." And the courts have uniformly taken the same approach with regard to the word "fraud".

In lieu of that narrow "no-profit" syndrome of *Howey,* the state supreme courts substituted the "economic reality test". Ultimately, on Nov. 30, 1971, the "economic reality" test was acknowledged by William Casey, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, in formal releases under the Securities Acts. In announcing that thereafter the SEC would employ the test of "economic reality," he also announced that so-called "pyramid schemes" would be regarded as a security and would also have to be registered before issuance. That not only made the sale of such distributorships subject to SEC Rule 10(b)5, but also made them subject to a prospectus similar to your proposed regulation.

Unfortunately, Mr. Casey went on to say that this would not apply to a franchise where the franchise undertakes certain responsibilities, thus returning to the *Howey* test once more. Well, we do not need Mr. William Casey's gratuitous description of a relationship with which he has no demonstrated familiarity or expertise. In fact, if a pyramid scheme distributorship is an investment contract, then the "economic realities" test is even more applicable to every franchise. An examination of the economic realities of the relationship will disclose the total domination and control exercised by the franchisor over his franchisee, that control emanating—and this is the only established legal standard we have—from the Lanham Act, namely that the licensor of a trademark risks its abandonment for failure to exercise complete quality control. Further, the franchisor obtains venture capital from the grant of a capital asset.

I do not think that anyone can truly suggest that we have to leave to a patent and trademark statute, the final determination of the rights of the franchisee, so long as adequate measures are taken to prevent confusion on the part of the ultimate consumer. Whether or not a trademark owner may retain or lose his trademark, is his business and maybe the business of the Lanham Act, but that Act can not govern this complex relationship, a relationship which now accounts for such a large segment of the Nation's business. Three years ago, the figures generally used were $90 billion a year, roughly 10 percent of the then Gross National Product, and roughly 20 to 25 percent of all retail sales. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, the year 1970–1971 represents a current $132½ billion a year figure, or a 50 percent increase in three years, and probably 25 percent or more of all retail sales.

Such a major segment of the national economy is too great to be governed by the Lanham Act prescription that a trademark will not be abandoned so long as the licensor exercises quality control. It should not be the sole basis upon which this relationship will be regulated. May I suggest that in the relationship we are talking about there is such domination and control, such pervasive opportunity and actual abuse, that standard common law theory must recognize the existence of a fiduciary relationship. Such obligations of good faith should be expressly recognized in your proposed trade regulation either in the definition of a franchise or in an express regulation.

For brevity, I wish to refer you to my article on that subject published in the April, 1971 issue of the Texas Law Review. I will not burden you with the repetition of that entire presentation, but I do suggest that you may already be bound by FTC opinions in this area of equitable jurisdiction. For example, you should be influenced by the public statement of Mr. Buffington, then General Counsel of the Federal Trade Commission, given in January, 1970, in his formal testimony before Senator Williams' committee, when he said, "Franchisors frequently talk of their relationship as a joint venture. It is truly a fiduciary relationship." He also reaffirmed Commissioner MacIntyre's statement made the prior year in a formal address to the International Franchise Association, to the effect that Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act carries with it an obligation of full disclosure of both favorable and unfavorable data, including pending lawsuits and also Federal Trade Commission proceedings, state and other complaints. We come down to an even later statement by Lawrence Meyer, whom I think I accurately describe as the FTC Director of Policy Planning and Evaluation.

Mr. DIXON. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN. He is certainly a major official of this agency. In August, 1971, before the Practicing Law Institute, in answer to the question, "Do you believe that the franchising relationship is a fiduciary relationship?" he publicly answered in the affirmative. Fearful that I might be quoting him in a casual manner, I formally requested his opinion and I received written confirmation that was without qualification, without condition. Similarly, I wrote to, and received a comparable answer from Casper Weinberger, presently, I believe, Deputy Director of an Agency that is in the Executive Offices of the President, and formerly Chairman of this Commission, reaffirming that there must be a duty of good faith in such an intimate relationship.

In the first case of which I have knowledge that specifically addressed itself to this problem, *Jirna,* a trial court in Toronto, after an extensive examination of the subject, said there is nothing new in this theory. It therefore ordered Mister Donut to refund all the kickbacks of five to 25 percent or more, received from each third party vendor.

On appeal, that case was reversed, with a reaffirmation of the equitable principles, but a declaration on the part of the appellate court, sitting in its sterile majesty, that in the particular case, the franchisee did not

have such a disparity of position as would warrant the application of the principles involved, thus totally ignoring the impressions and the findings of the trial court.

You see, if we formally recognize that a franchisee and a franchisor have mutually fiduciary obligations and if we recognize that a franchisee has a property right, a vested interest, all of a sudden we can answer some of the basic questions in the proposed trade regulation. For example, you asked several prior speakers whether in the absence of tying compulsion, there is any requirement to disclose kickbacks from third party vendors. That is a carry-over from the thought that the only principles governing this relationship are the anti-competitive standards emanating from the anti-trust laws: absent tying, absent disclosure.

As you heard from Mr. John Jackson, who preceded me here, there are numerous ways in which franchisees are tied into purchasing from the franchisor or named vendors. In addition to compulsion, there are all sorts of subtle inducements to go along, sufficient to satisfy the requirements of tying. But wholly aside from such a finding, there should be a duty of disclosure because a fiduciary has such a duty. A fiduciary cannot make such secret profits. That has been the law for centuries. But you should not promulgate a regulation based solely on antitrust and deceptive practice standards without a determination of the very nature of the relationship you are regulating. Now, if you have the power, and I do go along with you, to say that a holder in due course will lose that status in this situation as he does under most state regulations applicable to the consumer, at least where the UCC has been adopted, then I say you have the power to rule on other substantive matters. Possibly more than anyone else in the whole United States, you have the plenary power to declare once and for all that we recognize the existence of mutually fiduciary obligations, and we further recognize that the franchisee who is represented by every franchisor to be an "independent businessman", is precisely that.

General Motors has publicly said, "We design, engineer, manufacture, produce and deliver the product; teach how to sell, teach how to keep books, prepare the repair parts, advertise, teach the mechanics, and help the automobile dealer to sell automobiles, and, therefore, the automobile dealer has no goodwill in his dealership; any recognition of goodwill would be a windfall." The major oil companies all say the same thing, and most franchisors act as indifferently toward the franchisee's goodwill. A child should know that the franchisee who devotes his labor and effort to the building of his business, develops goodwill in that business. That goodwill is now beginning to receive recognition.

In *Fontana vs. Beech Aircraft*, the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals said, "We are living in a day and age when the implicit value of a franchise must be recognized." It therefore, reversed a District Court that had found an absence of the actuality of damage necessary in an anti-trust case. Even more recently, in Milsen v. Southland Corporation, the same court took cognizance of the "vested interest that a franchise builds through his expenditure of time and efforts." Your regulation must give similar recognition to such basic matters.

In the field of legislation, principally at the state level, we have had similar developments. One of the earliest general statutes was in Puerto Rico, where the 1964 statute not only prohibited termination, but required renewals, except for good cause. That same principle has been used in about twenty-five state statutes, going back as early as 1933 in Wisconsin for the automobile dealers. In 1971, Delaware enacted such a statute barring the termination or failure to renew a wholesaler's franchise except for good cause.

Franchisors have vigorously attacked the constitutionality of such statutes in their application to an existing contract. It is unfortunate that two or three courts have so exercised their judgment, but let's see what they were really saying. In ruling on the Puerto Rico Statute, the First Circuit Court of Appeals fumbled with constitutional theories on which to strike that statute; when the United States Supreme Court reversed the Circuit Court on the ground of abstention, in a per curiam decision, it nevertheless went out of its way to say, parenthetically, that it did not know on what basis the First Circuit had acted.

Earlier, a District Court held a Colorado automobile dealer's statute unconstitutional on the theory of retroactive changing of a contractural relationship, but it was followed by a whole string of state Supreme Court decisions upholding such statutes as a constitutional trade regulation regardless of their effect on existing contracts. The gross disparity in the relationship between the auto factories and automobile dealers is so notorious a fact, that it is a matter within the police power of both State and Federal Governments to regulate in this area. It is ridiculous to suggest that an existing contract should bind in the face of repeated U.S. Supreme Court decisions that in the matter of trade regulations, "We shall not be bound by the contract, but shall look to the economic realities," and its express ruling that the States may levy exemplary damages as a deterrent for the enforcement of strong public policy.

Let's talk about fraud. I do not really know what fraud is. In my written statement, I could only think of Sir Francis Bacon's quotation of Pilate 2,000 years ago, where having asked, "What is truth?" he then left without waiting for an answer. I suppose we have to say the same thing for fraud. Any attempt to define it with precision must end in frustration. In the last section of my written presentation, I suggested several theories as to what may constitute actionable fraud, but I suggest that what the FTC has already established to be the rules of the game, is quite sufficient.

Simply stated, I read your cases to require that the buyer is entitled to the full benefit of his bargain and that he shall be told the truth, the whole truth. There is not only a duty of full disclosure of the facts, says the Federal Trade Commission, but also of the meaning of the statement. In substance, it seems to me that you are following the same standards as in SEC Rule 10(b)5. But I believe that you are not justified in limiting the disclosure requirements to disclosures to prospective franchisees.

In your proposed rule, you are trying to cut yourselves in half by talking only about disclosure to prospective franchises and thus abdicating your duty in Section 5 of the Act, which is not so limited; the Act applies to all deceptive practices, whether at the inception or at any time thereafter. I know of no valid reason to limit your regulation in that manner and in my written presentation, I have felt it proper not to limit my description of the abuses and frauds in this field to matters at the preliminary stage. If you do nothing else, I suggest that you add the general prohibition of SEC rule 10(b)5 at the end of your rule and that it apply to all dealings with franchisees. Frankly, I do not know how you can avoid it. I have read your decisions, a superb series prohibiting any franchisor from engaging in any fraud or nondisclosure to prospective franchisees. I need not repeat those cases to you. You know them, but your decisions go far beyond that. They prohibit all kinds of frauds both to prospective franchisees and thereafter. Your regulation should do the same.

Curiously, we may not ultimately need this regulation, because contrary to Philip Loomis' theory, and even William Casey's theory, the federal Securities Acts already state that a "security" includes any promissory note, be it negotiable or otherwise subject to conditions or other covenants. In almost every franchise, there is such a promissory note, thus providing SEC 10b 5 coverage. For those who, following the Birnbaum case, thought that SEC rule 10B 5 required that fraud arise within the parameter of privity, causation, and damages, flowing from the purchase or sale of a security, the Supreme Court two months ago told us that we were wrong; what the statute says is that wherever "in connection with" the purchase or sale of a security, there is fraud, then coverage exists. There is no need to establish that there was fraud in the sale of a security. In a four-page opinion, the United States Supreme Court granted direct rights to the creditor of a defrauded corporation, a creditor whose rights arose much later. In the last footnote of that opinion, the court cited with approval a law review article titled, "The Demise of Birnbaum," confirming the view that there no longer exists the need to show privity, causation, or damages arising directly from the security transaction.

I therefore suggest to you that broad antifraud prohibitions may now be in effect under the aegis of SEC Rule 10B5. However, we welcome your participation and we welcome your guidance, because certainly an unwilling bride, such as the SEC, is hardly the place to which franchisees may justifiably look for protection in this complex field.

It is true that we were totally dissuaded as to our ability to combat the kind of lobbying which you have seen here in three weeks of testimony. The franchisors have presented an overwhelming amount of oral and written statements, while franchisees are barely represented because they lack the funds and the organizations to present their complaints. For those very reasons, in January, 1970, we began our campaign with state legislatures. Those who have commented upon that campaign, have missed the point completely. You were told here that some six states have now acted and some twenty or more are considering legislation. But it should not take a great deal of persuasion to prove to you that when you have states of every character, whether democrat, republican, conservative, liberal, north, south, east or west, simultaneously stirred by this subject matter, there must indeed be something wrong.

In decrying the risk of patch-quilt state regulation, the franchise lobbyists have completely misunderstood the meaning of State action. Neither I nor anybody, nor any single force could possibly sway that large a segment of this country, if it were not notoriously a fact that something had to be done. Since the IFA is on my coat-tails everywhere, let me tell them that just last Friday, it was the Governor of Pennsylvania, who said, "What can we do to stop all of this fraud?" So the IFA can start following us into Pennsylvania, Rhode Island and Tennessee; that is just for the last ten days.

Now, it is true, I have publicly stated it is not fair for franchisors to be subject to a "crazy quilt" pattern of legislation. And in fact we find a greater recognition of this on the part of state legislators than has been acknowledged. California was the first to adopt a Franchise Investment Law; good, bad or indifferent, it was the first one. And good, bad or indifferent, the State of Washington copied it verbatim. And when the Province of Ontario completed its fourteen month study of the franchise industry in ten hearings, and after hearing hundreds of witnesses, and came up with a disclosure proposal, it suggested the verbatim adoption of the disclosure requirements in the California Investment Law, solely to make it possible for businessmen to survive through the use of uniform requirements.

But the IFA seriously errs if it thinks that it is our intention to permit them as they did a week ago, to appear before the Massachusetts Joint Committee on Commerce and Labor, and attempt to forestall action because of the forthcoming Federal Trade Commission hearings commencing February 14th. Incidentally, the Massachusetts Petroleum Council opposed any action until after the Federal Trade Commission acts on its disclosure rule. Now while they are pleading with the state legislatures not to act until the FTC proceeds, they challenge your power and authority, nitpick every detail of your proposed disclosure regulation, and I warn you that they intend to stall you two, four, six, eight years, if possible. Now, the theory of delay is not new where the Federal Trade Commission is concerned.

Despite the Herculean efforts of this agency, its statutory debility with regard to temporary injunctions, its thoroughness, and its shortage of manpower, have all resulted in extreme cases such as the twelve year delay in Carter's Little Liver Pills. But in an ordinary frame of reference, this could be two to five years, shall we say, and even at the end of such time, what do we do? All we do is slap the hand, because if the franchise, or the defendant in any one of your cases, says, "I will now promise to be good," or if you fight him all the way, and you get an order requiring him to be good, and he is good from that day forward, he gives back nothing, he pays no penalty, there is no deterrence, the "delay profit" is endless. Now, of course, that is one of the things that your proposed trade regulations seek to prevent.

May I suggest to you that while I do not propose to get into the nitty-gritty details, there are just too many other things to talk about in your proposed trade regulations. Just hurry it up when you do make your final decision. Whether you have promulgated it or not, just hurry it up, because I shall now announce what we shall do. We shall get every State in the Nation, every State in the Nation to adopt the regulation; to provide private enforcement; if possible to provide exemplary damages, whether double or treble or possibly discretionary damages; to permit class suits; and to give all of the life which such a therapeutic regulation as it should have, and which I think you want, as evinced in Senator Williams' Bill, which lies dormant in some corner of a Congressional Committee.

Ultimately we shall win this battle on the ground of public opinion, not litigation, not legislation, not regulation. These gentlemen sitting there will win this battle for us (indicating the press), and your trade regulations goes down that line. I am sure you are well aware of the fact that Louis Brandeis in 1914 was the progenitor of this kind of control. In his book, "Other People's Money, and What the Bankers Do With It," he said "Sunlight is indeed the best of social as well as legal disinfectants." Your regulation will provide for that kind of disclosure. I am certain that when you require disclosure whether as to third party "kickbacks," tied-in sales, price fixing, and other such practices, that you do not thereby intend to give your approval. Franchisors totally misunderstood the purpose and intent of your therapy. As I understand it, by compelling full disclosure, franchisors must either change their illegal practices or become subject to public scrutiny. I think that is the purpose of your trade regulation, and I commend you for it.

Franchising is a totally acceptable method of marketing distribution. It can be operated legitimately. Oddly enough, it is the legitimate franchisor that desperately needs a good regulation of the kind you are considering here today. Historically, Wall Street fought this type of disclosure in the early thirties, when the New Deal securities legislation was coming onto the books. Now, of course, they recognize that even though it is a little bit short of what they hoped it to be, without it they could not have survived.

Those franchisors, and there is a strong trend in this direction, who think they can evade control by calling themselves not franchisors, but joint venturers, have a rude shock in store for themselves. Yet, the Academy Montesorri, a franchisor that utilizes quarter page advertisements in the Wall Street Journal under franchise offerings, avoided registration under the California Investment Law, on the theory that it was selling joint ventures, instead of a franchise. Of course, it is a deliberate lie. But if it were a joint venture, they failed to recognize that even the SEC has long since recognized that the sale of that type of a limited joint venture is within the parameter of the Securities Acts.

However, not only they, but also Sambo's Pewter Pot Muffin Shop, and a whole string of other franchisors are now changing to the sale of joint ventures. So under your regulation, it may turn out to be a total waste of activity unless you reexamine your definition to include the sale of such joint ventures, since otherwise the evaders will claim an exemption.

It was suggested to you by the IFA that there were but a marginal few whose practices would require supervision and that your regulations should not be too severe. Of course, as you have pointed out, the oil companies, who do not deign even to appear here, feel that they are not covered or that they ought to be exempt. I have not seen General Motors here at all. I do not know whether they are listed to appear, General Motors, Ford, Chrysler. I'm not certain whether they even filed written statements with you.

Mr. DIXON. They filed.

Mr. BROWN. I do not know whether they consider themselves covered or not, but can I assure you that almost everything I have ever complained about in the franchise field, is equally attributable to the major franchisors. Occasionally I may facetiously refer to some of the basest frauds. Like that of Best Line, in San Jose, California, the grossest fraud in existence in the U.S. today. Please listen to the call I had a week ago.

A fellow in Modesto, California, paid Best Line $50,000 for his franchise, $40,000 in cash, in addition to that, he paid $20,000 for 11 tons of biodegradable soap. This was in concentrated form at a ten to one ratio, so that the 11 tons of soap became 110 tons of biodegradable soap. This was all for an exclusive franchise for the sale of the soap in Mexico. There is, however, a modest problem. Mexico will not allow the stuff to be imported into the country. Would any of you have room for 110 tons of biodegradable soap? We will sell it to you for a lot less than the $60,000 that we just paid Best Line for it.

Now, that is a sordid story, I tell you, not because it is lacking in veracity, but because it stretches one's credulity. Yet when the franchisee turns out to have lawyers and accountants, and to be the major distributor of products to hotels and restaurants, as happened in this very case, then it is clear that a prospective franchisee is helpless no matter whom they may consult and no matter how sophisticated he may be in other business ventures.

While there are innumerable cases of fraud by the major oil companies, all we can do is present some specific cases that are undoubtedly typical. For example, in Houston, Texas, with some 161 Esso Gasoline Station Dealers, Esso (or Humble Oil) came up with a new prize game in which the highest prize would be $25, the plan being to eliminate a few large prizes in favor of many small winners. This was only eighteen months ago, lest any of you think it is ancient history. So Esso induced all of its dealers in town to pledge two cents a gallon contribution to the prize game. A funny thing happened. In nine months, Esso collected $3,860,000. And how many prizes do you think they gave out? None. Nobody could figure it out, and then a discharged superintendent from Esso showed up. Mr. Ligon, Secretary of the Texas Gasoline Dealers Association received a call from the fired superintendent, who said, "Do you know why there are not any winners?" He said, "Here are the tickets." He had every winning ticket. He then continued, "Well, they told me not to give them out unless I felt a particular station was doing a darn good job, and I did not think any of you were, so I did not give any of them out." Of course, Esso kept the $3 million 860 thousand. This is total larceny. There are no other words to describe it. It was a fraud on the dealers each of whom contributed a little bit toward the advertising campaign, the benefits of which depended on the awarding of numerous small prizes. And it was a fraud on the public who may have been misled into thinking there was an opportunity to obtain the twenty-five dollar prizes. No excuses were offered by Esso; it just kept all the money. The point is that the proposed trade regulation won't help to prevent or to remedy such deceptive practices.

Next, we can talk about Texaco. I am sure you are thoroughly familiar with FTC v. Texaco in which the United States Supreme Court said that the tie-in of the short-term leases to the purchases of TBA was an incipient anti-trust violation, even in the total absence of any overt pressure on the part of the franchisor. The court held that the dealers knew what was expected of them and that the franchisor used its power to obtain kickbacks from the TBA vendors. That is only the background of this story. Texaco was only a little impressed with that Supreme Court ruling. Maybe this story will enable you to go after Texaco for criminal contempt, so I shall give you the dates, times, and places.

This recently took place in Attleboro, Massachusetts, where a Texaco dealer who had been such a dealer for six years, rather successfully, was then approached by the Rhode Island Regional District Manager of Texaco, and asked whether he would like to make another fifteen percent on TBA. He said it could be done if the dealer became a warehouseman. The manager stated that while Texaco would do the selling, it needed a place where the fellows around here can come to pick up their merchandise. When asked what he meant, he said that the dealer would have to buy at least $20,000 of TBA, and that's what he did. Would any of you like to buy $20,000 of TBA? Not one cent of it has been sold. If Texaco does that in Attleboro, they assuredly do it all over the United States. They never use such practices in one place, and that is a beautiful way to dump $20,000 of TBA.

To make matters worse, as of October 31, 1971, Texaco said to this same dealer, that it would not renew his dealership. When asked why, no reason was given. So the dealer then had that $20,000 invested in TBA, another $10,000 in his equipment, and other TBA that he had bought for his own use. Then he looked for a qualified dealer to take his place and he came upon the Texaco dealer in North Attleboro, who had been a Texaco dealer for fifteen years, and who was willing to pay $30,000. While there would be no payment for goodwill, at least the TBA would be purchased. Without explanation, Texaco wouldn't approve. Instead, it presented the Attleboro dealer with a new student that had gone to one of their schools, who was willing to pay $15,000 and that is what happened. Such price-fixing and illegal restraints on alien-ability are in addition to Texaco's contempt for the FTC order. As for the proposed FTC order in Coors, your formula is not self-

operating. A franchise, if terminated for good cause, should have an opportunity within a six-month period to obtain a new franchise, whose approval should be subject only to reasonable standards. The story I have just told you about Texaco, also illustrates the manner in which the all powerful franchisor abuses its right to approve transfers.

As for more on Texaco, we can talk about Stuckies. There are several hundred Stuckies franchisees in the South and West. Stuckies is usually a gasoline station, frequently out on a main highway, where you can buy candies, maybe a sandwich or a coke, and in all but a few cases, Texaco Gas. Stuckies is a franchise that is owned by Pet, Inc., in St. Louis, Missouri. The deal that Pet has with Texaco is that for every gallon of gasoline that a Stuckies franchisee buys from Texaco, Texaco pays Pet 2 cents a gallon. Last year it was almost $4 million. Everytime that Pet sells a new franchise, and makes him take on Texaco gasoline, Texaco gives $10,000 in cash to Pet, the franchisor. And if the franchisee will hard-top the driveway, Texaco will lend the franchisee $5,000 to be repaid to Pet with interest. In other words, Pet obtains a $15,000 capital payment from Texaco, plus a kickback on every gallon of gas. Operations of this sort are so inherently fraudulent, that they hardly need justification for a rule such as you have described.

Let's talk about price fixing. You may have heard of the prospective auto dealer who is called a "dealer enterprise" dealer. He is a fellow who does not have quite enough money to open an auto dealership on his own. We can suppose that he needs one hundred thousand dollars, to open an automobile dealership. If he can come up with twenty-five percent, say $25,000, Chrysler will put up the $75,000, and give the dealer the right to buy out the other 75% from the profits generated by the dealership.

The fact is that Chrysler charges for that twenty-five percent whatever the traffic will bear, conduct that most of us would have doubted would be engaged in by the sixth largest company in the Nation. In Natick, Massachusetts, for twenty-five percent, they charged $18,000 on a dealership that ended up with 2,600 new cars a year. That is a big dealership. In Indianapolis, $21,000 for the same twenty-five percent. In Denver, Colorado, $47,000 for one dealership and $61,000 for the other, for a twenty-five percent interest in each case. In Indianapolis and the two in Denver, the dealerships sold 800 new cars a year, each one being one-third the size of the Natick dealership. But all of them were charged substantially more for the same 25% minority interest. In other words, Chrysler charged whatever it could grab from the innocent prospect.

Since these matters expressly involved the sale of stock, we filed a written complaint with the SEC and it did nothing, again showing a complete abdication of governmental responsibility. It is also a commentary on its general disdain for any protection for franchisees.

In addition to the clear-cut sale of stock, Chrysler gave each prospective dealer a pro forma balance sheet and profit and loss statement showing him how in three to five years he would become the owner of the business out of the profits. While Chrysler has several hundred of these dealerships, 450 of them have gone bankrupt. These minority dealers don't have a prayer of success.

Such predictable failures are not due to a bad location nor to a bad product. A Chrysler auto is just as good as the others. It is because Chrysler deliberately sees to it that these crippled dependent dealerships take grossly excessive numbers of vehicles and are forced to operate at a negative retail profit, the fact being that the manufacturer still obtains his manufacturer's profit, euphemistically called the "economic profit." Such losses are incurred under the general arrangement by which Chrysler retains exclusive voting rights until all of its interest has been purchased. It then compels the dealer to order and accept an excessive number of vehicles, this not only increases the interest cost for the floor planning, but also requires excessive advertising, high salesmen's expenses, and excessive trade-in allowances in order to keep up the high volume of activity.

In Natick, the dealer used full page newspaper advertisement in Bangor, Maine, over 500 miles away, stating that anybody interested could fly down from Bangor and stay overnight in a Holiday Inn Hotel; the dealer offered to pay the expenses whether or not an auto were bought. Of course, many people came down and many did buy. But it is foolish to think that an auto dealership could tolerate that kind of advertising expense. So in spite of the fact that every year Chrysler increased the DE dealership salaries from $12,000, to $18,000, to $21,000, and gave annual bonuses of $12,000, $15,000, and $20,000, when the dealer said he would like to buy the dealership, he was terminated and kicked out. In case you don't understand why, the answer is that Chrysler wanted to retain several hundred dependent dealerships through which it could dump cars regardless of retail losses. The whole scheme was deliberate larceny and fraud.

It is proper to ask if this happened to others. The answer is that it has happened to hundreds of Chrysler dealers. On one day alone, the day after Labor Day in 1969, it happened to four Chrysler dealers in Detroit; four dealers in one day in one city!

I think that this information may be useful to you. I hope it is. I can stop at anytime you would like.

Mr. DIXON. I was going to suggest, Mr. Brown, to wind it up, as quickly as possible.

Mr. BROWN. All right.

If any of the repression that is permitted to a franchisor over his franchisees can be justified, it is because the franchisee comes under the protection of a well-known trademark, or system of operation, and theoretically, for such benefits, a franchisee ought to be willing to give up some of his independence. Let's test that theory.

How about Academy Montesorri. Well, the name "Montesorri" is in the public domain. Doctor Montesorri invented a system of teaching pre-school children a long time ago, in 1906. For this franchisor to try to preempt that name is impossible; it is legally impossible. In fact, that franchisor was selling franchises even though it had no pilot operation or testing. In fact, the pro forma earnings statements disclosed that until the franchisee could shift the children from "child daycare" to "Montesorri care," he had to operate at a substantial loss. The reason for that was the $7,500 minimum annual franchise fee. The plan was probably the first time in history in which a franchisor had deliberately established a pattern of "bait and switch" on three-year old children, because Johnny in the "child daycare" center would represent a loss until Johnny had been persuaded to tell momma that he wanted to go with Bobby into the "Montesorri Care" Side.

There are other well-known franchisors who attempt to dilute the value of the franchise tradename. How can the franchisor fractionalize that trademark, and sell it over again, even as John J. Hooker did for the Minnie Pearl mark until he was put out of business.

It does not seem to us that the same standards are being applied on both sides of the fence. For example, Dunkin Donuts advertises that the franchisee will obtain a "business of your own." But is it really a "business of your own?" Well, last year the head of Dunkin Donuts was the President of the IFA, and the author of a book on franchising. While maintaining such faces of respectability, here are some of the practices of his company. In 1966, Dunkin Donuts publicized that it was dropping "kickbacks" and shifting to a royalty on gross sales. It therefore claimed that its skirts were clean. It lied. It is collecting "kickbacks" to this very day. Those who did not sign the agreement continue to be subjected to a list of some seventy companies from whom Dunkin Donuts continues to obtain kickbacks.

It may be worthwhile to inquire into the methods used by franchisors not only to threaten, but actually to terrorize, their franchisees. To be specific, let's examine Dunkin Donuts. In order to conceal its practices, that franchisor not only uses a separate franchise agreement, but they also have an equipment agreement. The latter says that the list of equipment is confidential and the franchisee covenants never to use it except for the manufacture of donuts as a Dunkin Donut franchisee at one location. In that way, the franchisor guarantees that in case of termination for any reason, there will be a total forfeiture of the value of the franchisee's business, including the $30,000 be paid for the equipment. While the franchisee's right to transfer is severely limited. Dunkin Donuts by contract retains the right to assign the contract to anyone in the world and, upon its assumption by the assignee, all further obligations of Dunkin Donuts will terminate. For lack of a better phrase, I call this a compulsory novation. It guarantees the right of the franchisor to walk away from all its obligations, without fear of liability.

Returning to Dunkin Donuts, it has spent almost $500,000 to develop a machine that they hope will make the donuts automatically. They still do not have the machine, but they are preparing the franchisees for a campaign in which they will be compelled to lease the new machine. For example, while it was always standard procedure to use freezers and "holding" bins for donuts, the franchisor is now engaged in a vicious campaign to eliminate such equipment as an antecedent to the promotion of the automatic equipment. To terrorize the franchisees, they swoop in to examine a location, announce that the place is filthy and that the product is poorly made. Without giving the franchisee a chance to contest such opinions, they just walk in, pick up eight or ten trays of donuts, and physically throw them out. The franchisee is denied any chance to test the product or to show that the inspector is wrong. The product is just thrown into the garbage can.

Well, several franchisees decided to find out how the company stores were being operated. Without notice, on January 24, 1972, the franchisees inspected two company stores. Both were filthy. In one, there hadn't been a cook for 24 hours. One of the counter-clerks was trying to cook donuts. She had never made donuts in her life. That was the way that company stores were being operated.

If you think that Dunkin Donuts was merely pretending, you are in error. To the contrary, this very month, we had to go to court to defend the franchisee from eviction. Because this franchisor subleases most of the locations to its franchisees and ties the lease to the grant of the franchise, whenever it declares that the franchisee is in default, it will try to steal the business through summary eviction proceedings. Not only Dunkin Donuts, but some companies as Chrysler and General Foods, provide in the lease that it will automatically end if the franchisee is declared in default. While it is sometimes possible to fend them off on some technical grounds, hundreds of dealers are thrown out through this procedure. Since most states provide that lessor-lessee covenants are independent of each other, the franchisee can't raise his own defenses in the eviction case.

Yet there is no question that by using the subleasing of the premises as the tie-in prod-

uct, the franchisor is violating the antitrust laws. The tying is often conditional on the lessee's handling the lessor's products. That issue is being tested in suits against the major oil companies based on their subleasing the premises solely on the condition that the lessee handle the lessor's gasoline products.

Such antitrust matters do not directly concern today's discussion, except that such practices are not disclosed to the prospective franchisee. In my written presentation, I have tried to illustrate the many areas of fraud on capital and operating matters as well as on the means of achieving control. The latter include record-keeping abuses, phony arbitration procedures, unilaterally levied fines and suspensions, capricious termination notices, and even the deliberate use of computerized records to effectuate defaults. In addition to the formal written presentation, I have also offered a thirteen-page document giving the names of the major franchisors who have perpetrated many of the frauds described in the statement.

I want to thank you for this opportunity to describe the franchisee's viewpoint on your proposed regulation.

Mr. DIXON. In view of the time consumed by your principal statement, Mr. Brown, I think we may have some questions, so with your permission, as we have with some other witnesses, we may, if you would agree to present them in writing, and ask for a written reply.

I wanted to pursue briefly one aspect of your statement, which I think is your basic point, and that goes to this question of the franchise constituting a fiduciary relationship, and we—Well, when the question, whether or not that does not prove too much, at least for our purpose, something sort of a syllogism, if I grant that, everything else follows, so if we grant it as a fiduciary relationship, and if it is, would not it require far, far more than we are talking about in this relatively modest disclosure rule?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, given the fourth dimension, my answer to you would be yes, but we have a fourth dimensional factor. Other than the one trial court which was reversed on a technicality, there are no court decisions sustaining our position. The fiduciary obligations have been recognized in some legislation such as in the Automobile Dealers Act in Massachusetts and in the franchise statute recently adopted in the State of Washington. Both of these recognize the obligation of good faith, but that is all there is on the books. Further, litigation is expensive and it takes a long while. If the FTC were to give formal recognition to the fiduciary relationship, it might be possible to forego much specific regulation. Among other advantages would be the fact that most attorneys and most courts are already familiar with obligations of a fiduciary character. As a result, it would be easier to open the door of the courts and of the law offices to those who desperately need that kind of relief. Further, franchisees could avoid the horrendous expenses involved in antitrust litigation.

Mr. DIXON. It is because of the concept of fiduciary relationship does have a fairly well settled meaning, and I think goes far beyond the duty of good faith.

We are familiar with here in our work, with the duty of good faith, between buyers and sellers, franchisors, and franchisees, but to call it a fiduciary relationship, in the sense in which I think you are using the term, would not it virtually require the franchisor to open his books to a franchisee?

Mr. BROWN. No, I have not opened my books to any of my clients. Yet attorneys have always recognized their fiduciary relationship with their clients. The fiduciary relationship prohibits secret self-preference, overbearing conduct, and conflict of interest. If I handle your passing of title in the purchase of a home, I cannot secretly get a kickback from the mortgagee for steering you to that particular bank. I would have to make full disclosure and ethical considerations might require even more.

To be precise, I believe that the fiduciary duty should be co-extensive with the power exercised by the particular franchisor. Where you have International House of Pancakes collecting the money, running the books for the franchisee, as well as specifying the products to be bought, all of those to me are classical illustrations of the sources of fiduciary obligations. In some cases, the fiduciary duties would be lessened because the franchisor exercises only minimal control over the franchisees. But I would caution those who would closely challenge the fiduciary relationship. Judges are not very anxious to draw a close line for the fiduciary who indulges in self preference or other larcenous conduct. To the contrary, once a court finds such abuse, it will usually take drastic measures to obtain redress. For example, there is ample precedent under which a court of equity will not only require restitution of the taken property, but may also require a refund of all fees, not matter how reasonable they may otherwise have been.

Mr. DIXON. So then, would you say that without necessarily endorsing every provision in the proposed rule, say that it covers everything it should cover in the preliminary disclosure rule, the thrust of the rule, the thrust of it comports with what you mean by a fiduciary relationship between these parties?

Mr. BROWN. Without question and in total. As we have seen in these hearings, there may be some areas in which some minor adjustments could be made.

For example, to get specific, I would endorse what John Jackson said about time for disclosure, It does not have to be necessarily at the very first contact in its inquiry stage, but certainly it should be made at the first interview or other serious discussion, whether it is in person or by telephone. Because once the poison is planted, it is almost impossible to reverse the enthusiasm of the prospective franchisee; I have dealt with dozens of them and I have found it almost impossible to bring them out once they have been hooked. I therefore endorse your entire trade regulation.

Incidentally, as to the holder in due course, it is addressed to a practice which the International House of Pancakes has effectively used to frighten a terminated franchisee to make an exchange of mutual releases. Since there is a substantial balance remaining due on the equipment note, often from thirty to sixty thousand dollars, the entire balance will automatically become due upon termination of the franchise for any reason whatsoever. Right there, the franchisor then holds the personal obligation of the franchisee for a huge sum of money that he cannot possibly pay. To protect his home, he will sign a release.

In the FTC files, you have the complaint of Rudolf Weth against International House of Pancakes involving that very situation. In his Wayne, New Jersey franchise, during his seven months of operation, he was never able to raise the temperature of his House of Pancakes franchise store above 55 degrees. It just would not work; he finally gave up the day after Christmas. Two days later, with his lawyer present, he was economically forced to enter a compromise settlement in order to avoid the loss of his home. They told him they would take away his home because there was a $33,000 balance due on the accelerated equipment note.

Mr. DIXON. Where is the second party holder in that situation?

Mr. BROWN. I do not even know with whom it was discounted.

Mr. DIXON. There was a third party holder?

Mr. BROWN. There may or may not have been. Just about that time, International House of Pancakes made a corporate merger in which they obtained $65 million. They may have been using their own funds. I am not quite certain. Oddly enough, they soon lost most of their liquidity and that has led to other abuses.

As a matter of fact, that franchisor collects the money from the franchisees and is supposed to pay the vendors. In fact, they were not paid. At this very minute, the franchisor is as much as fourteen weeks behind. Since it collects about a half million dollars a week and it is about 14 weeks in arrears, it has about seven-million dollars of the franchisees' money to use for its own corporate purposes. When the franchisees began to receive COD demands from various vendors and even eviction proceedings by the landlords, we sought temporary injunctive relief in the pending class antitrust suit. Judge Collinson ordered the franchisor to make prompt payment in full to the third party vendors, for which it had already collected from the franchisees. Since payment has not been made, the franchisor could be cited for contempt of court. The franchisees want the franchisor to pay the vendors, but it is an uphill battle. For example, Richard Erickson is a franchisee located on the Veterans of Foreign War Parkway, Boston, Massachusetts. He is only the customary four weeks behind in his payments, which is normal in the system since it takes that much time to verify the account. He recently received an eviction writ from the landowner, stating that it has not been paid any rent for thirteen months. Of course, Richard Erickson is a subleasee of the International House of Pancakes. His rent is paid up to date but thirteen months of rent have not been paid by the franchisor to the landowner.

Now, is this fraud?

Can you cover it with full disclosure? I don't know. I am leaving that problem to you.

I hope you come up with the answers. I fully support what you are doing.

Mr. DIXON. Thank you, Mr. Brown.

I think this would be a good spot for another five-minute recess.

(Whereupon, the hearing was in recess.)

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of loss that I give tribute to Chairman GEORGE MILLER on his leaving the Congress. I have been privileged to serve with Chairman MILLER on the House Committee on Science and Astronautics since my first day in the House. Our relationship has been one of friendship and respect and I will sincerely miss his presence and leadership in the years to come.

Chairman MILLER has given the committee outstanding leadership blended with a kindness and understanding which few men possess. The chairman has always been a very progressive and responsive leader and has been most instrumental in the development of sound and valuable programs of scientific and technological advancement for our Nation.

GEORGE has given the committee and the Congress much needed leadership in these areas and has always looked down the road in anticipating future needs of our space and scientific communities.

The desirability of our country converting to the metric system of measurement was, in large part, championed by the chairman and his contributions in this area alone will insure his place in history.

The chairman was responsible for the creation of a Subcommittee on International Cooperation in Science and Space and I was fortunate enough to be appointed as its first chairman. Mr. MILLER's keen foresight and leadership was most valuable to me in executing the responsibilities of that post and I will be forever grateful.

This Nation's space program has evolved into one of stability and far-reaching scientific implications. The chairman has been the most significant single figure in the progress we have been able to make in space and we all owe him a debt of gratitude for his efforts.

The chairman's leadership and support will be missed by me and my colleagues in the House. His friendship, however, will be with me forever and it means a great deal to me.

I wish the chairman every happiness in the years to come and I join wholeheartedly with my colleagues in paying tribute to an outstanding statesman and a wonderful man.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT NO. 9

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting, for the information of Members, their staff, and others who may be interested, a few excerpts from the most recent budget scorekeeping report for the session, prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

The report reflects the impact of congressional actions on the President's budget requests through the end of the session October 18.

The report contains considerable information for those who have need for details, and a copy has been sent to all Members.

The excerpts I am including—that is, the text highlights and the main scorekeeping table of the report—are more or less self-explanatory.

I would add that these scorekeeping reports, now in their fifth year, are the most comprehensive current source of information on what is happening legislatively to the President's budgetary recommendations. They are authoritative, being carefully prepared by an experienced staff dedicated to complete objectivity, reporting the facts as best they can be ascertained. Some estimating is necessary, especially in respect to legislative actions affecting outlays—expenditures.

The following material is excerpted from the "1973 Budget Scorekeeping Report No. 9," as of the end of the session October 18, 1972:

EXCERPTS FROM 1973 BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT NO. 9

HIGHLIGHTS

Fiscal 1973 scorekeeping—end of session

The impact of congressional action to the end of the session, October 18, 1972, on the President's fiscal year 1973 requests for budget authority, budget outlays and budget receipts, and the projected unified budget deficit, as shown in this report, may be summarized as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	House	Senate	Enacted
Budget authority:			
Appropriation bills	−6,318	−3,460	−6,561
Legislative bills:			
Net increase over requests	+14,981	+11,502	+13,376
Fiscal year 1972 revenue sharing request shift to 1973	+2,500	+2,500	+2,500
Inaction on legislative proposals in the 1973 budget	−244	−177	−264
Total, budget authority increase	+10,920	+10,365	+9,051
Outlays:			
Appropriation bills	−2,137	−173	−1,555
Legislative bills:			
Net increase over requests	+3,306	+9,921	+5 680
Fiscal year 1972 revenue sharing request shift to 1973	+2,250	+2,250	+2,250
Inaction on legislative proposals in the 1973 budget	−74	−37	−90
Total, outlay increase	+3,345	+11,962	+6,286
Revenue increase (decreases deficit)	+323	+1,534	+525
Deficit increase	+3,022	+10,428	+5,761

In terms of completed congressional action for this session, major scorekeeping actions affecting the President's budget requests include:

Black lung benefits—increase of $969 million in budget authority and outlays;

Social security benefits—increase of $2.8 billion in outlays, mainly the 20% benefit increase instead of the 5% increase requested;

Revenue sharing—increase of $3.0 billion in budget authority and $3.3 billion in outlays (including shift of $2.5 billion in budget authority and $2.25 billion in outlays requested for fiscal 1972 into fiscal 1973).

Water pollution control—increase of $11 billion in budget authority.

Various veterans benefits—increase of $330 million in budget authority and about $550 million in outlays.

With respect to revenue, congressional action during the session increased estimated budget receipts by $525 million. This is composed of a $425 million net increase because of inaction on certain budget revenue proposals and a net increase of $100 million from action on revenue legislation, mainly social security taxes.

This report shows congressional action as of the end of the session (October 18), and includes final Presidential approval or disapproval of legislation through October 23. It should be noted that the report does not reflect any changes which may subsequently be necessary as a result of possible vetoes of measures still pending final Presidential approval.

Fiscal 1973 budget deficit

The following is an analysis of the budget deficit for fiscal year 1973, reflecting budget revisions, amendments and congressional action to the end of the session, October 18, 1972:

	Deficit estimate (millions)
Original deficit estimate, January 1972 (outlays $246,257 million; receipts $220,785 million)	$25,472
Budget revisions, as of June 5, 1972:	
Net outlay increase due to certain congressional actions, mainly black lung benefits	+895
Shift of fiscal 1972 revenue sharing request into fiscal 1973, assuming enactment of retroactive provisions of pending legislation	+2,250
Net outlay changes, including interest	+583
Revenue revisions	−2,200
Revised deficit estimate, as of June 5 (outlays $250,000 million; receipts $223,000 million)	27,000
Amendments to the 1973 budget estimates, as transmitted to date:	
Additional outlays for Vietnam war	+1,200
Disaster-relief outlays incident to Hurricane Agnes, etc	+1,500
Additional outlays for drug abuse programs	+100
Additional outlays for other supplemental requests	+96
Deficit estimate, as revised and amended (outlays $252,896 million; receipts $223,000 million)	29,896
Revenue revisions, September 18, 1972 (excluding Congressional action)	−3,602
Deficit estimate, reflecting further revenue revision of September 18 (outlays $252,896 million; receipts $226,602 million)	26,294
Congressional action to date (in addition to amounts included in the June 5 budget revisions):	
Social security—all legislation (net):	
Payments, 20% increase, liberalization, etc	+2,842
Revenue increase	−100
Revenue sharing outlay increase not included in June 5 revisions above	+1,045
All other outlay changes, net (including inaction)	−746
All other revenue changes (including inaction)	−425
Deficit estimate, as revised and amended, and adjusted by Congressional action (outlays $256,037 million; receipts $227,127 million)	28,910

The unified budget deficit estimate of $28.9 billion reflects a federal funds deficit of $37.2 billion and a trust fund surplus of $8.3 billion.

Fiscal 1973 outlays

Current outlay estimates for Administration budget requests as amended and transmitted to date, together with Congressional action to the end of the session, October 18, are analyzed in tabular form as follows:

	Outlay estimate (millions)
Original outlay estimate, January 1972	$246,257
Amendments to the 1973 budget estimates, transmitted to date	+2,896
Congressional action to date	+6,286
All other revisions and rounding, net	+598
Outlay estimate, as revised and amended, and adjusted to include Congressional action to end of session (October 18, 1972)	256,037

SCOREKEEPING TABLE

TABLE 1.—ESTIMATED EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS DURING THE 2D SESSION OF THE 92D CONGRESS ON INDIVIDUAL BILLS AFFECTING BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS (EXPENDITURES) (AS OF END OF SESSION, OCT. 18, 1972)

[In thousands of dollars]

Items acted upon	Congressional actions on budget authority (changes from the budget)			Congressional actions on budget outlays (changes from the budget)		
	House	Senate	Enacted	House	Senate	Enacted
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Fiscal year 1973:						
Appropriation bills (changes from the 1973 budget):						
1972 Foreign assistance and related agencies (Public Law 92-242)				[1] −105,000	[1] −105,000	−105,000
Legislative Branch (Public Law 92-342)	−6,022	−4,625	−5,560	−5,500	−4,300	−5,200
2d supplemental, 1972 (Public Law 92-306)				−100,000	+550,000	+95,000
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and related agencies (H.R. 14989)	−100,884	+116,391	††−23,309	−74,000	+51,000	††−28,000
Housing and Urban Development, Space, Science and related agencies (Public Law 92-383)	−454,695	+85,187	−372,232	−3,500	+58,000	+34,000
Transportation and related agencies (Public Law 92-398)	−117,567	−2,187	−41,244	−75,000	−39,000	−48,000
District of Columbia (Public Law 92-344)	−11,000	−29,600	−26,913	−11,000	−29,600	−26,913
Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies (H.R. 16654) [2]	+835,815	[3] +835,815	††[3] +532,366	+275,000	[3] +275,000	††[3] +200,000
Interior and related agencies (Public Law 92-369)	+9,218	+23,769	+21,781	−7,100	+14,800	+10,000
Treasury, Postal Service and General Government (Public Law 92-351)	−9,458	−9,417	−8,776	−37,000	−37,000	−36,500
Public Works and Atomic Energy (Public Law 92-405)	−51,331	+82,638	+15,856	−20,000	+49,000	+27,700
Agriculture and Environmental and Consumer Protection (Public Law 92-399)	−55,179	+608,866	+481,842	[4] +78,000	[4] +315,000	[4] +250,000
Supplemental, 1972, disaster relief (Public Law 92-337)				+100,000	+100,000	+100,000
Supplemental, 1973, disaster relief (Public Law 92-393)	+17,500	+17,500	+17,500	+6,000	+6,000	+6,000
Department of Defense (H.R. 16593)	−5,016,636	−5,022,486	††−5,221,208	−2,000,000	−1,600,000	††−1,750,000
Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies (H.R. 16705) (H.J. Res. 1331, Public Law 92-510)	−967,869	−88,127	††[5] −1,510,323	−140,000	+1,500	††[5] −265,000
Military construction (H.R. 16754)	−380,600	−323,658	††−337,981	−10,000	−8,000	††−8,600
Supplemental, 1973 (H.R. 17034)	−8,904	+250,150	††−83,125	−8,000	+230,000	††−4,000
Subtotal, appropriation bills	−6,317,612	−3,459,784	−6,561,326	−2,137,100	−172,600	−1,554,513
Legislative bills with "backdoor" spending authorizations (changes from the 1973 budget):						
Higher education—student loans (borrowing authority) (Public Law 92-318)	Indefinite	Indefinite	Indefinite	NA	NA	NA
Housing Act of 1972 (contract authority) (S. 3248, H.R. 16704)	†+150,000	+300,000		†NA	NA	
Housing—temporary extension (contract authority) (Public Law 92-503)		+150,000	+150,000		NA	NA
Highway emergency relief (Public Law 92-361)	−50,000	−50,000	−50,000			
Federal-aid Highway Act of 1972 (S. 3939, H.R. 16656)	+1,511,350	+1,287,920	([6])	NA	NA	([6])
Airport and airways development (contract authority) (S. 3755)		+840,000	††+700,000			(‡‡)
REA loan guarantee (borrowing authority) (S. 3995)		†+20,000			†NA	
General revenue sharing (Public Law 92-512):						
Shift of fiscal 1972 request to 1973	+2,500,000	+2,500,000	+2,500,000	+2,250,000	+2,250,000	+2,250,000
Increase above request	+300,000	+300,000	+494,670	+850,000	+850,000	+1,044,670
State bond subsidy (permanent) (S. 3215)		†+29,000			†+29,000	
Water pollution control (contract authority) (Public Law 92-500)	[7] +11,000,000	+3,000,000	[7] +11,050,000	NA	NA	NA
Freight car loan guarantee (borrowing authority) (S. 1729)		+2,000,000			NA	
Subtotal, "backdoor"	+15,411,350	+10,376,920	+14,844,670	+3,100,000	+3,129,000	+3,294,670
Legislative bills with mandatory spending authorizations (changes from the 1973 budget):						
Wage board pay (Public Law 92-392)	[1] +30,000	[1] +30,000	+30,000	[1] +30,000	[1] +30,000	+30,000
Full District of Columbia Congressional representation (H.J. Res. 253)	†+960			†+960		
Federal employee health insurance (H.R. 12202)	+267,900	+39,600	(‡)	+267,900	+39,600	(‡)
Service contract wage rates (Public Law 92-473)	+10,000	+10,000	+10,000	+10,000	+10,000	+10,000
Council on International Economic Policy (Public Law 92-412)	−1,341			−1,316		
School lunch (Public Law 92-433)				[1] +200,000	[1] +200,000	+200,000
Equalization of military retired pay (Public Law 92-436)	−269,000	+6,000	−269,000	−269,000	+6,000	−269,000
National Guard retirement (S. 855)		+7,900			+7,900	
Additional military travel allowance (H.R. 3542)	+2,414			+2,414		
POW and MIA leave (H.R. 14911)	+13,400	+13,400	††+13,400	+13,400	+13,400	††+13,400
Military survivor annuity (Public Law 92-425)		−17,715	−17,715		−17,715	−17,715
National Foundation for Higher Education (Public Law 92-318)	[1] −90,000		−90,000	[1] −27,000		−27,000
Black lung benefits (Public Law 92-303)	[1] +968,712	+968,712	+968,712	[1] +968,712	+968,712	+968,712
Social security tax and benefit amendments (Public Law 92-336)		[8] −1,600,000	[8] −1,600,000		+2,100,000	+2,100,000
Social security liberalization, welfare reform, tax increase, etc. (H.R. 1)		[8] +2,500,000	††[8] +1,441,220		+3,700,000	††+742,220
Medicaid extension (H.R. 16811)				††+86,000		
Revenue sharing, HUD [9]	−200,000			−454,000	−454,000	−454,000
U.S. Marshals pay raise (H.R. 13895)	+2,129	+2,129	††+2,129	+2,129	+2,129	††+2,129
Extended unemployment benefits (H.R. 16810)					+200,000	††+200,000
Longshoremen's compensation (S. 2318)	+4,322	+6,000	††+5,310	+4,322	+6,000	††+5,310
Unemployment benefits—environmental improvement actions (H.R. 16071)	+100,000	+100,000	††+100,000	+100,000	+100,000	††+100,000
Air traffic controller retirement (Public Law 92-297)	[1] +31,500	+31,500	+31,500	[1] +31,500	+31,500	+31,500
Airport police pay raise (H.R. 7625)	+338			+338		
Early retirement—customs inspectors (H.R. 440)	+3,200			+3,200		
Handgun control (S. 2507)		+10,000			+10,000	
Veterans advance educational allowance (H.R. 12828)	+128,700	+692,000	††+146,641	+124,700	+900,900	††+371,600
Veterans medical care (H.R. 10880)	[1] +39,033	+150,850	††+39,033	[1] +39,033	+150,850	††+39,033
Veterans paraplegic housing (Public Law 92-341)	+3,500	+5,000	+3,500	+3,500	+5,000	+3,500
Veterans national cemeteries (H.R. 12674)	[1] +26,400	+26,400	††+26,400	[1] +23,100	[1] +23,100	††+23,100
Veterans compensation increase (Public Law 92-328)	+114,900	+169,000	+114,900	+114,900	+169,000	+114,900
World War I veterans pensions (S. 3070)		+109,000			+109,000	
Veterans disability compensation liberalization (S. 4006)		+197,895			+197,895	
Civil Service retirement—firemen (Public Law 92-382)	+6,700	+6,330	+6,700	+6,700	+6,330	+6,700
Civil Service—early retirement (H.R. 11255)	†+780,600			†+780,600		
Disaster relief, SBA (Public Law 92-385)	+94,772	+159,952	+50,000	+94,772	+159,952	+50,000
Minority enterprises (S. 3337)	+833	+883	††+883	+833	+883	††+883
Railroad Retirement benefit increase (Public Law 92-336)					+68,000	+68,000
Railroad Retirement—20 percent increase (Public Law 92-460)				+298,000	+298,000	+298,000
Railroad Retirement benefit increase (H.R. 1)		NA	††+18,000		NA	††+24,000
Subtotal, "mandatory"	+2,069,972	+3,624,836	+1,031,613	+2,455,697	+9,042,436	+4,635,272
Subtotal, legislative bills	+17,481,322	+14,001,756	+15,876,283	+5,555,697	+12,171,436	+7,929,942

Items acted upon	Congressional actions on budget authority (changes from the budget)			Congressional actions on budget outlays (changes from the budget)		
	House	Senate	Enacted	House	Senate	Enacted
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Inaction on legislative proposals included in the 1973 budget (see tables 4 and 5 for details):						
Student loan program revision	+288,000	+288,000	+288,000	+288,000	+288,000	+288,000
Stockpile sales (proprietary receipts)	+301,000	+301,000	+301,000	+301,000	+301,000	+301,000
Volunteer army	−360,000	−360,000	−360,000	−356,000	−356,000	−356,000
Armed forces retirement	−145,285	−145,285	−145,285	−139,285	−139,285	−139,285
Education revenue sharing	−223,911	−223,911	−223,911	−110,000	−110,000	−110,000
Other	−103,700	−36,700	−123,700	−57,399	−20,399	−73,399
Subtotal, "inaction"	−243,896	−176,896	−263,896	−73,684	−36,684	−89,684
Total, fiscal year 1973	+10,919,814	+10,365,076	+9,051,061	+3,344,913	+11,962,152	+6,285,74

[1] Enacted figure used for comparability.
[2] Earlier action on Labor-HEW appropriations (H.R. 15417) vetoed by President and sustained by House on Aug. 16, 1972.
[3] Reflects full effect of provision authorizing the President to make reductions down to the level of the House passed bill in the Senate version, and to the level of $29,300,000,000 as enacted. Outlay effect estimated.
[4] Does not include possible requirements for certain water pollution reimbursements provided in Public Law 92-500.
[5] Effect of annual rate provided in continuing resolution (H.J. Res. 1331).
[6] Scorekeeping on conference action not shown since Congress adjourned sine die before House approved conference report.
[7] Includes advance availability of $6,000,000,000 provided for fiscal 1974.
[8] Includes related social security tax revenue action.
[9] Scorekeeping reflects inclusion in appropriation bills of amounts for other housing programs. Special revenue sharing legislation not enacted.
‡Subject to or in conference.
†Committee action.
††Pending signature.
NA—Not available.

TRIBUTE TO HON. PAGE BELCHER

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, PAGE BELCHER has rendered distinguished service to his State and the Nation. We regret that he has chosen not to continue his service in the Congress.

PAGE BELCHER has devoted much of his life to public affairs. He has been a great voice for Oklahoma and has made a real contribution to the legislative process of the Nation.

PAGE BELCHER speaks a language that everyone understands. His great commonsense approach to the issues has been a great influence on the legislative process. His leadership has meant much to his people and our country.

It has been a privilege for me to know and serve with PAGE BELCHER, and I take this opportunity to wish him the very best as he reenters private life.

CONGRESSMAN FRANK BOW

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Congressman FRANK BOW who has served with the 16th District of Ohio with distinction for 22 years.

During FRANK'S tenure on the appropriations Committee he has become known as Mr. Fiscal Responsibility. Certainly, his diligence in overseeing the various budget requests clearly qualifies him for this title.

FRANK also has been the Ohio representative on the Republican Committee on Committees. In that capacity he always has been more than willing to help his Buckeye colleagues. I am particularly grateful to him for the assistance he has given me.

We pause this afternoon to congratulate FRANK on his retirement from the House of Representatives and to commend him for the contributions he has made to his constituents, the people of Ohio, and the Nation. However, he really is embarking on a new career. Thus, as he enters the diplomatic profession as Ambassador to Panama, I wish him well and Godspeed.

REVIEW OF THE 92D CONGRESS

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the 92d Congress enacted many significant measures which will benefit the people of Ohio. The more important accomplishments include:

The 26th amendment to the Constitution extending the right to vote to 18-year-olds;

Passage by the Congress of the equal rights for women amendment;

The higher education bill;

Health manpower legislation to provide the additional medical personnel which are so desperately needed;

A Federal election campaign law to provide a limit on campaign expenditures and better reporting of contributions;

Numerous environmental measures to control water pollution, pesticides, ocean dumping, toxic substances, to protect marine mammals and to provide a national land use policy;

General revenue sharing;

An equal employment opportunities law to strengthen civil rights enforcement;

A measure to provide improved benefits to coal miners who contract black lung disease;

Anticrime legislation;

Tax reform;

Improved veterans' benefits;

Improved social security benefits; and

Economic stabilization.

Despite these important measures, Congress failed to enact pension protection legislation, no-fault insurance, meaningful welfare reform, a minimum wage bill, and legislation to deal with the energy crisis. Unemployment remains too high and I am hopeful that we can undertake legislative initiatives to provide more job opportunities during the next session of the Congress.

In addition, we must act decisively to improve the quality of life in our cities and arrest the decay which has eaten away at many of our urban areas.

During the 92d Congress the Senate passed a total of 767 measures, acted on 19 treaties, and confirmed 66,054 Executive appointments.

We must continue to seek economy in Government and cut our wasteful and unproductive programs. Congress must also continually reevaluate priorities.

In submitting my report on the 92d Congress to the people of Ohio, measures which I believe to be of particular significance and which merit further discussion are as follows:

A. CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

One of the first bills I introduced as a Member of the Senate was a resolution to require financial disclosure by all Senators and key staff members. This proposal would close the loopholes in the present disclosure regulations. Under my resolution, Senators and staff members who earn more than $15,000 a year would be required to list publically all income received during the preceding year, to disclose all of their assets and liabilities, and to list all gifts received totaling $50 or more from any source. The only exception would be for Christ-

mas and birthday presents received from family members.

Charges of financial irregularity have been lodged against Senators and key staff members. The public is justified in being angry and concerned. Conflicts of interest undermine confidence in the Senate as an institution. I believe that the public should have the right to this information and not be left in the dark.

The Congress did pass the Federal Elections Campaign Act which became law on February 7, 1972. I regard this legislation as an important step toward adequate regulation of campaign spending and financing.

This legislation limits campaign expenditures for communications media to either $50,000 or 10 cents per eligible voter, whichever is greater. Newspapers, magazines and broadcasting stations can not discriminate against candidates by charging high fees for space or broadcasting time.

A candidate is prohibited from spending personal funds or those of his immediate family in excess of $50,000 in a campaign for President or Vice President, $35,000 in a campaign for Senator, and $25,000 in a campaign for Representative.

Corporations and labor organizations can solicit contributions to political funds from their employees, but cannot make such contributions mandatory.

Full disclosure is required of the expenditures and receipts of "political committees" which handle contributions or political expenditures totaling $1,000 or more. Other requirements include disclosures of the name, address, and principal place of business of anyone whose political contributions aggregate more than $100 per year.

I am hopeful that the spending limits and disclosure requirements in the Federal Elections Campaign Act will lessen the importance of these characteristics for political success and allow a candidate's merits and abilities to assume a greater role.

I have been opposed to the seniority system for many years. When I was a Member of the House of Representatives I headed a Republican group which abolished the seniority system in selecting committee chairmen and ranking committee members on the Republican side. This year I was appointed as a member of a five-man committee established by the Republican caucus to change the seniority system in the Senate. I am hopeful that the Republicans in the Senate will follow the example of the Republicans in the House and eliminate the seniority system here as well.

B. THE ECONOMY

Productivity and wage price stabilization.—On August 3, 1971, I joined with several other Republican Senators to introduce two bills which would enable the executive branch to deal more effectively with the problems of unemployment and inflation. The first measure would have established a Wage-Price Board with the authority to set standards by which decisions with respect to wages and prices could be measured in terms of their inflationary impact.

The second bill proposed the establishment of a National Council on Productivity. The Council would be designed to enlist the cooperation of labor, management and State and local governments to promote increased productivity. Some labor unions and corporations have failed to live up to their responsibilities to modernize facilities and update work rules. Consequently, the Government was required to act as the catalyst to insist that both parties take responsible positions to return American products to a competitive position.

Our legislation precipitated the President's dramatic August 15th announcement that he would impose wage and price controls and take steps to help improve the Nation's productivity. In addition, less than 5 months after we introduced these bills, legislation was passed which made the National Council on Productivity a reality.

Workers are concerned that automation may result in layoffs. But unless American products can be sold competitively on the world market, there will be neither jobs nor profits. If we are to protect American jobs, we must concentrate on increasing our productivity.

As early as April of 1971, I called for the reinstatement of the investment tax credit. I did so in order to help modernize America's tools of production and increase our efficiency. During the last 10 years, American productivity has increased at a slower rate than any Western nation. During that time, Japan's productivity has increased 180 percent while our increase per man-hour was 35 percent. Accordingly, it now takes the Japanese 5.7 man-hours to produce a ton of raw steel while it takes us 7.31 man-hours.

The significance of productivity is illustrated by the fact that an increase of 0.4 percent in the productivity growth rate for American industry would result in an additional $250 billion in gross national product during the next decade.

Americans will never become more efficient than their competitors, however, if its workers have to fight the battle with obsolescent tools. Forty-four percent of all industrial equipment in use in America is 10 years old or older; 10 years ago, only 35 percent of our machinery was that old. Americans invest a smaller percentage of their gross national product in new equipment than any other major industrial nation.

One of the principal reasons why our industry has become entrenched in this disadvantageous situation is that other countries give their industries more favorable tax treatment, as well as grants and loans in some cases, to encourage investment. For example, other major industrial nations allowed their industries to write off new investments for tax purposes in an average of 8.4 years. Prior to the Nixon administration's initiation of accelerated depreciation, or ADR, the average write-off period in the United States was 13 years. Shorter depreciation periods have increased the cash flow of foreign competitors and given them a greater capacity to reinvest in new and modern productive equipment.

The ADR and the investment tax credit will help to remove these competitive disadvantages. They will aid greatly in modernizing our factories, so that the American worker will not be forced to compete for his job using obsolete tools and equipment.

The Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, was given the responsibility for drawing up the legislation which would enable President Nixon to continue his policy of wage and price controls. The committee called for equal sacrifices by labor and business in the anti-inflation program. We saw to it that the "working poor" would not be subject to wage controls. We provided for the retroactive payment of wage increases to those workers who were scheduled to receive increases during the wage-price freeze. We created a means by which private citizens victimized by excessive price increases could sue for damages, and we took steps to lessen the administrative burden of wage and price controls on small businesses.

As of last June, the rate of increase in the cost of living had slowed from 3.8 percent in the 8 months of 1971 before wage and price controls were imposed—and 6.1 percent in early 1969—to 2.7 percent since the imposition of the freeze. Although there is certainly some controversy about the equitability of controls, the decision to allow the program to continue has apparently helped to reduce inflation.

International trade.—Millions of Americans are gripped by the fear that foreign workers are going to take away their jobs. The Christian Science Monitor recently estimated that more than 40,000 Americans lose their jobs through import competition each year.

Representative BURKE, Democrat of Massachusetts, and Senator HARTKE, Democrat of Indiana, have proposed that America respond to this challenge with across-the-board import quotas. We should reject the Burke-Hartke approach because it would lead to higher prices for American consumers and invite a trade war that would cost American jobs in export-related industries.

On August 18, 1972, I joined with Senator PERCY of Illinois to introduce the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act. This legislation would greatly increase the availability of Government loans, grants, and subsidies for workers, firms, and communities whose well-being has been threatened by imports.

Tariff increases and import quotas would also become more available. These import restrictions would be applied to specific products rather than to a wide range of goods. Safeguards are included to insure that any such restrictions do not lead to excessive price increases or retaliation by our trading partners.

The Trade Adjustment Assistance Act would fulfill the need to provide more help to those directly affected by increased imports. It is a positive alternative to protectionist legislation. We must work for its enactment during the 93d Congress.

The American worker has been assisted in protecting his job by the invest-

ment tax credit which gives him more modern tools with which to compete, and the revaluation of the dollar which makes it easier to export American goods and more costly for foreign companies to flood the American market with their products. The Trade Adjustment Assistance Act would be a further assistance to those whose jobs have been threatened by imports, without increasing prices paid by the American consumer.

Export decontrol.—Our Government's restriction of exports which are not of strategic value and not controlled by our foreign competitors is a costly anachronism left over from the cold war. It is hard to see how controlling the export of items which the Communists can buy freely from Western Europe and Japan benefits our national security. It only results in a worsened balance-of-payments situation, fewer sales for American industries, and fewer jobs for American workers.

As of last summer, the United States was handicapping itself by controlling approximately 48 percent more classifications of goods and technology than our allies. To help remedy this situation, I introduced the Equal Export Opportunity Act. This legislation would facilitate the decontrol of such exports by requiring the Commerce Department either to remove unilateral U.S. controls or justify their retention. The bill also creates industry advisory committees to help the Department collect essential information for determining the need for export controls.

This legislation has now been passed as title I of Public Law 92–412. It should result in the increased export of nonstrategic machine tools, other types of machinery, computers, electronic equipment, automotive goods, aerospace equipment, chemicals, business equipment, and certain types of fabrics and materials.

Export-Import Bank legislation.—The Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee developed legislation which expands substantially the powers of the Export-Import Bank of the United States to extend loans and guarantees to companies that sell American products abroad. Among other provisions, this measure lifts restrictions on loans and guarantees to Eastern European countries and almost triples the amount of outstanding guarantees and insurance that the Eximbank may charge against its reserves.

This legislation will provide jobs and income for Americans as a result of increased exports, and to build the foundation for a normalization of economic relations with the Communist countries of Eastern Europe.

C. HEALTH

National Cancer Act of 1971.—I am pleased that the Congress enacted the National Cancer Act of 1971, a measure which I cosponsored.

As recently as 1969, we spent $410 per citizen for national defense and only 89 cents per person for cancer research. The striking disparity of these figures is highlighted by the fact that in that same year, 323,000 Americans died as cancer victims.

The National Cancer Act of 1971 provides for the coordination of all programs aimed at finding a cure for cancer. I hope that as a result of this bill we can look forward to a meaningful breakthrough that can eradicate cancer and give hope to the millions of Americans over whom this disease hangs like a dark and ominous shadow.

Communicable Disease Control Amendments of 1972.—In a society as mobile as ours the only way to control communicable diseases effectively is through a coordinated national effort. This legislation, which I supported both in committee and on the floor, authorizes for each of the fiscal years of 1973, 1974, and 1975, $11 million for tuberculosis control, 6 million for the control of measles, and $23 million for the control of other communicable diseases. It establishes a venereal disease prevention and control program which I had cosponsored as a separate measure.

National Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung and Blood Act of 1972.—I cosponsored this legislation which has established a national commitment to combat heart disease, the Nation's No. 1 killer. This measure expands the authority of the National Institutes of Health to develop a major effort to combat cardiovascular and pulmonary diseases.

Multiple sclerosis.—I supported legislation which we enacted to establish a National Commission on Multiple Sclerosis for the purpose of finding the most productive avenues in developing better treatment of multiple sclerosis. This is a chronic and usually progressive disease of the nervous system and afflicts approximately 250,0000 people in the United States.

Lead-base paint poisoning.—This affects some 400,000 young Americans and will probably result in the deaths of 200 children this year. About 14,000 children will be treated, but half of them will be left mentally retarded. I cosponsored legislation to help with this problem, but unfortunately it died in the House after it was passed by the Senate.

Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971.—I cosponsored this measure which is designed to increase the number of doctors, dentists and nurses. Health insurance alone will not provide better health care if there are not enough trained personnel. This measure provides construction assistance grants for schools, and provides other assistance to see that the number of medical personnel is increased. Loans to students will be cancelled if they serve in designated areas where the shortage of medical personnel is most acute.

A companion measure which I cosponsored provides construction grants and other assistance to nursing schools and authorizes funds for the development of new nursing schools. I also supported a measure which we enacted to attract physicians, dentists and nurses into rural and inner city neighborhoods. There are today 5,000 communities in the United States without any health services. This measure extends for 1 year the National Service Corps with a new scholarship program for students entering it. The Corps was established in 1971 to channel medical, dental and other health specialists into areas where the shortage of health personnel is most acute.

Black lung benefits.—Since I have been in the Senate, there has been no bill on which my staff and I have worked harder than on the Black Lung Benefits Act of 1972. Each time we flip a light switch and each time a production line moves, we are depending on coal miners to go into the mines and risk their lungs and even their lives. This act recognizes the physical sacrifices which America's coal miners have made to provide a better standard of living for all Americans.

The heart of this bill provides that where a miner does not have a positive X-ray, but there is other evidence of respiratory disability, there shall be a presumption of black lung disease if he has worked in an underground mine or in a high dust area of a surface mine for a period of 15 years. This was the amendment I authored in committee, and I am pleased that it was retained when we met to compromise the differences between the House and Senate versions. This provision recognizes the injustice of having crippled men denied benefits solely because their disease could not be detected by an X-ray. The evidence is clear from autopsies that approximately 25 percent of black lung cases do not show up in X-rays. Before we passed this change in the law, men who had been crippled for life working in our Nation's coal mines had been unable to collect because of the way in which the previous law had been drafted.

My only reservation about this measure was the fact that it relieved the coal mine operators of their responsibilities for an additional period of 18 months. Under traditional workmen's compensation principles the companies should bear the cost of this program. Many of the companies which were the principal beneficiaries of this extension are among the largest in America. At a time when our budget is running a massive deficit there is questionable justification for having the American taxpayers relieve these corporations of their responsibility to their coal-mining employees.

D. EDUCATION

Higher education.—If there is to be a keystone in the bridge across this Nation's social and economic problems, it must surely be education. By augmenting educational opportunities for all Americans, we make a major thrust in the direction of better jobs and in turn, better housing.

Public Law 92–318, the Higher Education Amendments of 1972, represents a firm and positive reaffirmation of the Federal Government's support for our Nation's educational system. This law provides a program of basic educational opportunity grants, involving a commitment that no qualified student should be denied the resources to receive a higher education. The grants would be up to $1,400 per student. This program should reach 1,800,000 full-time students.

This law also provides a new scholarship program providing matched funds for State scholarships. It also expands work study programs and additional

assistance for community colleges and branch campuses which in Ohio have been such a vital part of our educational system. Community colleges bring educational opportunities to the hometowns of thousands of young people who might not otherwise be able to attend college. By allowing young men and women to live at home and work in their off hours, we greatly expand the educational horizons of thousands of young people.

I am delighted that title II of this measure adds "industrial arts" to the vocational education program. For too many years the educational elite have looked down their noses at vocational education. We have let this educational snobbery reach the point where many young people felt that they would become failures in life if they did not get a college education. The down-grading of vocational education has been nothing short of tragic. It is just as important to be a good electrician or a good toolmaker as it is to be a good lawyer or a good teacher. The expanded definition of vocational training in this measure begins to give recognition to the valuable contribution which students of vocational training are making to American life.

I cosponsored the original version of this bill and supported its final passage as perhaps the most important piece of higher education legislation to come before the Congress.

Busing.—Near the end of the 92d Congress, the Senate killed the antibusing bill. I do not believe that this bill as it was presented to the Senate was in any way an acceptable answer to the problem. No Senate committee considered this bill. No Senate hearings were held. It contained provisions which were of dubious constitutionality, and if enacted, would have presented administrative nightmares. This bill would have barred all busing except to the school closest or next closest to the pupil's home. The "next closest school" concept was unworkable and untested. It would have aimed to integrate schools solely in the city neighborhoods where blue collar whites lived closest to black neighborhoods. It would have permitted the reopening of court orders going all the way back to 1954, thereby injecting turmoil, hostility and uncertainty into communities which have been peaceably complying with court orders for many years. It is regrettable that some of those who are now speaking out against forced busing were not equally vocal when massive busing was used to perpetuate segregated schools.

My position has been and continues to be in opposition to the busing of students abnormal distances solely to create racial balance. Subject to that policy, I feel that courts have an obligation constitutionally to assure that transportation patterns are not used either to perpetuate or to promote segregation.

Every student should be offered the chance to obtain, and benefit from an education that not only teaches him how to survive in the world, but also contributes to the well-being of the community.

In my judgment, housing, economic opportunity, proper districting, and careful location of schools are some of the ways we can achieve the vital objective of equal opportunity in education.

Hopefully, some day Americans will all be accepted with regard to their color, their religion, or their national origin. But that day seems likely to be postponed by turning to a claimed remedy under which children are being transported back and forth across our cities solely because of their race. I did not believe that H.R. 13915 was in any way an acceptable answer to this problem.

Private Schools.—Because of the desperate financial plight of many private schools and private school systems I introduced a bill to allow Congress to provide Federal income tax credits for a part of the tuition paid by parents of private and parochial school students. The enrollment in private schools now exceeds 5.2 million, or about 10 percent of total school enrollment. In Ohio this includes approximately 34,000 students.

It is estimated that the cost of the shift from private to public schools could run as high as $4.7 billion for operating costs and up to $10 billion for the building of new facilities to accommodate such a shift. The collapse of the nonpublic school system would have tragic impact on all education. I am in hopes that the Congress will see the benefit of such a proposal and give early consideration to it in the new Congress.

School Lunches.—The nutrition of schoolchildren is one of our most important national goals. The national school lunch program, which provides assistance to schools serving free and reduced-priced lunches, has faced grave funding crises in the past. In 1971, I wrote to the President regarding serious questions regarding the reimbursement of schools and the eligibility of children. The Department of Agriculture subsequently clarified its regulations, and the Secretary was authorized to use additional funds for the school lunch program on a temporary basis.

In 1972, when the temporary funding expired, the Congress again acted to expand the child nutrition program. The Child Nutrition Act of 1972 extended the special—nonfood—assistance program for children and the school breakfast program through June 30, 1975, required the use of section 32 funds in such amounts as necessary to carry out the National School Lunch Act, and provided an average reimbursement rate of not less than 8 cents per meal in each State in fiscal 1973. This is an increase of 2 cents from the amount guaranteed in the law passed last year. The Child Nutrition Act set new guidelines for free lunches, with a maximum limit on family income for determination of children's eligibility for free lunches.

I cosponsored an amendment to make supplemental foods available to pregnant women and infants under 4 years old who are determined to be nutritional risks. I am pleased that this amendment was adopted because it has been shown that malnourished mothers have a tendency to produce brain-damaged children. A 2-year pilot study will be conducted on this project, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will be responsible for determining the benefits of the program in combating any medical or physical damage that might be caused to infants due to malnutrition of the mother.

The total commitment for child nutrition programs in fiscal year 1972 was $1.3 billion. This is an increase of almost 250 percent over the past 10 years.

E. WELFARE AND JOB TRAINING

I am disappointed that the 92d Congress did not act to clean up the welfare mess. Americans have had enough of a system which is administered by at least 1,152 local agencies. State welfare costs are increasing at a rate of 100 percent every 3 years, and over the past 6 years more than 1 million persons per year have been added to the Nation's welfare roles. One person in every five in Boston is on welfare.

Welfare payments vary by State from $335 per month in Connecticut to $60 per month in Mississippi. The disparity in welfare payments between States has contributed to the migration of rural poor to our northern urban areas. This migration has compounded our problems of crime, housing, and urban decay.

Other problems abound in the welfare system. In a majority of States welfare laws encourage the breakup of families by denying AFDC payments to families where the father is present. Men who work part time are discouraged from seeking full-time employment, because their families would lose eligibility for welfare if they worked full time. Families in which the father works full time but does not earn enough money to escape poverty are not helped at all. Yet 40 percent of the poor in this country live in families headed by a full-time worker.

Single people and childless couples under 65 are completely ineligible for assistance unless they are blind or disabled. Social services, day care, and job training needed to stimulate the employment of those presently receiving welfare have not been provided.

I believe that the time for reform is long overdue. During the welfare-reform debate, I supported a plan to provide $200 per month to a family of four, provide incentives to encourage poor people to work, and help those who are working but do not make enough money to escape poverty.

Because of the importance of this issue, it is essential for us to enact welfare-reform legislation during the next session of the Congress.

If welfare reform is to be effective, however, it must be accompanied by expanding job opportunities. The development of jobs for our unemployed youth is particularly important. In September of this year, the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate for young people 16 to 19 years old was 16.5 percent. For black teenagers, the seasonally adjusted rate was a staggering 32 percent.

Federal Job Corps training centers have created a new bureaucracy and with an average cost of $3,830 per trainee, and have been a costly and incomplete answer to this problem. In many cases,

young people have been trained for jobs which do not exist. The most hopeful alternative to a vastly expanded welfare program would be the creation of on-the-job training opportunities in private industry.

To help create those opportunities, I introduced the Human Investment Act. The act would provide an incentive to American business to invest in the improvement of the Nation's human resources by hiring, training, and employing presently unemployed workers who lack needed job skills.

I also cosponsored a bill to provide an opportunity for millions of American youths to obtain an occupational education. Because four out of five of our schoolchildren will need education for jobs not requiring a college degree, I consider the expansion and strengthening of occupational education programs in secondary schools, technical institutions, and community colleges a top priority.

Another measure which I cosponsored would provide $432 million over 3 years for opportunity industrialization centers. The OIC's have maintained a record of unparalleled success in job training. The job retention rate for OIC trainees is 76 percent, the highest of any manpower training program in the United States.

F. HOUSING

Many of the residents of our inner-city neighborhoods feel trapped. They have worked hard to earn a living and raise a family. The only investment they may have is their home. In all too many cases, however, these homes are beginning to deteriorate, as the neighborhoods around them undergo gradual decay.

Unable to afford the luxury of suburban living and too affluent for public housing, these residents frequently desire to remain in the old neighborhood, where their longtime friends and acquaintances still live. They are plagued by rising taxes and the fact that their homes are in need of costly repairs and may be substandard under building codes. For those who have retired and who are living on a modest, fixed income, these repairs become impossible to afford.

This kind of problem is widespread. In 1968, more than 6 million housing units were "substandard" and were either dilapidated, deteriorating, or lacking in full plumbing facilities. Over 245,000 of them were in Ohio. In Cleveland, more than 200 units every month are simply being left to rot.

I introduced the Urban Rehabilitation Act of 1972 to help stop housing decay.

This legislation would permit residences to be rehabilitated without increasing the monthly mortgage payment. By using the credit of the Federal Government to guarantee mortgages, these property owners could extend their loans and obtain money for rehabilitation.

This bill alone would not save neighborhoods, but I believe that it would prove to be an effective means of enabling owners to preserve housing and prevent housing deterioration—at very little cost to the Federal Government.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Housing, I saw my legislation incorporated in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1972. That act was a landmark attempt to eliminate the red-tape which has ensnarled our housing programs. It consolidated 50 Federal Housing Authority programs into eight, and created a program of block grants for community development. The community development program would replace eight individual programs of Federal aid to our cities, each of which has detailed requirements. As a result, decisionmaking power would have been taken away from the Department of Housing and Urban Development in Washington, and given to citizens of the localities who are going to be affected directly by the Federal programs. This legislation, however, was not passed by the House of Representatives.

In March 1972, I cosponsored legislation to help reduce the cost of housing. Americans are the richest people in the world, yet 50 percent of us cannot afford to buy a new home. The high cost of housing is partly a result of local building codes and collective-bargaining agreements which require expensive materials and construction methods to be used, even though these requirements are not necessary to insure the health and safety of home buyers or workers. The bill which I cosponsored would enable victims of excessively restrictive building codes or collective-bargaining agreements to recover financial losses in some cases, and to seek court actions which prevent the enforcement of the building codes or work agreements. I have written the President to urge that sufficient funds be made available so that public housing authorities do not go bankrupt or trim essential services, and I was pleased to hear recently that more money for public housing will be made available.

G. PENSION PROTECTION

The pension hearings which I chaired in Cleveland on June 5 confirmed to me how vital pension reform legislation is to the working men and women of the State of Ohio. Pension problems affect blue-collar and white-collar workers alike and involve pensions run by unions as well as those run by management.

During the Cleveland hearings we heard testimony from William Wheeler, age 64, who had worked for Gar Wood in Findlay for 42 years. He retired last year. To supplement his social security Mr. Wheeler had counted on a company pension of $134 a month. After Gar Wood was sold to Sargent Industries, a California conglomerate, the Findlay plant was closed and all the employees were laid off. Those who were currently employed and who had vested pensions were told that they would receive absolutely nothing whatever. Mr. Wheeler, who was already retired, received a letter telling him that there would be a "slight reduction" in his benefits. His next monthly check was $46.02. The "slight reduction" amounted to a 65-percent cut.

Many witnesses before the subcommittee, like Mr. Wheeler, had spent much of their adult lives building pension benefits only to find their hopes for retirement security shattered by a factory shutdown, by harsh vesting requirements, by inadequate funding, or by improper investment practices by trustees.

The Labor and Public Welfare Committee, of which I am a member, unanimously reported the pension reform bill, S. 3598. I was one of the principal authors of that bill. When the bill reached the floor, however, the Finance Committee claimed jurisdiction and deleted from the bill virtually all of the provisions which were designed to protect employees' pension rights. Those who have worked long years only to find their pensions evaporate when their plant closes will not be impressed by this type of jurisdictional squabble in the Senate.

While S. 3598 was not perfect, it did represent a landmark effort to assure that the pension benefits which are promised would actually be paid. I will do what I can to see that the enactment of pension reform legislation is undertaken promptly at the beginning of the next session.

H. UNEMPLOYMENT

Unemployment rates rose during 1970–71 and began to ease somewhat during 1972. Our Nation's urban centers have suffered severely as they bore the brunt of this unemployment. Jobless rates for teenage residents of poor neighborhoods have been as high as 24 percent and among black youths in these areas they have been over 35 percent.

As significant as unemployment figgures are, we must recognize that unemployment is not simply a matter of statistics. For many American families, unemployment represents a personal tragedy. Whether jobless rates are 3 percent or 10 percent, economic theories and statistical analyses offer little comfort to those who are unemployed.

In response to this problem Congress enacted the Emergency Employment Act of 1971. This law was written in the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty, of which I am now the ranking member. In its final form this act incorporates many of the suggestions which I presented at the subcommittee level and in my individual views.

This act was designed to provide approximately 200,000 transitional public service jobs for men and women who were unemployed. Unlike WPA, however, these men and women are employed by their State and local governments. They have been integrated into existing work forces without creating a new bureaucracy.

As I stated on the floor of the Senate, it is far preferable for these men and women to be engaged in productive work for State and local governments than to have them remain idle or become welfare recipients.

On August 12, 1971, $19,820,000 was allocated to Ohio and on September 21, we received an additional $4,182,300. I was disturbed, however, by the fact that the Department of Labor used out-of-date unemployment statistics in making the allocations, which had the effect of short-changing Ohio's steel towns where unemployment had become severe. Con-

sequently, I wrote to the President on October 1, 1971, and to the Assistant Secretary of Labor on October 13 about this deficiency. On October 18 a member of my staff met with the Assistant Secretary about the particular problems of Ohio, and very shortly thereafter additional funds were released for the urban areas of our State.

This measure has assisted us in combating unemployment, as the men and women hired under this act have been productive employees at the State and local levels.

We have also fought unemployment on other fronts. The removal of the excise tax from automobiles has helped maintain employment at Ohio's automobile plants. The voluntary steel import quotas have helped maintain employment for steel workers, and the revaluation of the dollar has made it easier for Ohio's manufacturers to compete for both domestic and foreign markets. Revaluation of the dollar has also made it more expensive for foreign companies to ship their products into the United States, and take away the jobs of American workers.

The impact of the investment tax credit is starting to be felt as new modern machinery has helped to increase the productivity of our factories. This has given the American worker a better chance to compete against his foreign rivals.

These measures taken together are not an instant cure for unemployment, but lay the groundwork for a solid and substantial improvement in job opportunities which should have a lasting impact on our employment situation in the years ahead.

I. LABOR

Minimum wage.—I believe all Americans desire to see an elimination of substandard and exploitative wage practices.

I supported an increase in the minimum wage to $2 and introduced legislation to bring the Federal minimum up to this level, with an additional provision to establish a differential minimum for youth. I also included in this legislation much needed improvements in existing child labor laws.

Unfortunately, the legislation I introduced was defeated in the Senate by a single vote and a $2.20 minimum wage bill approved. I could not support the Senate proposal as it increased the minimum too quickly and failed to provide a differential minimum for youth. Specifically, the Senate bill represented an increase in the minimum wage of 37.5 percent for non-agricultural employees. This approach far exceeds the 5.5 percent guidelines established under the economic stabilization programs, and would have proven to be detrimental to our Nation's economic recovery.

The House passed a minimum wage bill very similar to the legislation I introduced in the Senate, but failed to reach an agreement upon the appointment of conferees to meet with the Senate. Thus, no minimum wage legislation was passed by the 92d Congress.

I expect minimum wage legislation to be considered early in the next Congress, and I again will actively work for passage of constructive minimum wage legislation.

Railroad retirement.—Congress recently overrode a Presidential veto in approving a temporary 20-percent increase in Railroad Act benefits. I supported this increase, as I felt beneficiaries under the Railroad Retirement Act should receive the same percentage increase in benefits as social security recipients.

Many problems, however, have developed regarding the Railroad Retirement Act, and it is in need of extensive revision. The benefit fund established by the act is facing serious financial problems and will possibly be bankrupt in the 1980's unless constructive action is taken. Congress will act to refinance the fund next year, and I am hopeful that the rail industry and rail unions will be able to provide positive suggestions.

Occupational safety and health.—Job safety is of critical importance. The Occupational Safety and Health Act, however, has been poorly administered. For example, the Department of Labor recently required a small business consisting of just a man and his wife to have separate employee restrooms. In another case an employer who had used his fire extinguisher to put out a fire was fined $100 by an OSHA inspector an hour after the fire for not having a loaded fire extinguisher.

In response to problems such as these, Congress has voted to exempt businesses with three or fewer employees from coverage of the act, and also authorized the Department of Labor personnel to assist small businesses in complying with the act.

Further review and reform, however, is necessary regarding other provisions of the act, and I am hopeful action will be taken early in the next Congress.

Emergency strike.—The United States has suffered a number of national and regional strikes with crippling consequences. The effects of such strikes have reached far beyond the parties to the dispute and created tremendous losses and suffering for innocent third parties. For example, during east and west coast dock strikes this year many manufacturers were unable to export products and many farmers faced financial ruin because they could not market their crops. In Ohio approximately 2 million bushels of corn had to be dumped on the ground due to these strikes.

I introduced the Emergency Disputes Act of 1971 to deal with this problem. This bill covered all industries affecting interstate commerce and provided procedures whereby the Secretary of Labor would be given the authority to implement certain options where a national or emergency strike exists as a result of a labor dispute. Additionally, the legislation provided that cost savings realized by the elimination of unproductive work rules be shared by labor and management by an amount equal to 50 percent of the productivity gains attributable to such employment adjustments. Further, the employer could eliminate jobs only by attrition and no employees would lose their jobs as a result of new work rules.

The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, however, failed to report not only my proposal, but many other positive approaches to the problem of emergency disputes. I am hopeful that action will be taken by the next Congress in this area, as a need for such legislation has been clearly demonstrated.

J. CIVIL RIGHTS

Eight years ago, in response to a compelling national need, Congress enacted title VII of the Civil Rights Act creating the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission—EEOC. The responsibility of the Commission was to eliminate discriminatory employment practices in this country.

The EEOC made a concentrated attempt to reduce the incidence of employment discrimination in the Nation. The Commission was hampered, however, by ineffective enforcement procedures which proved to be a major flaw in the Civil Rights Act. Congress reacted this session by passing the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972. I was a cosponsor of this legislation and was quite pleased to see the President sign the bill in March of this year.

Under this new law the EEOC will be able to seek a Federal court order against an employer or union practicing job discrimination based on "race, color, religion, sex or national origin." The Attorney General is also given a similar power to bring suits involving discrimination by State or local government agencies.

Many people expressed concern regarding the original drafts of this legislation. They believed the Commission would be investigator, prosecutor, and judge. I believe this concern was justified and offered an amendment in the Senate to remove the prosecutory function from the Commission and place it with an independent general counsel. This amendment was adopted and is contained in the new law.

The enactment of this bill, however, will not automatically end employment discrimination in this country. A continuing effort must be made by both Government and private industry to insure equal employment opportunities for all Americans. I am pledged to this goal.

K. CONSUMER PROTECTION

During the 92d Congress initiatives to protect consumers were launched on a broad number of fronts.

Congressional studies indicated that unsafe products, having a potential for inflicting serious or vital injuries, had been marketed to consumers. Complaints regarding defective products have ranged from toys to automobiles. In response to this problem, Congress passed the Consumer Product Safety Act. This legislation creates an independent regulatory commission which is authorized to establish safety standards for consumer products. The bill does not apply to food and drugs which are regulated by the Food and Drug Administration.

This new law should help reduce the number of unsafe products on the American market.

Consumers also deserve better results from regulatory agencies. The Interstate Commerce Commission, for example, has adopted rate policies which overcharge consumers about $7 billion a year, according to a recent Brookings Institution study. This agency has demonstrated an amazing lack of consumer awareness, and I have introduced legislation to abolish it. The ultimate solution to adequate consumer representation, however, cannot be abolition of all Federal regulatory agencies. Instead, we must insist on better performance.

Recently, the Congress considered legislation to create a Consumer Protection Agency to safeguard the rights of consumers with respect to Federal agency determinations. The objective of this legislation was sound, but the bill was not properly drafted. A better approach would be to require Federal agencies to file consumer impact statements with the Consumer Protection Agency, similar to the environmental impact statement procedure used by EPA. I intend to introduce legislation along these lines in the next Congress.

In a speech before the Cincinnati Bar Association early in 1971 I pointed out that:

> If the average man buys a toaster and it does not work, there is no economically meaningful way for him to secure legal relief. An unscrupulous manufacturer can make and sell shoddy merchandise in full recognition that there is little practical relief available to the consumer. For this reason I think we should consider a reform in the law to allow class actions by consumers and modify the jurisdictional requisites of our courts so as to accommodate this type of suit. Of course, class actions can be a subject of abuse or mis-use, and we must keep proper safeguards against this tendency.

In that speech I also pointed out that the legal profession should take the lead in making the legal system responsive and effective in meeting the needs of the American consumer. The reform of our judicial system should be every bit as important to American consumers as the consumer legislation which the Congress has already enacted.

Protection for credit card holders.—On April 27, 1972, the Senate passed the Fair Credit Billing Act, which included my amendment to protect credit card customers.

Under present law, a housewife who buys a defective toaster with a credit card may find herself confronted with a bill from the credit card company—even though she has already returned the toaster. She is obligated to pay the bill, and the only way she can receive anything for her money is to buy something in the store which sold her the defective item. I do not think that is fair to the consumer.

Therefore, I sponsored an amendment which would require a merchant in this situation to have a credit issued on her credit card account when she returns the toaster. This amendment will stop credit card companies from billing consumers for goods which were returned or services which were never provided.

The Senate passed my amendment unanimously, but the Fair Credit Billing Act was not passed by the House of Representatives.

L. NO FAULT INSURANCE

America's automobile owners suffered a serious setback with the failure of the Congress to pass the no fault insurance bill.

At the present time, insurance agents, adjusters, attorneys and administrative personnel receive 56 cents of every premium dollar, leaving only 44 cents for people who are hurt in automobile accidents. A study conducted by the Department of Transportation showed that of seriously injured automobile victims, more than half received nothing. Those who were permanently disabled received an average of only 16 percent of their economic loss.

Litigation involving automobile accidents is congesting our courts. Delays in payments through the current settlement and judicial processes are frequently used as a bargaining weapon by insurance companies.

Tragically, those who can least afford an economic loss are the very individuals placed under the greatest economic pressure to settle cheaply out of court. For claimants having an economic loss of $2,500 or more, there is an average lapse of 19 months until settlement is reached.

Inaccurate and unsubstantiated statistics of special interest groups were used to help defeat this measure. These statistics were refuted by the president of one of America's largest insurance companies who committed his company to write insurance under the no fault bill without an increase in premiums in any State for a typical policyholder buying full coverage.

When less than half of automobile insurance dollars goes to pay people who are hurt and who have suffered economic loss, I believe it is time for a change in our system.

M. ENVIRONMENT

During the final days of this session, the Senate passed what I consider to be, the most significant piece of environmental legislation of this Congress.

During the past 20 years, we have spent nearly $20 billion in public and private funds on water quality programs in an effort to salvage the beauty and usefulness of our Nation's waters. The progress made has been minimal at best.

For years we have turned our rivers into sewers, we have ravaged our environment. As of 1965, insufficiently regulated strip mining and surface mining had destroyed over 3 million acres of land in the United States.

In 1968, some 48 million tons of waste were dumped into the ocean near America's coasts. Ohio can lay dubious claim to one of the only rivers in America which has actually caught on fire—the Cuyahoga.

I voted for the Federal Water Pollution Control Act when it passed the Senate, and I voted to override the President's veto of this legislation.

This massive bill attempts to put a stop to the pollution of U.S. waterways by 1985, with a budget of $24.5 billion over the next 3 fiscal years. This legislation covers every sort of pollutant, from heavy metals to heated water from electricity plants.

The bill turns off polluters by imposing a strict $25,000-a-day penalty for violators, plus a year in jail for plant officials.

In February of 1971 I cosponsored five bills to attack the problem of pollution on a broad scale. These measures were premised on the fact that our environmental efforts cannot be limited to air and water pollution. Every day barges loaded with garbage leave New York Harbor to be dumped into the Atlantic Ocean. Strip mining and urban sprawl are devouring our countryside.

During the 92d Congress I cosponsored a bill to control noise pollution which passed the Senate and a bill to protect ocean mammals which was adopted by both Houses.

I also helped author a bill to promote more effective use of recycled materials in Government procurement.

I have cosponsored legislation to provide financial assistance to landowners in the Great Lakes Basin in preserving their land and conserving wildlife, and cosponsored legislation to require massive new reclamation efforts to restore the land which has been ravaged by strip mining. I am hopeful that in the next Congress we can enact strip mining legislation that will assure future generations that there will be forests in these areas instead of barren wastelands.

N. VETERANS

The 92d Congress recognized the great sacrifice which America's veterans have made for their country. The Vietnam Era Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1972 was one of the most significant advances in veterans' benefits ever passed by the Congress. This bill increases veterans' educational allowances by 25.7 percent. Thus, a veteran who is a full-time student without dependents will have his allowance increased from $170 per month to $220 per month. Veterans with one dependent will receive $261 and those with 2 dependents will receive $298.

This bill will increase on-the-job training allowances by 48 percent and should go a long way toward improving employment opportunities for veterans. The law became effective retroactively to September 1, 1972.

A very important feature of this bill is its provision for advance educational payments. This should eliminate the hardship encountered by many students who have had to wait for the first payment to be processed. Advance payments will be drawn in the name of the veteran and mailed directly to his school to be held until the day of registration. This measure was long overdue and urgently needed.

I also supported the Veterans' Administration Health, Manpower Training Act of 1972. This measure, which we enacted, established eight medical schools to be operated in conjunction with Veterans' Administration hospitals. It also authorizes the Veterans' Administration Administrator to establish a pilot program for regional medical education centers.

This will permit the Veterans' Administration to utilize its vast medical facilities in helping to solve the Nation's critical shortage of doctors, nurses, and paramedical personnel. I supported the Veterans' Health Care Expansion Act of 1972.

This bill broadens the authority of the Veterans' Administration to provide outpatient services to all veterans and certain dependents. Outpatient treatment for any ailment was authorized for veterans having an 80 percent or greater service-connected disability. This measure was vetoed by the President after Congress adjourned and I expect that we will turn our attention to this matter when the 93d Congress convenes.

I also supported the Veterans' Compensation and Relief Act of 1972. This measure provides a 10 percent increase in compensation rates for service-connected disabilities and a 10 percent increase in monthly dependent's allowances, payable to dependents of veterans who are at least 50 percent disabled. This measure authorizes a clothing allowance of $150 per year for veterans whose disability requires the wearing or use of a prosthetic or orthopedic device. I am very pleased that this has become law.

The recent 20 percent increase in social security had the effect of reducing pensions for 2.3 million veterans. To correct this problem the Senate passed a bill to liberalize disability benefits and pensions. Unfortunately, this measure died in the House but I expect that action will be taken on it promptly in the next Congress.

The 92d Congress enacted a measure to increase from $12,500 to $17,500 the maximum amount payable to veterans with service-connected disabilities for specially adapted housing.

Finally under the higher education amendments of 1972 an incentive program was created to encourage colleges to recruit and enroll more Vietnam veterans. Colleges will receive a $300 grant for each Vietnam or post Korean war veteran it enrolls and the grant will be raised to $450 if the veteran is a high school drop-out.

O. AGRICULTURE

Farm credit legislation.—Agriculture has become a capital-intensive type of business with critical needs for credit. The Farm Credit Act of 1971, which I cosponsored, provides for expansion of the farm credit system, to furnish adequate and constructive credit and closely related services to farmers and ranchers, their cooperatives and selected farm related businesses necessary to efficient farm operations. Farm machinery and housing costs are rising, and the expanded credit provided in the Farm Credit Act contributes to stabilization of food supplies, while helping to keep consumer prices down.

The expanded financial assistance helps to preserve the family farm that has served America so well, and aids in continued rural development. This system is a unique example of self-help, and it costs the taxpayer nothing. The enactment of S. 1483, which passed the Senate and was signed into law by the President, will go a long way toward assuring our farmers, ranchers, cooperatives and the residents of rural America that they will continue to have available to them adequate credit and related services. These will in fact help increase their incomes and contribute to their well-being, while making rural America a better place to live.

Farm subsidies.—In 1971 I introduced an amendment to plug the loophole in the farm subsidy limit. Large farmers had been able to circumvent the $55,000 subsidy limitation by subdividing their holdings into separate corporations, each of which could receive a $55,000 subsidy. While my amendment was defeated, I am pleased that the Department of Agriculture tightened up the regulations somewhat to curb this practice.

In 1972 I supported an effort to reduce the subsidy limitation to $20,000. At a time when family farmers are being forced from their land because of their inability to make ends meet, it is outrageous for us to continue to provide such massive subsidies to certain large producers. I took to the floor of the Senate a computer printout, 400 pages thick, prepared by the Department of Agriculture listing those farmers who received more than $50,000 in subsidies under the 1971 program. That list did not contain a single farmer from the State of Ohio.

The average farmer in our country cannot be pleased at the way in which extremely large agriculture subsidies are placed in a few hands. The subsidy limitation has been a sieve torn wide open. Those whose cotton allotments exceed $55,000 for example, can lease or sell their allotments without leasing or selling their land and receive the excess subsidy back in the form of rent. This is a practice which should be stopped. While this amendment did not pass, I believe that Congress, during the next session, will adopt a subsidy program which is fairer to both taxpayers and a majority of farmers.

Rural Development Act.—The 92d Congress passed the Rural Development Act with my support. This legislation provides a comprehensive program for rural development credit and location incentives backed by essential scientific research, education and community improvement extension. This is the most comprehensive rural development legislation ever presented to the Senate. It expands and establishes programs dealing with financial investment, credit, technology, and research in rural areas. It extends the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act and creates an insurance fund for guaranteeing rural development loans.

The Watershed and Flood Prevention Act has been amended to authorize cost sharing in watershed projects and the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act was revised to provide for added Federal assistance in water storage, water quality management and rural fire prevention. The President signed the Rural Development Act into Public Law 92–419.

In recognition of the need for additional financial muscle in rural areas to stop and reverse the on-going trend of out migration, this rural development legislation goes a long way to encourage the strengthening of our small, rural towns and villages, and to provide jobs and services for those now living there, and those who would return. The Rural Development Act contributes greatly to the idea of balanced national growth that would keep rural America strong and uniquely rural, while making better use of the land for all the people.

Rural Revitalization Act.—In line with further steps for rural development, I cosponsored the Rural Revitalization Act. This legislation is aimed at slowing the migration of people from rural areas to urban areas by providing expanded authority for the Farmers Home Administration, renamed the Rural Development Administration. The new Administration would grant aid in the form of guaranteed loans from local financial institutions for long range community development.

Other farm legislation.—For those young people who have chosen to remain on the farms, I have supported legislation to make crop insurance available to persons between 18 and 21 years of age. This legislation was also signed into law by President Nixon.

I supported the amendment to the Federal Meat and Poultry Inspection Act, S. 1316, to increase from 50 to 80 percent the Federal Government's share of the cost of any cooperative meat inspection program of a State. I also supported the Mathias "equal to" amendment to provide that State inspected meat processing plants may sell their products in interstate commerce if State standards meet or exceed Federal regulations. The Mathias amendment failed, and present law allows State inspected plants to engage only in intrastate commerce. I will continue to work for equal participation for the State inspected meat processing plants, a major industry in our State.

The Senate also passed legislation amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit administration of diethylstilbestrol—DES—to animals intended for use as food. This drug has already been prohibited by the Food and Drug Administration, beginning January 1, 1973. S. 2818, which passed the Senate, was not considered in the House.

The Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act of 1971 passed the Senate by a unanimous vote of 71 yeas and has been signed into law by President Nixon. The new law will expand regulation of pesticides and require them to be classified for general or restricted use for the protection of children and adults.

P. BIG GOVERNMENT

Federal bureaucracy has become large and unwieldy. Mountains of redtape impede efficiency, and unnecessary agencies, such as the Board of Tea Tasters, continue long after their purpose has been served. Those of us in the Congress must remain on guard to see that the taxpayers' dollars are not wasted in boondoggles and bureaucratic inefficiency.

In 1971 I helped lead the fight in the Senate against the proposal to bail out Lockheed. I opposed this bill because I

do not believe that we should open the Public Treasury to bail out inefficient or mismanaged corporations. The farmers, small businessmen, and other taxpayers of Ohio do not want to see their hard-earned tax dollars used to prop up corporate giants. Unfortunately, this measure was adopted, having passed the Senate by a single vote. I believe that it sets a dangerous precedent and is unfair to the competitors of Lockheed who do not receive equivalent assistance.

I have cosponsored legislation to abolish the Interstate Commerce Commission. A consultant for the Department of Transportation stated to me that the ICC has more than 43 trillion railroad rates on file—without an index. This is equal to a stack almost eight times as tall as the Washington Monument. Rate hearings are long and expensive. The results are irrational and the consumers and shippers are the ones who suffer. The ICC was created to protect consumers against discriminatory rates. It has done just the opposite. It has fostered railroad rates which discriminate against Lake Erie's ports and prevent us from fully realizing the benefits of the St. Lawrence Seaway. For example, electrical transformers made in Zanesville, Ohio can be shipped all the way to New York City for export, for less than they can be shipped to Cleveland. These discriminatory policies have diverted thousands of jobs away from the Great Lakes and have retarded the development of our ports. The ICC represents bureaucracy at its worst and is not fulfilling its public responsibilities.

Last year it was revealed that the Army has been spying on over 100,000 American citizens who are unconnected with the military. The Army has been keeping dossiers and computerized data on the associations and political views of ordinary citizens, as well as Congressmen and churchmen. This is an unjustifiable invasion of Americans' rights to privacy. In an endeavor to stop this snooping, I cosponsored S. 3750, introduced by Senator ERVIN, which would once and for all put a stop to this type of Army surveillance.

All of us must be concerned about the extent of deficit spending. In the last 2 years it is estimated that Federal deficits will approach $60 billion. While a certain amount of deficit spending is justifiable during a recession to stimulate the economy, continued large deficits will generate inflation or higher taxes or both. For that reason I favored setting a spending ceiling of $250 billion. I was unwilling, however, to give to any President the authority to cut back or eliminate programs without congressional approval. I offered an amendment to the debt ceiling bill on October 13, 1972, that would give the President the power to cut up to 10 percent of any budget item, with the provision that cuts in excess of 10 percent could be overturned by either House of the Congress. Unfortunately my amendment was not adopted. The conference report gave the President the authority to cut up to 20 percent within 48 categories. These categories were so broad, however, that entire programs and agencies could be eliminated by the President without any congressional approval whatsoever. For example, a President could eliminate all military construction or all military research and development without congressional review. Alternatively, it would be possible for the President to eliminate the entire budget of the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, or the Department of the Interior, without further congressional approval.

Under this proposal, the President would have been able to hold up all public works projects in a Congressman's district if that Congressman did not vote for a bill favored by the White House. This would undermine the separation of powers and make the Congress extremely vulnerable to the executive branch in exercising its legislative judgment.

The Founding Fathers of our country knew how important it was for the Congress to have control over the Nation's spending. I for one was not willing to abdicate this constitutional responsibility and therefore I joined with others in rejecting the conference report.

I am hopeful that next year we can establish a spending limitation without subverting this constitutional power.

In an effort to make the Federal bureaucracy more responsible to the people I introduced the "Ombudsman Experimentation Act." This would provide a "peoples' advocate" to investigate unreasonable Executive action upon written complaint from any citizen. The Ombudsman would represent the citizen and intercede on his behalf. This legislation was not adopted this year; however, I am hopeful that we can establish several demonstration projects next year to test the workability of this concept.

Q. REVENUE SHARING

For several years I have been a stanch advocate of the principle of revenue sharing as being vital to our States and local governments. From 1960 to 1969, employment of State and local governments increased several times more rapidly than the civilian employment of the Federal Government. During the last 25 years, State and local expenses have increased twelvefold. State revenues, on the other hand, are relatively inelastic. I believe that it is more socially desirable to finance State and local needs through the more progressive Federal income tax system.

If State and local governments are to be responsive to the needs of the people our State and local officials will have to have the resources to do the job.

The bill passed by the Senate, however, was a serious blow to the State of Ohio. If the revenue-sharing funds were divided on a per capita basis, Ohio's share would be $277.7 million. The Senate, however, shortchanged Ohio by over $90 million. It costs just as much to solve the problems of crime, pollution, and urban decay in Ohio as it does in other States. If anything, an urban State, such as Ohio, should receive more than its per capita share; but certainly nothing less. The conference committee raised Ohio's share, but we are still $70 million short.

The disparities between States resulted from the fact that the factors used in the allocation formula were multiplied together. Consequently, instead of allocating a third of the funds according to each of the three factors—population, realtive income, and tax effort—the Finance Committee decided to multiply the factors together. This multiplication tended to distort the entire allocation for any State which had one low factor.

In addition, the tax effort factor is unfair to the people of Ohio because we receive no credit for license fees, proceeds of State liquor sales, and the profits earned by municipal powerplants. Other States, however, receive full credit for severance taxes and use taxes paid by nonresidents.

Because of the inequities in this formula, Ohio is shortchanged and there are wide disparities between communities within the State. In one county the per capita allocation among comparable communities varies by 738 percent.

While the Senate rejected my attempts to improve the formula, I hope that next year the Congress will recognize how unfair this formula is and undertake corrective action. Meanwhile, I have reluctantly voted for the conference report, because I believe the principle of revenue sharing is sound. Only our execution of it is faulty.

R. CRIME AND DRUGS

Those who would scoff at the words "law and order" should understand that these words represent the concern of every man for the safety of his wife on her way to the market and the safety of his children as they go to school. Crime in the inner city is no myth. It affects black and white, rich and poor, worker and welfare recipient alike. During the decade from 1960 to 1967, our crime rate rose 14-percent. A survey published by Life magazine, indicates that 78 percent of Americans feel unsafe in their own homes. Of big city residents, 80 percent are afraid to be in the streets at night. According to FBI statistics, in 1970, 11 serious crimes were committed every minute. During that year, over 100 police officers were slain in the performance of their duty.

When crime forces companies to take their factories out of the inner city, it means a loss of jobs to the very people who can least afford to be unemployed. When women are afraid to shop in the inner city, they reduce the number of jobs and the tax base that the inner city needs if it is to survive. In response to this problem I introduced several important crime-fighting measures.

The first bill I introduced as a Senator was a measure to provide a nationwide pay raise for all law enforcement officers and firemen, by excluding from their taxable income the first $2,400 that they earn.

In 1972, I joined with a group of Republican Senators in offering the Omnibus Criminal Justice Reform Act. This bill calls for expenditures of up to $1.5 billion in fighting crime. It would authorize special LEAA grants to State and local governments for the purpose of upgrading their police, court, jail, and prison systems. It would authorize addi-

tional LEAA grants for high crime areas, including special programs to combat violent street crimes. It would create regional law enforcement academies, prescribe minimum standards for the treatment of prison inmates, provide additional benefits for the families of policemen killed in the line of duty and establish a system to compensate the victims of violent crimes. While there was not time for this bill to pass during the 92d Congress, it should be a top priority item during the next session.

One-half of all arrests for serious crimes involved perscns under 18 years of age. The Congress passed the Juvenile Delinquency Control Act which provides better ways of dealing with teen-age offenders. This bill also provides funds for the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotics addicts. Because narcotics addicts are responsible for a very high percentage of inner city crime, our fight against the narcotics pushers is absolutely vital if crime is to be controlled.

Recent FBI reports show that among young people under 20, arrests for heroin violations have risen 120 percent during the last 4 years. As a further measure to combat drugs I cosponsored a resolution aimed at curbing illegal international traffic in narcotics through the United Nations.

I also cosponsored legislation calling for more stringent prosecution of hijackers and this legislation should also be enacted during the next session.

I have cosponsored legislation to reform our prison system. At present, we spend an average of $11.95 a day to keep a man locked up while his family often goes on welfare. Because of inadequate prison systems there is the likelihood that the ex-offender will return to crime as soon as he is released from prison because he has no other marketable skills.

Under my proposal, private corporations would lease prison industries and prisoners would earn union skilled wages. They would then be required to pay the Government for their room and board, to support their families, to pay taxes, and make social security payments. In addition, the prisoner would be required to contribute to a fund to compensate the victims of crime. Passage of this legislation is vital if we are to reform prisoners so they do not return to crime and if we are to compensate victims of crime and relieve society of the cost of keeping families of prisoners on welfare.

S. OLDER AMERICANS

Social security benefits.—On June 30, with my support, the Senate approved a 20-percent increase in social security payments for 27.8 million beneficiaries. This measure, which is now public law, will remove 1.9 million persons from the poverty rolls, including 1.4 million individuals 65 or older. A major provision in this measure makes social security payments "inflation-proof," by providing for an automatic increase in social security benefits correlated to increases in the cost-of-living.

I supported other major reforms in the social security program which were included in H.R. 1, the Social Security Amendments of 1972. This law raises widows' and widowers' benefits to 100 percent from 82.5 percent of a decreased spouse's benefits, increases to $2,100 from $1,680 the amount that a social security recipient would be allowed to earn without loss of benefits, provides for a minimum monthly benefit of $170 for persons who have worked in social security-covered employment for at least 30 years, extends medicare coverage to 1.7 million social security disability beneficiaries under age 65, and authorizes Federal takeover of the present Federal-State welfare system for the aged, blind and disabled.

Nutrition Program for the Elderly Act.—As much as 30 percent of the elderly live in poverty and cannot afford proper nutrition. In an effort to begin to combat the nutrition problem, I supported legislation which authorized $250 million to provide daily hot meals for the Nation's elderly. The program will be geared primarily toward the poor, but meals and other nutrition services would be available to the more affluent elderly on an ability-to-pay basis.

Under the 2-year program, the Federal Government would finance up to 90 percent of the cost of State-sponsored feeding projects for persons 60 or older. This program would not only give these older Americans the essential nutrition they require, but would bring them together at least once a day so that they could associate with their friends and neighbors.

As vital as this program is, I think that it is equally important to provide the same type of nutritional program and social contact for our disabled citizens. To this end, I introduced legislation to provide grants to States for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of low-cost meal programs for disabled Americans.

National Institute on Aging.—Legislation to create a National Institute on Aging was vetoed. I supported the bill both in committee and on the Senate floor because I believed it would fill a long-recognized but largely unmet need to greatly expand biological and behavioral research into the aging process.

In recent decades, improved nutrition and improved medical services have dramatically extended the average life expectancy of Americans. Today there are over 20 million Americans age 65 and over and this constitutes an almost sevenfold increase since the turn of the century. In addition, the over-65 segment of our population is growing almost twice as fast as the rest of our society.

I felt that this bill would produce a coherent and coordinated research program capable of systematically unlocking some of the secrets and problems of aging. Although the needs of the elderly are essentially the same as those of every adult, there is a difference in the older person's capacity to meet them independently because of the changes in biological, psychological and social functioning inherent in the aging process.

Older Americans Act of 1972.—This bill, which was also vetoed, contained some provisions which I believed would have made significant contributions to the well-being of our elderly citizens. It would have established an Administration on Aging and placed it within the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, created a "National Information and Resources Clearing House for the Aging," established a "Federal Council on the Aging" to assist and advise the President on matters relating to the needs of our older Americans, provided grants for State and community programs on aging, expanded and extended the foster grandparents program and other older Americans community service programs, and expanded the nutrition for the elderly program. The great majority of our senior citizens constitute a strong and independent segment of our society. Congress must address itself to this segment of our aged population by enacting legislation which will protect our senior citizens against circumstances that would destroy their independence, dignity and sense of purpose. We should strive to encourage legislation which will provide those citizens the opportunity for continued usefulness and meaningful activity and the chance to participate in family and community life as fully as ability and desire dictate.

T. TAXES

On December 10, 1971, the Senate passed a bill to cut taxes for the average taxpayer and provide incentives to modernize American industry.

This measure, the Revenue Act of 1971, raises the personal exemption from $650 to $675 for 1972 and increases it to $750 for 1973. The minimum standard deduction is raised from $1,050 to $1,300. When combined with cuts made in the 1969 Tax Reform Act, these changes add up to a 22-percent reduction in personal income taxes during the Nixon administration.

The bill also restored the 7 percent investment tax credit. In addition, it repealed the 7 percent automobile exise tax, thereby enabling a proposal which I had made 6 months earlier to become a reality. This provision reduced the price of a new car by about $200 and was designed to increase employment in the automobile, steel, and rubber industries.

I proposed several amendments to the bill. My amendment to allow small businessmen to file payroll taxes quarterly instead of monthly was passed by the Senate but deleted in conference. The amendment would have reduced the Federal paperwork burden, which is so expensive and time consuming for small businessmen.

Near the end of the congressional session, social security taxes were increased to cover the cost of providing our elderly citizens with the benefits they need and so richly deserve. The new benefits include a 20-percent increase in monthly payments; the extension of medicare coverage to disabled citizens under 65; guaranteed minimum monthly social security payments to help the "working poor"; a reduction in the amount social security beneficiaries are penalized for continuing to work after 65; Federal welfare payments for the aged, blind, and disabled; and equitable social security treatment for widows.

Congress briefly discussed various tax reform proposals, but took no final action on them. I believe that we should continually strive to eliminate loopholes in the tax laws. This is a complicated matter which requires careful study, and I hope that Congress will consider it fully during the upcoming session.

U. THE DRAFT

The Senate on June 8, 1971, took a major step toward an early end to the draft by approving the military pay schedule recommended some 18 months earlier by the President's Commission on An All-Volunteer Armed Forces—the Gates Commission. The Senate approved the military pay scale offered as an amendment to the Military Selective Service Act. I was a cosponsor of that amendment. This increase in military pay was vital if we were to successfully move to an all-volunteer army.

I also offered an amendment to the Selective Service Act which would have phased out the draft over a 2-year period by limiting the number of draftees to 100,000 in 1972 and to 60,000 in 1973. Unfortunately, my amendment was rejected.

I have consistently supported our national objective of proceeding toward an all-volunteer army and to that end in August of 1972 I supported the Hatfield amendment to the military procurement authorization bill to end the draft as of December 31, 1972. That amendment was also defeated, but I hope that peace time conscription will be eliminated.

One of the biggest mistakes of the Vietnam era was the attempt to fight an undeclared war in Asia with draftees. The war not only divided our country, but brought massive draft resisters as well. At the present time, more than 500 draft resisters are in Federal jails, and estimates of the number of young Americans living in exile, range as high as 70,000. Some of these draft resisters are victims of bad judgment and poor advice. Others, however, have acted out of deep, personal objections to the course which our country has followed as we became involved in the Vietnam conflict.

We must ask ourselves whether we will not offer them an opportunity to become productive citizens. We must decide whether it is more in our interest to have them spend their time in exile or to have them serve their country through VISTA, Veterans' Administration hospitals and other types of public service. In my judgment we should consider some type of qualified amnesty.

There is a long tradition of amnesty in America. George Washington gave amnesty to those participating in the Whiskey Rebellion. John Adams gave amnesty to the Pennsylvania insurrectionists. Presidents Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, Lincoln, Andrew Johnson, Grant, and Coolidge also made amnesty proclamations. In 1945, based upon the recommendation of an Amnesty Board, President Truman pardoned 1,523 young men who had evaded or otherwise violated the Selective Service Act during World War II.

The case for qualified amnesty becomes compelling when one considers the effect of the change in our Selective Service Law in 1970. Until the U.S. Supreme Court decided Welsh against United States, on June 15 of that year, individuals seeking conscientious objector status had to raise their objection in relation to their belief in a Supreme Being. When the Supreme Court ruled that a belief in a Supreme Being was no longer required, and that other deep felt personal views could suffice, obvious inequities became evident.

In one family, two brothers might have held the same deep opposition to war. The elder son, who became draft eligible before the Welsh decision, could not have been classified as a conscientious objector and might have gone to prison or into exile. His younger brother, holding exactly the same views on war, could have become a conscientious objector. He would not be a criminal, and could be lawfully serving his country in alternative service.

Is it really fair for us to treat the elder brother as a criminal and the other brother as a lawful citizen? I think not.

Because over 55,000 young Americans have lost their lives serving their country in Southeast Asia we should not grant amnesty to draft registers without requiring them to undertake service to their country. But it would also be a great mistake for us to forever foreclose them from participating in American life.

In an attempt to deal with this problem I have introduced the Amnesty Act of 1972. This would permit these young men to be released from prison or returned to the United States if they have agreed to serve their country for a period of 3 years. They could serve America as members of our Armed Forces or they could elect to serve in alternative service. The alternative service would include VISTA, Veterans' Administration hospitals, Public Health Service hospitals, and such other service as might be designated by the Attorney General.

This bill would not apply to those who have deserted from the Armed Forces since I believe that theirs is a separate problem which must be dealt with in other ways.

V. DISASTER RELIEF

When the Nation was ravaged by Hurricane Agnes last summer, Congress undertook a thorough review of our disaster relief laws. In the wake of the most destructive natural disaster in our history, we found that the existing disaster relief legislation was inadequate, inequitable, and administratively cumbersome.

First, although the assistance available might have been sufficient for a well-to-do homeowner whose vacation house had suffered a few thousand dollars damage, it was just not enough for a retired person whose home of 25 years had been devastated.

Second, the Government was providing a grant of the same amount to a millionaire for repairing his tennis courts as to a low-income worker whose home had been destroyed.

Third, too many people were using Government money to buy a boat or take a vacation rather than for property repairs.

Fourth, extensive disaster assistance was available only in areas designated by the President as major disasters. A person whose home was destroyed would be unable to receive substantial help if he happened to live in an area where the total destruction was not great enough to warrant designation by the President. Many Ohioans have suffered from small tornadoes and other disasters and have found themselves out in the cold as a result of this law.

I introduced legislation to eliminate all of these shortcomings. Congress subsequently enacted a bill which increased disaster relief and eliminated the discrimination against disaster victims in areas which are not Presidentially designated.

HELPING THE DISADVANTAGED

During the 92d Congress, I was one of the principal authors of a measure designed to create a National Legal Services Corporation. In my opinion, proper access to our courts should be a birthright of every American. Regrettably, thousands of economically deprived Americans cannot afford the cost of needed legal services. My proposal for a legal services corporation would remove legal services from political control and preserve the confidentiality of the attorney-client relationship.

The Congress passed this legislation as a part of the OEO bill. This measure was vetoed by the President because of the child care provisions which it also contained. Unfortunately, our later efforts to pass legal services legislation failed because of a disagreement over the composition of the board of directors.

I am hopeful that the 93d Congress can establish a legal services corporation so that poverty will not deny any American the opportunity of having his case fully and fairly presented in court.

In 1971, the Senate passed the economic opportunity amendments which included a provision for child development. I believe that child care and preschool services should be available for those children whose parents or legal guardians request them. However, I did not favor the inclusion of the child development provisions in S. 2007. Because these programs could have such far-reaching effects on the structure of family life and preschool educational systems, I believe they should be examined individually. I felt similarly that the child advocacy program, which did not have committee hearings, should be studied further and in greater detail. I offered a motion to recommit the legislation to the committee, with instructions to delete the child-development provisions. This motion failed. The OEO bill passed the Senate containing the provisions for child development; however, it was vetoed by President Nixon and the Senate sustained the veto.

The Headstart program has provided our basic model for the delivery of child development services aimed at a specific segment of the population. In the hope of meeting the President's major objections to the OEO bill, I was the prime sponsor of separate legislation to provide a variety of family oriented child day care, Headstart, and developmental activities, which would have been coor-

dinated with H.R. 1. My proposal was accepted by the Senate as part of the bipartisan compromise Comprehensive Headstart, Child Development, and Family Services Act of 1972. This bill would make it possible for thousands of parents to work or further their education to improve the well-being of their families with the confidence that their children have the opportunity to participate in quality educational day care programs. Although the legislation passed the Senate, it did not come to the House for a vote in the 92d Congress. Hopefully, the next Congress will examine child development and day care facilities in detailed hearings.

X. WAR POWERS

The framers of our Constitution granted Congress the power to declare war and charged the President with the responsibility for conducting hostilities once they had been lawfully commenced.

Despite that constitutional mandate there have been at least 165 instances during the history of this Nation when American Armed Forces have been committed abroad. On only five occasions, however, has war been declared by the United States. The last 20 years have witnessed a continued atrophy of the congressional war powers. At the same time, the Executive has taken an increasingly broad view of its prerogatives in this area. Under modern conditions, the irreversibility and the danger of Executive action without congressional authorization has accelerated to an unprecedented extent and therefore the concern for the problem is enormously enlarged.

This growing centralization of power in the Executive, accompanied as it has been by a similar centralization of domestic power in the Federal Government, has created a deep sense of frustration among the people who increasingly despair that they lack control over their own destinies. There is a demand for participatory democracy in foreign affairs as well as on the domestic scene. Just as means must be found to strengthen local governments in dealing with matters of domestic importance, so must we increase the participation of the elected representatives of the people in the foreign policy decisionmaking process, particularly as it applies to matters of war and peace. War is not only too important to be left to the generals, Americans abhor war to such an extent that it is too important to leave to the Executive alone.

In response to this problem I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 18 on January 27, 1971. This was the first war powers resolution introduced in the Senate. On March 25, 1971, I testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in behalf of war powers legislation. Subsequently, the Senate passed S. 2956, which incorporated many of the provisions of my bill. This legislation defines the situations in which the President may use the Armed Forces of the United States without a declaration of war, and provides for appropriate congressional review. While this measure did not pass the House during this session, I believe that its enactment is vital if we are to give meaning to the congressional war powers provided in our Constitution.

Much of the pressure for increased congressional activity comes with reference to our involvement in Southeast Asia. This is understandable—the process by which we became involved in Southeast Asia is a classic illustration of Executive usurpation of power from a Congress not willing to exercise its war powers, or an Executive willing to call for it. And what has been the result?

As Congress moves to reassert its constitutional prerogatives, we must profit by—rather than be blinded by—our experience in Southeast Asia. We must divorce, if possible, our great constitutional debate from the frustrations which many feel concerning our involvement there. Rather, the debate should be in terms of restoring a needed balance to the constitutional relationships between two great branches of government.

If the Congress is to have any role in the formulation of American foreign policy, it must have authority to participate in the determination of which interests are so vital to the American people that we must resort to the use of military force.

That is the purpose of this legislation.

Y. INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Great advancements have been made during the last 2 years in U.S. foreign relations, with such historic events as the U.S. peace settlement in Southeast Asia, the ratification of the strategic arms and anti-ballistic-missile treaties, and the establishment of relations with the Peoples Republic of China in the forefront.

Southeast Asia.—All Americans shared the objective of ending the fighting in Southeast Asia. The method of ending the war, however, split the country deeply. Many Americans felt the proper approach was to legislate an end to U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia. Congress considered numerous proposals to this end, but failed to enact any of them. I could not support these proposals, as I felt they would have severely restricted the President's flexibility to negotiate a settlement. It was my belief that a unilateral withdrawal of our troops would have jeopardized the return of our prisoners of war and would not have permanently ended the killing and bloodshed in Southeast Asia.

In retrospect, I believe this position has been proven correct. Far more important, however, is the advent of peace in Southeast Asia. Attention now must be turned to insuring that future "Vietnams" do not occur. I have cosponsored a joint resolution to establish a committee to investigate the origins of U.S. involvement in Vietnam. This committee would not attempt to second-guess past military decisions, but would go to the critical question as to the way in which we became involved in Vietnam and make such findings available to avoid similar tragedies in the future.

I also introduced and actively supported war powers legislation to limit the power of the Executive to commit U.S. military forces **without prior** congressional approval. My thoughts on this legislation are contained in another part of this report.

SALT Agreement.—Senate ratification of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty—ABM—and Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty—SALT—amount to a most significant breakthrough in limiting expenditures for nuclear weapons, and hopefully will prove to be the first of many bilateral steps toward abating the deadly threat of nuclear destruction.

Critics of the SALT agreement argued that the Soviet Union would so dramatically improve their technological sophistication of nuclear weaponry as to render the United States diplomatically and militarily impotent. This argument was fallacious. The SALT agreement did not give the Soviets an edge in overall military capacity. The United States has at its disposal more than twice as many deliverable nuclear warheads as the U.S.S.R. and the Soviets are a long way from developing sophisticated multiple warheads. United States intelligence sources have revealed no evidence that the Russiasn are developing the necessary missile hardware or steering systems for multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles.

Arguments against the adoption of the SALT agreement were further laid to rest by adoption of an amendment by Senator JACKSON insuring future equality in arms agreements between the United States and the U.S.S.R. I supported Senator JACKSON'S amendment and also cosponsored two amendments with Senator CRANSTON which stated that SALT should only be a first stage in mutual reduction of arms and that less of our national resources in the future should be expended for arms if world conditions permit. Both of these amendments were adopted.

Currently, however, the United States should continue to develop weapons systems that are not covered by SALT I to insure a strong bargaining position in future arms limitations talks. I, therefore, voted to support the military procurement bill, which included authorization for the development of the Trident submarine and missile system, the CVN–70 nuclear carrier, and the B–1 bomber. The United States must continue to remain powerful to insure a strong bargaining position in future arms limitation talks. I also believe the existence of these weapons can be a major deterrent force that will help preserve peace in the world.

China.—United States relations with the Peoples Republic of China and the Soviet Union have been greatly improved through initiatives undertaken by the President and Congress.

Precedent-breaking trips by the President and congressional leaders to mainland China have opened channels of communication with the world's most populous nation and have already produced economic and cultural gains. Establishment of contact with the Peoples Republic was also instrumental in reaching a peace settlement in Vietnam and may well lead to greater futures stability in Southeast Asia.

Soviet Union.—Constructive developments have also occurred during the last 2 years in United States-Soviet relations. Significant advances include: the previously mentioned arms limitation treaties, the settlement of terms for the repayment of Soviet World War II debts, and the finalization of procedures for exchange of scientific and medical research data.

The Soviet policy of levying exit fees on Jews who wish to emigrate, however, has presented a major obstacle for expanded trade and economic ties. Preliminary negotiations have been successful in this area and there is no doubt increased trade would be beneficial for both the United States and the U.S.S.R. Along with many other Members of Congress, however, I am concerned with the current Soviet policy for Jews. I feel no matter how desirable increased trade with the Soviet Union may be, certain limitations should be imposed on trade with the U.S.S.R., until such time as Jews are given freedom to emigrate without the levy of repressive exit fees. Hopefully this is occurring. I joined with 75 other Senators in cosponsoring an amendment to the East West Trade Relations Act which denies "most favored nation" status to the Soviet Union and places other restrictions on United States-Soviet trade until such time as the fees are eliminated. I also cosponsored the Soviet Jews Relief Act of 1971, authorizing the issuance of 30,000 additional refugees visas for the admission of Soviet Jews to the United States.

I am encouraged by the recent actions of the Soviet Government in permitting Jews to leave the country without paying exit fees and hope this policy will be made permanent.

Middle East.—The unrest in the Middle East continues to be dangerous. The scope of hostilities between Israeli and Arab factions, however, has not been confined to the Middle East, but has spread throughout the world. I deplore these terrorist activities and sincerely hope they will be halted.

It is my opinion that the countries involved should be able to resolve their differences without undue outside interference, although major power guarantees should be sought. The principal condition I would impose would be that any settlement would result in borders which are secure and defensible.

Z. HELPING OHIO

My office, both in Washington and Ohio, work with local governmental agencies in an attempt to get Federal funds for Ohio. I am attempting to make sure that Ohio receives its fair share.

During fiscal 1971, Ohio received $7,526,966,939 from the Federal Government in grants and contracts. The following are examples of the kinds of Federal assistance which my office helped to secure:

The Scioto County Community Action Agency received $340,000 for a 12-month program to provide job training and employment for mentally retarded adults. This program also placed 350 families in adequate housing, provided emergency food service to 2,000 families, and continued three clinics for the elderly.

Cleveland recently received $535,000 to fight street level heroin pushers and to provide treatment to users through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

Toledo received $467,000 from the Environmental Protection Agency for water purification treatment at the Collins Park filtration plant.

Troy received $2,550,950 from EPA for construction of a sewage treatment plant.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has established eight model cities programs in Ohio. Dayton, for example, has received $16,900,000 for the construction and upkeep of its model cities neighborhood.

The Department of Commerce has taken the initiative to award a $240,000 grant to help create immediate construction jobs for the unemployed in Adams County. The money will provide jobs for 50 men who will renovate and expand the courthouse and jail at West Union.

Ohio has received $689,000 in Disaster Relief Funds from the Office of Emergency Preparedness to help Ohioans recover from the effects of severe storms and flooding caused by tropical storm Agnes.

Columbus received approval of a grant for $680,000 for the staffing of their mental health center. They also received $879,000 for their comprehensive drug treatment and rehabilitation program.

During 1971, I worked through the Department of Transportation to have the national automobile compliance testing center locate in East Liberty. The site was approved by Congress, and received $9.6 million for construction.

Cincinnati received $28 million under the agriculture environment and consumer protection bill to build an environmental health center. Construction is now underway on this building which will be the center for antipollutant research activities.

I also work with constituents on a personal basis to help them get the individual attention they need from the Government.

I receive approximately 50 letters a day from Ohioans who have become bogged down while trying to wade through the mass of bureaucratic redtape surrounding our Federal agencies.

A cab driver wrote to me claiming he had been shortchanged by the Bureau of Retirement and Survivors Insurance because he could not prove to them that he was 65, and entitled to full retirement benefits. The only record of his birth had been written in the family Bible, which had been destroyed by fire. My office intervened in his behalf, and after four letters to the Commissioner of Social Security, we were able to prove that he indeed was 65, and entitled to full benefits.

An Ohio girl was traveling in Europe when a member of her family became ill. Her parents had last heard from her from Greece. They contacted my office to help find her, somewhere in Europe and bring her home. We worked through the State Department and the American Embassy in Greece, located her, informed her of the family illness, and helped her get back to Ohio.

A common problem among Ohio servicemen is exemplified by a man who recently received an early release from the service to start college under the GI bill. A returning serviceman needs an enormous amount of money to move back home, find and furnish an apartment, adjust to civilian life, and start school. He depends on his monthly check from the Veterans' Administration to make ends meet. In this case, his record for payment had been lost in some Federal computer, and he had not received his check for a month. I was able to get him immediate hardship payments, while the computer searched for his record and later began to send regular checks.

During the regular session of Congress, I try to return to Ohio at least twice a month to meet with my constituents in my three district offices, hold public hearings, and be available to discuss pending legislation.

THE AGENDA AHEAD

The 93d Congress will face an agenda of critical importance to the people of Ohio. Heading the list for action will be pension reform, no fault insurance, consumer protection, welfare reform, minimum wage, war powers legislation, and efforts to provide better health care for the American people.

The energy crisis has already curbed the sale of gas in many parts of Ohio, and projections indicate that existing sources of natural gas in America will be largely depleted in about 18 years. If we are to be able to heat our homes and run our factories in the years ahead, we will have to find a solution to the energy crisis. I expect to introduce major legislation on this subject during the 93d Congress, since I consider it to be one of the most important problems that America faces.

We will have to undertake better control over the Federal budget. A ceiling on expenditures is necessary and I expect that we can accomplish this during the 93d Congress without abrogating the historic control which Congress has had over Federal spending.

We must continue to provide better care for the veterans who sacrified so much for our country, and we must provide better care for our elderly. Older Americans should never feel neglected or that they have been cast aside like worn out shoes. The years which they have given to their country should be remembered by those of us in the Congress.

We must launch new programs to begin rebuilding our cities which have too frequently been the victims of crime, neglect, and decay.

We must continually reexamine our tax structure so that loopholes are closed and every American pays his fair share of Federal taxes.

Of course we will have to continue shifting from a wartime to a peacetime economy, and this will continue to result in a readjustment in employment. Federal programs will be necessary to assist this transition.

Now that the war in Vietnam is almost behind us, we must redirect our resources toward improving the quality of life in America. We must bind up the divisions which the war has produced and bring ourselves together as one people.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES KEE

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 13, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my many colleagues in expressing regret upon the retirement of my good friend JAMES KEE.

JAMES KEE follows a tradition of public service. Both his mother and father served with distinction as Members of the House of Representatives.

He has been an outstanding legislator, using his knowledge and ability to serve the people of his district and State of West Virginia.

JAMES KEE has contributed to the progress of America through his conscientious work on the Public Works Committee and the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. His work on the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, Public Lands, and Environment has been important to his State of West Virginia and the Nation.

I wish my good friend JAMES KEE the very best in the future years ahead.

PREVENT AIR HIJACKING

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD a letter I received from Miss Jessie Lackey who is a resident of Kentucky and who is presently employed as a hostess on one of our overseas airlines.

I found it a very interesting and helpful letter and took occasion to comment on it when hearings were being held before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the International Convention to deter hijacking. I also ask consent that my letter in response to her letter be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follow:

SEPTEMBER 2, 1972.

DEAR SENATOR COOPER: For a long time I have been watching with disgust the inability of our law enforcement agencies to prevent the air hijackings that have become an everyday occurrence. Though I know they are doing their very best to stop this threat to our lives and freedom, I cannot understand why our representatives who, by their positions of authority have a degree of power, have not stood up with the courage and conviction of Vice President Agnew to aid the FBI and law agencies in their efforts. It seems to me evident to even the most simple individual that the large majority of these hijackings might *never* have occurred had they not been encouraged by the news media. The glorified, front page reporting feeds the sick and desperate individual with a last chance idea to be recognized. The detailed and emotional reporting supplies these and the more criminally or politically motivated hijacker with the do's and don'ts of "how to be a successful hijacker." To have "freedom of the press" is one thing, but to use it to increase one's "take" of the "almighty dollar" at the risk of innocent lives is to me the immoral use of one's position and should be considered an accessory to the crime. I do not know enough about law, but it seems to me the airlines and passenger-victims of hijackings should consider sueing the reporters, editors and newspapers whose news clippings have been found in the possession of hijackers. For the honest, news-reading public there is no need to explain the details of how the FBI managed to get on board or get a gun on board. The fact that the hijacking took place, that the FBI managed or didn't to thwart it, is enough to sell newspapers. The one who pours over those details is the potential hijacker.

I am particularly interested in this matter as I am an air hostess. It is frustrating to be briefed on how to act in such an incident, only to read our "secret passwords" and methods of talking to these hijackers on the front page next day. This only prevents these methods from working the next time. Recently, a hijacking was stopped by an FBI agent dressed as a pilot delivering the money to the plane. He was made to undress and dress before entering the plane. He had a gun in his pocket. Front Page News! The very next week a hijacker refused anyone to come near the plane in anything more than bathing suit trunks. Another attempt was stopped by a gun being handed on a pole to the pilot while the hijacker was watching the money-carrier. Again front page news—detailed reporting! That method certainly won't work again! Crews are briefed on delaying tactics. Yet, the Algerian bound hijackers were reported as having refused to accept delaying excuses. They told the FBI: "It will be done like I want it done. It will not be done the way you want it done." This is a direct quote from a newspaper clipping which I've enclosed. Now, hijackers will refuse to accept any delays. What's the use of training crews, buying fancy detection equipment, etc., etc., if the newspapers are going to tell them how to cope with these methods and devices. As if descriptive articles aren't enough, Roy Crane has decided he must show how it's done by his recent comic strip (enclosed). Eventually, all this will mean total inspection and belly loading of a baggage plus a complete "frisking" of passengers from skin out—our only protection for the many from the few. Hardly what I'd call "freedom of travel." I can just hear my passengers now!!

To belong to a society, to the right to hold positions of authority and power carry hidden responsibilities—like the "small print" on a contract. If one doesn't uphold these responsibilities the society fails, just as the contract is broken if one doesn't pay attention to the fine print. To my mind the communication network of our country, whether it be T.V., movies, magazines or newspapers, is guilty of failing to carry out these hidden responsibilities—the "small print" of its contract to our society. This responsibility is the same for all of us in a free society who wish to share in a community. It is a moral obligation to consider our actions and words from all angles, to assess that what we do is not just for our personal benefit, but that it does not infringe upon the life, liberties or happiness of any other individual. Detailed reporting of hijackings, murders, violent disturbances, etc. feeds the egos of those individuals involved and encourages others by giving a blueprint to go by.

I beg you to do whatever you can to encourage the news media to curb their detailed reporting. I also urge you to consider helping Mr. John F. Leyden, President of the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization, in asking Transportation Secretary Volpe to help in curbing information to the news media (clipping enclosed). If there are channels through which you may encourage a study of this situation that might lead to helping our law officers by curbing our "free" information to potential criminals, please consider them.

Thank you for listening to my thoughts on this subject. I had to put in my "two cents worth" as my life and those of my passengers are worth just slightly more than selling a few extra newspapers!

Thank you again for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JESSIE LACKEY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

SEPTEMBER 27, 1972.

DEAR MS. LACKEY: I received your letter of September 2 concerning the problem of hi-jacking and while it has become a matter of national and international concern, I can understand your personal feelings about air hi-jacking and other crimes committed on aircraft and against aircraft facilities.

I am sending you a copy of the bill which was passed by the Senate on September 21, 1972, and I hope that it will be accepted by the House. It represents stronger legislation than has been enacted by the Congress and I hope it will be of help.

I note your comments upon the news media and your belief that their articles encourage this illegal activity and apprehension. As you state, it is within the capacity of the news media to show restraint but I am afraid that under the First Amendment to the Constitution, there is no way to prohibit the selection of news by the media.

A few days ago, when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was conducting a hearing upon the approval of an international convention designed to deter hi-jacking, I took the liberty of commenting on your letter and asking that it be placed in the Record of the hearings. I have not yet done so, but if you will write me that you have no objection, I will do so and if you have no objection, I would like to place it in the Congressional Record which is printed every day and has about 500,000 readers. I will be glad to hear from you.

With kindest regards, I am,

Yours sincerely,

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER.

P.S.—Miss Mecham of my office thoroughly concurs with your remarks. She is a former Pan American stewardess.

CONGRESSMAN JACKSON E. BETTS

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, for 22 years Congressman JACKSON E. BETTS has represented the Eighth District of Ohio in this House. Before his election to the Congress, JACK served for a decade in Ohio General Assembly, 2 years during which he was the Speaker of the House. Throughout his entire legislative career, JACK'S efforts have always reflected his deep concern for the well-being of his constituents, the people of Ohio, and the Nation. As a result, he not only has earned the respect of his people, but of his colleague as well.

JACK has been an extremely effective member of the Ways and Means Committee, His knowledge in the varied areas over which the committee has jurisdiction has contributed immensely to the formation of responsible legislation. In addition, his contributions as a

member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation will long be a testimonial to his leadership. I hope retirement will bring JACK great happiness, and I wish him Godspeed.

SENATOR DAVID H. GAMBRELL

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I am pleased to join in the salute to my colleague, the junior Senator from Georgia, DAVID H. GAMBRELL.

Coming as he did, to fill the unexpired term of one of the Senate's most outstanding Members, Richard Brevard Russell, he has served with distinction, devotion, and effectiveness. He has made a significant contribution to his State and Nation in this body.

I will miss DAVID GAMBRELL and hope he will return from time to time to give us the benefit of his wisdom and insight.

OMAHA-COUNCIL BLUFFS RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Kansas City Federal Regional Council awarded an integrated grant to help support the first year of planning for the Omaha-Council Bluffs riverfront development program. This project has been conceived by the local, public, and private sector leadership of the area to guide the economic, social, and physical development of 54 miles of the Missouri River Valley from Blair to Bellevue, Neb. Included are a population of more than 600,000 persons and a land area of 200 square miles.

The riverfront program is one of the most extensive and complex development efforts initiated in the United States in terms of the numbers of participating governments, the size of the land area encompassed, the provisions for private sector participation and the long period of time envisioned for its execution. The preliminary stages alone extend to 1985.

It was my privilege in association with other members of the Nebraska and Iowa congressional delegations to announce the integrated grant award at a ceremony convened in the Omaha-Council Bluffs area by the several Chambers of Commerce who have played major roles in launching the riverfront program.

The integrated grant administration program is an innovative approach under the leadership of the Office of Management and Budget to facilitate Federal interagency support of local development programs. The award to the riverfront program constitutes Federal endorsement of the planning concept and a Federal commitment to participate in the unique partnership being formed to translate this concept into specific projects.

I would like to share with the Senate my remarks on the occasion of this award and ask unanimous consent that they be inserted in the RECORD at this time.

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

OMAHA-COUNCIL BLUFFS RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM INTEGRATED GRANT AWARD

(By Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA)

Today we recognize and celebrate the awarding of a federal grant.

It is an Integrated Grant Administration Award to the Omaha-Council Bluffs Metropolitan Area Planning Agency and its 35 component members for the first year of Riverfront Development planning.

The federal contribution approaches $1,000,000. It will exceed that figure substantially when the application for about $100,000 in Federal environment funds is confirmed. This application enjoys a high priority with the Environmental Protection Agency.

Local and State contributions for today's grant total about $1,000,000.

Thus, a total of some $2,000,000 is available for first year planning.

In 1971, Congress authorized the Corps of Engineers to initiate Riverfront studies. Congress recently increased the funds available for the Corps studies to $210,000. These actions opened the door to the larger expression of federal commitment we are receiving today from the Kansas City Regional Council. Although only civilian agencies participate in the Integrated Grant Program, the Corps has worked closely with the Regional Council on Riverfront matters.

This grant, however, is far more than "just another federal grant."

It is a beginning of a new partnership of public resources—federal and local—with the resources of the private sector of our economy.

This new partnership is unique. Its presence in this metropolitan area, if not the first case of its kind in this country, is certainly one of the very earliest.

Viewed in its true and whole context, it looms as one of the most exciting developments in the political-social-economic arena in decades. Its meaning to us and to succeeding generations is far reaching in significance.

The quality of uniqueness lies chiefly in the focus of decision and authority, which will be with the people in the Riverfront project. These people will act through their locally constructed political subdivisions and elected officials and representatives.

The local entities will do the planning; they will call the shots; they will determine the direction, the thrust; and they will make the decisions. This is because they are best equipped to do so.

The federal government will be called to help, but not to direct. It will be expected to give guidance and advice, but not orders or ultimatums.

Federal resources possess vast, varied, and expert knowledge and experience. The local participation will give these resources a place and a purpose in which to function effectively and efficiently.

Such an approach has been inevitable for a long time. When I went to Congress some 20 years ago, it was said that about 40 federal grant programs existed. Today there are reported to be more than 1000 federal programs. Obviously, they could not continue to function much longer on individual, independent and solitary paths. To do so would involve duplication, conflict, waste and poor results.

This is why we need the new partnership I have described. Hence, the participation of the Kansas City Federal Regional Council and the results we have today.

Adoption of this new concept means that the Riverfront project is giving new directions to the great experiment in human settlement that our region represents. Part of our heritage is a constant concern with learning to live in communities. Our forefathers came from many corners of the world to settle this land. Despite their many differences in language, culture, and temperament, they succeeded in starting sound communities. They never expected to finish the task. Rather, they handed down a legacy of hard work and cooperation in achieving the common good.

This new concept means that, far more significant than the physical features of Riverfront with which you are all familiar, there will be a strengthening of lasting cooperative spirit which has been stimulated among the cities, counties, state governments, private organizations, and federal agencies.

With that accomplished, the potential for progress is limitless.

We should not underestimate our accomplishments or the challenges we have accepted. Riverfront is one of the most complex joint public-private and intergovernmental partnerships ever launched in the United States. We have joined hands across the lines that usually separate men—across city lines, county lines, state lines, the lines between business and government, and the lines between social, racial, economic and religious groups. This joining of hands testifies to the deep underlying strengths of our federal and free enterprise systems. These systems *can* meet the demands of an urbanizing society for great advances, not only in the usual amenities of living but, more importantly, in assuring freedom and equal opportunity for each citizen.

Riverfront is a powerful witness to the community spirit that rises when men unite behind common purposes. Where this spirit will lead us in the years ahead, I cannot predict. But I am confident that we and our descendants will succeed in strengthening our community as did our fathers before us. There is something infectious about this new spirit. Already there are Riverfront-type stirrings in the Sioux City area to the North, and to the South in the counties below the confluence of the Missouri and Platte. In the years ahead, we should expect a surge of economic and social development in the Missouri River Valley. It will far surpass our past achievements in mastering the Valley's physical resources. Today will stand as a decisive step in that process of development. It is good that we pause to celebrate this step and recognize those who have made it possible.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, among those present to comment on the significance of the riverfront program were Dr. Charles Kimball, the distinguished president of the Midwest Research Institute at Kansas City, Mo., and Dr. Charles Anderson, the distinguished president of the Stanford Research Institute at Menlo Park, Calif. These two institutes have made major contributions to the Nation's efforts to understand and guide metropolitan development. Both have been selected to furnish technical management for the planning phase of the riverfront program.

Dr. Kimball in commenting on the regional significance of the program noted that—

The time has come for a new set of alternatives. The people and leadership of Omaha/Council Bluffs are, in effect, serving notice to

the nation that you now offer an attractive new option for life quality in a metropolitan area—an option so favorable in the case of the Riverfront Development Project, that it may well serve as a progressive model to others throughout the balance of this century.

Dr. Anderson, in his remarks on the national significance of the riverfront program emphasized its uniqueness and observed that—

It is a grassroots program—a program created and worked out and planned by hundreds of people from all the sectors of society—worked out and planned in concept here and not in Washington. In this respect it is not only unique, but it is an outstanding example and application of stated non-partisan policies of both President Nixon and the Congress—policies related to the desirable objectives of reassuming responsibility for decision making and problem solution at the local and regional levels where these problems exist.

The remarks of Drs. Kimball and Anderson should be of interest to all persons concerned with the problems and prospects of orderly growth in our metropolitan areas. I ask unanimous consent that they be included in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OMAHA-COUNCIL BLUFFS RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

(By Charles Kimball)

It is generally held that by the turn of the century, all but 10–15% of Americans will live within metropolitan areas. And there is much talk and some planning about the nation's need for 100 new cities to accommodate the 50–100 million people who will be added to our population before the year 2000.

I want to say something here about the larger subject of all cities. It is distilled from some 25 years of experience of Midwest Research Institute, observing, measuring and forecasting events in both the private and public segment of our country.

There are arguments that are convincing to me, at least, against the idea of scores of new cities, rising unnaturally on the virgin landscape, without the cultural traditions of the present communities. The concept is clearly impractical, but the symbolism is valid. But more sensible, less costly by far, less damaging to the countryside, and more rewarding in human values—is to plan now for the 50–100 million additional persons to locate in present cities of manageable size.

We must ask ourselves NOW where all of us are going to live in 1999, or more realistically, where our kids are going to live—and not just WHERE but HOW—in good style? with dignity? with reasonable accessibility to each other? and above all, with room to stretch?

The Riverfront Development Project may be one of the answers. Civic leaders and private businessmen, city, county, state and federal agencies, are all doing sound planning for this undertaking, without destroying the very amenities you wish for here and already have in great measure.

Excessive growth in very large coastal cities can best be controlled not by any rigid attempt to set limits; expansion can be checked only by attracting it to other centers like yours.

There are important urban changes underway today—not all of them as tragic, depressing, and hopeless as headlines imply. There is a marked shift of the cities that lead this country—a rejection of traditional influences. Historically, the inland cities have always looked to the metropolises for a lifestyle. The mass communication offices—Hollywood studios or New York editorial offices—told us what to wear, how to govern, where and how to live. This is largely unacceptable today to many Americans, who are simply not willing to embrace either the sprawl and smog of Los Angeles or the degrading density of the East.

Cities like yours are not plagued as are many ports of coastal cities, with too many people, too rapid or stagnant growth, extreme poverty, commuting, pollution and lack of recreation. These are great issues, now commanding the highest level of attention in those beleagured centers. You can learn from them. You don't have to repeat their mistakes.

In an age of jet airplanes and modern communications, midwestern cities are becoming key distribution centers, intensifying foreign trade—international cities. In an age of migration, they are becoming urban centers—still hubs for agricultural business, but much more deeply involved in industry and science, government and finance, in manufacturing and trade.

This area is moving inevitably toward a role as one of America's Inland Capitals—a regional center with opportunities for international links to other nations, an important center for federal government which is now decentralizing gradually out of Washington, D.C.

Few people in America realize what is happening in the Omaha/Council Bluffs area. For example, that this is the—

World's largest livestock market.

The nation's 4th largest railroad centers.

Home of more than 600 manufacturing plants and 35 insurance companies.

Shipper of more than $1 billion of foodstuffs annually.

An educational center with 5 colleges and 2 medical schools—the only city of its size in the U.S. with 2 medical schools.

81 million in new construction permits in 1971—1.4 billion in the last 12 years.

An urban area with an effective buying income per household ($11,734) greater than Dallas, St. Louis, Kansas City, Fort Worth, New Orleans, and a score of other important U.S. cities.

Of your impressive new banking center in Council Bluffs and that City's thoughtful approach to renewal of its urban area.

The time has come for a new set of alternatives. The people and leadership of Omaha/Council Bluffs are, in effect, serving notice to the nation that you now offer an attractive new option for life quality in a metropolitan area—an option so favorable in the case of the Riverfront Development Project, that it may well serve as a progressive model to others throughout the balance of this century.

A major shift in American cities has occurred because of the revolution of the service industries, a dramatic historical progression following the agrarian revolution and the industrial revolution.

Most cities—nearly destroyed by archaic property taxes and the onslaught of the internal combustion engine—now face a new series of demands brought into focus by the new type of employee, the men and women in the service sector of our economy.

Ours is the first and only country in history to employ more people in services than in manufacturing. This calls for a new kind of city, with a new point of view with much less emphasis on industrial sites and railroad sidings, or cheap labor.

It emphasizes values based on being in the center of things, geared to house skilled minds and highly mobile people, linked to air routes, and structured for the dignified life-style demanded by those within the service professions. The company town we knew as kids is passe!

Have you ever wondered why the insurance industry, one of the most powerful in the service sector, repeatedly selects cities like your own here, Hartford, Wausau, or Des Moines, for headquarters locations?

It is because these communities provide this very thing I mentioned—an emphasis on values concerned with the quality of life, rather than with growth for growth's sake.

Much more serious thought will need to be given in the years immediately ahead to some redistribution of population, as was done a hundred years ago when the inducement was the Homestead Act—really, in fact, the GI Bill of Rights for the Union soldiers. This Act opened up the West and had an important impact here. But such plans cannot be forced on the people. They must not conflict with our rising level of expectations.

One of my major concerns is that cities like Omaha and Council Bluffs are underrecognized and under-utilized. But this does not mean they are under-developed or backward, or cowtowns. It means that they are not and have not been aggressive enough in competing for the attention of decision makers throughout the country.

Over the 25 years I have lived in the Middlewest, we have seen an exodus of talented people to both coasts, the best ones leaving first, what the British call the "Brain Drain." There simply were not adequate employment opportunities. But now we notice a marked reversal in that trend. Some of the best former emigrants who have located in the cities on the two coasts and the Great Lakes, have *"had it"*—commuting, congestion, corruption, and pollution. Many of the key people on MRI's staff have come back to the Midwest.

Some of the return of the native movement has to do with what the unions call "portal-to-portal time." In your area of over ½ million persons, more than 90% live within 30 minutes of their work—most within 20 minutes.

This sort of accessibility has new and important meaning today. It enriches leisure time for the individual, which in turn increases productivity for the employer. To the brainy, talented individuals of the service revolution, "portal-to-portal time" is increasingly significant.

Yours is one of the metropolitan areas in the U.S. that appears to have the physical plant to absorb in an orderly fashion the expected increase of 50–100 million people in our country by the end of this century. Most of these cities have options open that, properly exercised, can assure that they will be both liveable and governable in the year 2000.

Unfortunately, too few of these cities today appear to be thinking about this or exploring their options in this context. But this community has shown clearly one way a city can continue to grow, provide alternatives to the urban sprawl, and can continue to make life more attractive for its people.

But just as important—and perhaps of more significance—is the ecumenical spirit that has been created among the multiplicity of governments within the area of Omaha and Council Bluffs.

This means bi-state compacts and support and cooperation between two state legislatures, 6 counties, 5 cities, and a dozen other functional government sub-divisions. The land involved in the Riverfront Development Project—some 54 miles—encompassing these communities, counties, and the two states, will be zoned and developed according to a comprehensive master plan.

You will see more of this kind of thinking and planning in the future of other cities, if they are to meet the challenges of the decentralizing of American industry and government, and increasing population, and the continuing quest for a better way to live.

My own Institution, Midwest Research Institute, has been deeply involved in this in a variety of ways for many years, and not just through speeches I make. Our Centers for Regional Progress, now with offices in Des Moines, Omaha, and Topeka, working on

many public problems in those states, is designed not only to help solve such problems, but to serve in an advocacy role for this part of the country.

MRI is proud to have a significant role in this exciting project because it exemplifies the type of service commitment this Institute made to the people of Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma and Arkansas, when it was founded 28 years ago.

I am delighted to have Tom Brinton representing MRI in this important undertaking. His fine work record and proven ability to get things done, will fit in just fine with your own goals and aspirations.

We're delighted to be in this effort with SRI, a sister institution with strong capabilities and a fine reputation.

MRI continues to develop as a Research Center with a strong regional commitment. We maintain our special concern for developing programs and skills which apply constructively to the needs of the Midwest, its industry, and its people.

In this context, the challenging Riverfront Development Project responsibility we have undertaken for you will have our wholehearted support.

Let's get on with this job. This dream is too important to be left to dreamers.

OMAHA-COUNCIL BLUFFS RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

(By Charles A. Anderson)

Dr. Kimball has told you that SRI and Midwest Research Institute have been selected to furnish the technical management for the planning phase of the Riverfront Development Project. As President of SRI my job is to manage our approximately 3,000 Institute employees and to provide executive direction for the more than 1,000 projects which we work on each year for industry and for government agencies at all levels, both domestic and international.

As I look across the broad spectrum of interdisciplinary projects we are associated with today and as I think back over the thousands we have completed during my term with SRI, the Missouri Riverfront Development certainly stands out. Of course, I am not as intimately involved with it as is Harry Posner, the leader of our SRI team, and the Technical Director of your Riverfront Project. But because I am once-removed, I believe that I am more excited about this project, more impressed with what you have accomplished and with what you are going to accomplish than you are yourselves.

I have talked with many of the hundreds of Nebraskans and Iowans involved with this program and I'm constantly amazed at the enthusiasm and confidence all of you display. You have accepted the Riverfront program as a part of your lives, as a program you will live with for decades. As so many of you have told me, you're planning for the next 100 years. But as a result, I think you have gotten to where you hardly think about the enormous significance of this program to the rest of the United States.

As someone with more of an outside viewpoint, I think maybe my sense of perspective on this project may be quite different. I am tremendously impressed with what you are doing, with what you are planning for the 200 square miles of the project area. But I am even more impressed with what you are doing for the nation, for our way of thinking about the people's relationship to government and to each other, of the relationships of government to government, of business to government.

Certainly, as we all know, this project is unique. It is a grassroots program—a program created and worked out and planned by hundreds of people from all the sectors of society—worked out and planned in concept here and not in Washington. In this respect it is not only unique, but it is an outstanding example and application of stated non-partisan policies of both President Nixon and the Congress—policies related to the desirable objectives of reassuming responsibility for decision making and problem solution at the local and regional levels where these problems exist.

It is a program marked by an almost incredible spirit of unity and cooperation among the Federal government, two states, six counties, five municipalities, and scores of businesses, individuals, universities—the list goes on and on. It includes, for example, the four Chambers of Commerce represented here today, the civic clubs, the academic community. It has been spared political partisanship, even in an election year. And all that is unique. It is in short, an inspiring story of what we used to call good old American enterprise. It's the old pioneer barnraising spirit on a massive scale.

Certainly, we at SRI look upon this long-range riverfront development as a significant and tremendously important program. We see it as a milestone in the growth of this nation, as a demonstration of how people and business and government can work effectively together to solve some of the major social and economic problems that confront us all.

We have seen piecemeal efforts fail. Many of the so-called urban renewals have turned into urban displacements; they have not solved problems, they have just moved them into someone else's jurisdiction. Others have brought new problems because they started first with a massive development. Then local governments had to come in and try to graft onto the development the needed services such as transportation, law enforcement, schools, hospitals, and the like. Some have failed because they have tried to solve everything with housing, with little or no thought to where jobs can be found.

Your idea is a refreshing contrast. Businessmen, the men who know something about where jobs are and about job creation, have been in on the planning from the start. Just as an example, the foresight among business, governments, citizens and educators in the grouping of housing, industrial parks and vocational schools in the Riverfront program is really remarkable.

You are dealing with an area large enough so that all requirements can be accommodated and you won't be pawning problems off on someone else. You will demonstrate something that has, regrettably, become somewhat rare: the ability of people at the grassroots level to solve their own problems and enhance the quality of life for everyone in your region. The idea is bound to spread—as it has so quickly up and down the river from Blair to Bellevue. Someone said jokingly—but maybe with some serious justification—that if you project out the enthusiastic growth of the Riverfront development program, you'll find that the Riverfront committee and MAPA will be running the whole country by 1980.

Seriously, all of us at SRI are enjoying the opportunity to be associated with the launching of the Riverfront project and we look forward to the next two or three years of working with everyone concerned to get this early phase successfully completed.

Perhaps most of you who have worked so hard and so long to develop the Riverfront program—or dream, if you will—could object to my calling this the beginning of the plan, but that's what I think it is. This first Integrated grant, large as it seems and welcome as it is, is only the beginning, the door-opener to what will surely be decades of work.

And that brings me to my one word of advice, or admonition, today. I have said that you are pioneers, that you are due a nationwide round of applause for what you have accomplished and for the way you have accomplished it. In a very real sense, you have the eyes of the nation on you. You living here in the Missouri Riverfront Development area are involved in what, I am confident, will soon be recognized as the model for successful regional development. If this were a NASA program, it would be called Pioneer I.

So I think all of you—all of us—have not only an outstanding opportunity to improve this area and to make a real and lasting contribution to national development but we also have a very real and very serious *obligation* to insure that this Riverfront development becomes the success we all have dreamed it will be.

So far the enthusiasm and vision of a beginning have brought people together and have swept aside petty divisions and major obstacles. But, as I said, this is only the beginning. You are planning for the next 100 years. Now you and your children must work to see that this vision of the river, of buildings, homes, factories, playgrounds, forests and schools really comes to pass.

In closing I would like to cite three brief quotations which are germane to our collecman's problems, inspiration and creativity—quotations which are germane to our collective efforts underway here today.

First from Confucius—"Good government obtains when those who are near are made happy and those who are far off are attracted."

Second from Thomas Jefferson—"I know no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves."

And last from Franklin Delano Roosevelt—"These unhappy times call for the building of plans that build from the bottom up and not from the top down, that put their faith once more in the forgotten man at the bottom of the pyramid."

Thank you for asking me to join you today. It has been a pleasure.

TRIBUTE TO SPEEDY O. LONG

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is losing one of its most dedicated Members in SPEEDY LONG. I am proud to be able to count myself among his many friends and admirers.

SPEEDY LONG has served the people of his district well for 8 years in Congress. He has achieved an outstanding record of service to the people of his district, State, and the Nation.

I have had the pleasure of working with SPEEDY LONG on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and I know him to be a capable and conscientious legislator. The representation he has given to the Congress is certainly one of which he and his people can be proud.

I am going to miss my association with SPEEDY LONG and I know the House of Representatives will also. I do wish him the very best as he continues to serve the people of Louisiana.

CAMPAIGNING WITH McGOVERN

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, each day as the two major presidential candidates travel this country, their words and actions are reported to the rest of the Nation by a small band of reporters who accompany them. The job of reporting on a presidential campaign is a demanding task and requires not only long hours of work, but special knowledge and ability. For these reasons, the newsmen selected to travel with the candidates are generally among the best in their profession.

Recently, Ken Scheibel, a former Nevada newsman and now the Washington correspondent for a number of newspapers across the country, accompanied Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN on a campaign swing through the West. Mr. Scheibel is a veteran journalist who has the experience and know-how to provide his readers with factual and informative reporting. His writing exemplifies journalism at its best and I ask unanimous consent that one of his recent dispatches from the Packer newspaper, entitled "Campaigning With McGovern," be reprinted in the RECORD.

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

CAMPAIGNING WITH MCGOVERN

(By Ken Scheibel)

(NOTE.—In the Sept. 30 issue of The Packer, Ken Scheibel, our Washington correspondent, commented on the election campaign efforts of Earl Butz on behalf of President Nixon. In this week's column, Scheibel reports on a campaign tour by Sen. George McGovern.)

In shirt sleeves and stockinged feet after a long hard day George McGovern looks out at the land from 30,000 feet in his campaign jet and tells of his hopes for farmers.

"I want farmers to stay on their farms," he says quietly, "not have to leave them for the cities."

Born and bred of the prairie, the senator from South Dakota pledges a better deal for farmers if he is elected President of the United States.

"The small businessman and the small farmer need help," he says slowly and earnestly. "They need a fair reward for their labor and investment."

Although McGovern's critics call him a "radical," he proposes few sweeping new programs, laws, or policies for agriculture.

"We can use the laws, the authority we have now," he says. "If I am elected president, I will order the Secretary of Agriculture to use it." Specifically, McGovern complains past secretaries have set prices too low. McGovern wants prices for wheat, feed grains, and dairy products set at 90 per cent of parity.

"This can and should be done at once," he says.

The setting sun glints off the wing of the Dakota Queen and east Texas slides by below. "The farmers in Texas and Oklahoma really got rooked on the wheat deal," he says, sadly.

To George McGovern it is unthinkable that President Nixon is considered a friend of farmers.

"Nixon has been in power four years," McGovern continues. "All that time farmers have been in trouble."

There is one major new bill in Congress which McGovern has pressed—legislation to give farmers equal collective bargaining rights. In McGovern's view a new law would ease the plight of the small farmer.

A recent campaign swing took McGovern to North Dakota, Washington, Oregon, California and Texas.

His audiences were large and responsive. Many listeners were youthful. Placards and banners were plentiful. "Agnew Smokes Lettuce," said one. "The Great Grain Robbery," said another.

At Houston, Tex., McGovern told an audience of 15,000 that Republicans favor big business over the small businessman and small farmer.

"The six big grain companies of America have a president—and his name is Richard Nixon," McGovern said. The crowd roared. And he recalled that as vice-president, Nixon was associated with Ezra Taft Benson, President Eisenhower's controversial Secretary of Agriculture. Nixon is a man whose heart beats, "but not for the farmer," he said.

Nor did McGovern neglect Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz.

"You can take Earl Butz out of the board room," he quipped, "but you can not take the board room out of Butz."

At Fort Worth McGovern again told of his concern for the small businessman and small farmer. "It is time we had a president who is willing to fight for the small businessman and the small farmer," he told a cheering rally. In the throng someone waved a placard, "The Russians get wheat and the farmers get the chaff."

McGovern's father was a minister, so was McGovern himself briefly. There are frequent references to the Bible. Hitting at racism, McGovern said, "When I was a boy we used to sing red, and yellow, and black, and white. All are precious in His sight."

In his campaign against "big interests," McGovern has picked some fights which some of his farm advisers question. One was to support Cesar Chavez and the lettuce boycott.

"George should not have taken such a specific stand," said a farm spokesman. "And I don't think promising 90 per cent of parity makes sense either." McGovern feels otherwise. And at San Diego, Calif., on the platform with McGovern was Cesar Chavez.

McGovern works hard. A 16-hour day is not unusual. Often he runs behind schedule. He is an ardent handshaker. He is known for a mild manner and easygoing ways. But he can get weary. Once in a while there is a show of temper. When he thinks he might have offended someone he hastens to apologize.

To George McGovern running for president is serious business. Unlike many politicians McGovern shuns small talk or wasting words. There are few jokes, little horseplay in the campaign. But he is no martinet. Possibly, he is too tolerant of inefficiency or human failing. The man he pushes hardest of all is George McGovern.

At the end of a grinding day McGovern's big campaign jet streaks across America and night falls softly over the land.

In his compartment McGovern pushes campaign documents off the table and removes the black half glasses from his nose. A stewardess brings a tray. It is one of a thousand or more such meals the candidate for president has tasted in the past 20 months.

There is beef. There is fruit. There is a piece of bread. There is black coffee. But nowhere on McGovern's tray is there a scrap of lettuce.

ELAINE EDWARDS

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, on August 1, ELAINE EDWARDS began her term as U.S. Senator. I was delighted that she graced the seat next to mine in this Chamber. In the short period of her service, she dedicated herself to the difficult tasks required of a Senator representing the people of Louisiana.

ELAINE EDWARDS was a sensitive and responsive representative of her State. She faithfully attended meetings, and worked diligently on legislation. A memorial fellowship to pay the transportation cost for underprivileged children to come to Washington will now be awarded as a result of her fine efforts.

I know that ELAINE will continue her good work when she resumes her position as first lady of Louisiana. My colleagues and I will miss her when the 93d Congress resumes.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR LEN B. JORDAN UPON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, the diverse experience, skills, and knowledge which its Members bring to the Senate and expand during their service here is one of the greatest sources of strength in this legislative body to which we are all devoted.

Thus the departure of one whose talents have contributed demonstrably to that strength must inevitably leave a void not quickly filled.

That is how I feel about the retirement of my good friend and valued colleague, LEN JORDAN, who is going back to Idaho at the end of this year.

Though we are not related, are of different parties, and representing States almost a continent apart, I have felt a sense of kinship with him throughout the decade we have spent together here in Washington.

It stems partly from our common interest in natural resource conservation and development and our membership together for a time on the Senate Public Works Committee and partly from the fact that both our States have an important stake in agriculture.

It is more, however, because of the personal qualities which so typify LEN JORDAN as a man—qualities of integrity, strength of character, dedication to duty and country and a capacity for compassion and understanding.

As an administrator, engineer, legislator, and economist, LEN JORDAN has established a record of public service which will be long remembered by all who have been privileged to know him.

I am glad that he chose to climax it with his service among us and I know I speak for every Member of this body in wishing him happiness and fulfillment in the retirement years to which he is now entitled.

TRIBUTE TO PATRICK T. CAFFERY

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, PAT CAFFERY, a young man with promise of a great congressional career, has chosen for the sake of his family to return to his native Louisiana.

PAT has served well on the important Public Works Committee and his dedicated representation has meant much to his State and district.

He has long devoted much of his time and effort to public service and civic affairs and I am sure that the people of his district will continue to benefit from his service.

I want to wish him the very best and I know PAT CAFFERY, as an avid outdoorsman, will welcome the opportunity to spend more time in the sportsman's paradise of Louisiana.

DR. WOODROW STRICKLER, PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE, RESIGNS

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, a very wonderful man, Dr. Woodrow Strickler, resigned on August 31 as president of the University of Louisville. The University of Louisville, which was the oldest municipal university in the United States, has recently become associated with the University of Kentucky. It is a university noted for its diversity, freedom of speech and discussion, for its scholarship and for the breadth of its interests in the humanities, science, and the arts. Dr. Strickler has served the University of Louisville as vice president and executive vice president before he became president and in every capacity, his scholarship, his sensitivity, and rare executive abilities have been manifested.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article of the Louisville Courier-Journal entitled, "Strickler Resigns University of Louisville Presidency" and an article from the University of Louisville Quarterly of May 1968 by Mary Phyllis Riedley, a very fine account of President Strickler and his wife Florence, and also an article in the Louisville Times of August 25, entitled, "Strickler, Glad It's Almost Over, Looks Back at Job as University of Louisville Head."

The University of Louisville has been honored and benefited by Dr. Strickler's presidency as has the entire State of Kentucky.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRICKLER RESIGNS UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE PRESIDENCY

(By Michael A. McKinney and Richard Wilson)

Dr. Woodrow M. Strickler, president of the University of Louisville since 1968, resigned yesterday effective Aug. 31.

He cited recent developments at the University of Louisville and his own health as prime reasons for his action.

Edwin G. Middleton, chairman of the University of Louisville's Board of Trustees, said Strickler's resignation "would not have been accepted but for the president's strong wishes in this matter," Middleton added that the resignation was accepted "with deep regret."

A University of Louisville spokesman said Strickler, who has been at the university 34 years in various positions, will remain at the school. But there was no indication in what capacity he would serve.

An interim president won't be appointed, university officials explained, since Strickler's resignation doesn't become effective until Aug. 31.

In resigning, Strickler noted that the university has received major funding from the 1972 General Assembly and "is now firmly established" as a member of the state system of public higher education.

Strickler, who became University of Louisville president in 1968, said that this begins "a new phase in the university's development, and I believe that new and fresh leadership might well be expected and deserved."

Strickler, 59, also said that his health "exercises considerable influence in helping me to arrive at this decision."

Strickler's resignation as the University of Louisville's 15th president had been rumored since early last month when he entered the hospital for what was officially described as "routine tests." He has a history of heart problems and in fact has suffered two coronary disturbances in the past year.

In fact some acquaintances have speculated for the past year that the balding, soft-spoken Pennsylvania native would likely step down after the recent session of the General Assembly if the U of L received sufficient state funds to overcome its financial adversity of the past decade.

The university received a $30.3 million state appropriation for the 1972–74 biennium—an increase of 130 per cent over previous financing and the lion's share of new money appropriated for the state's higher education system.

Much of the success in the U of L's transformation from the nation's oldest municipal university to state status is directly attributable to Strickler's patience and ability to sell state officials and the legislature on both the school's financial needs and its potential benefit to the state.

For instance, in 1970, then-Gov. Louie B. Nunn's proposed budget only called for an $8.2 million U of L appropriation. But Strickler, along with aide Dee Akers and others, convinced a predominantly Democratic legislature that this appropriation fell far short of the university's needs. The final budget, which Nunn signed, allocated $13.2 million to the U of L for 1970–72.

Last week, in an address to the faculty—an event which one close observer described privately as "a farewell speech"—Strickler for the first time since assuming the presidency in 1968, only briefly touched on the topic of the U of L's precarious financial position.

"I think that enough has been said about our institutional survival," Strickler said. "And a time has come for all of us to give more attention to the life and vitality of this university." He urged the U of L faculty to "begin an all-out inquisition of the status quo of this institution."

Strickler first gave serious consideration to resignation earlier this month when he wrote a letter to Trustee Chairman Middleton informing him of his intentions to step down no later than Aug. 31. The same letter was sent to other trustees Sunday. Members of the U of L central administration were informed of Strickler's decision yesterday.

U of L regulations now call an elected search committee of 13 faculty members to aid the trustees in searching for Strickler's successor. Middleton, asked last night if he foresaw the trustees' naming Strickler's successor by Aug. 31, said "I wouldn't speculate on that."

[From the University of Louisville Quarterly, May 1968]

UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

(By Mary Phyllis Riedley)

The title is new but the face and the philosophy of University of Louisville President Woodrow M. Strickler have been part of the university scene since 1938.

The face is kindly, with a totally engaging smile that suggests an intrinsic benevolence. Though baldish and bespectacled, Woodrow Strickler at 55 has never lost youth's most charming qualities—enthusiasm and curiosity. He speaks softly and thoughtfully and . . . he listens.

The two decades he served U of L as a vice president and executive vice president well prepared him for the top post on Belknap Campus. His unanimous election to the presidency of the University March 29 met with enthusiastic approval of everyone.

"I've been here a long time," he mused, "long enough to be sufficiently familiar with the problems of this university and its operations.

". . . and long enough so that nothing has come up yet to be a real surprise to me."

Though he hates to recognize "so prosaic a task," adequate financing is his greatest immediate concern.

"Here at U of L and everywhere else," he said, "there seems to be no easy solution. We must broaden our basis of financial support. We can no longer rely on community support and tuitions."

Then, a bit wistfully, he added:

"We're one of the last of our kind."

President Strickler isn't apprehensive about the possibility of political pressures should U of L affiliate with the University of Kentucky.

"There's an old academic saying that it doesn't matter how you get money, you work hard for it. There are many pressures and disadvantages that come with accepting private funds."

He enjoys talking with student groups, values and appreciate their opinions.

"Many of the students' suggestions are very good. I think we have needed a little pressure to convince us that certain things are more important to the students than we thought."

He's a great admirer of today's youth.

"They're different from their fathers. They're more serious, more lively, have fresher ideas and more inquiring minds. It's not a question of higher IQ. Today's student has to prove he's smarter to get in and stay in school."

President Strickler feels students are searching not only for meaningful college experiences, but looking for an opportunity to do meaningful tasks while in college.

"I think this kind of interest can be tremendously helpful to colleges and universities if the institutions will permit and encourage communication between students,

faculty and all groups making up the organization."

Rebels? Strickler thinks not. "Today's student is just less apt than his predecessors to accept established goals and procedures simply because they seemed to be adequate in the past."

Strickler is the product of a "plain folks" Pennsylvania upbringing. He was born in Columbia, Pa., of Mennonite parents, and reared in nearby Harrisburg, Pa.

Though no longer a practicing Mennonite, the influences of his background have left their mark on his person and personality. He dresses simply. His preference tends toward conservatively cut brown suits and dark ties.

An undergraduate at Bucknell University in Lewisburg, Pa., he did graduate work in public utilities operation and management at the University of Pennsylvania and at Northwestern University.

It was while at Northwestern that he met his wife, Florence. They have no children.

After Northwestern, he worked for a while as a staff member on the Illinois Commerce Commission, did a stint with a Chicago advertising firm, and . . . some part-time teaching.

Once bitten by the academic bug, he never recovered.

"One day I was talking to the chairman of the economics department at Northwestern and he mentioned that the University of Louisville was looking for an economics instructor. I wrote and asked for the job and they hired me."

Strickler went into the administration side of things at U of L in 1951 when he became director of the Department of Cooperative Education.

After three years in the Navy, he returned in 1946 as director of the Division of Adult Education. This division has since become University College.

In 1952, shortly after Dr. Philip Davidson became president, Strickler was named vice-president. A few years later he moved up to executive vice president.

Educated mainly in urban-oriented universities, Strickler is strong in his contention that these metropolitan-centered institutions are the wave of the future in American higher education.

"Just look at the tremendous job being done by schools like the University of Chicago, Western Reserve in Cleveland and by those schools in the enormous educational complexes in New York and Los Angeles."

He is equally clear-eyed and beautifully articulate on a university's responsibility to its students. The purpose of a college education, he says, is:

1. To give a student an understanding of the world in which he lives by helping him explore the reason he thinks and reacts in certain ways to social, political and cultural concepts and circumstances.

2. To pass on knowledge from one generation to another by giving him skill to perform competently in his chosen field of work or profession.

3. To develop a sense of values that will enable him to act as a responsible citizen in determining and evaluating present and future goals.

THE PRESIDENT'S WIFE

Mrs. Woodrow Strickler, the wife of U of L's new president, is . . . well, a rarity. She's a contented woman. Not complacent. Content.

She's found her niche—the academic life—and it suits her to a tea. With grace, aplomb and thoughtful preparation, Florence Strickler has contributed in great measure to the "excitement and stimulation" that she finds omnipresent at U of L.

In the entrance hall of the Stricklers' hilltop home on Valley Road is a wall hanging—a sort of king-sized sampler—that Mrs. Strickler made, stitch by painstaking stitch, in 1938, the year she came to U of L as a new bride.

"That," she said, "was my salvation. Every new faculty wife needs something to occupy her time until she gets acquainted with the other wives and gets involved in university activities."

Not any more. Not at U. of L. Perhaps it's the daily reminder of that sampler on the wall, but Mrs. Strickler has for years been among the first to welcome new faculty wives to the university family.

Today, before she can thread a needle, the newcomer has become acquainted and has been introduced to all things social and cultural that university life offers. If Mrs. Newcomer would rather make samplers, that's all right, too. Mrs. Strickler will be delighted to have her bring her samplers and talk about her art at the next get-acquainted coffee.

These get-togethers were inaugurated by Mrs. Strickler last spring. A tea-drinker herself, she calls them "coffee breaks." They're a sort of university show-and-tell. The university wives present the programs at each of the teas.

Mrs. Joseph Maloney, wife of the director of the Urban Studies Center, has spoken on her specialty, African art, at eight different coffees . . . "but, not to the same audience," Mrs. Strickler hastens to explain.

The president's wife is a veteran talent scout. When she was president of the University of Louisville Women's Club in 1954, Mrs. Strickler, with the instinct of a divining rod, discovered and programmed the speaking and musical prowess of friends inside and outside the university.

Florence Strickler also can introduce you to an awful lot of interesting animals. She knows a dog that smiles. He lives down the street. She has another canine neighbor which takes her newspaper each morning and delivers it to 'Senorita," the horse next door.

She's on speaking and feeding terms with any number of squirrels and one formal fellow insisted on being fed at the dining room table.

She has yet to find a dog which is willing to live with her two cats, Josephine and Geraldine.

Born Florence Gertrude MacLeod in Winnepeg, Canada, Mrs. Strickler met her husband at Northwestern University where both were doing graduate work. They were married on Dec. 21, 1928, three months after Dr. Strickler came to U. of L.

Mrs. Strickler's tie quilt also dates back to those first years at U of L. Edged in velvet, it's made of men's ties.

"Every professor on the campus contributed to that quilt," said Mrs. Strickler. "One professor continued to send me his ties after he left here and was on the faculty at the University of Oregon."

For five years, 1947 through 1951, Mrs. Strickler worked as student adviser in the office of Dr. J. J. Oppenheimer, dean of the Arts and Science School.

"The most stimulating thing I've ever done in my life," she says. "I could hardly wait to get to work in the mornings. Nothing keeps you more alert and mentally young than daily contact with students."

At the present, she and Dr. Strickler, who served almost two decades as U of L's vice-president and as executive vice-president, have little direct contact with the students, but Mrs. Strickler hopes to do something about this gap.

She's getting uninvolved elsewhere, so she'll be "on call" for more university affairs.

"You can't plan everything," she said. "Things come up—convocations, dinners, banquets, unexpected visitors. . ."

In the past, she has devoted specific days to the American Red Cross and the Goodwill Industries Auxiliary. She has also served on the board of the Woman's Club of Louisville.

"The work is still very important to me, but it isn't fair to promise a specific day and have to cancel out."

She has few days that are all her own, but she doesn't mind. The academic life, she says, "is a privilege."

"The people—the poets, artists, authors—the wonderful minds I've met!"

Dr. Arnold Toynbee, Eleanor Roosevelt, Sir Alexander Fleming, Gen. George Marshall, former President Harry S. Truman, Archibald MacLeish, Carl Sandburg (". . . with that little-boy smile and impish twinkle in his eyes?") have all added to Mrs. Strickler's memorable moments at U of L.

"I doubt," she said, "that I'd be very good anymore at advising students about courses to take. I'm so completely prejudiced about the academic life."

The two months that Dr. Strickler spent as U of L's acting president, Mrs. Strickler spent making plans to welcome the new president's wife.

"I had no idea whether she would be a young woman or an older woman," said Mrs. Strickler, "so I prepared for every possibility."

There was a pause . . . then a smile.

"No, I guess I didn't prepare for every possibility, after all."

No need. Florence Strickler is a natural for the role.

[From the Louisville Times, Aug. 25, 1972]

STRICKLER, GLAD IT'S ALMOST OVER, LOOKS BACK AT JOB AS UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE HEAD

(By Judy Rosenfield)

It will be a happy Woodrow Strickler who steps down as the University of Louisville's 15th president next Thursday.

A Woodrow Strickler who lately wakes up with the feeling there are few new administrative dragons to slay.

A Woodrow Strickler who is frankly a little weary of immersing himself in balance sheets in his institution's continuing battles of the budget.

A Woodrow Strickler who figures he has steered U of L into a new era—from the nation's oldest semi-private municipal university to an almost full-fledged member of the state system of higher education—and that it's time for a change of command.

"I'm sort of ready to step out," says Dr. Woodrow M. Strickler, beaming, balding, mild-mannered college president.

He's ready, he says, for many reasons.

It's been 34 years since he joined U of L, a 26-year-old economics instructor who lived in an apartment on Ormsby and took his phone calls in a downstairs bar.

This is his 20th year as a member of the university's central administration, his fifth year as its president. He took over in 1968 after the resignation of Dr. Philip G. Davidson.

"Very rarely," he admitted in a recent interview, "does something occur now that is a radical departure from experiences in the past. Maybe it's a question of not looking forward to a new, exciting experience frequently enough."

The financial problems which have troubled U of L in recent years have meant "selling and re-selling and re-selling" the university's needs to government and the public.

"After a time you begin to think that maybe you've done as much as you can and maybe someone else might come along with a fresh, new and more vibrant point of view," he says.

U of L's new status as a state school makes the time especially ripe for new leadership, he believes. "If I were younger," says the 59-year-old Strickler, "maybe I could view the new environment as an additional challenge."

And there is the matter of his health. He has a history of heart problems and suffered three coronary disturbances in the past year.

"That made me think a little more seriously about my situation," he says. "I began to think that maybe someone was trying to tell me something and that maybe I'd better begin to pay a little more attention."

ISN'T AS MUCH FUN

Finally, says Strickler, being a college administrator just isn't as much fun as it used to be.

For one thing it's become more complicated. "Think about a university," he says. "It runs a major hotel business in the city. It runs one of the largest food services, one of the most complicated insurance programs, a large construction business, one of the most complicated purchasing systems because we deal in everything from cadavers to precious metals, and it has one of the biggest entertainment programs.

"I've talked about all these things and I haven't even mentioned education—and that has to be the most important thing."

For another thing, says Strickler, the campus revolutions which added faculty and student voices to decision-making have taken away part of the challenge of administering.

"You can't go out on a limb anymore," he explains with a chuckle.

"You move much more slowly today. I personally feel it substantially reduces the personal challenge and personal excitement."

Seldom, he says, does a president have the "satisfaction of taking action which moved the university forward" and knowing "YOU had done it, that it was your own personal accomplishment."

Being U of L's president is a job which has absorbed evenings and weekends, which has made vending machine lunches over his big wooden desk a habit.

"Hobbies? I have none," says Strickler. "My whole life is tied up in the university."

He and his wife Florence have seen one movie in the past five years—he can't remember the title. "This fellow and his wife went to New York City for a holiday. . . ."

But, says Strickler, he's never regretted taking the job. "As a younger man I was interested in widening my horizons, in having new experiences . . . and I felt that restricting myself to teaching limited me. Maybe you call this ambition. . . ."

New experiences are something Strickler's seen plenty of.

MEMORABLE CRISES

Name a crisis which rocked academia in recent years and, chances are, he's seen it.

There were wranglings with student groups, controversy over obscenities in the student newspaper, the takeover of his office in 1969 by black students.

(At the luncheon given the Black Student Union this year to honor black progress at U of L, Strickler, who was at U of L when it first admitted Negroes in 1950, confided, "I don't know if I could have been so patient.")

There have been financial headaches:

The one in 1970 when then-Gov. Louie B. Nunn cut U of L's biennial budget request of $34.5 million to $8.2 million, which Strickler calls "one of the darkest moments." (The legislature later raised U of L's share to $13.2 million.)

The past two years of financial tight-rope-walking during which the university consumed its unrestricted endowment fund for operating expenses.

The crisis that began this spring when city and county governments sliced aid to U of L in half for next year—from $1.8 million to just under $900,000.

(The Louisville Board of Aldermen voted this week to appropriate an additional $100,000 to the school now, and another $300,000 later if the city receives additional money from revenue-sharing or other sources. U of L officials are still hoping, however, for additional funds from the county.)

And there have been the critical challenges of the university's new role as a public institution—the need for politicking, for lobbying for a statutory role the school could feel comfortable with.

NO PLACE FOR HESITANCY

"This job," says Strickler, "is no place for a man who has hesitancy in presenting the viewpoints of his institution, of his constituency in the academic world."

Financial crises are tougher than any student problems as Strickler sees it, because an administrator has less control of their outcome.

"I've always felt you could meet with students, talk with students, reason with students," he says. "Maybe you did it in a difficult environment, but it was something you could do something about directly with them."

Being with students and with faculty members is something Strickler says he misses. For today's college administrator, he says, there just isn't enough time.

If he has any advice for his successor, it is this:

"Remember that the most important aspects of the university today continue to be the student body and faculty . . . They really deserve first attention in your thinking. If you don't have their support, you really have little in the way of a good, effective, efficient educational institution."

A second bit of advice he adds as an afterthought: "Don't react too quickly. I've torn up a lot of letters . . . I've learned to count to 10 and by then I often change my mind."

He remains a diplomatic man, even with liberation from U of L's presidency just a matter of days away, carefully prefacing the scattering of critical remarks which crop up in conversation with "off the record."

"PHASING OUT GRADUALLY"

These days, he says, he is 'phasing out gradually" in preparation for next Thursday. More and more, presidential responsibilities are being shifted to Dr. William F. Ekstrom, U of L vice-president for academic affairs who will become acting president Sept. 1.

As for Strickler . . . While a 16-person search committee is looking for his successor, a process expected to take as long as a year, he plans to travel a little and probably then will return to U of L to teach economics or business.

"I'll have to do a job of re-tooling," he says. "But I like to think I was a pretty good teacher."

He just bought a new car, wine-colored. He's had black cars for the past 20 years, he says, and jokes about "changing my way of life."

"You know, it would be interesting . . ." Strickler recently mused. "I've often wondered what it would be like to be the principal administrative officer at a small college which gave maybe one (type of) degree, with a relatively small student body located in a small community."

"I'd be bored," he said with a laugh. "I never would have remained in academic life."

TRIBUTE TO HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with his many colleagues and friends in extending a farewell to Congressman JAMES BYRNE.

The people of his district have benefitted from his service to them. More importantly, JIM BYRNE, through his untiring efforts on the Armed Services Committee in behalf of a strong America, has served the Nation.

It has been a privilege for me to serve on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee with this distinguished Pennsylvania statesman.

I join in wishing him and his wife, Virginia, every possible happiness and success in the years ahead.

SENATOR CLINTON ANDERSON

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to New Mexico's CLINTON ANDERSON. He is retiring at the end of the 92d Congress after a distinguished career of nearly four decades in public life. CLINTON ANDERSON came to the Senate after holding office in New Mexico and in the House of Representatives for 6 years and after having served as Secretary of Agriculture under President Truman. In the Senate, CLINTON ANDERSON served on the Agriculture Committee, the Finance Committee, the Interior Committee, the Committee on Aeronautical Sciences, and Space, on four joint committees namely, Atomic Energy, Internal Revenue, Navaho-Hopi Indian Administration, and Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

During these years, he worked with great success and distinction. As a member and chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee, CLINTON ANDERSON became the top congressional expert on peaceful uses of atomic energy. He took the leadership in the fight for the development of nuclear submarine and in indemnity legislation. CLINTON ANDERSON also is noted for his outstanding achievements in the field of conservation. As a member of the Interior Committee and chairman during the early 1960's he played a leading role in the passage of the Wilderness Act of 1964, the creation of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the development of the national system of saline water conversion, the Navaho Irrigation project, and many soil and water conservation programs.

Mr. President, those of us in the Senate, the citizens of New Mexico, and the people of this Nation will miss his leadership. I wish CLINTON ANDERSON and his family all happiness in his retirement years.

SENATOR ELAINE S. EDWARDS

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, it has been my pleasure and good fortune to have been associated during the past few months with the gracious junior Senator from Louisiana, Mrs. ELAINE S. EDWARDS.

It is unfortunate that Mrs. EDWARDS will not be in the Senate for a longer period of time. It is obvious, even during

her short tenure, that she has the ability and capacity to become one of the more influential Members of this body.

We shall all miss her, and I wish her well as she returns to her duties as the first lady of the great State of Louisiana.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM P. CURLIN, JR.

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, BILL CURLIN has chosen to return to his home in Kentucky to devote his time to his family.

In our short time here together, I have come to know and respect BILL CURLIN. We have had an opportunity to work together as members of the Banking and Currency Committee and I always found BILL to possess a great concern and dedication to duty.

As a freshman member, BILL CURLIN has been a great credit to his State and district. I know that had he chosen to remain, his career as a Member of Congress would have been long and very distinguished.

I hope the future years hold much happiness and success as he returns to his beloved Kentucky.

GEORGE WASHINGTON HOUSE

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, in Bladensburg, Md., there is a unique historic landmark—the "George Washington House." The building at one time housed the Indian Queen Tavern, where George Washington stopped frequently during his trips to Annapolis, Baltimore, and Philadelphia. Unfortunately, the site has fallen into a bad state of disrepair, but the Prince Georges County Jaycees recently purchased the property with an eye to restoring the structure in a replica of the original Indian Queen Tavern.

Recently I addressed the Prince Georges Jaycees at a dinner given to raise funds for the project. At that time I commended the organization for their donation of time and money to prevent the destruction of the historic structure and to provide citizens with an opportunity to learn about the rich history of Prince Georges County.

The Washington Post published an article describing the history of the George Washington House as well as the Jaycees' plans for restoration. Mr. Speaker, I now insert that article into the RECORD:

GEORGE WASHINGTON DRANK HERE

(By Tom Candela)

If it wasn't for the sign on its south wall, the old house at Baltimore Avenue and Upshur Street near the Peace Cross in Bladensburg could be mistaken for just another run-down, uncared-for house in an industrial neighborhood. In faded white letters it proclaims: "Gen. Washington House 1732."

The brick and frame exterior is nearly devoid of paint; virtually every window is broken out; the front porch and railing are beyond repair, and the yard is overgrown with weeds and knee-high grass.

Its neighbors are a country-and-western nightclub, a trash collection company, the Digi-Data Corp., and mountains of galvanized fencing at the National Fence Manufacturing Co. across Baltimore Avenue.

But the Washington House—in fact, the Indian Queen Tavern—is a 240-year-old survivor of early United States history.

George Washington's diary carries more than one reference to stopovers at the Indian Queen, which in those days was about the only rest stop between Baltimore or Annapolis and Washington.

Highlights of the long and proud history of the Indian Queen area include:

The site of the Bladensburg dueling grounds, where 150 duels were fought in the mid-19th century.

The site of the battle in 1814 when British troops engaged federal soldiers blocking the road to Washington. The British pushed through the Americans and marched on to burn down the White House.

The night-life center of the once-thriving port of Bladensburg in the 18th and 19th centuries.

Despite these rich links to the past, the Indian Queen has never gained respect as a landmark.

The Prince George's County Junior Chamber of Commerce, however, has set out to change all that.

Early last March the civic group submitted a $1,000 down payment for the house and its grounds. On March 22, however, a fire broke out in the rear of the house. Firemen were forced to break the windows to release the intense heat and smoke.

"The fire inside did more harm to the historical nature of the house than physical damage," said Jaycees President James Hutcheson. Hutcheson said the windows destroyed by the firemen were "over 200 years old," and some of the front windows were thought to be original. Also destroyed was some original woodwork.

But the Jaycees went ahead, and on June 31, they bought the Indian Queen for $42,500.

The owner of the house, Florence Morgan of Bladensburg, lived in the Indian Queen until 1970, and maintained the tavern service until 1962. Her family had owned it since 1898.

She had held out for a non-commercial buyer, renting the house and grounds as a storehouse and parking facility to Digi-Data. She finally sold to the Jaycees at below market value, Mrs. Morgan said, in the hope of seeing it restored and opened to the public.

Hutcheson claims his group already has invested 1,000 man-hours in work preparatory to restoration. He estimated that the restoration will cost "at least $100,000."

John Giannetti, immediate past president of the Jaycees, and Indian Queen project chairman, says the Jaycees have extended an open invitation to all area civic organizations to join in the project. He said some women's clubs, Lions' clubs and Boy Scout groups have shown interest. The Prince George's County Historical Society has endorsed the project.

THE HONORABLE FRED HARRIS

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, when the 93d Congress convenes in January, it will do so without the presence of the senior Senator from Oklahoma—the Honorable FRED HARRIS. I will be sorry for that. During his 8 years in the Senate, FRED HARRIS earned a reputation as a man of independent judgment, a champion of human rights, as a man who never walked away from a fight when he knew he was right.

Capitol Hill will also miss the presence of the Senator's wife—Ladonna Harris. With vigor and enthusiasm, with special gifts of leadership, FRED and Donna advanced the rights of minorities and the welfare of all Americans. We will miss their courage, honesty, and devotion to the principles of the people's cause.

It is with a deep sense of personal regret that I bid FRED HARRIS farewell. Let him know that his compassion and his enthusiasm will serve as a lasting inspiration to us all.

ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY IN THE 92D CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I ask unanimous consent to present for the information of my colleagues the annual report on the activities and accomplishments of the joint committee. This report covers the activities of this second session of the 92d Congress.

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

ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY IN THE 92D CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION, 1972

FOREWORD

It has been the practice of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, at the close of each session of the Congress, to submit for the information of the Congress, the executive branch, and the public a report of its activities. (The report for the first session of the 92d Congress was printed in the Congressional Record of December 11, 1971, S–21442.)

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was organized on August 2, 1946. It consists of nine Members from the Senate and nine Members from the House of Representatives. No more than five from each body can be members of the same political party. The chairmanship alternates between the Senate and the House of Representatives with each Congress.

Present Membership is:

John O. Pastore, Rhode Island, Chairman.
Melvin Price, Illinois, Vice Chairman.
Clinton P. Anderson, New Mexico.
Henry M. Jackson, Washington.
Stuart Symington, Missouri.
Alan Bible, Nevada.
George D. Aiken, Vermont.
Wallace F. Bennett, Utah.
Peter H. Dominick, Colorado.
Howard H. Baker, Jr., Tennessee.
Chet Holifield, California.
Wayne N. Aspinall, Colorado.
John Young, Texas.
Ed Edmondson, Oklahoma.
Craig Hosmer, California.
John B. Anderson, Illinois.

William M. McCulloch, Ohio.
Orval Hansen, Idaho.

The Joint Committee is one of the few committees established by statute rather than by rule of each House and is unique in several respects. For example, it is the only Joint Committee of the Congress with legislative functions, including the receipt and reporting of legislative proposals. The committee is also charged by law with legislative responsibility as "watchdog" of the U.S. atomic energy program. As part of its responsibilities, the committee follows closely the classified activities of the executive agencies, including the Atomic Energy Commission and the Departments of Defense and State, concerning the peaceful and military applications of atomic energy. The unclassified activities are closely reviewed as well.

In all of these activities, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, representing the Congress and the public, seeks to assure the implementation of the following national policy expressed in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954:

"The development, use, and control of atomic energy shall be directed so as to make the maximum contribution to the general welfare, subject at all times to the paramount objective of making the maximum contribution to the common defense and security. * * *"

During the 92d Congress, second session, the full Joint Committee met on a total of 35 occasions, 14 of which were public and 21 of which were executive meetings. In addition, there were 2 subcommittee meetings held in public session.

A total of 16 publications consisting of hearings, reports, and committee prints were published by the Joint Committee in the second session of the 92d Congress. These publications include testimony taken in executive session with classified material deleted before printing.

A list of the publications follows: 1972 (92d Cong., 2d Sess.):

AEC Authorizing Legislation, Fiscal Year 1973:

Part 1: Hearings Jan. 26, Feb. 3, and 17.
Part 2: Hearings Feb. 22 and 23.
Part 3: Hearings Feb. 29 and Mar. 1.
Part 4: Hearings Mar. 7, 8, and 9.
Part 5: Volume 1, Environmental Statements 1 through 8; Volume 2, Environmental Statements 9 through 15.

Report: Authorizing Appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for Fiscal Year 1973, S. Rept. 92-802, May 23, 1972. (H. Rept. 92-1066, May 16, 1972.)

Use of Uranium Mill Tailings for Construction Purposes, Hearings October 28 and 29, 1971.

The Controlled Thermonuclear Research Program in the United States, Hearings November 10 and 11, 1971.

Current Membership of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Committee Print, March 1972.

H.R. 13731 and H.R. 13732, To Amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Regarding the Licensing of Nuclear Facilities:

Part 1, Hearings Mar. 16 and 17.
Part 2, Supplemental Materials.

Report: Amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 * * * To Issue Temporary Operating Licenses for Nuclear Power Reactors, S. Rept. 92-787, May 9, 1972. (H. Rept. 92-1027, Apr. 27, 1972.)

Nuclear Power and Related Energy Problems, Committee Print, January.

Selected Materials on the Calvert Cliffs Decision, Its Origin and Aftermath, Committee Print, February.

Atomic Energy Legislation Through the 92d Congress, 1st Session, Committee Print, January.

Nuclear Propulsion for Naval Warships, Hearing (and subsequent inquiry), May 5, 1971-Sept. 30, 1972.

The following publications are scheduled to be printed in the near future:

Naval Nuclear Propulsion Programs 1972—Hearing February 8, 1972.

Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor Demonstration Plant, Hearings Sept. 7, 8, and 12, 1972.

I. LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

A. Atomic Energy Commission Fiscal Year 1973 Authorization Act (Public Law 92-314):

The Atomic Energy Commission's authorization request for fiscal year 1973, as initially submitted to the Congress on January 24, 1972, and amended on March 3, 1972, called for authorization of $2,068,430,000 for "Operating expenses" and $656,420,000 for "Plant and capital equipment" (including increases in prior-year authorizations) making a total requested authorization of $2,724,850,000. This request represents an increase of $399,663,000, or about 17 percent, above the $2,325,187,000 authorized for fiscal year 1972.

The Joint Committee's recommended authorization for fiscal year 1973 was $2,602,975,000 which is $121,875,000—about 4.5 percent—less than the amount requested, but which is $277,788,000—about 11.9 percent—more than the amount authorized for fiscal year 1972.

The AEC Fiscal Year 1973 Authorization became Public Law 92-314 on June 16, 1972.

The highlights of this authorization legislation were:

1. Increased support for the gaseous diffusion plants by both higher power levels and acceleration of the Cascade Improvement Program.
2. Increased funding for the nuclear reactor safety research program.
3. Support for new laser fusion facilities.
4. Delay of bedrock waste storage facility.
5. Title II of the authorization bill authorized AEC to enter into a cooperative arrangement with the State of Colorado under which AEC would provide up to 75 percent of the financial assistance for a State program of remedial action to reduce exposure to radiation resulting from the use of mill tailings for construction.

On September 22, 1972, the Atomic Energy Commission furnished to the Committee, in accordance with Title II of the authorizing legislation, the terms and conditions of a proposed arrangement between the Commission and the State of Colorado with respect to a program of remedial action to limit radiation exposure from uranium mill tailings used as a construction-related material in the area of Grand Junction, Colorado. On October 16, 1972, the Committee, by majority vote, waived the remaining portion of the 30-day period during which such arrangement was to lie before the Committee.

B. Authority to issue temporary operating licenses for nuclear power reactors:

On March 8, 1972, the Atomic Energy Commission submitted to the Congress a legislative proposal which included, in addition to interim licensing authority, provisions which would clarify the AEC's existing authority to require a construction permit before the environment is substantially disturbed. Dr. Schlesinger testified that only the interim licensing authority was urgently needed. On March 8, 1972, Representative Hosmer introduced in the House a bill, H.R. 13732, which was concerned only with temporary operating license authority. On March 23, 1972, Mr. Holifield introduced a bill, H.R. 14065, which would amend the Atomic Energy Act to give the Commission the authority to issue temporary operating licenses under prescribed circumstances. Hearings on H.R. 13731 and 13732 were held by the Joint Committee on March 16 and 17, 1972.

The Joint Committee met in executive session on April 11, 20, 25, and 26, 1972, to consider those bills. At those sessions, the Committee approved, by unanimous consent, certain amendments to H.R. 14065.

The adopted amendments were incorporated in a clean bill introduced on April 26, 1972, by Mr. Holifield as H.R. 14655, and on April 27, 1972, by Senator Anderson (for himself and Senator Aiken) as S. 3543. The Committee met on April 27, 1972, in executive session and ordered the clean bill to be reported favorably without amendment.

S. 3543 and its companion bill, H.R. 14655, conferred new authority upon the Atomic Energy Commission to issue temporary operating licenses for nuclear power reactors when power from those reactors is needed to meet or avert an identified power shortage. (Public Law 92-307, June 2, 1972.)

C. LMFBR Cooperative Demonstration Plant:

On January 14, 1972, the Commission announced that it had accepted as a basis for detailed negotiations, a joint proposal of the Commonwealth Edison Company of Chicago and the Tennessee Valley Authority for the construction and operation of the Nation's first demonstration Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor plant. The plant is intended to produce in the range of 300-500 MWE and is to be located on the Clinch River, adjacent to the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee. The AEC's final environmental statement on the demonstraton project was published in April 1972, prior to selection of the Clinch River site, and reflects comments received from interested agencies and concerned public organizations. An additional environmental statement incorporating specific site information will be prepared upon completion of studies now underway.

A Breeder Reactor Corporation and a Project Management Corporation have been incorporated and staffed. The Breeder Reactor Corporation includes representation of the utility companies, both public and private, that have provided funds for the demonstration plant. The Project Management Corporation includes personnel assigned by Commonwealth Edison Company and Tennessee Valley Authority and will actually contract for construction and operate the demonstration plant.

Proposals for the design and construction of the first LMFBR demonstration plant have been prepared by the principal liquid metal reactor vendors and are currently under evaluation by the Project Management Corporation and the AEC. On August 11, 1972, the basis for the definitive cooperative arrangement for construction and operation of this demonstration plant was submitted to the Joint Committee in accordance with the fiscal year 1971 authorization act.

The Joint Committee held public hearings on the LMFBR Demonstration Plant on September 7, 8, and 12, 1972.

The Committee has urged all parties to the cooperative arrangement for the construction and operation of the first liquid metal fast breeder demonstration plant to pursue their respective roles with diligence in view of the tight schedule which has been established.

II. CIVILIAN AGREEMENTS FOR COOPERATION

Under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, proposed agreements for cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy between the United States and other nations, and amendments thereof, must be submitted to the Joint Committee and a period of 30 days must elapse while Congress is in session before such agreements become effective. In accordance with such procedures, 2 civil agreements and 2 agreements were submitted to the Committee by the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission with the approval of the President.

The two agreements were those with Brazil and the Republic of China; both being long-term power agreements which superseded the respective research level agreements in effect. Each agreement has a 30-year term and permits the export of U.S. nuclear power reac-

tors and the supply of enriched uranium fuel for specified reactors. The agreements contain provisions reflecting the transfer of safeguards responsibilities for materials and facilities received by Brazil and the Republic of China under the agreements to the International Atomic Energy Agency pursuant to trilateral agreements executed in 1968.

The two amendments were with Japan and the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM). The purpose of the Japanese amendment was to increase the quantity of U-235 which could be transferred under the 1968 agreement. The EURATOM amendment related to the 1960 Additional Agreement for Cooperation. This amendment concerned provisions governing the supply of special nuclear material but did not affect the authorized ceiling limitation on U-235.

The two agreements and the Japanese amendment have entered into force. The prescribed 30-day period was not completed for the EURATOM amendment prior to adjournment of the Congress.

III. INFORMATIONAL HEARINGS

A. Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program:

The Joint Committee held an executive hearing on the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program on February 8, 1972. At that time, Admiral Rickover outlined progress made and plans for future developments in this vitally important segment of our national defense. This hearing was sent to the Department of Defense for review in order that classified material could be deleted and the information provided by Admiral Rickover could be published as a Joint Committee hearing print. This has been done and it is expected that the hearing print entitled "Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program 1972" will be published in the near future.

IV. CLASSIFIED ACTIVITIES

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held a number of executive sessions on sensitive and classified information. These included briefings by the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, briefings by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and Arms Control and Disarmament personnel on separate occasions concerning the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT), intensive review of certain matters relating to Naval nuclear propulsion, and a session relating to charges that the Director of the AEC's Division of Security had borrowed money from AEC employees without paying it back.

V. OTHER MATTERS

A. New particle accelerators:

The Meson Physics Facility at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico, achieved its design proton energy of 800-Mev. early in the morning of June 9, 1972, about a month ahead of the projected schedule which was established at the groundbreaking ceremonies in February 1968. On September 29, 1972, the facility was named the Clinton P. Anderson Meson Physics Facility in honor of the senior Senator from New Mexico who retired at the end of the 92d Congress.

B. National Accelerator Laboratory (NAL):

On March 1, 1972, the proton beam at the National Accelerator Laboratory (NAL) Batavia, Illinois, reached its design value of 200 Bev. The 200 Bev energy level is almost three times as high as that produced by the world's second largest machine—the 76 Bev Russian accelerator at Sorpukhov. On July 16, 1972, the NAL proton beam reached 300 Bev. 50 percent higher than design energy. Efforts are underway to achieve full beam intensity and to push the proton energy to 400 Bev.

C. Nuclear electric power in space:

There are now four Apollo Lunar Surface Experiment Packages operating successfully on the moon. The first package was emplaced by the crew of Apollo 12 in November 1969; the second, by the Apollo 14 crew in January 1971; the third, by the Apollo 15 crew in July 1971; and the fourth, by the Apollo 16 crew on April 16, 1972. The next Apollo launch is scheduled for December 1972.

The Pioneer-10 rocket for a Jupiter flyby was launched at 8:49 p.m. on March 2, 1972. The mission to Jupiter will take about 21 months. The gravitational forces of Jupiter will cause the PIONEER satellite to swing behind the giant planet and leave the universe. A plaque has been installed on the satellite which, by hieroglyphics, could convey to intelligent beings in another galaxy that this satellite was launched from earth in 1972.

The only power source considered suitable for Pioneer-10 was Pu-238 fueled generators, since Jupiter's distance from the sun would make solar cells useless, and the long flight precluded the use of chemical power sources. Total System power of the four generators is still greater than 150 watts, well above the minimum energy of about 135 watts necessary to transmit data back to earth.

Because of the −270°F temperature in the vicinity of Jupiter, 12 tiny radioisotope fueled one-watt heaters are also used in the satellite to keep the magnetometer, sun sensor and the propellant thrusters (which are used for course guidance) from freezing.

Day 300 (26 October 1972), 5,694 hours after launch, the spaceship was approaching the limits of the Asteroid Belt and was about 308 million miles from earth. Pioneer is racing toward Jupiter at about 21,000 m.p.h. or 500,000 miles per day.

On September 2, 1972, the Navy's newest navigational satellite—Transit—was launched from Vandenberg AFB, California. The power for the satellite is being provided by a nuclear fueled generator which is operating at design value of about 35 watts. The nuclear generator was provided by the Atomic Energy Commission. The system has been designed to operate for five years and to stay in orbit for about 100 years. This generator is similar to those powering experiments on the moon and is also comparable to the four generators aboard the Pioneer satellite which is approaching Jupiter.

D. Confirmation hearings:

The Senate section of the Joint Committee held hearings on August 1, 1972 on the nomination of Dr. Dixy Lee Ray to be an AEC Commissioner for a five-year term. The Senate approved the nomination on August 2, 1972.

On August 14, 1972 the Senate section also approved the nomination of AEC Chairman James Schlesinger to be U.S. representative to the 16th Session of the General Conference of the IAEA along with six alternate repersentatives. The Senate approved these nominations on August 15, 1972.

TRIBUTE TO W. R. HULL, JR.

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, W. R. "BILL" HULL of Missouri has served his district, State, and Nation well. In BILL HULL's 18-year tenure in the Congress, he has achieved a fine record of outstanding service.

His capable representation has earned him the great respect of his colleagues and the people of Missouri.

I have known BILL HULL as a dedicated and stalwart legislator. His service as a member of the Appropriations Committee has been of significant importance to the Congress and the Nation.

I wish him the best in the future.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR EVERETT JORDAN

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I would like to join my colleagues in paying special tribute to Senator EVERETT JORDAN, who leaves the Senate after dedicated and distinguished service on behalf of his State and Nation as well as on behalf of the Senate as chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

In the 4 years I have served in the Senate, I have been most appreciative of the sympathetic and helpful ear EVERETT has turned to the special problems and needs those of us from large States have in trying to represent effectively our constituents. The modernization process which the Senate is now undertaking certainly could not have progressed without his understanding and cooperation.

I also bid farewell to a good personal friend who sat next to me in my first 2 years in the Senate. In those first days of my term, EVERETT's counsel and guidance was invaluable and I shall sorely miss him.

ROBERT W. FRASE

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the announcement that Robert W. Frase has resigned as vice president and Washington director of the Association of American Publishers came as a surprise to me, as it did I am sure to all those Members of Congress with whom Bob has worked over the past 22 years.

Books have been Bob's life throughout this period, and certainly all those who love the printed word and believe that a wider dissemination of books must continue to be a primary factor in our development as a nation will be eternally in his debt for what he has accomplished in this field.

Bob has always looked at the book publishing and distributing business from the viewpoint of the economist, but this never dismayed his friends, who realized that beneath his brisk attitude was a man who was deeply interested in his work and in the world of books. And in this area he was immensely effective. A mere listing of the programs in which he played a vital role over the years gives some idea of the extent of his influence. These include copyright, postal rates on books, censorship, international trade as embodied in the Florence Agreement, library services, and various educational

programs which are tied in with textbooks and instructional materials.

In some of the more technical aspects of book publishing, Bob has been instrumental in the establishment of an international system of identifying books by number, in having catalog numbers put in publications, and in the rationalization of U.S. Government book publishing statistics under UNESCO. This has made for a more universal exchange of books and data.

Books are the basic means of communication between peoples and nations, and Bob has contributed greatly to the building of cultural bridges which have helped in the breaking down of barriers. He was a delegate to four book publishing conferences behind the Iron Curtain in the years from 1962 to 1970.

Prior to his identification with book publishing, Mr. Frase held several important positions in the Government. During World War II he played a prominent role in the efforts to get Japanese-Americans out of concentration camps, to alleviate one of the worst consequences of war hysteria.

Bob's contacts with Members of Congress were developed over many years, and were based upon mutual respect. These were of great help to him in the many battles in which he became involved, and at the same time many Members have reason to thank Mr. Frase for his wise and knowing counsel.

Bob realized, as many fail to do, that books and other educational materials do not get into schools and libraries by some magic wave of the wand. They are a business like many others, and those who make up the principal markets for books need more financial assistance than do most businesses. Books are an essential part of our life as a nation, and it is hard to imagine being without them, or having them reduced to the status of a luxury for the few. But books cost money, more each year. And a substantial part of this money in the future must come from public sources.

Book publishers and their various distributing affiliates are to be congratulated for the understanding they have displayed in retaining intelligent and effective representation in Washington over the years. I have no doubt that Robert Frase will continue to be a part of the publishing and the congressional scene for many years, and I wish him the best of success and happiness in whatever he does.

JUDGE HOMER FERGUSON

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, recently, our former colleague in the U.S. Senate, the Honorable Homer Ferguson, retired as a judge of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals, sitting in Washington, D.C.

Judge Homer Ferguson's career has been a most interesting one as he has served his country in its three branches; As a Member of the U.S. Senate from Michigan, as an Ambassador of the United States to the Republic of the Philippines; and, since April 9, 1956, as an associate judge of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals.

Before Judge Ferguson came to the U.S. Senate, he had been a teacher of law in the Detroit College of Law and a circuit judge of the Michigan third circuit—Detroit and Wayne County. As presiding judge he became nationally famous for his exposure of corruption.

In the U.S. Senate he served with great distinction for 12 years and all those who served with him—and it was my good fortune to serve with him—remember him for his hard work, his deep convictions, and integrity. Always enjoying life and his work, he has been sustained by the help of a noble woman, his wife Myrtle. It has been my good fortune and that of my wife, Lorraine, to count them as close and dear friends.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a short statement which I have prepared on Judge Homer Ferguson, and also an article which appeared in the Detroit Free Press on Tuesday, May 18, 1971, entitled, "Homer Ferguson, Famed Grand Juror, Is Retiring."

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

JUDGE HOMER FERGUSON

Judge Homer Ferguson was born in Harrison City, Pennsylvanuia, and educated in the local public schools and in Irwin, Pennsylvania High School. He attended the University of Pittsburgh in 1910 and 1911 and graduated from the University of Michigan Law School in 1913 with the degree of Bachelor of Laws. He served as a school principal in Larmer and Export, Pennsylvania, and was admitted to the bar in the State of Michigan in 1913. Thereafter, he practiced law in Detroit and taught Criminal Law, Ethics, and Evidence for a number of years at the Detroit College of Law. Engaging in general practice and civil trial work, he was appointed in 1929 as Circuit Judge of the Third Michigan Circuit for Detroit and Wayne County, Michigan.

While serving as presiding Judge in September 1939, he was petitioned by a citizens group to appoint a one-man Grand Jury under Michigan law to investigate allegations of civic corruption and bribery in Detroit and Wayne County. Serving as that Grand Jury himself, at the request of the other seventeen Judges on the Circuit, he opened a far-reaching investigation with a personal staff of investigators and young lawyers, many of whom served for a fee of $1.00 per year. The investigation continued from September 1939 to July 1942 and resulted in the indictment and conviction of many prominent public officials for bribery and corruption. The civic clean-up which resulted from this investigation and ensuing trials caused some forty-five thousand Michigan citizens to petition Judge Ferguson to offer himself as a candidate for the United States Senate. Taking a leave of absence from his judicial position, he ran for the Senate and was elected in November 1942. Thereafter he served with distinction for two terms, ending in January 1955. During his tenure in the Senate, he was particularly known for his service on the Truman Committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, Appropriations Committee, and the Joint Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee. He also served as Chairman of the Republican Policy Committee. His courtesy, probity, and high character are well remembered by those of us who served with him.

After leaving the Senate, Judge Ferguson served on the Second Hoover Commission and as Special Counsel to the Department of Defense.

Several months later, President Eisenhower appointed him United States Ambassador to the Republic of the Philippines, in which position he served with distinction until April 9, 1956, on whch date he was named Associate Judge, United States Court of Military Appeals, to complete the unexpired term of the late Judge Paul Brosman, as well as to a full fifteen-year term, dated from May 1, 1956.

At the time Judge Ferguson came to the Court of Military Appeals, it was still an innovation in military justice—one of a highly experimental nature. Experience in World War II led Congress to believe it was necessary, as a part of American tradition of civilian control of the military, to superimpose on the military court-martial system an impartial civilian judiciary, designed to insure fair treatment to all military accused and to eliminate the frequent abuses of the past.

From the commencement of his term, Judge Ferguson introduced to the hitherto arbitrary concepts of military law, the enduring philosophy of our civilian justice under law. Without damage to military discipline or interference in military operations, his long years of judicial experience and spirit of legislative compromise brought the Court to its full flower as the supreme judicial body in military law. More than any other single individual, he has been responsible for converting a simple, arbitrary disciplinary system into a fully manned system of courts, comparable in every respect to our civilian Federal judiciary and capable of handing out the same even quality of justice under law to which every American citizen, uniformed or not, is entitled.

Principal among the concepts to which his judicial philosophy has led military justice are the creation of a real hearing at the court-martial level; the recognition of intermediate appellate Boards of Review as intermediate Courts of Military Review; the establishment of the fact that he who puts on the uniform does not thereby put aside the citizen and lose the precious rights guaranteed him by the United States Constitution; and, lastly but not leastly, recognition of the United States Court of Military Appeals by other Federal courts, including the Supreme Court, as an outstanding Federal judicial body.

As late as 1949, members of our armed services were frequently tried for capital crimes without benefit of counsel, before a group of laymen unguided by even a legally trained court member. Even after the enactment of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, it was by no means rare for an accused to lie in a prison without charges against him and unable to have counsel appointed to represent him until they were preferred. Little attention was given to speedy trials, the importance of criminal procedural safeguards, the right to counsel, instructions to the court on the issues presented, or many other matters which are accepted by the civilian bench and bar as commonplace. Indeed, many trials were conducted by use of depositions on written interrogatories—the accused never facing the witnesses against him and cross-examination by mail being almost entirely unsatisfactory, if not impossible.

Judge Ferguson's steadfast efforts have done much to eliminate these abuses. Trials are conducted much more rapidly; counsel are made available in accordance with constitutional dictates; procedural safeguards have been enforced; and, with the help of the late Judge Paul Kilday, Judge Ferguson's pungent opinions have gone far in making what used to be the law officer of a general court-martial into a true military judge, respected by the court members and able to

guide them by proper instructions to a fair verdict for the accused and the Government. Some have referred to him as the "GI's Judge" and if that means he is dedicated to seeing the citizen-soldier receives a full measure of fair, lawful treatment, it is indeed true. But his real, enduring monument is our present truly judicial military justice system—on occasion maladministered, but a model for the punishment of crime in any armed force in the world. Our defense establishment should applaud this great American for the public confidence which he has almost single-handedly restored to the administration of military justice in our services.

Judge Ferguson's term as Associate Judge expired on May 1, 1971. Under existing law, he has continued to serve as Senior Judge and contribute his scholarly approach to the manifold problems of criminal law presented in this Court. With the recent appointment and confirmation of Associate Judge Robert M. Duncan, Judge Ferguson's service is drawing to a close.

For nearly fifty years he has served his nation as Judge, legislator, Ambassador, and Judge again. He has been awarded honorary degrees by the University of Michigan, Detroit College of Law, Kalamazoo College, and Muhlenberg College. He has also been made an honorary member of the Interparliamentary Union. Such however is small recompense for one who has so unselfishly devoted his life to his Country and, above all, has done more than any single individual to provide our armed forces with a truly sound system of justice under the law. He deserves the recognition and thanks of his Country for a job well done.

[From the Detroit Free Press, May 18, 1971]

HOMER FERGUSON, FAMED GRAND JUROR, IS RETIRING

(By Lee Winfrey)

WASHINGTON.—Homer Ferguson, who broke open the biggest graft scandal in the history of Detroit, is retiring after a 42-year career in law and government.

Three decades ago, Ferguson directed a grand jury that convicted the mayor, the sheriff, the county prosecutor, the police superintendent and 152 lesser lights, including many policemen.

His crime-busting catapulted Ferguson into the U.S. Senate, where he served two terms. Later he served two years as U.S. ambassador to the Philippines.

Since 1956, Ferguson has been one of three judges on the U.S. Court of Military Appeals. The panel, which sits in Washington, is the supreme court of the military.

Ferguson, now 82, completed a 15-year term on the court May 1.

He will continue to serve until President Nixon appoints a successor and then, as senior judge, will sit on occasions when one of the regular members is ill or has to be absent.

Asked during an interview here about his retirement plans, Ferguson said: "I may write a book on my grand jury in Detroit."

Ferguson declined direct comment in Detroit's latest police-gambling scandal, the arrest of 18 officers May 6 for alleged complicity in a bookmaking network. He said he was not familiar with details of the case.

But he said that this and other cases which have cropped up since his grand jury have not led him to the conclusion that Detroit is ceaselessly corrupt. Just the opposite.

"I don't think there is more corruption in Detroit than other places," he said. "Detroit is alive to trying to keep it down. A lot of places, they just don't care. They get to the point they never think of it."

The grand jury that made Ferguson famous began with a suicide.

On Aug. 5, 1939, a divorcee named Janet McDonald killed herself and her 11-year-old daughter because of having been jilted by her underworld lover, a petty gambler named William McBride.

Mrs. McDonald ran an adding machine at the Great Lakes Mutuel Co., a numbers house managed by McBride. She left suicide notes accusing McBride of paying off Lt. John P. McCarthy, head of the Rackets Squad of the Detroit Police Department.

At first, it seemed like everyone who held an office or wore a uniform tried to hush it up.

Mayor Richard W. Reading told Police Superintendent Fred W. Frahm to investigate. Frahm appointed Chief Inspector Fred R. Clark, who exonerated McCarthy in only two days.

County Prosecutor Duncan C. McCrea, out of town when Mrs. McDonald killed herself, hurried home by plane to stop an investigation by one of the honest members of his staff.

McCrea, who liked to call himself "The Fighting Prosecutor," said he couldn't investigate because he would have to use policemen as the sleuths and that would wind up as a whitewash.

Mayor Reading saw a plot afoot. "The critics of the Police Department," he alleged, "are chiefly from the CIO and the Communist Party."

But the newspapers would not let the case die and neither would an aroused and angry public. They called for a one-man grand jury and Ferguson, a circuit judge for a decade, got the job.

Ferguson said chance chose him.

"I happened to be the presiding judge that month. The other judges said: 'You take it.'"

With Chester P. O'Hara as grand jury prosecutor, Ferguson took it through an inquiry that ran from mid-1939 until the end of 1942. Some of the highlights:

Police Inspector Raymond W. Boettcher said that every month for eight months he took $2,000 in protection money from numbers men, carried it to Room 2815 of the Book-Cadillac Hotel (now Sheraton-Cadillac) and gave it to Mayor Reading.

"I had a room there," the mayor admitted, "but only for the purpose of keeping a change of wardrobe for attending social functions and taking a shower bath."

Gus Pines, collection man for Wayne County Sheriff Thomas C. (Tom-Tom) Wilcox, testified he gave Wilcox $33,477 in graft money from such underworld luminaries as downriver gambler Eddie Way and a Hamtramck madam, Big Bertha Malone.

Ferguson charged that Wilcox collected protection money from 23 handbooks, 14 brothels and unnumbered slot machines. The sheriff, who bought an orange grove in Texas with part of the proceeds, also spent three years at Jackson Prison.

McCrea, "the Fighting Prosecutor," spent most of 1940 fighting the grand jury. He tried to raid the grand jury rooms, allegedly in search of a "torture chamber" where witnesses were supposedly abused, and tried to get O'Hara charged with extortion.

McCrea had taken too much money for it all to be hidden, however. Sam Block, his collection man, said McCrea's price was $100 to $300 monthly for a brothel, $100 to $200 for a numbers house, $50 to $200 for a handbook and $10 for each slot machine. It added up to $104,000 altogether, for which McCrea also did three years.

In their investigation, Ferguson and O'Hara did not have the benefit of the wiretapping which lies at the heart of the latest gambling bust made by the FBI this month.

"I had to use stool pigeons, men who had been in the rackets," Ferguson said. "That was the only way."

Ferguson said he paid informers who had been on the inside of the rackets, an arrangement approved by the county.

He said fictitious names were used to protect some who were paid, and some of the jury's informants have never been identified to this day.

Immunity granted to witnesses helped, too.

Ferguson, for example, granted immunity from prosecution to the three men who ran the National Sports Junior Baseball Pool in order to sack Prosecutor McCrea and Police Superintendent Frahm. Those two were protecting the pool, which was a massive $1-million-a-year operation that employed more than 2,000 people.

The greed of the police also helped. The gamblers were groaning as more and more officials went on the take. In one case, they had to continue paying a police inspector $250 a month even after he retired from the force.

When they got a chance to strike back through the grand jury, many did.

Many personalities from those colorful days are gone now. O'Hara, who succeeded Ferguson as a circuit judge when Ferguson went to the U.S. Senate, died in 1964.

Reading, the disgraced mayor, died in 1952, and McCrea, the non-prosecuting prosecutor, gave up his fight in 1951.

Ferguson, past the age of four score, still looks hearty and quite capable of doing a book about it all. Never a smoker or drinker, a hard worker all his life, he appears little changed now from the white-haired, bespectacled jurist who got hold of an investigation and never let it die until the last culprit was caught.

"My father had a homely expression," he said: "A blind hog will find an acorn if he'll just keep his nose down."

Homer Ferguson, far from blind, followed that adage and it made him famous.

TRIBUTE TO ELLIOTT G. HAGAN

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to say a few words about my colleague and friend, ELLIOTT HAGAN, who is retiring after 12 years of service in the Congress.

ELLIOTT HAGAN'S integrity and devotion to duty are reflected in his fine record of accomplishments.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee he has served as a strong voice in shaping a strong defense posture for our Nation. His contributions are many and will continue to benefit us all for years to come.

It has been my privilege to serve with him and to count him as a friend. I offer him and his family best wishes in his retirement from the Congress.

THE MILITARY IN AMERICAN SOCIETY

HON. HAROLD E. HUGHES

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, on September 13 and 14, 1972, I was pleased to join with several of my colleagues from both the Senate and the House of Representatives in sponsoring a congressional conference of academic military

and governmental experts on the military in American society.

This timely gathering focused on the questions of command and control problems in the Armed Forces, military influence on the U.S. economy and foreign policy and the broader aspects of civil-military relations.

Several distinguished retired officers participated in the conference, including Adm. Gene LaRocque, Col. Anthony Herbert, Col. Edward King, and Col. James Donovan. These men brought their direct personal knowledge to bear on the questions of command and control and the military career systems.

Other participants spoke from their experience in various governmental agencies and related it to the issues of military influence on foreign policy and even on domestic affairs. Among the noted participants were Robert Jordan III, Herbert Scoville, and Adam Yarmolinsky.

Academic experts such as Profs. Morris Janowitz, Bruce Russett, and Thomas Schelling added their special knowledge to the discussions.

This conference sought an airing of ideas rather than a set of conclusions and recommendations.

But the 2 days of discussion touched a wide range of subjects related to the role of the military in American society. Interest in the discussion was heightened by the fact that hearings on the Lavelle case were in progress at the time and growing support for end-the-war legislation was being registered in the Congress. The deliberations of this timely conference pointed up some of the most basic and provocative questions facing the American people—relating to the state of our Military Establishment itself; the military's expanded influence on our economy and our culture and our foreign policy; and where we are headed with the military in the future in terms of our national security, our well-being as a people and the preservation of our basic liberties.

I shall not attempt to summarize the points made in the unstructured discussions of this conference. The proceedings of the conference will be published, and I commend them to my colleagues as provocative reading, whatever one's particular viewpoint on the subjects covered may be.

THE 1972 QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a copy of my latest congressional newsletter, which I intend to send out to my constituents in November. One section of the newsletter contains the results of my 1972 questionnaire:

REES' 1972 QUESTIONNAIRE

CONGRESS FINALLY ADJOURNS

The 92d Congress finally adjourned three weeks before election day, and everyone breathed a sigh of relief. Nothing can be quite as confusing as watching Washington in action during the waning days of a presidential election, especially when Democrats control the Congress and Republicans control the presidency. The voter finds it difficult to know who is responsible for what.

Essentially, the Congress, as the legislative branch, is responsible for passing the laws and appropriating the funds to support the government; the executive branch (the President) enforces the laws and operates the government. But behind this rather simple explanation there are confusions—some real, some not. Election year does little to shed much light on the matter.

OUR FEDERAL BUDGET DEFICIT

For example, now that the elections are over, I might take a crack at trying to explain the federal budget deficit. In the past four years, spending has exceeded revenue by about $75.8 billion. This is the largest peacetime deficit ever amassed over any four-year period in our history. In the past three years, the administration has requested appropriations of $458 billion from Congress. Congress has appropriated $444 billion, $14 billion less than requested.

Looking at these figures, it is difficult for someone to figure out how the executive branch can call the legislative branch "reckless' in its spending. On the other hand, it is difficult for the legislative branch to accuse the executive branch of being a reckless spender, as Congress did appropriate the money the executive branch spent.

One of the main reasons we have had such massive budget deficits these past four years is that there has been a recession; when that occurs government tax revenue is down—an unemployed breadwinner doesn't pay much in taxes. With the economy apparently recovering, budget deficits should go down.

HOW DOES THE FEDERAL BUDGET DEFICIT AFFECT YOU?

The new $75.8 billion deficit added to past federal deficits must be financed; in order to do so, the government borrows from the nation's money market, the same way you might borrow from the bank to cover your home mortgage. The government competes with everyone else who is borrowing, whether it be you, your bank, insurance company, neighborhood supermarket, or department store.

This competition to borrow money forces interest rates up. If more money is created to cover the new demand, then the rate of inflation is accelerated and this, in turn, increases consumer costs. This might happen in the middle of 1973.

THE CONGRESSIONAL SESSION WAS PRODUCTIVE

The last session of Congress was responsible for landmark legislation which will have an effect on this country for many years to come.

Revenue sharing

This new and expensive ($30.2 billion over five years) program gives no-strings-attached grants of money to state and local governments which have run out of new tax sources. In the past, grants to state and local governments have been made to encourage or supplement new and existing federal programs at the local level; for example, poverty, welfare, and compensatory education programs.

I voted against the bill. Although I realize that local governments have a very limited tax base since much of their income is derived from property and sales taxes, the bill also included state governments as recipients of the new money; I opposed this, as the state can raise just about any type of tax that the federal government can.

Why should we in California, where we have a hefty state income and sales tax, pay money to the federal government which will then be given to other states, such as Texas, which have no income tax? The sacrifice should be shared more equally. I think the net result of revenue sharing in California will be that we'll send more money out of the state than we receive back, and much of it will be sent to states which do not have our high state tax burden.

I also believe there should be a closer relationship between tax collecting and tax spending. Instead of handing out money to local jurisdictions, we should be giving them new tax sources to use as they wish. Each local elective body can then balance its needs more effectively with its resources.

Water pollution

Congress passed a historic water pollution control bill which is designed to deal effectively with pollution of our nation's rivers, lakes, and oceans by 1985. While the price is high ($24 billion), I believe it is absolutely necessary to clean up and preserve this crucial element in our environment. Of this sum, $18 billion will be given to state and local governments for the construction of waste treatment plants.

Highways and mass transit

While no legislation was passed, it now appears as if 1973 will see a great deal of progress in creating a balanced transportation system in this country. For the first time, the highway lobby did not have the muscle to keep rapid transit from receiving money from the highway trust fund. The battle ended in a stalemate, but it looks as if more funds will be provided for transit in the future and that there will be less emphasis on the super-highway fixation which has dominated transportation policy.

As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I was able to work successfully to include more construction and operating funds for rapid transit in the housing bill. Unfortunately, the bill was sidetracked at the last moment, but I predict early passage next year.

Welfare reform

Half of this major legislation was lost in the last minute shuffle of the congressional session. The Welfare Reform Act's main purpose was to federalize welfare in the same way that Social Security and unemployment insurance now are; that is, place welfare under federal jurisdiction and base it on national standards. Much of the confusion in our present welfare system is caused by the fact that there are too many jurisdictions—states, counties, and many times, cities—each with their own criteria. A unified federal system would go a long way in cleaning up "the welfare mess."

Those of us favoring uniform federal standards did win half the battle, as there will now be federalization of programs, affecting those people who are 65 and over, blind, or permanently disabled. It is estimated that three million persons will be transferred from state welfare rolls to the new federal program. This will mean a savings in county and state budgets.

Other milestones

A listing of other accomplishments includes the Constitutional Amendment providing for the 18-year-old vote; the Constitutional Amendment calling for equal rights for women; tighter federal election campaign contribution laws; and the virtual elimination of selective service, and the first steps toward the development of an all volunteer army. A 32% increase in Social Security benefits passed in 1971 and 1972 should help to combat the problem of inflation faced by our senior citizens on a fixed income. For veterans of the Vietnam Conflict, Congress has just passed a new G.I. Bill with increased educational allowances. Fulltime single students will be receiving $220 a month; married students $261 a month. In the field of medical care, two new laws provide nearly $4 billion to train more family doctors and nurses.

Congressional Projects for 1973

It looks as if Congress will soon be moving more aggressively in the field of tax reform. Welfare reform should also remain a top priority—as mentioned above, much of the effort will be directed toward federalizing all welfare and thus taking the welfare burden off the shoulders of local government.

We still have not dealt with the crisis of educational costs. Early next year the Supreme Court will probably hand down a decision which calls for the rewriting of state and federal laws affecting the financing of education at the elementary and secondary level. The shift will be away from the use of the property tax and more toward broadly-based state and federal financing designed to equalize the currently unequal tax burden which plagues thousands of our nation's school districts. It is predicted that this can and will be done without adversely affecting the traditional local control of school districts.

Rees Projects

Thank you very much for re-electing me to Congress. I'm looking forward to the privilege of representing you in Washington for the next two years.

During the next Congress I will again be concentrating on congressional reform. While some progress has been made in the past two years, I still believe that Congress has been seriously lagging in its functions as the legislative branch of our government.

The seniority system in Congress, which uses time of service as the sole criterion for advancement, needs a complete overhauling. While I believe that age and experience are necessary ingredients of leadership, they should not be the only standards for advancement as is now the case in Congress. Too many younger members (in Congress, this means anyone under the age of 55), are leaving because the inflexible seniority system offers them no opportunity to use their talents to help solve the problems facing our country and the world. As a result, we are losing people of ability and talent we can little afford to lose.

One of the reform measures I'll be sponsoring calls for broadening the criteria for choosing committee chairmen so that characteristics such as competency, ability, energy, and an awareness of the issues will be considered in the choice.

Also, more congressional deliberations need to be opened up to the public. Too many meetings are held in secret with the result that the public has no opportunity to know what is being considered in vital fields such as federal budget expenditures, taxation, and military programs.

As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, which has jurisdiction over the Department of Housing and Urban Development, I will be continuing my efforts to develop more and better housing, rapid transit, and new towns. These matters are especially important to California where high land costs have fragmented our development. Too many times the increasing land costs have forced limited-income individuals and families to leave communities where they have lived for years. We also need more low and moderate-income housing for those working at jobs which do not allow them to own homes because of spiraling land and construction costs.

I will also be drafting legislation to establish a new concept of federal disaster insurance to cover those losses not ordinarily covered by standard insurance policies. This is especially important to Southern California where we are threatened by earthquake and flood losses not usually covered in regular policies.

New Disaster Loan Provisions Aid Los Angeles Earthquake Victims

For the past several months of the Congressional session, I worked on legislation which would liberalize disaster loans. While the final bill was designed mainly to aid those victims of Hurricane Agnes which occurred last June, it does have provisions to help those who had property losses in the 1971 Southern California earthquake. Those who now have disaster loans to repair earthquake damages can have their 5⅛% loans reduced to 3%. Another provision liberalizes the $2,500 forgiveness feature of the old law, so that the recipient does not have to pay off the first $500 as was previously required.

New Valley Congressional Field Office

With the change in the 26th Congressional District boundary lines by the Legislature, I have opened a second district office, this one in the San Fernando Valley. The address is 13535 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 205, and the phone number is 990-2370.

Mrs. Lauretta Newman, long a resident of the Valley and active in Valley civic affairs, has been appointed to manage the office.

I wish all of you a very happy and satisfying holiday season. May the new year bring us a world where mankind can live together peacefully.

THE 1972 CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

In early summer of this year I sent out to you the 1972 Questionnaire—the answers came back by the mailbag. With the help of our summer interns we were able to tabulate the results and also answer many of the specific inquiries which you had. Here are the results on a district-wide basis:

The economy

Wage and Price Controls

1. Do you believe that the current wage and price controls are adequate to do the job of controlling inflation?

Yes	13.0
No	84.0
Abstained	3.0

2. If your answer to the above is "No," do you think:

(a) There should be broader and stricter controls which also include items not currently covered by the Administration's plan, such as food prices and interest rates?

Yes	81.5
No	6.7
Abstained	11.8

(b) The Cost of Living Council should have tougher regulations for: (*choose one*)

1. Wages?	8.2
2. Prices?	29.3
3. Both equally?	50.6
4. Abstained	11.9

Minimum Wages

3. Do you favor an increase in the federal minimum wage to $2.00 an hour?

Yes	65.5
No	27.2
Abstained	7.3

Southeast Asia

4. Do you favor the Administration's policy of mining North Vietnamese harbors?

Yes	45.4
No	52.4
Abstained	2.2

5. In view of the North Vietnamese invasion of South Vietnam, should we increase the U.S. military presence with more air and ground forces?

Yes	27.3
No	68.3
Abstained	4.4

6. Should we use U.S. air and naval power to protect South Vietnam even if and when we evacuate our remaining ground personnel?

Yes	34.3
No	59.3
Abstained	6.4

7. Should we set a date—for example, September 1, 1972—by which time all American forces would be removed from South Vietnam?

Yes	55.9
No	35.3
Abstained	8.8

8. Should we continue to give military aid to South Vietnam even if and when we withdraw all U.S. ground, air, and naval forces?

Yes	45.0
No	48.8
Abstained	6.2

9. Do you feel we have any commitment to give peacetime economic aid to Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos after the cessation of hostilities so that those countries might rebuild themselves?

Yes	64.4
No	28.3
Abstained	7.3

Future Vietnams?

10. Should Congress limit the President's power to commit U.S. troops to an undeclared war?

Yes	71.8
No	22.6
Abstained	5.6

Amnesty

Senator Taft of Ohio has proposed that conditional amnesty should be granted to those young men who left the country or who went to prison because of their opposition to the Vietnam War and their refusal to be inducted into the armed services. Should these young men: (*choose one*)

11. (a) Be granted total amnesty; that is, be completely forgiven and allowed to return to this country without penalty?—25.7.

(b) Be pardoned or allowed to return only if they agreed to a form of alternative service in a peacetime government program; for example, the Peace Corps, VISTA, etc.?—41.1.

(c) Be granted no amnesty at all? If they return to this country, they should be arrested and tried for draft evasion.—29.6.

Abstained.—3.6.

Overseas military commitments

There has been much discussion in Congress about whether or not the U.S. should continue its present level of overseas military commitments. Examples of these commitments are our NATO forces in Europe, as well as our forces in Turkey, South Korea, Formosa, Spain, and the Philippines.

12. Should we cut back these commitments?

Yes	57.0
No	29.2
Abstained	13.8

Education

Busing

The most explosive current domestic issue concerns the busing of school children to achieve equality of education, racial integration, or both.

What are your thoughts on the following statements, each of which is reflected in a recent court decision or a proposal before Congress?

13. Until adequate education can be guaranteed for all children, busing should be used to achieve at least equality of existing educational resources.

Yes	43.2
No	42.5
Abstained	14.3

14. Regardless of the availability of quality education, busing should be used to achieve racial integration in schools.

Yes	17.6
No	68.7
Abstained	13.7

15. If your answer to No. 14 is "Yes," busing should be used to achieve integration: (*choose one*)

(a) Even after the school district has made a sincere effort to integrate; for example, open enrollment, changing of school district attendance lines.—41.6.

(b) Only if no local effort is made to break racial segregation patterns.—49.2.

Abstained.—9.2.

16. The neighborhood school should be preserved, and no student should be forced to be bused out of his or her neighborhood regardless of inequality of opportunity and/or existing patterns of neighborhood segregation.

Yes	59.8
No	28.6
Abstained	11.6

School financing

17. Do you believe that our local school systems are being adequately financed?

Yes	24.0
No	69.4
Abstained	6.6

18. If your answer to the above is "No," would you favor:

(a) A federal program guaranteeing a uniform dollar payment to all school districts in the country for each child in attendance?

Yes	69.5
No	17.1
Abstained	13.4

(b) Equalizing local property tax burdens so that the amount of property tax spent for a child's education is standard throughout the state?

Yes	57.2
No	15.5
Abstained	24.3

(c) Greater state aid on a set formula basis; for example, a guarantee state payment of 50% of the local school district's cost?

Yes	63.3
No	12.4
Abstained	27.3

Other issues

Do you favor:

19. The proposed space shuttle?

Yes	46.2
No	41.0
Abstained	12.8

20. A federally financed system of health insurance?

Yes	74.5
No	18.7
Abstained	6.8

21. Increased Social Security benefits?

Yes	76.6
No	15.1
Abstained	8.3

22. A national system of no-fault automobile insurance?

Yes	76.3
No	15.8
Abstained	7.9

23. A national system of child care centers?

Yes	59.8
No	34.9
Abstained	5.3

National priorities

24. Listed below are general areas of federal expenditure. Would you favor an increase (I), decrease (D), or a continuation of the some (S) budgetary appropriations for the following?

(a) National defense, (D).
(b) Social Security, (I).
(c) Veterans affairs, (S).
(d) Space exploration, (D).
(e) Highway construction, (S).
(f) Elementary and secondary education, (I).
(g) Higher education, (I).
(h) Low- and moderate-income housing, (I).
(i) Welfare, (D).
(j) Foreign economic aid, (D).
(k) Foreign military aid, (D).
(l) Rapid transit, (I).
(m) Health facilities and research, (I).
(n) Crime control, (I).
(o) Air and water pollution, (I).
(p) Parks and recreation, (I).
(q) Conservation of natural resources, (I).
(r) Drug abuse control, (I).
(s) Consumer protection, (I).

DAVID GAMBRELL

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, since February 1971, when DAVID GAMBRELL was appointed to fill out the term of the late Senator Richard B. Russell, I have had the benefit of a first-rate man's wisdom and friendship. As the representative of the people of Georgia, DAVID GAMBRELL showed a sensitivity and dedication to the needs of his constituency which I have greatly admired.

In the Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee, where I have had the additional privilege of serving alongside Senator GAMBRELL, I found him to be a stanch supporter of meaningful housing legislation. DAVID GAMBRELL was, in fact, instrumental in exempting small communities from certain requirements contained in the housing and community development bill which was a major accomplishment of our committee in the 92d Congress. He energetically and successfully represented the interest of rural America, of the people of Georgia, in sponsoring a number of provisions in the bill to assist municipalities with populations under 25,000.

DAVID GAMBRELL has made his mark in the short time he has served in the Senate as a man of high integrity and esteem. He will be missed. I am confident, though, that his past successes will be matched in the course of his future endeavors, whatever they may be. He has my very best wishes for a long life of achievement and personal fulfillment.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. ELIZABETH ANDREWS

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, in the past few months the Members of Congress have come to know the gracious and charming lady from Alabama, Mrs. ELIZABETH ANDREWS.

All of us knew and respected her husband, the late George Andrews, a Member of this House for nearly 28 years. The people exercised good judgment in selecting her to fill out his term.

In her own right, ELIZABETH has performed as a knowledgeable and active legislator. Her solid record will be remembered by us all.

PRESCOTT BUSH

HON. PETER H. DOMINICK

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the Honorable Prescott Bush was a distinguished public servant in the grand old tradition, and I was deeply saddened by his recent passing. The people of Connecticut were fortunate to have such a man serve their interests in the U.S. Senate. He contributed not only his wisdom, but a rare sense of integrity and justice throughout his public career.

My deepest sympathies go out to Mrs. Bush and the rest of the family for their deep personal loss. May they take comfort in knowing that Senator Bush made a memorable and lasting contribution to his country and to the State of Connecticut.

HORATIO ALGER AWARDS

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I do not know whether the story of the Honorable Adron Doran who was a recipient of one of the Horatio Alger Awards in 1971 has been placed in the RECORD, but for fear it has not, I am taking the liberty at this date of asking permission to insert in the RECORD a copy of the list of those selected by the Horatio Alger Awards Committee who were honored at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on May 12, 1971. I also ask unanimous consent that Dr. Doran's response at the time he received the award be printed in the RECORD.

Dr. Adron Doran is president of Morehead State University in Kentucky and is one of Kentucky's and the Nation's outstanding university presidents and educators. Under his leadership the university has grown in attendance from less than 1,000 to 8,000. It is a beautiful university, located in the hills of eastern Kentucky and served by an outstanding faculty, educating and developing a great body of young men and women.

In past years, Dr. Doran, before he turned his great talents to education, was an outstanding young political leader in the Democratic Party, serving at one time as Speaker of the House of the General Assembly of Kentucky and it was thought by many that he would

serve Kentucky either as Governor or U.S. Senator.

All that have known him have been impressed by his great abilities, his enthusiasm, and his desire that his work shall serve not only the university but all of the people of eastern Kentucky. His life has been marked by success and service, with the help of an equally able and charming person, his wife Mignon. It can be predicted that both Morehead State University and Dr. Adron Doran's service will continually enlarge and benefit Kentucky.

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

AWARD WINNERS, 1971

Robert Henry Abplanalp, President and Chairman of the Board, Precision Valve Corporation, Yonkers, New York.

Lawrence A. Appley, Chairman of the Board, American Management Association, Hamilton, New York.

Dr. Adron Doran, President, Morehead State University, Morehead, Kentucky.

Robert S. Fogarty, Jr., President and Founder, Habitation Resources, Inc., Torrance, California.

Alexander G. Hardy, Chairman of the Board, The AVEMCO Group, Bethesda, Maryland.

Leon W. "Pete" Harman, President, Harman-Managers Investment, Inc., Los Altos, California.

Charles Stewart Mott, Director of General Motors, Founder, The Mott Foundation, Flint, Michigan.

Dr. Howard A. Rusk, Director, Institute of Rehabilitation Medicine, New York University Medical Center, New York, New York.

Edward Durell Stone, Internationally Famous Architect, New York, New York.

Lowell Thomas, America's Foremost Commentator, New York, New York.

HORATIO ALGER AWARD, WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, MAY 12, 1971

I am exceedingly honored to receive the coveted Horatio Alger Award which places me in company with these distinguished Americans here today and those who have been so honored during the past 25 years.

I am filled with joy at the presence of my wife, Mignon; my youngest brother, Lewis, and his wife, Ruth; my hometown newspaper editor, W. E. Crutcher; my bank president, Alpha Hutchinson; and a number of distinguished friends and alumni of Morehead State University.

I read the Horatio Alger stories as a student in grade school and in high school. I have been motivated to read some of them again since Mr. Baker notified me of my selection for this Award. The stories are best known for their "rags to riches" theme. I suppose I am the only person who has ever received the Award who is still in rags.

Though I do not possess riches as men ordinarily measure wealth, I do lay claim to riches which have come through investments in the education of the youth of America and in investments in the incomparable treasures of the Kingdom of God.

If I represent anyone today, I think I represent one who was born and who grew up in an isolated, unproductive, and underdeveloped section of Western Kentucky and Tennessee. So isolated were we that my father, his brother, and their sister married my mother, her brother, and their sister. The Dorans simply did not know nor did they ever see anyone but the Clements, with whom they went to school, to church, and to the "post office." I was half grown before I knew that the big road which ran in front of the house was the state line between Graves County, Kentucky, and Weakley County, Tennessee.

The first time that I ever heard of a high school graduate was when Francis Hill came to teach in the one-room school in which I was enrolled as a seventh grade student. The first time I ever saw a high school was when I walked five miles, from the home of an old maid aunt, with whom I was living, to enroll in the ninth grade. After graduation from high school, I enrolled at Freed-Hardeman College, Henderson, Tennessee, which was the first time I had ever seen or been on a college campus.

The burning desire for an education, the motivation to be better than I was, and the obsession to prepare to serve my fellow man through the schools and the church account for my position as President of one of the great regional universities in America today.

My parents were honest, hard working, God fearing, and frugal people. They were the salt of the earth and provided a stable and secure home in which the five (5) boys were reared. They sowed the seeds of enterprise, competition, excellency, endurance, and a will to work in our hungry minds and hearts. These seeds found root in good soils to produce many fold.

While I was a junior in college, I met and married Mignon McClain on August 23, 1931. This was in the deep of one of our greatest economic depressions, but we managed together to make our way then and since by diligent application of our talents, our confidence in one another, and our faith in God. I have earned a baccalaureate, a master's, and a doctor's degree since we married. She has served as a true helpmeet, an assistant breadwinner, a competent critic, a constant companion and a responsible wife. I owe most of what I am and have achieved to her.

Whether the son of a tenant farmer, a stock boy in a clothing factory, a news butch on a passenger train, an export box maker in an auto plant, or a door-to-door cosmetics salesman—Whether in the schoolroom as a teacher, on the basketball court as a coach, in the speaker's chair as a legislator, in the pulpit as a minister, in the composing room as a newspaper editor, before the radio microphone as a singer, in the presidency of a state university, or as a servant in the community, I have learned, in whatever state of being, the worth of an individual human and the dignity to which he is entitled.

I have learned the sweet uses of adversity and the bitter outcomes of success. I have learned the joy of citizenship in the great American democracy, and I have learned the sorrows of neglect, waste, and misuse of the opportunities available to the youth and adults in this great land of ours.

I want to spend my remaining days in testimony and witness of one who has learned and practiced the Horatio Alger way of life.

TRIBUTE TO HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, GEORGE MILLER has established an enviable record of devoted service to his district, State, and Nation during his 28 years in the House.

My friendship and association with GEORGE MILLER spans over 20 years. When I was an assistant to Congressman John Bell Williams, our office was located next to Congressman MILLER. It has been a great privilege for me to serve and work with him as a Member of the House in recent years.

GEORGE MILLER's contributions to the country have been many. As chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, he has been an important leader of the Nation's space program.

I know the Congress and the Nation will miss this fine gentleman and legislator after having the benefit of his many years of service. I wish him and Mrs. Miller well in the future.

SENATOR JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the retirement of JOHN SHERMAN COOPER from the Senate is a loss, not only for the people of Kentucky, but also for the Senate as an institution. He has brought to the Senate a degree of integrity and sense of decency which have enhanced the quality of our work here. The Senate has been a better place for his presence and he will be missed by colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

The details of Senator COOPER's distinguished career are well known. What is less well known is the nature of his performance in the Senate. In his quiet way, he has exercised leadership on major issues in fields ranging from conservation to foreign relations. His influence has been felt because of the sincerity of his convictions and because of the respect accorded him by fellow Senators.

It is no secret that JOHN SHERMAN COOPER and I have disagreed on some of these issues in recent years. He has been a formidable but fair adversary and I am happy to say that our friendship has survived our debates on the Senate floor.

Mr. President, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER can look back on a long career as a judge, an ambassador, and a Senator with a deep sense of satisfaction. He has served his State and country well and I am confident that he will find new opportunities for service in the years ahead.

TRIBUTE TO HON. CLINTON ANDERSON

HON. GORDON ALLOTT

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, during my years in the Senate, I have come to know CLINTON ANDERSON as a friend. His decision to retire leaves a void which will be difficult, if not impossible, to fill.

Senator ANDERSON's wisdom has been a cornerstone of not only all the Senate, but also of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee where it has been my distinct pleasure to serve with him.

I join with my colleagues in wishing Senator ANDERSON and his wonderful wife, Henrietta, many, many happy days in this well-earned retirement.

FEDERAL LAND GRANTS TO RAILROADS

HON. FRED R. HARRIS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, 6 weeks ago, I informed the Senate that 12 Senators and Congressmen joined me in urging the Secretary of the Interior to report to the Congress the status of grants of Federal lands to certain railroad companies. Accompanying our letter was a list of questions concerning those grants. As yet, Mr. Morton has not responded.

Mr. President, those Senators and Congressmen who joined with me in a letter to Secretary Morton are Senators EDWARD KENNEDY and GAYLORD NELSON and Representatives ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, JAMES ABOUREZK, PHILLIP BURTON, RONALD V. DELLUMS, BOB ECKHARDT, DON EDWARDS, PAUL N. MCCLOSKEY, JR., JOHN F. SEIBERLING, JEROME R. WALDIE and the late William F. Ryan.

Inasmuch as Mr. Morton has not yet answered our request, I would like to inform him of a recent St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial reprinted in the Fresno Bee, October 9, 1972, which said:

While we do not expect Mr. Morton to follow Senator Harris' lead and take a strong law and order stand in regard to this matter, we do think he owes the Senator and the public a thorough examination of the situation before it makes its inevitable way into the courts. Federal law, passed more than 70 years ago . . . requires that Mr. Morton to do that much—and he should not shy from his responsibilities just because the controversy raises difficult questions of equity, economics, and public policy.

After the National Coalition for Land Reform and the California Coalition of Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers filed their original complaint in June, the Southern Pacific Transportation and Land Co. asked for time in which to respond to the complaint. They did, and the National Coalition for Land Reform filed a brief in October in response to the reply brief filed by the Southern Pacific. As yet, the Interior Department has not acted on the issue, but it seems to me, that the many questions raised by the Southern Pacific brief further justifies the need for a thorough examination of these grants.

I might add, Mr. President, that the Southern Pacific is not the only railroad involved. Other railroads receiving Federal land grants are the Union Pacific, the Burlington-Northern, and the Santa Fe.

I ask permission at this time that the first half of the brief filed by the National Coalition for Land Reform be placed in the RECORD. Representative JEROME WALDIE of California, a tireless crusader for the people of his district and State will put the second half of the brief in the RECORD later today.

I also ask permission that the editorial referred to in my remarks be inserted in the RECORD as well as an article from the September 16 issue of Business Week on this subject.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fresno Bee, Oct. 9, 1972]

ROUND ONE BEGINS

In what could turn into an interesting and undoubtedly drawn-out legal battle, a group calling itself the National Coalition for Land Reform is taking on some of the nation's biggest landowners—the railroads. The group, headed by Oklahoma's Populist Sen. Fred R. Harris, contends that the railroads have violated conditions under which they received vast tracts of land from the federal government in the 19th century.

In addition to being unfair to the taxpayers who originally owned the land, it is argued that the situation has contributed to the shaky, sometimes wheeling-dealing economics of American railroads (a la Penn Central) and helped create conditions today in which several of the largest land-owning railroads find their earnings from rail services nearly matched by their returns from land development and the leasing of oil and mineral rights.

The Coalition believes the land and the earnings from it ought to be returned to the government if the terms of the land grant have not been met, and they have asked Interior Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton to investigate their charges. The railroads, as might be suspected, have already discounted the Coalition's contentions and stand ready with a host of lawyers to derail any challenge to their right to the millions of acres they now own.

While we do not expect Mr. Morton to follow Sen. Harris' lead and take a strong law and order stand in regard to this matter, we do think he owes the senator and the public a thorough examination of the situation before it makes its inevitable way into the courts. Federal law, passed more than 70 years ago when another controversy over railroad landholdings was raging, requires Mr. Morton to do that much—and he should not shy from his responsibilities just because the controversy rages difficult questions of equity, economics and public policy.

[From Business Week, Sept. 16, 1972]

RAILROADS—A NEW FIGHT ERUPTS OVER LAND GRANTS

The stakes were high more than a century ago when Congress gave rail barons rights to land along their routes to help finance the track that linked the Mississippi to the Pacific. The grants eventually totaled more than 120-million acres, about 6% of the land area of the 48 states.

Periodically, the land grants have sparked controversy and, with the stakes still high, a new one is boiling in the form of an attack from a coalition of California land reformers. This week, Interior Dept. lawyers are checking through a new 52-page submission on the land-grant issue that they requested from the Southern Pacific Co., whose 2-million acres of grant land in California make it the largest land owner in the state.

The request came after a group of nine senators and representatives, led by Oklahoma's lame-duck Democratic Senator Fred R. Harris, asked Interior Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton for answers to a long list of questions about the railroad's land holdings. These land grants, created in 17 separate laws between 1840 and 1870, spelled out what the roads could and could not do with the land, and in many cases to whom they should sell the land and for how much.

The complexities of the laws, the way they were administered, and the actual and potential wealth involved led to court cases that ran for decades. The railroads contend that Congress settled the controversy once and for all with legislation in 1940 and 1945 that gave the roads title to the land grants.

Harris and the other eight Congressmen acted on behalf of two activist groups organized to buck the power of large landowners and corporate agriculture in California—the National Coalition for Land Reform and the California Coalition of Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers. Earlier, the two coalitions filed an 18-page "administrative complaint" with Morton. It was studded with citations of court decisions bolstering their contention that the department should "initiate an immediate and detailed investigation" into the land grants. The coalition's complaint focused on the Southern Pacific according to Sheldon Greene, one of its lawyers, "because we had more information about this company. But we are talking about all land grants."

Greene cites a number of Southern Pacific's grant-land uses that he says should be investigated. The company, he says, controls 200,000 acres of prime agricultural land in the San Joaquin Valley, and thus is unjustly a major beneficiary of the state's costly water projects. He also charges that the company is illegally tapping mineral deposits, including oil and gas leases grossing more than $3-million, and that it still controls land in the Sierras, which allegedly was to have been disposed of within three years after the road was completed in 1869.

NADER'S INFLUENCE

The coalition cites figures from Southern Pacific annual reports showing that it earned $24-million in 1970 from oil, gas, and agricultural leases, including $15.4-million from industrial and commercial rentals. A Southern Pacific official speculates that "some of the coalition's material was extracted from the two-volume study on power and land in California" published last fall by Ralph Nader's task force on land use in California, and that the Nader report was the coalition's impetus for the attack.

The Nader California report, in an appendix devoted to a case study of the SP's land holdings, concluded that the grant land was never meant to become a permanent asset of the railroad, and that it should be challenged in court. The purpose: "To return all of the company's nontransportation land holdings to the government" and collect damages "for past profit from illegal use of this land."

CONDITIONS

Behind the dispute are the actual terms of the grants. Typically, the railroad, after charting its route, was allowed to reserve alternate sections of land (a section is one square mile) in a checkerboard pattern along the right-of-way. As a length of track was completed, the carrier was given a patent to the land, which it then could sell or mortgage to finance another stretch of track. But there were conditions attached. For example, some grants required the land to be sold to settlers at not more than $2.50 an acre, and the land was to revert to the U.S. if the line was not completed.

The SP says that "acts of Congress, Supreme Court decisions, and administrative rulings over the years have made it abundantly and repeatedly clear that grant land has been irrevocably vested in the railroads, that the railroads . . . have full and clear title, and that grant lands are no longer subject to government preemption."

An Interior Dept. spokesman says that the department is now "at the point of looking at the threshold legal question: What is the government's obligation, if any, under those

statutes?" He suggests that "maybe Congress would like to look into it."

[U.S. Department of the Interior—Administrative Complaint]

PETITIONERS' RESPONSE TO REPLY BRIEF OF SOUTHERN PACIFIC TRANSPORTATION CO. AND SOUTHERN PACIFIC LAND CO.

National Coalition for Land Reform, California Coalition of Seasonal and Migrant Farmworkers v. Rogers C. B. Morton, individually and as Secretary of the Interior, and the U.S. Department of the Interior.

David H. Kirkpatrick, Sheldon Greene, California Rural Legal Assistance, San Francisco, Calif., Attorneys for Petitioners.

David M. Madway, National Housing and Economic Development Law Project, Berkeley, Calif., of Counsel.

This brief is submitted on behalf of Petitioners and in response to the reply brief of the Southern Pacific Transportation Company and the Southern Pacific Land Company, dated August 31, 1972.

In their Administrative Complaint, Petitioners request that the Secretary of the Interior conduct an investigation and report to Congress regarding the extent to which various railroads (and not simply the Southern Pacific, as its brief suggests [see Southern Pacific brief (hereinafter cited S.P.Br.), pp. 1–2.]) have failed to conform to the express requirements of the statutes under which approximately 150 million acres of public lands were granted to those railroads.[1] All of those statutes reserve mineral rights to the United States and many require that grant lands be sold to settlers in parcels not to exceed 160 acres and at a maximum price of $2.50 per acre, or in some cases, $1.25 per acre.

Southern Pacific urges six substantive[2] grounds for rejecting Petitioners' request for an investigation and report. Those grounds, in summary, and petitioners' responses, also in summary, are as follows:

1. Southern Pacific says that the decisions of the Supreme Court in *Oregon and California R. R. Co.* v. *United States*, 238 U.S. 393 (1915) and 243 U.S. 549 (1917), dealt with a "unique" matter, which is "now a closed book." (S.P.Br. 12.)

In response, Petitioners say that since Southern Pacific's grant lands adjacent to its railroad line from the Oregon border south to Roseville, California, (the California and Oregon Railroad grant) are covered by precisely the same mandatory sale-to-settlers proviso as the Court in *Oregon and California* held to be "covenants and enforceable," those decisions are clearly applicable to it. Moreover, since those decisions are the single most important judicial pronouncements on the mandatory sale-to-settlers proviso, it is inconceivable that they could simply be disregarded, as Southern Pacific apparently urges.

2. Southern Pacific says that the Department of the Interior has no "jurisdiction" to investigate and report to Congress because the railroad grant lands have been patented to the railroads. (S.P.Br.14–25.)

In response, Petitioners say that the Department has continuing responsibility for reporting on the status of such lands, that for over 100 years it has had responsibility for administering the railroad land grants, that it has statutorily prescribed duties related to the railroad land grants, and that accordingly it has broad investigative authority which should be invoked in these circumstances.

3. Southern Pacific says that the mandatory sale-to-settlers proviso in the Central Pacific granting statute is not violated because (a) one portion of that grant was sold to a Charles McLaughlin; (b) other portions of those grant lands were mortgaged; (c) the mandatory sale-to-settlers proviso was "rendered nugatory" by repeal of preemption laws and (d) by the "Speyer Agreement" the United States "released . . . all claims" on the Central Pacific and California and Oregon grant lands. (S.P.Br.25–32.)

In response, Petitioners say that (a) the elaborate series of transactions which resulted in the transfer to McLaughlin of vast quantities of grant lands raises more questions than it settles; (b) the mortgaging of grant lands in no way washed them of the obligations of the mandatory sale-to-settlers proviso; (c) the repeal of preemption laws was of no effect whatsoever on the sale-to-settlers obligation in the absence of specific reference in the preemption repealer to the railroad land grant statutes; and (d) the signatories to the Speyer Agreement were, by the express terms of the statute granting them their commission, authorized *only* to settle rights of the United States under certain mortgages, and reliance on any purported compromise of the rights of the United States to enforce the covenants and conditions of the land grant statutes is unwarranted and of no effect.

4. Southern Pacific says that the railroads are entitled to commercially exploit all grant lands. (S.P.Br.32–37.)

In response, Petitioners say that the effect of provisions in the granting statutes expressly reserving mineral lands to the United States and of the Supreme Court's holding in the second *Oregon and California* case (243 U.S. 549 (1917))—that where there is a mandatory sale-to-settlers proviso, the railroad had no right to harvest timber from grant lands—is to clearly limit a grantee railroad's rights to commercial exploitation of grant lands.

5. Southern Pacific says that an investigation would be fruitless since no remedies are available to the United States because (a) Congress must specially authorize the federal government to retake grant lands held in violation of the law; (b) relief is barred by the six year statute of limitations of 43 U.S.C. § 900, and (c) by the Transportation Acts of 1940 and 1945, Congress intended to "write finis" to the land grant issue. (S.P.Br.37–46.)

In response, Petitioners say that (a) even assuming Congress must specially authorize certain government action in respect of grant lands, it has done so on numerous occasions in the past on the basis of Department of the Interior reports and should be given the opportunity to do so again on the basis of a full and complete investigation and report; (b) relief granted in the past demonstrates, and the Supreme Court itself has said, that the statute of limitations is no bar to remedial action, and (c) the Transportation Acts of 1940 and 1945 say nothing whatsoever about any waiver of federal government rights to enforce the covenants and conditions of the granting statutes.

6. Southern Pacific says that the contributions of the land grant railroads to the national welfare balances the equities in favor of not burdening them with the kind of investigation which might jeopardize proposed Congressional action to make available further taxpayer-financed subsidies to railroads. (S.P.Br.46–53.)

In response, Petitioners say that now is precisely the time when the issue of past and present violations of earlier railroad subsidy laws (the land grant statutes) should be fully investigated and the facts placed before Congress so that it can determine the propriety of advancing still more aid.

We turn now to a detailed discussion of the grounds on which the Southern Pacific urges that the Department of the Interior refuse to conduct any investigation.

Footnotes at end of article.

1. THE OREGON AND CALIFORNIA CASES DEALT WITH A "UNIQUE" MATTER, WHICH IS NOW A "CLOSED BOOK"

If the *Oregon and California* matter is "unique," it may be attributable to the fact that, for the most part, the procedure for overseeing railroad land grants worked as intended: the Secretary of the Interior made reports on the land transactions of the Oregon and California Railroad (283 U.S. at 410); based on those reports, the Congress directed the Attorney General "to institute and prosecute any and all suits" to enforce provisions of the granting statutes (238 U.S. at 395); the Attorney General instituted such a suit and the Court concluded that the mandatory sale proviso had been violated and that Congress should be given an opportunity to enact remedial legislation (238 U.S. at 438–439); by the Chamberlain-Ferris Act (39 Stat. 218), Congress enacted such legislation; and while the matter found its way to the Supreme Court once more (243 U.S. 549), it was finally determined in an accounting suit authorized by the Chamberlain-Ferris Act (*sub. nom., United States* v. *Oregon and California R. R. Co.*, 8 F. 2d 645 (Or. 1925)).

If Southern Pacific means to assert that the Oregon land matter is a "closed book" because the issue of whether the grantee railroad violated the mandatory sale proviso covering the Oregon lands has been finally determined, Petitioners would agree. If they mean to say, however, that the Supreme Court's decisions in that case offer no guidance for present controversies, we submit that they have propounded a novel and not altogether congenial theory of jurisprudence. The *Oregon and California* decisions have much to tell us.

The mandatory sale proviso at issue in that case reads as follows:

"And provided further, that the lands granted by the Act aforesaid shall be sold to actual settlers only, in quantities not greater than one-quarter section to one purchaser, and for a price not exceeding $2.50 per acre."

While the Court agreed that the primary purpose of the granting statutes was to promote construction of the western railroads, it stated that the existence of the proviso demonstrated a further purpose; to encourage settlement. And attainment of the primary purpose in no way justified disregard of the secondary:

"[T]he secondary purpose was regarded and provided for in the provisos under review. Both purposes must be considered. It may be that it was not expected that actual settlers would crowd into 'the vast unpeopled territory,' but the existence of such settlers at such time must have been contemplated. *Both purposes, we repeat, were to be subserved.* . . ." 238 U.S. at 417. (Emphasis added.)

The Court swept away the railroad's objections to enforcement of the proviso in unequivocal terms and suggested almost 60 years ago precisely what Petitioners now urge—that if the provisos were onerous, burdensome, expensive, or impractical, the proper forum for redress was Congress; none of these factors justified violation then and neither do they now:

"If the provisos were ignorantly adopted as they are asserted to have been; if the actual conditions were unknown as is asserted; if but little of the land was arable, most of it covered with timber and valuable only for timber and not fit for the acquisition of homes; if a great deal of it was nothing but a wilderness of mountain and rock and forest; if its character was given evidence by the application of the Timber and Stone Act to the reserved lands; if settlers neither crowded before nor crowded after the railroad, nor could do so; if the grants were not

as valuable for sale or credit as they were supposed to have been and difficulties beset both uses; the remedy was obvious. *Granting the obstacles and infirmities, they were but promptings and reason for an appeal to Congress to relax the law; they were neither cause nor justification for violating it.*" 238 U.S. at 422–423. (Emphasis added.)

The Court denied the government's request for an automatic forfeiture of the railroad land, finding that the grant provisos were covenants rather than conditions subsequent and required further action by Congress before the land could be reclaimed. But as to the effect of the provisos as covenants, the Court's holding could hardly have been stated more clearly:

"[T]*he provisos . . . are covenants, and enforceable;*" . . . 238 U.S. at 423. (Emphasis added.)

Later in its brief, Southern Pacific suggests that the *Oregon and California* case should be disregarded because the language of the proviso there was different in some respects from the provisos set forth in the statutes granting some of the land now held by Southern Pacific. (S.P.Br.37.) Petitioners submit, on the contrary, that the difference in the language of the provisos makes an even stronger argument for enforceability of the provisos found in grants other than the *Oregon and California* cases without further legislation. Thus, the language of the proviso in the grant to Central Pacific, a predecessor of Southern Pacific, provides as follows:

". . . And all such lands, so granted by this section, which shall not be sold or disposed of by said company within three years after the entire road shall have been completed, shall be subject to settlement and preemption, like other lands, at a price not exceeding $1.25 per acre, to be paid to said company." 12 Stat. 492, 493–494.

The language in the Central Pacific proviso seems to cure two of the weaknesses found by the Supreme Court in the *Oregon and California* proviso and which led the Court to find that it was a covenant rather than a condition subsequent. Thus, in the Central Pacific situation, the class of eligible purchasers is not limited simply to "actual settlers," but rather the lands are open for purchase at the prescribed price by all who wish to settle on them. Similarly, the Supreme Court was concerned about the lack of any statement in the Oregon grants as to the time when the obligation of the provisos matured (238 U.S. at 417–418). Under the Central Pacific proviso there can be no such question, for the proviso states clearly that if the lands have not been sold or disposed of three years after completion of the line, they are to be made available for settlement at the prescribed price.

Finally, at pages 25 and 26 of its brief, Southern Pacific quotes the mandatory sale proviso covering lands granted to the Central Pacific and notes that "none of the other Southern Pacific grants contained this provision." While it is true that none of the other grants made to Southern Pacific or its predecessors contained this *exact* language, the statute granting lands contiguous to Southern Pacific's line from the Oregon border south to Roseville, California—a distance of some 300 miles—does contain a mandatory sale proviso, though the language varies somewhat from that found in the Central Pacific grant. In this context, Southern Pacific's effort to drain the *Oregon and California* decisions of significance is understandable. For its Northern California land grant holdings are covered by *precisely* the same mandatory sale proviso as the Supreme Court in *Oregon and California* held to be "covenants and enforceable." 238 U.S. at 423.

It is also worth noting that nowhere in its brief does Southern Pacific discuss the grant lands along its railroad line from the Oregon border to Roseville, California, except to indicate that it in fact obtained "title" to such lands under one of the granting statutes (S.P. Br. 6.), and in connection with the "Speyer Agreement" (S.P. Br. 30–31.). Nowhere does it reveal that those lands are covered by a mandatory sale-to-settlers proviso. It is a telling omission. Applying the holding in *Oregon and California* to those lands clearly requires a determination that Southern Pacific is in violation of the statute under which those lands were granted.

2. THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR HAS NO "JURISDICTION"

Southern Pacific argues that the Department of the Interior lacks "jurisdiction" to conduct any investigation of railroad grant lands. (S.P. Br. 19–25.) It asserts, in effect, that because those lands have been patented to the railroads the Department has no authority to adjudicate disputes with respect to them. The issue, of course, is a straw man and its demolition by elaborate citation of hoary authority is an interesting, if irrelevant, exercise.[3] Petitioners do *not* at this point seek to adjudicate any controversy and nowhere does the Administrative Complaint ask the Department to perform any such judicial or quasi-judicial functions. What Petitioners do seek is an investigation and report eliciting vital information with respect to a matter of substantial and legitimate public concern.

That the Department has the authority to conduct such an investigation is undeniable. Kenneth Culp Davis, in his seminal work on administrative law, describes the broad scope of investigatory authority vested in administrative agencies:

"[M]any administrative proceedings are investigations—proceedings designed for the purpose of producing information. Investigations are useful for all administrative functions, not only for rule making, adjudication, and licensing, *but also for prosecuting, for supervising and directing, for determining general policy, for recommending legislation, and for purposes no more specific than illuminating obscure areas to find out what if anything should be done.*" 1 K. C. Davis, *Administrative* Law Treatise 160 (1957). (Emphasis added.)

It is likewise undeniable that the Department conducted such investigations and issued reports to Congress regularly until 1915.[4] The statute under which it performed those functions, provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

". . . [T]he duties of the Auditor [of Railroad Accounts] under and subject to the Direction of the Secretary of the Interior shall be, to prescribe a system of reports to be rendered to him by the railroad companies whose roads are in whole or in part west, north or south of the Mississippi River, *and to which the United States have granted any loan of credit as subsidy in bonds or lands;* to examine the books and account of each of said railroad companies once in each fiscal year, . . . *to see that the laws relating to said companies are enforced;* . . . *and to make an annual report to the Secretary of the Interior.* . . ." 20 Stat. 169, 170, § 3 (1878). (Emphasis added.)

This reporting function was performed by the Auditor and later, by the Commissioner of Railroads (21 Stat. 409, §§ 1–3) and their reports were transmitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Interior. *Oregon and California R.R. Co. v. United States,* 238 U.S. 393, 410 (1915). So far as Petitioners have been able to determine, that reporting duty continues to exist and to reside with the Department of the Interior.

Southern Pacific claims that Title 43, sections 2 (setting forth the Department's duties in respect of public lands), 894 (directing the Secretary to adjust railroad land grants in accordance with Supreme Court decisions), and 895 (directing the Secretary to take steps to accomplish the cancellation of erroneously issued patents to railroad grant lands) fail to support any investigatory authority by the Department in respect of grant lands. It is clear, however, that investigatory power is the foundation on which these statutory duties are erected; and that without such power those statutory duties could never properly be performed.

Certain facts are irrefutably established: grants of public land were made to railroads to aid in financing construction; all the granting statutes in some way reserve mineral lands to the United States; many of the granting statutes compel sale of the lands to settlers in parcels not to exceed a prescribed size and at prices not to exceed $1.25 or, in some cases, $2.50 per acre; the Supreme Court has held the compulsory sale provisions to be convenants for the violation of which remedies do lie [*E.g., Oregon and California R. R. Co.* v. *United States,* 238 U.S. 393, 421 (1915); *United States* v. *Oregon and California R. R. Co.,* 8 F. 2d 645, 647–649 (Or. 1925); *United States* v. *Northern Pacific Ry Co.,* 41 F. Supp. 273, 277–278 (E.D. Wash. 1941)]; railroad companies continue to hold millions of acres of grant lands[1] (Southern Pacific, by its own admission, holds some 3.8 million acres in three states [S.P.Br. 10.]) from which timber is being harvested and minerals extracted; and the granting statutes are still on the books, with all of their conditions and restrictions, covenants and reservations.

Much remains to be determined, including: how much of the acreage still held by the railroads was granted subject to the compulsory sale provisions; how much has been sold in parcels and at prices in excess of the statutorily prescribed limits; to what extent timber has been harvested and minerals extracted from such lands; and how these lands should be treated in the future.

In short, all available evidence points to continuing violations of statutes, the administration of which has been the responsibility of the Department of the Interior or its predecessors for over 100 years. In the past, investigations similar to that which Petitioners request have resulted in the passage of remedial legislation by Congress. Thus, before 1890, Congress, based on such reports, adopted 15 special forfeiture acts causing over 25 million acres of grant lands to revert to the public domain and in 1890, Congress declared a general forfeiture of all lands granted for the construction of lines which were not yet completed and in violation of their completion dates (21 Stat. 496). It has also directed that the Attorney General institute suits against land grant railroads for violations of, among other things, the mandatory sale provisos (*e.g., California and Oregon R. R. Co.* v. *United States, supra,* 238 U.S. 393, 421 (1915); *United States* v. *Northern Pacific Ry Co.,* 311 U.S. 317 (1940)). It is manifest that there is now vast confusion and uncertainty as to the status of grant lands still in the hands of railroads. The Department, by a complete investigation and report, can facilitate clarification of the situation and provide a sound basis for appropriate Congressional action.

In the face of what *is* known and is *not* known regarding the railroad land grants, a refusal by the Department to investigate and report could only be interpreted as an abrogation of its responsibilities.

3. THE MANDATORY SALE PROVISO IN THE CENTRAL PACIFIC GRANTING STATUTE WAS NOT VIOLATED

Southern Pacific tells us that by a series of intricate transfers, assignments and further transfers, the Sacramento to San Jose portion of the Central Pacific grant (all of which was taken over by Southern Pacific and which contains a mandatory sale pro-

---

Footnotes at end of article.

viso) ended up in the hands of one Charles McLaughlin. (S.P.Br.5,26.) In Southern Pacific's view, that apparently lays the matter to rest. But questions remain. Did this intricate web of transfers wash the land of the covenants and restrictions covering it? Who was Mr. McLaughlin? Was the sale to him made in good faith, and was it an arms' length transaction? It not, other and further remedial action may be appropriate.

The only information about Mr. McLaughlin available to the Petitioners is the brief reference to him in *Western Pacific R. R. Co.* v. *United States*, 107 U.S. 526, 528 (1883). In that case the Court describes him as the agent of the railroad company who fraudulently filed for a patent on mineral lands. Such information only raises further questions about the Western Pacific land rather than providing answers.

Southern Pacific next asserts that the grant conditions governing the Central Pacific line from Sacramento to the junction with the Union Pacific near Ogden, Utah are no longer effective for at least three reasons. First, Southern Pacific claims that under *Platt v. Union Pacific Railroad Co.*, 99 U.S. 48 (1878), since the land has been subject to a mortgage, the mandatory sale-to-settlers proviso does not apply. (S.P.Br.26.) It concludes that once grant lands are mortgaged, the grantee railroad is entitled to hold it and exploit it indefinitely notwithstanding any covenants and conditions. Second, Southern Pacific argues that by signing the Speyer Agreement of 1899, the Federal Government abandoned or waived all its rights to enforce provisions of the statutes granting lands covered by that agreement. (S.P.Br.29–31.) Third, Southern Pacific claims that the mandatory sale proviso was voided when the Preemption Act was repealed in 1891. (S.P.Br.28.) None of these arguments meet Petitioners' contentions that the granting statutes, including the mandatory sale proviso, are enforceable, that they have been breached, and that an investigation and report are necessary and proper.

When it was decided in 1879, the *Platt* case was expressly limited by the Court to a very narrow set of circumstances. The case concerned the rights of a settler who sought to claim Union Pacific grant land pursuant to a land grant condition identical with the one governing the Central Pacific:

"All such lands so granted by this section which shall not be sold or disposed of by said company within three years after the entire road shall have been completed shall be subject to settlement and preemption like other lands, at a price not exceeding $1.25 per acre to be paid to said company." (12 Stat. 492)

The land in question had been mortgaged *during the period of construction* in order to raise funds to complete the rail line. With three Justices dissenting, Justice Strong held that where there was a mortgage which was not entered into to circumvent the grant conditions, but solely *"for the purpose of raising money necessary to continue and complete construction of the railroad* in accordance with the act of Congress," (99 U.S. 420 at 429 [Emphasis added]), the land would be deemed to have been "sold or disposed of." The Court further expressly refused to treat the issue of whether the mandatory sale proviso would apply when the "construction" mortgage no longer covered the land:

"Nor are we now called upon to decide whether the lands covered by the mortgage will not be open for preemption, if they shall remain unsold after the mortgage shall be extinguished. That question is not now before us." 99 U.S. at 429.

FOOTNOTES

[1] This figure is so staggering—10% of the total land area of the United States—that one is inclined to leap to the conclusion, often assisted by the railroads, that had the land grant scheme never been employed, the major portion of the U.S. railway system would never have come into being. In point of fact, federal land grants accounted for about 17,500 miles of track, something less than 7% of the total miles of railroad lines in the United States. "Public Aids to Domestic Transportation," House Doc. No. 159, 79th Cong., 1st Sess. (September 19, 1944), p. 155.

[2] Much of Southern Pacific's brief consists of public relations puffery. Most of it is simply irrelevant: thus, while it is reassuring to know that Southern Pacific "maintains a graduate ecologist on its payroll" (S.P. Br. 17) to tend lands which it may hold in violation of law, that should in no way shift the balance of equities in its favor. And some of it is downright misleading: Southern Pacific totes up the property taxes paid to counties in which grant lands are located and concludes that this is one of the "benefits" conferred upon the nation by the land grant railroads. (S.P. Br. 51.) What it fails to point out is that if these lands had been sold to settlers, as so many of the granting acts require, those purchasers too would have paid county property taxes. And since many of those purchasers would have enhanced the value of their lands by construction of homes and other improvements, the tax base probably would have been substantially greater had the provisos been adhered to.

[3] All of the cases cited by Southern Pacific in this section of its brief relate to contests of one sort or another over title. The most that can be said of them is that they direct the contestants to settle their disputes in an appropriate court. But Petitioners are not requesting the Department to adjudicate the question of title to land. The Department of the Interior does continue to adjudicate such rights with respect to railroad grant lands which have not been patented to railroads, but which were "sold" by them to various purchasers. See, *e.g.*, *Southern Pacific Co.* v. *Louis G. Wedekind*, 77 Interior Dec. 177 (1970); *United States* v. *Southern Pacific Co.*, 77 Interior Dec. 41 (1970); *Southern Pacific Co.*, 76 Interior Dec. 1 (1969); *Southern Pacific Co.*, 71 Interior Dec. 224 (1964). If the Department of the Interior is authorized to actually adjudicate private party rights in this area, surely it has investigatory authority in respect of government rights in grant lands.

[4] Index of Congressional Documents Prior to 1931, Catalogue of the Library of Congress.

SOME THOUGHTS ON FIRST AMENDMENT

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a commencement address I gave at Centre College in Kentucky on June 4, 1972. In this statement I attempted to develop, if briefly, some thoughts upon the first amendment to the Constitution.

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

THE USES OF FREEDOM

(A Commencement Address by Senator John Sherman Cooper)

I need not tell you that it is a great honor to speak at Centre College and to this graduating class.

As I have said on many such occasions, I have always found it difficult to speak to a graduating class, and I find it particularly so today. Perhaps it is because of my relationship with Centre College, my admiration for it and my desire that I could say something commensurate with the occasion. Justice Holmes said, "No man has earned the right to intellectual ambition until he has learned to lay his course by a star which he has never seen—to dig by the divining rod for springs which he may never reach".

In the Congress we are necessarily influenced by the issues and events of our time and I think it natural that I should seek a subject which bears relationship to this time in our country's history, to the function of our colleges and universities and to the outlook, the role and responsibility that the members of this class will decide to assume as they move out into a new life.

I have always argued that one of the great purposes of education is to enable men and women to recognize realities and to deal with them rationally and constructively.

The realities are before us. The Vietnam war has split our country. Technology provides, on one hand, an affluence and leisure never dreamed of a few years ago, but lack of knowledge, training and incentive prevent many from enjoying its fruits.

The thrust of black citizens and other minorities seeking their full rights as citizens must be fulfilled. The phenomenon of the movement of millions from rural to urban areas has engendered problems in our cities, economic and social, which our country had never before known. The disadvantaged, the alienated may slip outside the full stream of American life and leave the mark of a class society contrary to all the purposes of our nation.

These realities have led some to doubt the values of our system of government and society, to assert our country is incapable of their solution, or fighting wrong, and that technology, wealth, the power of the government and the so-called establishment, are repressive of freedom, and make it impossible for individuals to participate effectively and to affect the course of human affairs.

I rule out, and hope that you do, the idea that a totalitarian system could resolve doubt and cure our problems. Such a system may suit other peoples, they may move at times more quickly than ours, but they shatter the individualism, the intellectual and religious freedom which proceed from one's most innermost views of his relationship with a Creator or the universe and self-fulfillment. There are few in the country who would like the experience of the people of Czechoslovakia who, four years ago, found themselves bereft in a few days of the small freedoms they had nurtured. I remember the caption of one news report from Czechoslovakia—the words of a student who said, "We were happy for a time".

Freedom requires the searching examination of our institutions and their values. Many people, young and old, are making this examination, with the high purpose of insisting upon the realization of the best values of our civilization, and to assist in meeting the promises and hopes which have meant so much to its people and the world.

But, there are also those, young and old, who are alienated from society, seeking purposefully or mindlessly to destroy society or, at a minimum, to drop out from its tasks. There is a tendency to attempt the resolution of our deep-seated problems, by slogans, expedients, threats and violence rather than through freedom, reason, law and consent. A mark of this discontent is the failure of communication between old and young, political groups between those who have lost faith and those whose faith in the values of our country remains unchanged.

Communication, freedom of expression, the

hearing and consideration of the views of others is the very essence of freedom and of democratic government, and it is of this freedom that I speak today.

The framework of our government is tenuous, depending in large measure upon trust—trust of the people in their government and trust by the government in its people. It implicitly and specifically recognizes that the individual is superior to the State and must be free from the arbitrary power of others, whether of majorities or minorities, and of the State itself.

The First Amendment, more than any other section of the Bill of Rights, was written to protect and free the spiritual and personal rights of man. It is worth reading often.

Since World War II, it has been so construed by the Supreme Court that practically any speech or action may be exercised if it bears a reasonable relationship to the object sought or opposed.

Freedom of expression—speech or action—is protected unless it presents a clear and present danger to the overthrow of government, violates a law which does not repress its guarantees, or unduly treads on the rights of others—the so-called balancing theory—that the rights of an individual must be balanced with the rights of others.

There has never been a time in the history of our country or of any country, including Great Britain, when free speech and dissent have been so widely and freely used by our people. Because of a broader interpretation and understanding of First Amendment rights, larger numbers of people, particularly young people, are expressing their views about government, about public officials, and issues before the country, with a freedom that does not exist elsewhere in the world. It is my view that, because of this exercise of freedom by the young, that the legislation authorizing voting at the age of 18 was enacted by the Congress, it is bringing millions into the field of political action.

But, despite these facts, the meaning of the First Amendment, the use of freedom, has been often distorted.

Freedom, dissent have come to mean in many places throughout the country, and in some schools, college, universities—and I do not except public office—the right to express one's views but also a right to deny free speech by others—a right to shout down, to obstruct by violence the normal acivities of our government, of schools, and the lives of others. The claim has been made that civil disobedience follows the example of Thoreau and Gandhi. I do not think so. Thoreau's experience was limited. Gandhi asked his people to break the law of the British because India was the country of the Indian people and not Great Britain's. And of greater importance, he taught that only those could rightfully practice civil disobedience who were willing to accept its penalties, and did so with love in their hearts for their adversaries. Violence, hate and obscenities do not meet his principle of love.

I do not minimize the problems of the United States, but I know of no country in the world which has such problems and whose government and people as a whole are seeking to correct them—whether in the field of discrimination, of poverty, the environment, education or social needs.

The war in Vietnam is perhaps the chief cause of the alienation of our people. I have expressed my views about the war in all Administrations and have sought legislative action against its expansion and for its ending. But, I know also that two million men have served in Vietnam and 50,000 have died, and that their views may be different than those who feel so passionately against the war today. It is my hope that the peace proposal of President Nixon for a cease-fire, the release of prisoners and the withdrawal in four months will be agreed to by North Vietnam. There is some ground to believe that serious negotiations will now take place.

If North Vietnam will not negotiate then the Congress should require the withdrawal, at an appropriate time, of all our forces without conditions, except for the protection of our forces as they are withdrawn. I believe our prisoners of war would be released upon withdrawal. I used the words, "withdrawal at an appropriate time" because the massive assault of North Vietnam has placed our 63,000 troops in danger—separated as they are and with only 19,000 combat troops and arrangements for their safe withdrawal must be prepared.

In contrast to the deterioration of communication, of exchange of ideas between some groups of our people, our open exchange of ideas has brought about recently an improvement of American relations with two great countries.

A decade ago, relations between the Peoples Republic of China and the United States could not have been worse. The gap between the Communist Chinese, who referred to the United States as "imperialist running dogs" and rejected even coexistence and the United States—with its policy of containing Communist China with a ring of armed states—seemed unbridgeable.

Largely because of the persistent efforts of scholars from our colleges and universities, the irrational antipathy between China and the United States was broken down as they contended that new facts and new doctrines had made friendly relations with China possible.

But, at last, it was the willingness of President Nixon and the Chinese leaders, Mao Tse Tung and Chou En Lai to shed the old dogmas and engage in talks and exchange positions and ideas that has led, at least, to the beginning of a new relationship between the two countries with constructive possibilities.

The meeting of President Nixon with the Soviet leaders furnishes another example. Since World War II the Soviet Union and the United States had steadily matched the other in developing more fearsome and sophisticated nuclear weapons, seeking superiority. It has reached the point today, where the two powers' nuclear strength is equal to 15 tons of TNT over the head of every being on earth. Each has the capability of destroying the other 100 times over, even though the subject of a first aggressive strike. There seemed no end to this spiraling and costly race.

A decade ago we were terribly concerned about an alleged missile gap and feared that we could be overwhelmed by superior Soviet nuclear forces.

If I may use a personal illustration, I was concerned and I asked Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara to inform me fully of the relative nuclear strength of the two countries. I shall never forget his answer.

He took a small black notebook from his desk which showed in detail the nuclear weapons of the United States and the Soviet Union. There was no missile gap. I told Secretary McNamara that he should tell the American people the facts. Whether it was because of my request, I do not know, but Mr. McNamara began to inform the people and the Congress in detail and the practice has been continued throughout the years.

Steadily and accurately, each country has been informed of the nuclear strength of the other through publications and effective monitoring by satellites, American scientists, those who conceived the weapons, and those who built them, began to educate the Executive and the Congress of the need for their limitation. The Congress educated itself and the country in the ABM debate. Staggering costs which could run to hundreds of billions of dollars, the fact that each possesses the capability of destroying the other, and civilization as we know it, and the change from dark fear to knowledge, finally led to negotiations and now the treaty and interim agreement.

The treaty limits defensive anti-ballistic nuclear systems to two sites each with an equal number of missile launchers and radars. It will be submitted to the Senate as a treaty requiring a two-thirds vote.

The five-year interim agreement limits land-based and submarine-based offensive missiles to approximately those now in being or under construction. The Soviet Union will have more in number, and this has raised some fears. But, the United States has twice as many warheads in their missiles—the actual striking element—about 5500–2200, and it can increase the number to 10,000. Two or three warheads could destroy the largest city in either country.

President Nixon is a tough negotiator and would not compromise the security of this country. I have no doubt that both agreements will be approved.

The alternative is a continued nuclear arms race with its fears and instability. The agreements represent an effort to turn technology from the path of nuclear destruction and toward the rational control of science and technology for the peaceful use of mankind.

One may not agree with the decisions that have been made, and we do not know they will be wholly successful, but it is clear that the agreements and revision of policies that have occurred come from the open minds of the leaders of two different systems of government and society, and from an exchange of facts and ideas. The exchange of ideas among the leaders of three countries—democratic and communist—is not a perfect example of the use of freedom, but on the other hand it says something for the examination of facts and open minds.

My plea today is that the future of our country, the solution of its problems, will best be served by the true use of freedom of expression within the limits of the First Amendment, without force, violence, with each individual exercising his rights, but respecting the similar rights of his fellow man and searching for the truth.

The true guardians of freedom of speech, and thus of freedom itself, should be our colleges and universities. They have a cherished duty to preserve and study the experience of the past, and the challenging imperative to inquire ceaselessly for the truth in the physical world and in the realms of imagination and spirit.

It is their duty to defend the right of questioning what might otherwise be accepted as truth. It is through the skeptical temper, the constant testing of accepted ideas against man's constantly enlarging experience that useful knowledge is bound to the service of mankind. But, skeptical temper can only remain free of dogma if tolerance is also present. Unless there is a willingness to hear all points of view, how can one be certain, as Mill argued so long ago, that the mind is not closed to new facts and new truths.

You who graduate from this great college have been taught these duties. And it may well be that you will find the statement of Malabranche, the 17th century French philosopher, correct. He said: "Lord, only Thou knowest the truth. Give us the duty to search for it."

I have said that it is difficult for me to speak today because of my relationship with Centre College. I cannot close without saying that Centre College has meant very much to me. Coming to Centre was an experience that most first year students share, the first break from the ties of home. Here, I made new friendships that have become old and even more valued as the years have gone. I learned as thousands have, of the kindness, hospitality and civility of the people who live in this community.

Centre College then had its great teams and athletes, and they are legendary, but at the same time it adhered to the highest standards of scholarship. Its teachers were

steeped in learning and the humanities, with the ability to cause one to want to learn and to fulfill one's capabilities, whatever they might be. I have never found their superior.

I am honored that I had the opportunity to attend Centre College as did two of my brothers and two of my sisters at Kentucky College for Women. It is led by a great president, Dr. Thomas A. Spragens, supported by its Board of Trustees and a loyal alumni body. Its name is known and honored throughout our country and in many lands where its graduates have served. We are told that Pericles called Athens the school of Hellas. Athens, the school of Pericles, was not only the school of Greece, but of Western civilization. In the same way, we salute Centre as a college for a State and for our country and civilization.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1972

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, now that H.R. 1, the Social Security Amendments of 1972 has become law, I respectfully ask that the following summary of the major provisions be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1972

I. SOCIAL SECURITY CASH BENEFIT PROVISIONS

1. Special minimum cash benefits

The bill would provide a special minimum benefit of $8.50 multiplied by the number of years in covered employment up to 30 years, producing a benefit of at least $170 a month for a worker who has been employed for 30 years under social security coverage. This benefit would be paid as an alternative to the regular benefits in cases where a higher benefit would result.

Under this provision, the new higher minimum benefit would become payable to people with 20 or more years of employment; at that point, the special minimum benefit would be more than the regular minimum—$85 as compared to the regular minimum benefit of $84.50 payable under present law. A worker with 25 years of employment under social security would thus be guaranteed a benefit of at least $127.50; while one with 30 years would receive at least $170 a month. Minimum payments to a couple would be one and one-half times these amounts.

2. Increase in widow's and widower's insurance benefits

Under present law, when benefits begin at or after age 62 the benefit for a widow (or dependent widower) is equal to 82½ percent of the amount the deceased worker would have received if his benefit had started when he was age 65. A widow can get a benefit at age 60 reduced to take account of the additional 2 years in which she would be getting benefits.

The bill would provide benefits for a widow equal to the benefit her deceased husband would have received if he were still living. Under the bill, a widow whose benefits start at age 65 or after would receive either 100 percent of her deceased husband's primary insurance amount (the amount he would have been entitled to receive if he began his retirement at age 65) or, if his benefits began before age 65, an amount equal to the reduced benefit he would have been receiving if he were alive.

Under the bill, the benefit for a widow (or widower) who comes on the rolls between 60 and 65, would be reduced (in a way similar to the way in which widows' benefits are reduced under present law when they begin drawing benefits between ages 60 and 62) to take account of the longer period over which the benefit would be paid.

3. Increased benefits for those who delay retirement beyond age 65

The bill includes a provision which would provide for an increase in social security benefits of 1 percent for each year after age 65 that the individual delays his retirement.

Effective date.—For computation and recomputation after 1973 based on earnings after 1973.

4. Age 62 computation point for men

Under present law, the method of computing benefits for men and women differs in that years up to age 65 must be taken into account in determining average earnings for men, while for women only years up to age 62 must be taken into account. Also, benefit eligibility is figured up to age 65 for men, but only up to age 62 for women. Under the bill, these differences, which provide special advantages for women, would be eliminated by applying the same rules to men as now apply to women.

Effective date.—The new provision would become effective, starting January 1973 and become fully effective in January 1975.

5. Liberalization of the retirement test

The amount that a beneficiary under age 72 may earn a year and still be paid full social security benefits for the year would be increased from the present $1,600 to $2,100. Under present law, benefits are reduced by $1 for each $2 of earnings between $1,680 and $2,800 and for each $1 of earnings above $2,880. The committee bill would provide for a $1 reduction for each $2 of all earnings above $2,100, there would be no $1-for-$1 reduction as under present law. Also, in the year in which a person attains age 72 his earnings in and after the month in which he attains age 72 would not be included, as they are under present law, in determining his total earnings for the year.

Future increases in the amount of exempt earnings would also be automatic as average earnings rise.

6. Dependent widower's benefits at age 60

Aged dependent widowers under age 62 could be paid reduced benefits (on the same basis as widows under present law) starting as early as age 60.

7. Childhood disability benefits

Childhood disability benefits would be paid to the disabled child of an insured retired, deceased, or disabled worker, if the disability began before age 22, rather than before 18 as under present law. In addition, a person who was entitled to childhood disability benefits could become re-entitled if he again becomes disabled within 7 years after his prior entitlement to such benefits was terminated.

Effective date.—January 1973.

8. Continuation of child's benefits through the end of a semester

Payment of benefits to a child attending school would continue through the end of the semester or quarter in which the student (including a student in a vocational school) attains age 22 (rather than the month before he attains age 22) if he has not received, or completed the requirements for, a bachelor's degree from a college or university.

9. Eligibility of a child adopted by an old-age or disability insurance beneficiary

The provisions of present law relating to eligibility requirements for child's benefits in the case of adoption by old-age and disability insurance beneficiaries would be modified to make the requirements uniform in both cases. A child adopted after a retired or disabled worker becomes entitled to benefits would be eligible for child's benefits based on the worker's earnings if the child is the natural child or stepchild of the worker or if (1) the adoption was decreed by a court of competent jurisdiction within the United States, (2) the child lived with the worker in the United States for the year before the worker become disabled or entitled to an old-age or disability insurance benefit, (3) the child received at least one-half of his support from the worker for that year, and (4) the child was under age 18 at the time he began living with the worker.

10. Benefits for a child entitled on the record of more than one worker

The bill would provide that a child who is entitled to benefits on the earnings record of more than one worker would get benefits based on the earnings record which results in paying him the highest amount, if the payment would not reduce the benefits of any other individual who is entitled to benefits based on that earnings record. (Entitlement of a child on the earnings record that will give the child the highest benefit could otherwise result in a reduction of the benefits for other people entitled on the same earnings record because of the family maximum limitation.)

11. Benefits for a child based on the earnings record of a grandparent

Under the bill, benefits would be extended to grandchildren not adopted by their grandparents if their parents have died or are disabled and if the grandchildren were living with a grandparent at the time the grandparent qualified for benefits.

12. Nontermination of child's benefits by reason of adoption

Under present law, a child's entitlement to benefits ends if he is adopted unless he is adopted by (1) his natural parent, (2) his natural parent's spouse jointly with the natural parent, (3) the worker (e.g., a stepparent) on whose earnings the child is getting benefits, or (4) a stepparent, grandparent, aunt, uncle, brother, or sister after the death of the worker on whose earnings the child is getting benefits.

Under the bill, a child's benefits would no longer stop when the child is adopted, regardless of who adopts him.

13. Elimination of the support requirements for divorced women

Under present law, benefits are payable to a divorced wife age 62 or older and a divorced widow age 60 or older if her marriage lasted 20 years before the divorce, and to a surviving divorced mother. In order to qualify for any of these benefits a divorced woman is required to show that: (1) she was receiving at least one-half of her support from her former husband, (2) she was receiving substantial contributions from her former husband pursuant to a written agreement, or (3) there was a court order in effect providing for substantial contributions to her support by her former husband. The bill would eliminate these support requirements for divorced wives, divorced widows, and surviving divorced mothers.

14. Waiver of duration-of-marriage requirement in case of remarriage

The duration-of-marriage requirement in present law for entitlement to benefits as a worker's widow, widower, or stepchild—that is, the period of not less than 9 months immediately prior to the day on which the worker died that is now required (except where death was accidental or in the line of duty in the uniformed service in which case the period is 3 months)—would be waived in cases where the worker and his spouse were previously married, divorced, and remarried, if they were married at the time of the worker's death and if the duration-of-marriage requirement would have been met at the time of the divorce had the worker died then.

15. Reduction in waiting period for disability benefits

Under the bill, the present 6-month period throughout which a person must be disabled before he can be paid disability benefits would be reduced by 1 month (to 5 months).

16. Disability insured status for individuals who are blind

Under present law, to be insured for disability insurance benefits a worker must be fully insured and meet a test of substantial recent covered work (generally 20 quarters of coverage in the period of 40 calendar quarters preceding disablement). The bill would eliminate the test of recent attachment to covered work for blind people; thus a blind person would be insured for disability benefits if he is fully insured—that is, he has as many quarter of coverage as the number of calendar years that elapsed after 1950 (or the year he reached age 21, if later) and up to the year in which he became disabled.

17. Disability insurance benefits applications filed after death

Disability insurance benefits (and dependents' benefits based on a worker's entitlement to disability benefits) would be paid to the disabled worker's survivors if an application for benefits is filed within 3 months after the worker's death, or within 3 months after enactment of the provision. It would be effective for deaths occurring after 1969.

18. Disability benefits affected by the receipt of workmen's compensation

Under present law, social security disability benefits must be reduced when workmen's compensation is also payable if the combined payments exceed 80 percent of the worker's average current earnings before disablement. Average current earnings for this purpose can be computed on two different bases and the larger amount will be used. The bill adds a third alternative base, under which a worker's average current earnings can be based on the 1 year of his highest earnings in a period consisting of the year of disablement and the 5 preceding years.

19. Wage credits for members of the uniformed services

Present law provides for a social security noncontributory wage credit of up to $300, in addition to contributory credit for basic pay, for each calendar quarter of military service after 1967. Under the bill, the $300 noncontributory wage credits would also be provided for service during the period January 1957 (when military service came under contributory social security coverage) through December 1967.

20. Optional determination of self-employment earnings

Self-employed persons could elect to report for social security purposes two-thirds of their gross income from nonfarm self-employment. Not more than $1,600 in income (farm and nonfarm) could be reported in this manner. (This optional method of reporting is similar to the option available under present law for farm self-employment.) A regularity of coverage requirement would have to be met and the option could be used only five times by any individual.

21. Coverage of members of religious orders who are under a vow of poverty

Social security coverage would be made available to members of religious orders who have taken a vow of poverty, if the order makes an irrevocable election to cover these members as employees of the order.

22. Self-employment income of certain individuals living temporarily outside the United States

Under present law, a U.S. citizen who retains his residence in the United States but who is present in a foreign country or countries for approximately 17 months out of 18 consecutive months, must exclude the first $20,000 of his earned income in computing his taxable income for social security and income tax purposes. The bill would provide that U.S. citizens who are self-employed outside the United States and who retain their residence in the United States would not exclude the first $20,000 of earned income for social security purposes and would compute their earnings for self-employment for social security purposes in the same way as those who are self-employed in the United States.

23. Issuance of social security numbers and penalty for furnishing false information to obtain a number

The bill includes a number of provisions dealing with the method of issuing social security account numbers. Under present law, numbers are issued upon application, often by mail, upon the individual's motion.

Under the bill the Secretary would be required to issue numbers to non-citizens entering the country under conditions which would permit them to work. In the case of a person who may not legally work at the time he is admitted to the United States, the number would be issued at the time his status changes. In addition to these general rules, numbers would be issued to persons who do not have them at the time they apply for benefits under any federally financed program.

The Secretary would be authorized to issue numbers to individuals when they enter the school system.

As a corollary to this more orderly system of issuing social security account numbers, the bill would provide criminal penalties for (1) furnishing false information in applying for a social security number; (2) knowingly and willfully using a social security number that was obtained with false information or (3) using someone else's social security number. The penalty would involve a fine up to $1,000 or imprisonment for up to 1 year or both.

24. Trust fund expenditures for rehabilitation services

The bill provides an increase in the amount of social security trust fund moneys that may be used to pay for the costs of rehabilitating social security disability beneficiaries. The amount would be increased from 1 percent of the previous year's disability benefits (as under present law) to 1¼ percent for fiscal year 1973 and to 1½ percent for fiscal year 1974 and subsequent years.

25. Recomputation of benefits based on combined railroad and social security earnings

The bill would provide that a deceased individual who during his lifetime was entitled to social security benefits and railroad compensation and whose railroad remuneration and earnings under social security are, upon his death, to be combined for social security purposes would have his primary insurance amount recomputed on the basis of his combined earnings, whether or not he had earnings after 1965.

26. Payments to disabled former employee

Provides that payments made by an employer to a former disabled employee will not be counted for social security benefit or tax purposes if the payment is made after the calendar year in which the former employee became entitled to social security disability insurance benefits.

27. Social security coverage for foreign missionaries

Eliminates for certain foreign ministers the $20,000 exclusion from earned income earned abroad in the case of a minister or a member of a religious order.

28. Coverage of students and certain part-time employees

Permits States to modify their social security coverage agreements for State and local employees so as to remove from coverage services of students employed by the public school or college they are attending, and the services of part-time employees.

29. Wage credits for World War II internees

Provides non-contributory social security credits for U.S. citizens of Japanese ancestry who were interned by the U.S. Government during World War II. In order to qualify for the wage credits an individual must have been age 18 or older at the time he was interned and the credits will be determined on the basis of the then prevailing minimum wage or the individual's prior earnings, whichever is larger.

30. Duration-of-relationship requirements

Amends the provision of present law which reduces from 9 months to 3 months the duration-of-relationship requirement when death is accidental or in line of duty in the Armed Forces so that there would be no duration-of-relationship requirement in cases of an accidental death if it is reasonable to expect that the deceased would have lived for at least 9 months.

II. MEDICARE-MEDICAID AMENDMENTS

1. Medicare coverage for the disabled

Effective July 1, 1973, a social security disability beneficiary would be covered under medicare after he had been entitled to disability benefits for not less than 24 consecutive months. Those covered would include disabled workers at any age; disabled widows and disabled dependent widowers between the ages of 50 and 65; beneficiaries age 18 or older who receive benefits because of disability prior to reaching age 22; and disabled qualified railroad retirement annuitants. An estimated 1.7 million disabled beneficiaries would be eligible initially.

2. Hospital insurance for the uninsured

The bill will permit persons age 65 or over who are ineligible for part A of medicare to voluntarily enroll for hospital insurance coverage by paying the full cost of coverage (initially estimated at $33 monthly and to be recalculated annually). Where the Secretary of HEW finds it administratively feasible, those State and other public employee groups which have, in the past, voluntarily elected *not* to participate in the Social Security program could opt for and pay the part A premium costs for their retired or active employees age 65 or over. Enrollment in part B of medicare would be required as a condition of buying into the part A program.

Effective date: July 1, 1973.

3. Part B premium increases

The bill will limit part B premium increases for fiscal years 1974 and thereafter to not more than the percentage by which the Social Security cash benefits had been generally increased since the last part B premium adjustment. Costs above those met by such premium payments would be paid out of general revenues in addition to the regular general revenue matching.

Effective date: July 1, 1973.

4. Part B deductible

Beginning with calendar year 1973, the bill increases the annual part B deductible from $50 to $60.

5. Automatic enrollment in part B

Effective July 1, 1973, the bill provides (except for residents of Puerto Rico and foreign countries) for automatic enrollment under part B for the elderly and the disabled as they become eligible for part A hospital insurance coverage. Persons eligible for automatic enrollment must also be fully informed as to the procedure and given an opportunity to decline the coverage.

6. Effective utilization review programs in medicaid

Effective July 1, 1973, the bill authorizes a one-third reduction in Federal matching payments for long-term stays in hospitals, nursing homes, intermediate care facilities,

and mental institutions, if States fail to have effective programs of control over the utilization of institutional services or where they fail to conduct the independent professional audits of patients as required by law. The bill also authorizes the Secretary, after June 30, 1973, to compute a reasonable differential between the cost of skilled nursing facility services and intermediate care facility services provided in a State to medicaid patients.

7. Cost sharing under medicaid

The bill made the following changes with respect to premiums, copayments, and deductibles under medicaid.

1. It requires States which cover the medically indigent to impose monthly premium charges. The premium would be graduated by income in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary.

2. States could, at their option, require payment by the medically indigent of nominal deductibles and nominal co-payment amounts which would not have to vary by level of income.

3. With respect to cash assistance recipients, nominal deductible and co-payment requirements, which prohibited for the six mandatory services required under Federal law (inpatient hospital services; outpatient hospital services; other X-ray and laboratory services; skilled nursing home services; physicians' services; and home health services), would be permitted with respect to optional medicaid services such as prescribed drugs, hearing aids, etc.

8. Protection against loss of medicaid because of increased earnings

An individual or member of a family eligible for cash public assistance and medicaid who would otherwise lose eligibility for medicaid as a result of increased earnings from employment would be continued on medicaid for a period of 4 months from the date where medicaid eligibility would otherwise terminate.

9. Coordination between medicare and Federal employee plans

Effective January 1, 1975, medicare would not pay a beneficiary, who is also a Federal retiree or employee, for services covered under his Federal employee's health insurance policy which are also covered under medicare unless he has had an option of selecting a policy *supplementing* medicare benefits. If a supplemental policy is not made available, the F.E.P. would then have to pay first on any items of care which were covered under both the Federal employee's program and medicare.

Effective date: January 1974.

10. Medicare services outside of the United States

Effective January 1, 1973, the bill authorizes use of a foreign hospital by a U.S. resident where such hospital was closer to his residence or more accessible than the nearest suitable United States hospital. Such hospitals must be approved under an appropriate hospital approval program.

In addition, the bill authorizes part B payments for necessary physicians' services furnished in conjunction with such hospitalization.

The bill also authorizes medicare payments for emergency hospital and physician services needed by beneficiaries in transit between Alaska and the other continental States.

11. Optometrists under medicaid

The bill requires States, which had previously covered optometric services under medicaid and which, in their State plans, specifically provided for coverage for eye care under "physicians' services," which an optometrist is licensed to provide, to reimburse for such care whether provided by a physician or an optometrist.

Effective date: Enactment.

12. Beneficiary liability under medicare

The bill would, with respect to claims for services provided after the date of enactment, relieve beneficiaries from liability in certain situations where medicare claims are disallowed and the beneficiary is without fault.

13. Limitation on Federal payments for disapproved capital expenditures

The bill would preclude medicare and medicaid payments for certain disapproved capital expenditures (except for construction toward which preliminary expenditures of $100,000 or more had been made in the 3-year period ending December 17, 1970) which are specifically determined to be inconsistent with State or local health facility plans. The provision would become effective after December 31, 1972 or earlier, if requested by a State.

14. Demonstrations and reports

The bill authorizes the Secretary to undertake studies, experiments or demonstration projects with respect to: various forms of prospective reimbursement of facilities; ambulatory surgical centers; intermediate care and homemaker services (with respect to the extended care benefit under medicare); elimination or reduction of the three-day prior hospitalization requirement for admission to a skilled nursing facility; determination of the most appropriate methods of reimbursing for the services of physicians' assistants and nurse practitioners; provision of day care services to older persons eligible under medicare and medicaid; and, possible means of making the services of clinical psychologists more generally available under medicare.

Effective date: Enactment.

15. Limitation on coverage of costs under medicare

The bill authorizes the Secretary to establish limits on overall direct or indirect costs which will be recognized as reasonable for comparable services in comparable facilities in an area. He may also establish maximum acceptable costs in such facilities with respect to items or groups of services (for example, food costs, or standby costs). The beneficiary would be liable (except in the case of emergency care) for any amounts determined as excessive (except that he may not be charged for excessive amounts in a facility in which his admitting physician has a direct or indirect ownership in the facility.

16. Limits on prevailing physician charge levels

The bill recognizes as reasonable, for medicare reimbursement purposes only, those charges which fall within the 75th percentile. Starting in 1973, increases in physicians' fees allowable for medicare purposes, would be limited by a factor which takes into account increased costs of practice and the increase in earnings levels in an area.

With respect to reasonable charges for medical supplies and equipment, the amendment would provide for recognizing only the lowest charges at which supplies of similar quality are widely and consistently available.

17. Limits on payments to skilled nursing facilities and intermediate care facilities under medicaid

Effective January 1, 1973, Federal financial participation in reimbursement for skilled nursing facility care and intermediate care per diem costs would not be available to the extent such costs exceed 105 percent of prior year levels of payment under the provision (except for those costs attributable to any additional required services). The provision would except increased payment resulting from increases in the Federal minimum wage or other new Federal laws.

18. Payments to health maintenance organizations

Authorizes medicare to make a single combined Part A and B payment, on a capitation basis, to a "Health Maintenance Organization," which would agree to provide care to a group not more than one-half of whom are medicare beneficiaries who freely choose this arrangement. Such payments may not exceed 100 percent of present Part A and B per capita costs in a given geographic area, and the exact amount of the payment would be dependent on the efficiency of the HMO.

The Secretary could make these arrangements with existing prepaid groups and foundations, and with new organizations which eventually meet the broadly defined term "Health Maintenance Organization."

19. Payments for the services of teaching physicians

The bill provides that, for accounting periods beginning after June 30, 1973, services of teaching physicians would be reimbursed on a costs basis unless:

(A) The patient is bona fide private or;

(B) The hospital has charged all patients and collected from a majority on a fee-for-service basis.

For donated services of teaching physicians, a salary cost would be imputed equal to the prorated usual costs of full-time salaried physicians. Any such payment would be made to a special fund designated by the medical staff to be used for charitable or educational purposes.

20. Advance approval of ECF and home health coverage

The bill authorizes Secretary to establish, by diagnosis, minimum periods during which the posthospital patient would be presumed to be eligible for benefits.

21. Termination of payment to suppliers of service

Under the bill the Secretary would be authorized to suspend or terminate medicare payments to a provider found to have abused the program. Further, there would be no Federal participation in medicaid payments which might be made subsequently to this provider. Program review teams would be established in each State to furnish the Secretary with professional advice in discharging this authority.

22. Elimination of requirement that States move toward comprehensive medicaid program

The bill repeals Section 1903(e) which required each State to show that it was making efforts in the direction of broadening the scope of services in its medicaid program and liberalizing eligibility requirements for medical assistance.

23. Elimination of medicaid maintenance of effort

The bill repeals Section 1902(d). Under Section 1902(d) a State could not reduce its aggregate expenditures for the State share of its medicaid program from one year to the next.

Effective date: Enactment.

24. Determination of reasonable cost of inpatient hospital services under medicaid and maternal and child health programs

The bill would allow States, with the advance approval of the Secretary, to develop their own methods and standards for reimbursement of the reasonable costs of inpatient hospital services. Reimbursement by the States would in no case exceed reasonable cost reimbursement as provided for under medicare.

25. Customary charges less than reasonable costs under medicare

Effective for accounting periods beginning after December 31, 1972, the bill provides that reimbursement for services under medicaid and medicare cannot exceed the lesser of rea-

sonable costs determined under medicare, or the customary charges to the general public. The provisions would not apply to services furnished by public providers free of charge or at a nominal fee. In such cases reimbursement would be based on those items included in the reasonable cost determination which would result in fair compensation.

26. Coverage of chiropractic services under part B of medicare

The bill broadens the definition of the term "physician" in title XVIII to include a licensed chiropractor who also meets uniform minimum standards to be promulgated by the Secretary.

The services furnished by chiropractors would be covered under the program as "physicians' services," but only with respect to treatment of the spine by means of manual manipulation which the chiropractor is legally authorized to perform. Claims for such treatment must be verifiable with a satisfactory X-ray indicating the existence of a subluxation of the spine.

The amendment would become effective with respect to services provided on or after July 1, 1973.

27. Chiropractors' services under medicaid

The bill conforms the coverage of chiropractic under medicaid with the provisions conditioning eligibility of such services included in the amendment adding chiropractic coverage to Part B of medicare except for the requirement that an *X*-ray show the existence of a subluxation.

III. SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME FOR THE AGED, BLIND, AND DISABLED

The bill would replace the present State programs of aid to the aged, blind, and disabled, effective January 1, 1974, with a new wholly Federal program of supplemental security income.

National supplemental security income; disregard of social security or other income

Under the bill, aged, blind, and disabled persons with no other income would be guaranteed a monthly income of at least $130 for an individual or $195 for a couple. In addition the bill would provide that the first $20 of social security or any other income would not cause any reduction in supplemental security income payments.

As a result, aged, blind, and disabled persons who also have monthly income from social security or other sources (which are not need-related) of at least $20 would, be assured total monthly income of at least $150 for individual or $215 for a couple.

Earned income disregard

In addition to a monthly disregard of $20 of social security or other income, there would be an additional disregard of $65 of earned income plus one-half of any earnings above $65. This will enable those aged, blind, and disabled individuals who are able to do some work to do so and in the process give them a higher income in addition to supplemental security income.

In addition, as under present law, any income necessary for the fulfillment of a plan for achieving self-support would be disregarded for persons qualifying on the basis of blindness. A savings clause would assure that blind persons would not receive any reduction in benefits due to these provisions.

Definitions of blindness and disability

Under present law each State is free to prescribe its own definition of blindness and disability for purposes of eligibility for aid to the blind and aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

Under the new supplemental security income program, there would be a uniform Federal definition of "disability" and "blindness."

The term "disability" would be defined as "inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 months." This definition is the same as that now used in the Social Security disability insurance program.

The term "blindness" would be defined as central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye with the use of correcting lenses. Also included in this definition is the particular sight limitation which is referred to as "tunnel vision."

A blind or disabled person who was on the rolls in December 1973 and met the State definition for blindness or disability as defined in the State plan in effect October 1972 would be considered blind or disabled for purposes of this title so long as he continues to be blind or disabled.

No disabled person would be eligible if the disability is medically determined to be due solely to drug addiction or alcoholism unless such individual is undergoing appropriate treatment, if available. Payments for addicts or alcoholics would only be made to third parties as protective payments.

Other Federal eligibility standards

Eligibility for supplemental security income would be open to an aged, blind or disabled individual if his resources were less than $1500 (or $2250 for a couple). In determining the amount of his resources, the value of the home (including land surrounding home), household goods, personal effects, including an automobile, and property needed for self support would, if found to be reasonable, be excluded. Life insurance policies would not be counted if the face value of all policies was less than $1,500. (Current recipients under State programs with higher resource limits would retain their eligibility.)

State supplementation

States wishing to pay an aged, blind or disabled person amounts in addition to the Federal supplemental security income payment would be free to do so. The bill would permit States to enter into agreements for Federal administration of State supplemental benefits. Under these agreements supplemental payments would have to be made to all persons eligible for Federal supplemental security income payments except that a State could require a period of residence in the State as a condition of eligibility.

Ineligibility for food stamps

Individuals in the Supplemental Security Income program would not be eligible for food stamps or surplus commodities.

Savings clause

The bill provides no direct Federal participation in the costs of State supplemental payments. However, a savings clause is included under which the Federal Government would assume all of a State's costs of supplemental payments which exceed its calendar year 1972 share of the costs of aid to the aged, blind, and disabled. This savings clause would apply only to State supplementation needed to maintain the State's assistance levels in effect as of January 1972. The savings clause would, however, also cover an upward adjustment over the January levels to the extent necessary to offset the elimination of food stamp eligibility.

Medicaid coverage

Under present law, the States are required to cover all cash assistance recipients under the medicaid program. The bill would exempt from their requirement newly eligible recipients who qualify because of the new provision for a $130 minimum benefit with a disregard of $20 of social security or other income.

Social services

States would be authorized to continue programs providing social services to aged, blind, and disabled persons. These services are currently provided under the welfare programs for the aged, blind, and disabled which would be replaced by the new Federal supplemental security income program. There would be 75 percent Federal matching for the services provided, subject to the overall limitations established by the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act.

AMENDMENTS TO PRESENT LAW FOR AID TO AGED, BLIND, AND DISABLED PERSONS (EFFECTIVE UNTIL ASSISTANCE JANUARY 1, 1974):

Separation of social services not required

Separation of social services and eligibility determination is specifically not required.

Cost for providing manuals

At its option, the State may require a change for reasonable cost of providing manuals and other policy issuancees.

Appeals process

The bill provides that the decision of the local agency on the matter considered at an evidentiary hearing may be implemented immediately.

Absence from State for 90 days

The bill provides that the State may make any person ineligible for money payments who has been absent from the State over 90 consecutive days until such person has been present in the State for 30 consecutive days in the State during such period or 90 days in the case of any other individual.

Rent payments for public housing

Permits the States, if they elect to do so, to make rent payments directly to a public housing agency on behalf of a recipient or a group or groups of recipients.

Safeguarding information

The bill permits the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants or recipients.

Passalong of social security increases

Present law requires State programs of aid to the aged, blind, and disabled to assure that the total income of recipients who also get social security are at least $4 higher as a result of the 1969 social security benefit increase. The bill would add an additional $4 "passalong" related to this year's 20 percent social security increase and would make both "passalong" provisions applicable until January 1974.

IV. CHILD WELFARE SERVICES AND SOCIAL SERVICES

Grants to States for child welfare services (including foster care and adoptions)

The committee adopted an amendment increasing the annual authorization for Federal grants to the States for child welfare services to $196 million in fiscal year 1973, rising to $266 million in 1977 and thereafter. For fiscal year 1973, this is $150 million more than the $46 million which has been appropriated every year since 1967. It is anticipated that a substantial part of any increased appropriation under this higher authorization will go toward meeting the costs of providing foster care which now represents the largest single item of child welfare expenditure on the county level. The bill, however, avoided earmarking amounts specifically for foster care so that wherever possible the State and counties could use the additional funds to expand preventive child welfare services with the aim of helping families stay together and thus avoiding the need for foster care. The additional funds can also be used for adoption services, including action to increase adoptions of hard-to-place children.

Social services

Provides a saving provision to the limitation on expenditures for social services contained in the State and Local Assistance Act of 1972 so that States for the first quarter of fiscal 1973 will be reimbursed as they would have been under previous laws. This saving provision would be applicable only to the extent that the resultant Federal funding for this quarter does not exceed $50 million.

CODELL CONSTRUCTION CO., WINCHESTER, KY.

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, one of the most active and successful construction firms in Kentucky has been owned and managed by one family, the Codells, of Winchester, Ky., for 64 years. A most interesting story about the Codell Construction Co., of which Mr. J. C. Codell, Jr., is now president, appeared in the publication, Big, published by the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., entitled, "Codell Construction Likes To Take on the Tough Ones." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

CODELL CONSTRUCTION LIKES TO TAKE ON THE TOUGH ONES

(By Terry McConnell)

Sixty-four-year-old firm is currently engaged in four major jobs—two highways, one rail bed, one dam—in Indiana and its home state of Kentucky.

James C. Codell, Jr. started out the hard way. And he has enjoyed doing things that way ever since.

"I joined the firm in 1930 as a water boy," the 52-year-old head of the Codell Construction Co. of Winchester, Ky., recalls.

Grinning, he adds: "And it was a drought year."

The fact that he was joining a well established grade and drainage contracting firm, founded 23 years earlier by his father, cut little ice and less rock.

The senior J. C. Codell was a firm believer in bringing a man up through the ranks, his son included. His belief established a tradition that is still being carried on in the now third-generation company, among the oldest and largest of its kind in the state.

This is not to say that Codell would automatically pick the hard way. The fact is, there's simply no easy way to do what his company does best.

"We specialize in tough jobs," he says. "Jobs that nobody else wants. When we see a complicated job that requires some extra ingenuity to make it pay, we pull a superintendent off another job to look it over with the engineers and estimators. Then we bid it."

The system apparently works well: during the first seven months of 1971 Codell was successful on a phenomenal 10.9% of jobs bid, to the tune of $13 million in new-construction business.

The secret? Codell sees it this way:

"Any damn fool can figure out how much something will cost. This business is ingenuity and know-how—the kind of imaginative innovation that comes from a close flow of ideas among superintendents and engineers."

He might add: and the kind of combined construction and engineering expertise that is a natural result of promoting key personnel through the ranks.

The younger generation of Codells is coming up the same way their father did. James C. Codell, III, at 30, is executive vice president of the company. But he got there a rung at a time: first as laborer; then foreman, superintendent—and finally to the executive level.

Another son, 27-year-old Hagan Codell, is assistant general superintendent. David Codell, 20, a student at Transylvania University, Lexington, Ky., plans an engineering future.

"We see the difficult jobs differently from our competition." Codell says. "We're optimists. And we've got the faith in our men to be able to out-plan and out-scheme our competitors."

He admits that the "I can, I can" approach can lead to an occasional bad scare.

"But that's the challenge of this business," he says, "—coming out on the close ones."

The Codell Company has a way of "coming out," even if it has to build a mountain to do it. And that actually happened one time. It was this way:

The firm was low bidder on a highway relocation job near Wellsville, O., with $600,000 "left on the table." There were several million yards of rock overhanging the Pennsylvania Railroad's heavily traveled main line between Pittsburgh, Pa., and Columbus, O. The rock had to be drilled, shot and disposed of without interrupting the railroad's operation.

There was no easy way to do it—no obviously easy way, that is.

"Other bidders were sure we had made a serious mistake," Codell said. "But we've found that a 'mistake' in judgment or calculation is the only way you *can* get a job in this business!"

The grin again: "Of course, the mistake is only in the eyes of the competition. What we did was to devise an elaborate system of haul roads over the top of a nearby mountain, purchase disposal rights in an adjacent valley, and build ourselves a mountain with the waste."

The "mistake" turned out to be a very profitable job. To Codell, it wasn't a problem. It was just a "challenge".

The ability of the Codell team to meet such challenges is attested by the fact that the company has ranked well up in *Engineering News Record's* "Top 400" list of U.S. contractors each of the eight years this list has been published.

The firm is licensed to bid in 18 states. Currently, it has four major jobs underway, all overseen by General Superintendent John B. Callaway, a 43-year Codell veteran. One of these jobs is the rock-fill, earth-core Laurel River Dam near London, Ky.—an $11-million, 50–50 effort with Oman Construction Co., Nashville, Tenn. (See BIG, Vol. 27, No. 1). The two firms will soon team up again on a $2-million railroad to U.S. Steel mines near Harlan, Ky.

Of the three other major jobs, two are in the Blue Grass state, one just across the Indiana border.

The most spectacular of the three is a Martin County, Ky., railroad job. There, 250 Codell men and their machines are blasting and biting their way through 24 miles of rugged Eastern Kentucky mountains, with a Norfolk & Western track-laying train not far behind.

The project will open the Martin County coal fields, providing the Massey Coal Compay and Island Creek Coal Company with modern rail service. The job was let in four separate contracts, three of which were won by Codell.

The contracts involve three eight-mile sections, each under the eye of a different Codell superintendent. Section 1, leading west from the N&W mail line, is bossed respectively by Ray Stanfield, a leathery 31-year Codell veteran. Hagan Codell, who has worked for the family firm for 7 years, was in charge of Section 2 prior to being named assistant general superintendent.

The first two sections lead to a 1,500-foot tunnel being cut by another contractor. On the other side of the mountain is Codell's Section 4, together with eight more miles of rail bed and the west portal of the tunnel. Another Codell veteran, Grant Hamblin (20 years with the firm), is superintendent of this final section.

Codell's other Kentucky job is a $7-million highway project in Bell County, where a five-mile stretch of old U.S. 25E is being widened to four lanes. Just under three million yards are involved, including wasting a half-million yards going into the Cannon Creek Dam. Codell's job includes four bridges, two spanning the L&N Railroad and two Yellow Creek.

As usual on a Codell contract, the job had its share of built-in challenges. Said Superintendent James F. Brantley: "We had to shoot eight, 10 and sometimes 20 thousand yards of shale a day, much of it directly over a Louisville & Nashville Railroad tunnel, and at the same time maintain car traffic along existing 25E."

Codell's major out-of-state operation is another highway bed preparation job, this one an 8½-mile section of Interstate 64 in Harrison and Floyd counties in Indiana. It's primarily an earthmoving, grading and draining job; heading it up is superintendent Roy (Scotty) Miller, a 31-year man with Codell.

Here, too, Codell planners anticipated a challenge that could spell the difference between profit and loss on the $5.6-million project. But this time it was to be an unknown all the way down the line: weather.

Codell estimators checked the records, and expected the more-than-ample rainfall typical of southern Indiana. But what they actually got was rain of almost Biblical proportions. In the four months of May to August of 1971, the 100-man crew was able to work only three full weeks. The rest of the time was spent working a few days here, a few nights there, and—for the most part—watching the rains churn the site into an 8½-mile river of Indiana mud.

Unanticipated, the weather would have made a disaster out of the contract. As it is, however, the company is on schedule and expects to complete the job well within the contract terms.

Jim Codell ranks equipment cost control as a major whetstone for sharpening the company's profit edge.

Our equipment represents a $10-million investment," he points out. "The best way we can protect that investment is to know exactly when any piece is ready for replacement."

The company computerized six years ago, launching an intricate cost-control program under the direction of Charles Kindred, a 20-year Codell man who now heads the Data Processing department. Data on each new piece of equipment is fed into the computer the day it is delivered. Up-to-date information goes in each month, for as long as the equipment wears the Codell yellow paint.

At a moment's notice, the computer department can retrieve and compile detailed, current reports on the status of any given equipment, broken down into hours worked; hours down; per cent of availability; per-hour cost of tires, tracks and repairs; and a host of additional data.

With this information, it's easy for the company to make an appraisal, comparing the figures with experience-rated life spans. The human element is not removed ("We still trade when we get a good deal"), but guesswork is eliminated.

In its 64 years, Codell has engaged in virtually every kind of construction that requires the moving and shaping of rock and earth. But since 1908, when Jim's father won his first rail, contract, the railroads have been the firm's bread and butter.

A favorite memento in the company's executive offices is a faded yellow railroad contract, dated 1917, let by the Virginia Railroad Co., now a part of the Norfolk & Western line for which Codell is building the Martin County route.

The Codells are traditionally community-minded, contributing heavily to schools, hospitals, churches and other good works. Their reputation as "do-ers" has made the Codell office a natural first stop for anyone in the community who wants to launch a beneficial project. It's well known that when the Codells are behind it, success is almost certain.

The Codell family home is a landmark of the Winchester area: a 1,500-acre working farm in the heart of the Blue Grass country. As unusual feature of the farm is a steel hangar and lighted runway—base for the company's new Merlin III propjet and a Helio Courier. Jim Codell and other company personnel log approximately 500 hours annually on the Merlin, as they use it for bidding and inspecting trips. The STOL-equipped (Short Take-Off and Landing) Helio Courier earns its way by making emergency on-site deliveries of parts (it can take off and land on less than 150 feet of level ground), and by providing quick hops to construction sites for over-all supervisory personnel.

The Codell Construction Company is a family business, but the "family" is not limited to blood lines. Of 750 employees, 160 have been with the company more than three years. Two generations of one family are often working side by side. Evident in each is a personal interest in and devotion to the firm.

And each employee knows he has a share in the things that make running a difficult business worthwhile to Jim Codell: the pride and satisfaction he feels when he can look at a completed job and say: "We did that"

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN

HON. HOWARD W. CANNON

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, an impressive legislator is leaving national service after 15 years of dedicated public service. He is my longtime colleague and personal friend, B. EVERETT JORDAN of North Carolina. As a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration under the leadership of Senator JORDAN, I have had a great opportunity to know the man and his work well.

I have long admired EVERETT for his tremendous capacity for hard work, his dedication to his Nation and State and his unfailing courtesy toward all who work and associate with him.

Much valuable legislation, including the Federal Elections Campaign Act, came to fruition in great part due to his great interest and tireless efforts.

His service on the Public Works Committee led to some excellent environmental legislation, which included the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1970 and strengthening of the National Air Quality Standards Act.

It is for these reasons that Senator JORDAN's work in the Senate and for his constituents have endeared him to all throughout the years. He has done a great job. His colleagues and the Nation will miss him.

The Daily Times News of Burlington, N.C., wrote an outstanding tribute to Senator JORDAN. With unanimous consent I would like to share it with my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

SENATOR JORDAN ACHIEVES IMPRESSIVE RECORD OF SERVICE

WASHINGTON.—Someone else's name will be on Sen. B. Everett Jordan's desk when the 93rd Congress opens for business on Jan. 3.

He will once again be a private citizen after nearly 15 years on Capitol Hill.

There is already clear evidence, however, that his departure from the legislative arena is going to leave a void that his replacement will find extremely hard to fill.

The record speaks for itself as it reflects the stature the North Carolina lawmaker had attained in the Senate since coming to Washington—19th ranking Democrat, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, second-ranking member of the Public Works Committee and third-ranking member of the Agriculture Committee.

The same record shows that during his final year he served as chairman of more legislative committees and subcommittees and joint and selective committees in combination than did any other of the 535 members of the Senate and House.

No other member of Congress can lay claim to Jordan's distinction of having been named chairman of the Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies in three consecutive Presidential election years.

Still another hallmark of the final phase of the North Carolinian's Senate career was the start of construction on the James Madison Memorial and Library of Congress Annex—a multimillion dollar project authorized by legislation which he sponsored and planned by a coordinating committee for which he served as chairman.

TRIBUTES

It remained, however, for colleagues with whom he has served to provide the most convincing proof of how high he ranks with them both as a man and as a legislator and the degree to which he will be missed by those fellow Senators.

The pages of the Congressional Record were laced with personal tributes to him during the days immediately prior to adjournment and they covered the whole spectrum of the Senate—Republicans as well as Democrats, liberals as well as moderates and conservatives, and Senate leaders as well as rank-and-file members.

The words of the tributes varied.

Some cited his kindness, compassion and capacity for friendship and understanding.

Others spoke of his integrity, sound judgment and sense of dedication.

His legislative accomplishments, particularly in the fields of agriculture and public works, and his contributions to effective and efficient Senate operations in his capacity as chairman of the Rules Committee, came in for prominent mention.

If the words differed, though, the message was the same. It was an expression of admiration, respect and even warm affection for Everett Jordan from people who wanted him to know how they felt.

Just as significant was a happening of a few days before the end of the session. On the night of Oct. 12 Sen. Ernest Hollings decided to stage a reception in Jordan's honor.

Since it appeared then that Congress might adjourn sometime on the 14th, the night of the 13th was the only available time.

It took until noon of that day to make arrangements and get notes out to senatorial offices, and the remainder of the invitations had to be made by telephone.

MANY EXPRESSIONS

Even so, there were at least 250 guests there to greet the honoree and Mrs. Jordan. A good half of the Senate members were on hand at various times, shuttling between the reception room and the floor where a night Senate session was still in progress.

Typically, even Jordan did some shuttling in order not to miss any of the roll call votes.

He was just as faithful in his attendance right up to adjournment night, even though some of the sessions during the final week ran to midnight or later.

Walking briskly into the office before 9 a.m. the morning after one of those sessions he remarked cheerily to an aide that "it takes us young folks to stand up to that kind of hours."

BILLS PASSED

When adjournment finally came on the night of Oct. 18 Jordan could, notwithstanding his primary defeat, look back with pride and satisfaction at a year in which seven bills he had introduced and 11 others of which he was a co-sponsor had been signed into law.

Probably the best-known of the measures on the list which he co-sponsored was the Federal Elections Campaign Act devised jointly by his Senate Rules Committee and the Senate Commerce Committee as a means of limiting campaign spending and requiring fuller reporting of contributions and expenses.

The bill which could conceivably, in the long run, be the most important measure of his career is one known as the Technology Assessment Act.

Its purpose, in simple terms, is the creation of an Office of Technology Assessment staffed with experts equipped to advise Congress on legislation involving complex technical or scientific factors and on the impact which can be anticipated from adoption of such measures.

Jordan's view in proposing that measure was that in dealing with the complicated issues of space-age living Congress needs the best information it can possibly get "and the bill in question proposes a way for it to be provided when and in the way it is needed."

Other measures on the Jordan introduction or cosponsor list cover a wide range of subjects ranging from water pollution control and a study of the Great Dismal Swamp to designation of Depository libraries (the N.C. Supreme Court Library being the first so tagged), amendment of public building regulations, increased compensation for (disabled) veterans and provision for rural development.

ANOTHER ASSIGNMENT

Even though his legislative work ended with congressional adjournment, Jordan still has one more Senate assignment to complete before his term expires. He has been named by Majority Leader Mansfield as a representative to a meeting of the North American Treaty Organization in Bonn, Germany, in mid-November, a mission for which he was selected on the basis of his long experience as vice-chairman of the U.S. delegation to the Interparliamentary Union.

Presumably that will complete his Senate work, but those who know Everett Jordan best are convinced that he will be just as eager to work for the good of North Carolina and the country at the end of his Senate career as he was at the beginning.

REPORT ON SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIR AND WATER POLLUTION ACTIVITY IN THE 92D CONGRESS

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, which I chair, is responsible for legisla-

tion and oversight in the Committee on Public Works relating to air and water pollution, solid waste management and resource recovery, control of noise and other matters affecting the environment. During the 92d Congress, the subcommittee produced major new laws in the areas of water and noise pollution and devoted considerable time to oversight of Federal efforts to control air pollution and solid waste which were undertaken pursuant to laws passed in 1970.

In 1972, the subcommittee held 24 days of public hearings and participated in 10 executive sessions relating to subcommittee matters. Members also participated in 39 conference committee sessions with Members of the House of Representatives. In 1971, the subcommittee held 25 days of public hearings and participated in 46 executive sessions relating to subcommittee matters.

It is clear from both the oversight hearings and the resistance encountered with respect to new laws—particularly the President's veto of the new water pollution control legislation—that the environmental honeymoon has long since passed. Entrenched opposition to the kind of public regulation, enforcement and investment that is necessary for meaningful environmental protection and improvement has surfaced in both the public and the private sectors, and continued vigilance is vital if we are to insure continued progress.

CLEAN AIR ACT OVERSIGHT

The necessity of this vigilance became evident during the subcommittee's oversight hearings on air pollution.

The oversight activity began February 16, 1972, and included 12 days of hearings in Washington, one field hearing in Los Angeles, Calif., on March 25, and an executive session on June 2 at which representatives of the Environmental Protection Agency discussed potential criminal violations by the auto companies in implementing the Clean Air Act.

The hearings were divided into two stages. The first stage examined implementation of title I, which requires the development of State implementation plans to assure that primary air quality standards are met by 1975—guaranteeing air quality which will protect the public health—and that secondary air quality standards—guaranteeing air quality that will protect the public welfare—are met by a reasonable time thereafter. Title I also establishes uniform national standards for performance of new stationary sources of air pollution and for air pollution from hazardous substances. In regard to title I, testimony at the hearings and staff investigations indicated that:

First. Officials at the White House, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Department of Commerce—working through its National Industrial Pollution Control Council—assumed a major role in developing and revising key guidelines relating to the Clean Air Act. The hearings produced a flow chart—repudiated by EPA—which showed that OMB, rather than EPA would be responsible for final review of State implementation plans. In addition, testimony indicated that the NIPCC reviewed EPA guidelines before they were made public, that members of NIPCC commented on EPA guidelines during the public review stages, and that NIPCC had a third opportunity to review, comment on, and revise EPA guidelines after the public review period had closed. Subsequent investigations indicate that OMB has delayed issuance of guidelines relating to hazardous substances since the spring of 1972, with the result that, nearly 2 years after enactment of the Clean Air Act, no action has been taken to control air pollution from such dangerous substances as asbestos. The final publication of standards relating to lead in gasoline, originally proposed in February 1972, also has been delayed.

Second. The specific requirement of the Clean Air Act that emission limitations be imposed on industrial polluters as an element of the control strategy of State plans was ignored. Instead, EPA was allowing a "closed loop" control strategy favored by industrial polluters. This strategy, State and local witnesses testified, was one which made it very difficult to monitor performance and enforce clean air standards. During the hearings, a smelter in El Paso, Tex., was singled out by industry witnesses as the most successful "closed loop" system. Subsequently, it was revealed that air pollution from this El Paso smelter was causing very serious lead pollution problems in the El Paso community. As of this date, EPA has not published guidelines relating to "closed loop" emission control systems.

Third. Clear legislative history and the administration's own guidelines under the 1967 Clean Air Act, which prohibited degradation of air quality in areas with air cleaner than the standards, were being ignored and degradation was being permitted. In effect the Clean Air Act, which Congress intended as a device to achieve cleaner air, was being interpreted as a license to make clean air dirtier up to certain maximum levels. Though EPA defended this interpretation, a U.S. district court and a court of appeals have ruled that EPA was wrong and that the Clean Air Act did prohibit degradation of clean air.

Fourth. At the direction of the Office of Management and Budget and the National Industrial Pollution Control Council, EPA had revised its guidelines to allow consideration of cost effectiveness by States in developing regulations to protect public health, despite clear legislative history that public health not be sacrificed to short term cost considerations. Several witnesses testified that this changed interpretation resulted in heavy pressure by industries against States which desired to adopt strict control regulations.

Fifth. Major Federal leadership was urgently needed in developing new technology to control air pollution from stationary sources—particularly sulfur oxide pollution from coal-burning electric powerplants. However, this Federal leadership appeared to be lacking because the administration planned to spend only about one-fourth of the amount authorized by Congress for research. Research efforts in some areas, including sulfur oxide control, were actually being curtailed, although there was no evidence that techniques had been developed and perfected to the point where they could be readily marketed to solve the air pollution problems.

Subsequent to the hearings, the Environmental Protection Agency reviewed and approved most of the State plans for achieving primary air quality standards in the five air pollutant categories for which EPA had published standards. In most instances where the States, as allowed by the law, requested extensions of the 1975 deadline for achieving primary air quality standards, the extensions were granted despite the fact that most States requesting the extensions appeared to have made little effort to achieve desired levels of air quality through land use or transportation controls. These controls were suggested in the Clean Air Act as devices to improve air quality where controls of individual emissions, by themselves, were not adequate.

The second phase of the hearings concerned title II, the provisions of the Clean Air Act establishing emission control standards for motor vehicles, including requirements for a 90 percent reduction of carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon emissions by 1975 and a 90 percent reduction of nitrogen oxide emissions by 1976. While the hearings were in progress, EPA denied the automakers' request for a 1-year extension of the 1975 emission control standards. The hearings and staff investigations indicated that:

First. Technology appeared to be available to meet the 1975 air quality standards despite a study by the National Academy of Sciences which indicated to the contrary. During testimony, witnesses from the NAS admitted that their study was based primarily on data supplied from the auto industry. Subsequent to the hearing, manufacturers of three automobiles, Mercedes Benz, Mazda, and Honda, have indicated that their cars will meet the 1975 standards.

Second. EPA had determined that they would not allow the auto industry to gain certification of cars as meeting the standards through "averaging" of vehicles, allowing some to be produced that were below the standards and if replacement of elements of the emission control system was required before the end of the useful life of the car, these replacements would be made at no additional cost to the auto owners—that is the cost would have to be included in the purchase price of the car. Auto industry executives had termed these two points "major concessions" which if granted would make it much easier for them to meet the 1975 standards.

Third. Many of the cost figures for meeting the 1975 standards which were being discussed were grossly inflated over actual cost and represented "sticker price" or "retail price" which included sizable markups in price over the actual cost to the manufacturer or the real cost at which cars would be sold to consumers.

Fourth. Emission control devices cur-

rently receiving most attention by American manufacturers might result in less efficient use of gasoline and some reduction in performance over current models. One study of catalytic converters discussed at the hearing, however, had indicated no substantial reductions in performance or fuel mileage.

Fifth. The Ford Motor Co. announced that it had performed unauthorized maintenance in testing of its 1972 and 1973 model year prototypes and that this maintenance had not been reported to EPA with vehicle certification requests, thus violating provisions of the Clean Air Act. As of this date no civil or criminal action has been taken against the Ford Motor Co. or any Ford employees in connection with the violations of the act.

Sixth. A study by the General Accounting Office, done at the request of the subcommittee, indicated that EPA procedures for overseeing certification of new motor vehicles were woefully inadequate and that, principally because of inadequate funding, the EPA test facility was only utilized to one-third of capacity, there were no in-plant inspections of manufacturers' testing activities, and only 17 EPA employees were assigned to monitor testing and certification relating to 52 auto companies and hundreds of different models of cars.

Seventh. The 1-year limit on vehicle certifications imposed by the Clean Air Act had been ignored by 10 auto companies with the consent of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Eighth. Because of the inadequacy of EPA test procedures, auto manufacturers had been able to rig their automobile emission control devices to pass the tests but at the same time fail to work under many normal driving conditions.

RESOURCE RECOVERY ACT OVERSIGHT

The subcommittee also held oversight hearings during the 92d Congress on the Government's response to the Resource Recovery Act and found that inaction and misdirection have forestalled any significant progress in the area of solid waste management and resource recovery.

A field hearing in San Diego on August 23 and other investigations by the subcommittee staff indicated that major changes in the current solid waste program appear to be necessary if the Federal programs dealing with the solid waste management problem are to have any degree of success. The hearings and investigations indicated the following:

First. The mandate of the 1970 Resource Recovery Act that Federal policy change direction from emphasizing disposal to emphasizing recycling and resource recovery has been almost entirely ignored in implementation of the act.

Second. Sites for future land disposal of solid waste are increasingly difficult to find.

Third. Current Federal policies relating to taxes, freight rates, public lands management, and other economic influences strongly favor disposal after first use of raw materials rather than recycling and reuse of once-used materials.

Fourth. Federal regulation of products to reduce the volume of solid waste before the point of disposal is probably necessary, particularly in the area of packaging.

Fifth. There is significant citizen awareness of the need to engage in better solid waste management practices, but this is accompanied by frustration at limitations on the availability of recycleable and reusable products and potential markets for goods and materials which can be recycled.

WATER POLLUTION LEGISLATION

Final enactment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 was the subcommittee's most important achievement. During 1972, subcommittee members met in 39 conference committee sessions with representatives of the House Committee on Public Works. This was preceded in 1971 by 33 days of public hearings and 45 executive sessions of the subcommittee and the committee on the water bill. Thus, subcommittee members met a total of 117 times in developing the most comprehensive water-pollution legislation ever enacted.

On September 14, 1972, the conferees reached agreement. Both Houses of Congress agreed to the conference report on October 5—the Senate by a margin of 74 to 0.

The water pollution bill was vetoed by the President on October 17, but the veto was overridden by a 52-to-12 margin in the Senate and a 247-to-23 margin in the House, and the water pollution bill was enacted into law as Public Law 92–500.

Key provisions of the new law relate to:

POLLUTION DILUTION

The law specifically bans pollution dilution as an alternative to waste treatment, although stream flow augmentation is recognized as a useful means of reducing the environmental impact of runoff from nonpoint sources.

INPLACE POLLUTANTS

Because of the rigorous nature of the test to be applied to any application for a permit for the disposal of dredged soil, the law provides for a program to assure that the economic base of Great Lakes harbors would not be disrupted by environmental requirements. The law intends that a major effort be put forth to remove inplace pollutants, especially toxic pollutants, from harbors in the Great Lakes and that material be disposed of in a manner which shall assure minimal environmental impact.

CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

The law authorizes $18 billion for fiscal years 1973 to 1975 for 75-percent Federal grants to communities through contract authority for construction of sewage treatment facilities. This provision also authorizes grants for the reconstruction of existing sewage collection systems and the installation of new collection systems in existing communities but not new communities. Priority on the distribution of funds made available is to be given to the construction of needed waste treatment facilities.

The removal of a requirement in the previous law that a State participate in each project in order to receive a higher level of Federal assistance should provide the States with more flexibility in the distribution of limited funds.

The new law changes the financing method to a contract authority approach with contract obligations later fulfilled by appropriations. This way the States and communities are assured an orderly flow of Federal payments. This should in turn result in substantial savings and efficiency.

The law provides for reimbursement to those agencies—including States, municipalities and intermunicipal agencies—which have continued with their water pollution control construction program but which did not receive the full amount of Federal contributions.

The $2.75 billion authorized for this purpose is intended to place all States and cities on an equal basis and to redress any discrimination that may have existed in prior programs against those larger municipal agencies which were unable to take full advantage of the Federal sharing programs in effect at various times since the inception of the program.

AREA WASTE TREATMENT MANAGEMENT

The law requires the development of areawide waste management plans with statewide planning, either through a regional process in a designated area or by the State for areas outside of designated regions. There must be a waste management planning process within 1 year after enactment, and initial plans must be filed with the Administrator within 2 years after that process is initiated. Waste management agencies must be designated covering the entire area of the State. More than one management agency may be designated in any planning region, and existing entities, including local governments or the State itself, are to be utilized where appropriate.

EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS

A two-phase program is established for the application and enforcement of effluent limitations. The first phase requires point sources to achieve that level of effluent reduction identified as "best practicable control technology" no later than July 1, 1977; the second phase requires the application of "best available control technology" by July 1, 1983.

In defining "best practicable" for any given industrial category, the Environmental Protection Agency is expected to take a number of factors into account. These factors should include the age of the plants, their size, the unit processes involved, and the cost of applying such controls.

The EPA may interpret "best practicable" to require higher levels of control than any currently in place if it determines that the technology to achieve those higher levels can be practicably applied.

The law requires that implementation plans and compliance schedules in existing water quality standards be adhered to, to the extent that those plans and schedules require compliance no later than July 1, 1977, and to the extent that they call for a degree of pollution control no less stringent than that defined by "best practicable control technology."

A different test is applied to the En-

vironmental Protection Agency's determination of "best available demonstrated technology." In determining the degree of effluent reduction to be achieved for a category or class of sources by 1983, the EPA may consider a broader range of technological alternatives and should, at a minimum, review capabilities which exist in operation or which can be applied as a result of public and private research efforts.

In making the determination of "best available" for a category or class, the EPA is expected to apply the same principles involved in making the determination of "best practicable"—outlined above—except as to cost-benefit analysis. As to the cost of 'best available" technology, the law intends that, while cost should be a factor in the Environmental Protection Agency's judgment, no balancing test will be required. Also, rather than establishing the range of levels in reference to the average of the best performers in an industrial category, the range should, at a minimum, be established with reference to the best performer in any industrial category.

The distinction between "best practicable" and "best available" is intended to reflect the need to press toward increasingly higher levels of control in 6-year stages. Through the research and development of new processes, modifications, replacement of obsolete plans and processes, and other improvements in technology, it is anticipated that it should be possible, taking into account the cost of controls, to achieve by 1983 levels of control with approach and achieve the elimination of the discharge of pollutants.

INFORMATION AND GUIDELINES

The Environmental Protection Agency must publish guidelines for the establishment of the effluent limitations to be achieved by categories and classes of point sources—other than publicly owned treatment works.

EPA is expected to be precise in the guidelines so as to assure that similar point sources with similar characteristics, regardless of their location or the nature of the water into which the discharge is made, will meet similar effluent limitations.

However, EPA may modify any effluent limitation based on "best available technology" to be achieved by July 1, 1983, with respect to any individual point source, upon a showing by the owner or operator of such point source that an effluent limitation so modified will represent the maximum use of technology within the economic capability of the operator and will result in reasonable further progress toward the goal of the elimination of the discharge of pollutants.

The law clearly contemplates that the decisionmaking responsibility, as in the Clean Air Act, on guidelines and regulations to be published under this act rests, unless otherwise specified, with the Administrator of EPA and not such other agencies as the Office of Management and Budget and the National Industrial Pollution Control Council. EPA regulations and guidelines are not to be reviewed by these and other agencies prior to their promulgation except on the same basis as review and comment by members of the public. OMB comment and review should thus come in the form of comments available to the public, made during the period for public comment.

NATIONAL STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE

In order to assure that a reasonable cost test is met, the Administrator must take into account the cost of compliance with any new source performance standards as applied to any category or class of new sources. The law expects that this cost test would be considerably more restrictive than the test which would be applied to "best available technology" because pollution control alternatives are available to a new source which are not available to existing sources.

It may be that in most instances, the technology for elimination of discharge of pollutants from new sources can be achieved on a considerably more reasonable basis than for existing sources. The law intends that this alternative be examined carefully and each determination of standards applicable to any category of new sources be periodically reexamined by the Administrator to insure that any new source constructed does the best that can be done in terms of performance.

TOXIC AND PRETREATMENT EFFLUENT STANDARDS

Each municipal waste treatment plant must, as a condition of a permit for discharge, identify any industrial users of that plant and pretreatment requirements applicable to each industrial user. A violation by the industrial user of pretreatment requirements would be enforceable directly against that user by the EPA.

FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT

EPA is required to issue abatement orders where it finds that any person is in violation of enumerated regulatory requirements of the act.

It is expected, of course, that upon receipt of information giving the EPA reason to believe that a violation has occurred, it has an affirmative duty to take the steps necessary to determine whether a violation has occurred, including such investigation as may be necessary, and to make a finding as expeditiously as practicable.

It is intended that enforcement actions be initiated against both continuous and intermittent violations of effluent limitations as well as against violations of compliance schedules. Because permits are expected to include precise compliance schedules, the Administrator must initiate enforcement action whenever there are delays in such actions as completion of plans and design, letting of contracts, initiation of construction, or the meeting of construction deadlines.

OIL AND HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE LIABILITY

The law provides that during the first 2 years following enactment, a penalty procedure establishing a liability limit of $50,000 for nonremovable discharges of oil and hazardous substances from vessels and onshore and offshore facilities shall apply. At the expiration of this 2-year period, a modified liability-penalty provision will be implemented. The 2-year period should provide the Administrator with ample opportunity to designate those substances which are hazardous and cannot be removed, and to establish a penalty level for each.

During the initial 2-year period, the Administrator and affected parties will examine any problems associated with administrative establishment of liability limits. This period will also permit examination of the need for legislation to improve the existing methods of storing, shipping, and handling hazardous substances which cannot be removed from the water.

Prior to the expiration of the 2-year period under which the penalty is operative, and after the maritime industry, the insurance industry, the chemical industry, and appropriate Federal agencies have examined the implications of the modified liability—penalty provision, legislative recommendations should be made to the appropriate committees of Congress as to the needs to improve the capability of vessels to avoid hazardous substance spills. Should new legislation be considered any liability provisions imposed will be reviewed and necessary changes proposed by the Committees on Public Works.

NATIONAL STUDY COMMISSION

The law provides for a study to provide Congress with an independent evaluation of the economic, social, and environmental implications of the regulatory aspects of the legislation.

THERMAL DISCHARGES

Thermal pollutants will be regulated as any other pollutant unless an owner or operator of a point source can prove that a modified thermal limitation can be applied which will assure "protection and propagation of a balanced indigenous population of fish, shellfish, and wildlife."

CERTIFICATION

The certification provision provides that a State water pollution control agency will have an opportunity to determine whether or not effluent limitations established for discharges subject to a section 402 permit will be at least as stringent as any applicable requirements of existing State program. Secondly, a State may attach to any federally issued license or permit such conditions as may be necessary to assure compliance with water quality standards in that State.

NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM

The law provides that the Administrator may review any permit issued pursuant to this act as to its consistency with the guidelines and requirements of the act. Should the Administrator find that a proposed permit does not conform to the guidelines issued pursuant to this act, he shall notify the State of his determination, and the permit cannot issue until the Administrator determines that the necessary changes have been made to assure compliance with such guidelines and requirements. The Administrator is permitted to waive entirely his authority to review permits for certain categories and classes of pollution sources to all States which receive a delegation. The Administrator is also permitted to specify categories and classes for which he will not review for

States.

No enforcement action should be taken for failure to have a permit until December 31, 1974. This will provide an adequate opportunity for the Administrator to review and issue or not issue permits for the application pending on the date of enactment or pending as a result of expansion of the program.

Concern has been expressed that the "immunity" provision will cause dismissal of pending enforcement actions under the Refuse Act of 1899. Section 4, the savings provision, provides the following relevant words pertaining to the Refuse Act:

> No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the Administrator or any other officer or employee of the United States in his official capacity . . . shall abate by reason of the taking effect of the amendment made by section 2 of this Act.

Without question, it is intended that this provision includes enforcement actions brought under the Refuse Act, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and any other acts of Congress.

Additionally, it should be noted that the Administrator may immediately act on pending permit applications. Should he deny a permit to an applicant, enforcement provisions would also be available immediately.

OCEAN DUMPING

The law provides for the Administrator to review any proposed discharge into the oceans prior to the issuance of guidelines under this section and to make a determination whether or not such discharges are in the public interest.

This section regulates the discharge of any pollutants subject to this act from any outfall sewer regardless of where that sewer ends and from any vessel within the 3-mile limit, any other legislation to the contrary notwithstanding. Should the Administrator find that criteria regulating discharges into the territorial sea from vessels established by other legislation are in conflict with this legislation, this legislation prevails.

PERMITS FOR DREDGED OR FILL MATERIAL

The law intends that the Secretary of the Army have the permit-issuing authority with respect to the disposal of dredged spoil. However, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency has three clear responsibilities and authorities.

First, the Administrator has both responsibility and authority for failure to obtain a permit for disposal of dredged spoil or failure to comply with the condition thereon. Enforcement authority is available because discharge of the "pollutant" dredged spoil without a permit or in violation of a permit would violate effluent limitations established by the act.

Second, the Environmental Protection Agency must determine whether or not a site to be used for the disposal of dredged spoil is acceptable when judged against the criteria established for fresh and ocean waters similar to that required under the ocean dumping section of the law.

Third, the Administrator must determine that the material to be disposed of will not adversely affect municipal water supplies, shellfish beds and fishery areas—including spawning and breeding areas—wildlife or recreational areas in the specified site. Should the Administrator so determine, no permit may issue.

DISPOSAL OF SEWAGE SLUDGE

The law includes a provision which relates to the disposal of sewage sludge from waste treatment plants. Disposition of sewage sludge—either by dumping sludge on land in such a fashion as to run off into waters or dumping in the ocean in such a manner as would have it returned into territorial waters—in any manner which might affect the inland or coastal navigable waters is prohibited. This provision should, in conjunction with the provision which regulates any ocean dumping inside the 3-mile limit, provide adequate safeguards against immediate threats to the shorelines, beaches and fish, shellfish and wildlife and recreational resources in coastal areas.

EMERGENCY POWERS

Under the law, the Administrator may seek an injunction against any discharge which presents an imminent substantial endangerment to the health of persons, to their economic well-being, or to fish and wildlife. This provision is intended to be a supplement to and not a substitute for the regulatory provisions of the bill.

CITIZEN SUITS

For purposes of the citizen suit section of the law, a citizen is defined as a "person or persons having an interest which is or may be adversely affected." Thus, under the language of the law, a citizen suit may be brought only by those persons or groups which are among those whose interest—whether environmental or economic—is or may be injured by the violation of the act which is the basis of the suit. Citizens seeking to bring an action are required to give appropriate notice and wait 60 days before filing suit to give the appropriate administrative agencies a chance to act.

OTHER AFFECTED AUTHORITY

The law intends to clarify the relationship between the Federal Water Pollution Control Act—FWPCA—and the National Environmental Policy Act—NEPA—and to extend the provisions of NEPA to two activities of the Administrator: the making of grants for the construction of publicly owned waste treatment works and the issuance of permits under section 402 of the FWPCA to "new sources" as defined in the law.

Application of sections 102(2)(C) and 102(2)(D) of NEPA to the making of waste treatment grants requires the Administrator to consider "alternative" methods of waste treatment which may have the beneficial effect of decreasing blind reliance on "secondary treatment" and stimulate more innovative methods of waste treatment. Additionally, the Administrator is required to consider the various "alternatives" described in sections 102(2)(C) and 102(2)(D) of NEPA

Further, this provision addresses itself to the authority of Federal licensing and permitting agencies, other than EPA, as relates to effluent limitations and other requirements established pursuant to the FWPCA. EPA is the sole Federal agency specifically charged with comprehensive responsibility to regulate the discharge of pollutants into the waters of the United States, and section 511(c)(2) will ensure that no source of discharge which is in lawful compliance with an effluent limitation established pursuant to the FWPCA will be required to meet a different standard as a condition of a license or permit granted by another Federal agency, such as the Atomic Energy Commission. Such agencies shall accept as dispositive the determinations of EPA and the States; however, nothing in section 511(c)(2) is to be construed to discharge any Federal licensing or permitting agency, other than EPA, from its full range of NEPA to be licensed or permitted.

ENVIRONMENTAL FINANCING AUTHORITY

The law establishes an Environmental Financing Authority—EFA—to assist communities unable to obtain adequate financing to fund the local share of the cost of waste treatment projects assisted by this Act. EFA will cease to exist on July 1, 1975. This termination date was included to permit a complete reevaluation of EFA at any early date.

The law does not intend that EFA come into competition with the private underwriting market, nor should EFA become involved in any circumstances where a community can borrow money on the open market at reasonable rates. EFA is intended only to assist those communities which, after a reasonable attempt to obtain financing in the private market, have been unable to obtain funds needed to construct waste treatment facilities at a reasonable cost.

NOISE CONTROL LEGISLATION

In 1972 the subcommittee also developed the first comprehensive legislation for the control of noise. The subcommittee held public hearings on noise control legislation on March 24 in San Francisco, Calif., and on April 12 and 13 in Washington, D.C. Following the public hearings there were two executive sessions by the subcommittee and six executive sessions by the full committee, culminating in committee's reporting the Environmental Noise Control Act of 1972 on September 19. The noise bill passed the Senate on October 13 and was finally approved by both Houses of Congress on October 18 when the House passed the Senate bill with amendments which the Senate subsequently agreed to.

The version of the act finally approved was a distinct improvement over either the Senate or the House bill. This new law should offer the Nation some protection from the growing onslought of unwanted sounds which threatens to impair the physical and mental well-being of a growing number of Americans.

Key features of this legislation provide for the regulation of manufactured products, aircraft, and interstate carriers. The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is required to identify

products which are major sources of noise and which fall into the categories of construction equipment, transportation equipment, any motor or engine, or electrical or electronic equipment, as distinguished from household appliances. He must establish noise emission standards for these products within 24 months after enactment.

Not only must EPA determine the level of noise emissions from a product which will assure that the product's use under varying conditions will not contribute to unacceptable environmental noise levels, EPA must also be assured that noise emission standards for a product will be adequate to protect public health and welfare when that product is used in combination with other products or sources of noise. This will necessitate standards for an individual source of noise which are considerably more stringent than might be required if that product were always to be used alone. In establishing these regulations, the Administrator must take into account the technology which is available to reduce noise.

Additionally, States and local governments retain the right to adopt and enforce controls on environmental noise which are more stringent than Federal product standards, through the licensing, regulation or restriction of the use, operation or movement of any product or combination of products. State and local regulatory agencies will be aided by EPA, which is required to develop and publish information identifying levels of environmental noise at which adverse effects on public health and welfare can be avoided with an adequate margin of safety.

The Environmental Protection Agency is also authorized to initiate a regulatory process to protect public health and welfare from aircraft noise. The Administrator shall conclude within 9 months a study of aircraft noise problems, including the implications and means of achieving levels of cumulative noise around airports, the adequacy of existing noise emission standards and operational controls, and the impact of aircraft noise on public health and welfare. Subsequent to that study the Administrator is required to take the lead on the control of aircraft noise, submitting regulations adequate to protect public health and welfare from aircraft noise and sonic boom. Such regulations must include proposed means of reducing noise in airport environments through the imposition of curfews, the application of noise emission standards on new and existing aircraft and the imposition of flight path alternatives, and controls to increase the load factor on commercial flights or other reductions in the joint use of airports.

Within 30 days, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall publish the EPA-proposed regulations as its notice of proposed rulemaking and, within 60 days he must hold a public hearing on the EPA proposal. On the basis of that hearing and after consultation with the EPA, the FAA must publicly accept, modify or reject the regulations contained in the EPA proposal. The FAA Administrator is required, as the result of the hearing process and after consultation with the EPA, to prescribe regulations to implement the proposed or modified recommendations. In summary, both a technological response in the form of emission standards and a regulatory procedure in the form of operational and other airport noise controls must be established.

The Federal Aviation Administration's regulatory responsibility is retained in order to assure technological availability and to ensure air safety. However, the FAA, following the lead of EPA, will be required to promulgate regulations which assure protection of public health and welfare in airport environments even where it is not possible to achieve necessary noise reductions through the application of specific emission controls on engines and aircraft.

The decisions of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration in accepting, modifying, or rejecting the proposals of the Environmental Protection Agency, or in promulgating aircraft noise standards, are subject to judicial review. In addition, any individual can bring suit against the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for failure to perform a duty which is not discretionary. In such a case, the test of the Administrator's action is not whether it is arbitrary or capricious, but whether it is consistent with the express requirements of the act.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is also authorized to establish noise emission standards for interstate carriers, including railroads, trucks, and buses. This preemption provision is designed to reduce the impact of conflicting State and local noise controls on interstate carriers. However, the administration is permitted to waive this provision as necessitated by local conditions, to protect the public health and welfare; $21 million is authorized for fiscal years 1973 through 1975 to implement the noise control program.

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL CENTERS

In March of 1971, several members of the committee introduced the National Environmental Laboratory Act of 1971. The bill was designed to establish a national system of environmental laboratories which would provide the needed research and data on environmental pollution. Ultimately, 34 Senators cosponsored this legislation.

Following 6 days of public hearings, the bill, retitled the National Environmental Centers Act of 1971, was reported to the Senate on November 30, 1971, and passed on December 7, 1971. The House did not act on this bill in the 92d Congress.

INTERSTATE ENVIRONMENTAL COMPACTS LEGISLATION

On January 24, the subcommittee held a hearing on a bill to permit establishment of interstate environmental compacts. The bill had previously been reported from the Judiciary Committee. An executive session was held on this bill on February 15 at which time it was reported to the Senate with amendments. The subcommittee amendments which were accepted by the Senate on March 1, 1972, provided assurances that provisions of interstate compacts affecting the environment could be reviewed by Congress, before final adoption, to avoid any adverse implications for the environment. The House did not act on the interstate compacts bill during the 92d Congress.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

In May and June 1971, the subcommittee held 3 days of public hearings into the possibility of economic dislocation resulting from environmental control orders. Testimony at these hearings and subsequent investigations served as the basis for amendments included in the 1972 economic development legislation to protect employees who might lose jobs because of environmental control orders and require EPA investigations of plant closings justified because of environmental control orders to determine if environmental matters were being used to disguise other reasons for a plant closing.

The 1972 economic development legislation was vetoed in part because of inclusion of these provisions.

New developments in cleaning up automobile exhaust, including alternatives to the internal combustion engine, and their potential impact in meeting standards prescribed by the Clean Air Act were examined at a hearing held by the subcommittee's panel on Environmental Science and Technology in Washington, D.C. on March 14, 1972.

The subcommittee, in conjunction with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held 4 days of oversight hearings on the Impact of the National Environmental Policy Act beginning on March 1, 1972.

An oversight hearing was also held on the environmental problems of the Lake Tahoe Basin and Federal policies affecting those problems on August 21, 1972 at Lake Tahoe.

DEDICATION OF SCIENCE CENTER AT COVINGTON, KY.

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of an address I made at the dedication of the Science Center at Thomas More College, Covington, Ky., on September 24, 1972.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHN SHERMAN COOPER AT DEDICATION OF SCIENCE CENTER, THOMAS MORE COLLEGE, COVINGTON, KY., SEPTEMBER 24, 1972

It is a great honor to be asked to speak during these days of the dedication of the Science Center which you commenced in 1971, marking the 50th anniversary of this college. Today you mark another stage in the history of Thomas More College, formerly Villa Madonna College which has served with such excellence, the religious communities which have fostered it and the citizenry of this community and the nation, indeed.

Your progress and excellence in traditional academic fields has led to the establishment of this Science Center as a creative institution for training in a demanding area of thought. The reputation for academic excellence which attends Thomas More College is a tribute to President DeGaff, to your faculty, the interest and support of the college administration, its alumni and certainly of the citizens of Covington, Newport and many other communities.

It is also fitting that you have on exhibit during these ceremonies a moon rock acquired during Apollo XII Flight, November 14, 1969–November 24, 1969. The Astronauts were Charles Conrad and Alan Bean. I am told that the characteristics of this rock do not occur on our own planet and it is a reminder of the universe whose secrets man is still discovering. I appreciate being given the universe in which to roam but, upon taking thought, I know at once that I do not have the scientific and technical knowledge or the imagination which flows from such knowledge which has been opened to mankind in the exploration in space. I appreciate as you do, those who have such imagination and knowledge and the daring and courage of those who have been sent into space but I think it better to leave these broader aspects to those who teach and study here and to illustrious scientists and philosophers who will certainly visit you in the future. It does indicate to us that our nation depends in ever increasing degree on its colleges and universities for creative thought and intellectual leadership in the search for basic knowledge.

There is another and perhaps more important aspect of this day. It is to emphasize the necessity of our schools, colleges and universities in joining with home and church in the nurture of those fundamental qualities of character and spirituality without which the life of the individual and our country will become barren.

I sense that there is an appropriate connection between the dedication of the new science building and the life and example of the man for whom your college is named. It is not often said that Sir Thomas More was one of the great scientists of his day. But in his life it was possible for great scholars to master almost all written knowledge. In a time of great scholars, he was known as a man of deep and humane learning whose scholarship ranged over the whole frontier of knowledge. Sir Thomas More, whose life bridged the end of the 15th century and the beginning of the 16th, was part of the enthusiasm of learning and knowledge that produced such distinguished humanists as Erasmus and John Colet and led to the great achievements of Montaigne, Shakespeare and Copernicus of the age to follow. In his time, there was no break between the sciences and the arts. A scholar was a master of all the arts, medicine, philosophy, law, music and even war. The highest science, the Divine Science, was the study of philosophy and theology. Thomas More, as did the other leaders of his day, saw a consistency in the teachings of God, the physical facts of the universe and the conduct of mankind.

Thomas More is treasured and remembered because he died for principle, for his belief in the sanctity of truth and knowledge. For his courage and his faith in reason and law, he was made a saint in the Catholic Church.

The age in which Thomas More lived was no less troubled than our own. The Tudor world of Henry the Eighth was one of violence and intrigue. The discoveries of new phenomena in the natural world challenged accepted beliefs just as they do now, the machinations and varying fortunes of rulers and states, different in detail, of course, are very similar in kind to the situations we all face now.

We value Thomas More for his utopian recognition of the complexities of life. His *Utopia* was a masterful work of irony very similar in purpose if different in kind to his friend Erasmus' great work, *In Praise of Folly*. Both Erasmus and More saw how far short of perfection the works of mankind reached, and wrote of the true world they lived in and its contrast with the ideal world of reason and faith. The life of both men, but particularly that of Thomas More, was affected by the fortunes of unprincipled men and nations. He was a friend of Henry the Eighth, and his chief counselor, as a great lawyer and philosopher, but greater than that friendship, he was firm in his belief that the world, to have meaning, must be principled. Thomas More was executed for his steadfastness and refusal to twist the law for the purposes of the King and the State. He refused to bend, because to do so would have broken his faith in God, in reason and the truth of natural law. It is reported that before he was beheaded, he invoked the prayers of the people, said that he died for his church and that he was "the King's good servant, but God's first."

Very few men are called upon to make a choice between dying for belief or betrayal of ones rational beliefs and inner faith and soul. But the ultimate example of Thomas More's sacrifice for belief has its parallel in the daily lives of us all, whether it is in deciding upon how to vote on a bill before the Congress, how to deal with and live with ones friends, acquaintances and those unknown, of all races and classes in the daily rounds of life in college, in business or at home.

We have great problems before our country. The Vietnam war has caused disaffection. Technology and science provide an affluence and leisure we never dreamed of a few years ago, but lack of knowledge, training, and even incentive prevent many from enjoying its fruits. The movement of countless thousands from rural to urban areas has caused strains in our cities, economic and social, which thus far we have not been able to solve. And, there is always the danger that it may be difficult to bring back into the full stream of American life those who are disadvantaged, discontented and alienated.

These facts have led some to doubt our government and society, to claim they are repressive of freedom and opportunity, and that it is impossible for the individual to affect the course of human affairs.

I know as you do, that a totalitarian system could not resolve any doubt or cure our problems. It may suit other peoples, it may move with its actual repression more quickly than ours, but we know that it shatters the intellectual and religious freedom which comes from ones deep held views of his relationship with the Creator and self-fulfillment. Those who protest and doubt might very well recall the experience of the people of Czechoslovakia who in 1968 were bereft in two days of the small freedoms they had nurtured. The caption of one news report from Czechoslovakia gave the words of a student and underlined the pathos of a people when he said, "We were happy for a time."

Our Constitution, the Bill of Rights, our laws, express the freedom of the individual in this country. There must be free expression, there must be a continuous and searching examination of our institutions but I abjure with all my heart the tendency among many in this country, both young and old, to abuse this freedom by the violation of law and by threats and violence.

Violence, hate and obscenities do not accord with freedom of expression, with freedom in its broadest sense and with any principle of love or reason upon which the association of men must depend. As I have said many times, I do not minimize the problems of our country, but I know of no country in the world whose government and people as a whole are making such determined efforts to correct them—in the fields of discrimination, poverty, the environment, education and social needs.

A scholar, Alfred Bestor, wrote in 1952: "What we do not recognize clearly is the necessity of producing the free men who are to inhabit the world we seek to preserve." The true object of education is the individual. It is the development of his full capacities, for the good of our country, its security, its leadership, its prosperity, and its culture. But above all, it is for him, and it is to open, as has been written: "Those unlimited worlds of the senses, the remembrance, the mind and heart, which beyond that of their own existence, are the only human hope, dignity, solace and joy." It is true as it has been from the beginning that it is the man of liberal education who comprehends mankind and the universe, and is free. This free man is needed today.

I rejoice with you today on the dedication of this Science Center which will do its part in assuring the development of the full capacities of all those who may study here—the free man to inhabit this dear country we seek to preserve. I rejoice with you in the history of this great college, in the memory of those who have created it, the loyalty of those who have supported it and in its never failing purpose that not mind, alone, but the character and spirit of man must be nurtured.

We can remember Thomas More for his dedication to a life of faith, of reason, and of just conduct with his fellowmen. His life is an enduring example and an appropriate one for this college which today dedicates the Science Center, which will surely enlarge the minds, perspectives and faith of all those who study here.

It was my good fortune several years ago to see the play, "A Man for All Seasons," and recalling it, I repeat these quotations:

Robert Whittinton: "More is a man of an angel's wit and singular learning; I know not his fellow. For where is the man of that gentleness, lowliness, and affability? And as time requireth a man of marvellous mirth and pastimes; and sometimes of as sad gravity: a man for all seasons."

Samuel Johnson: "He was the person of the greatest virtue these islands ever produced."

May all of us here be worthy of Thomas More College.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1972

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the announced retirement of the Honorable CHARLES H. GRIFFIN, of the Mississippi Third District, is news of the saddest kind, forecasting the absence from this Chamber of a man of great mind and formidable personality; a man truly concerned for the interests of his district, the State of Mississippi, and the Nation at large.

Attracted to public life at an early age, CHARLES GRIFFIN entered the political arena immediately following his graduation from Mississippi State University in 1949, as administrative assistant to Congressman John Bell Williams of Mississippi. He was to hold that post for 19 years, before succeeding Congressman Williams as Representative of the Mississippi Third District in 1968.

In his brief congressional career, CHARLES GRIFFIN has impressed us all with his businesslike, conscientious manner, his close devotion to detail, and his broad understanding of the problems confronting his district and the country. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee he established overnight a reputation for knowledge of money matters that has rivaled that of many of his seniors.

As a vigorous campaigner, none can be said to outshine this remarkable man, who picked up 64 percent of the vote in his district 2 years ago and seemed certain of reelection this year, preceding his decision to retire.

My friendship with CHARLES GRIFFIN has not been a long one. But in the period of our acquaintance he has impressed me as a person of the greatest capabilities. I would like at this time to wish him well, on the occasion of his retirement, in the knowledge that wherever he goes and whatever occupation he chooses to pursue in the period ahead, he is certain of success.

THE FOURTH 6 MONTHS: A LEGISLATIVE RECORD, JULY 1972 TO ADJOURNMENT

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with my policy of providing detailed information to my constituents of the Third District of Kentucky, I am inserting in the RECORD the following summary of my legislative activity during the final months of the second session of the 92d Congress:

THE FOURTH 6 MONTHS: A LEGISLATIVE RECORD, JULY 1972 TO ADJOURNMENT

1. PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY

The final adjournment of the 92d Congress occurred at 8:49 p.m. Wednesday, October 18, 1972. After the last bells had sounded, the final records of the Tally Clerk showed that Members of the House of Representatives had taken part in an unprecedented 648 roll call votes.

This total represents an incredible 46 per cent increase over the number of "on the record" votes taken in the preceding Congress, during which Members answered to their names on only 443 votes.

The major reason for this great increase in public accountability was the elimination of the old "secret teller vote," procedure, which in the past had enabled Congressman to cast many controversial votes without public disclosure of their actions.

My personal voting record for the entire 92d Congress shows that I took part in 634 of the 648 "on the record" votes for a percentage of 97.8. When the 284 Quorum Calls taken during the 92d Congress were added in, I ended up with an overall voting-attendance record of 97.4 per cent, having answered to 908 out of 932 roll calls.

The trend toward a more open and accountable Congress is, in my opinion, very healthy and very important. I am pleased that I was able to achieve a high percentage because I feel very strongly that my constituents have a right to know how their Representative voted on all of the important questions considered by the Congress.

2. THE EXECUTIVE VERSUS THE LEGISLATIVE

The closing months of the 92d Congress were marked by several clashes of authority between the Legislative and Executive branches of our government. During this period, Congress twice overrode Presidential vetoes and denied the Administration's request for unrestricted power to impose a Federal spending limit. Congress also considered, but failed to pass, legislation to limit the President's power to involve American forces in prolonged, undeclared wars.

These issues—plus the President's dozen vetoes handed down after the Congress had adjourned and could no longer vote to override—tended to obscure the major, positive achievements of the final months of the Session.

(These important achievements—revenue sharing, ratification of the S.A.L.T. agreement, liberalization of Social Security provisions and increases in veterans' educational benefits—are discussed elsewhere in this summary.)

For the most part, the differences between the Executive and Legislative branches pertained to spending priorities—and who, under our Constitution, is responsible for setting them.

This issue was most clearly presented by the President's request that Congress set a $250 billion spending limit for this fiscal year and give him unrestricted authority to determine where spending cuts should be made.

Because of inflation and because of the possibility of the need for Federal tax increases in the immediate future, I favored the President's objective of holding the line on Federal spending. However, I did not believe that he should be given the sole authority to decide which programs should be reduced or eliminated.

Accordingly, I voted for an amendment to authorize the imposition of the $250 billion ceiling, but requiring the President to submit his proposed spending reductions to Congress for approval. When this amendment failed, I supported the President's original proposal. The Senate, however, did not go along with the spending ceiling authorization and the proposal did not gain final passage.

I voted, along with majorities in both Houses of Congress, to override the vetoes of the Water Pollution Control bill and the legislation to increase Railroad Retirement benefits. In both instances, I felt that legitimate domestic priorities were being served. And, in the case of the Railroad Retirement bill, I am confident the next Congress will act to restructure this important pension fund and restore it to a fiscally sound condition.

Another serious question—touching on the basic Constitutional principle of separation of powers—was raised in legislative proposals to reaffirm the role of Congress in declaring wars or committing troops to combat.

The House, in August, voted to substitute its own version of legislation defining "the war powers of Congress and the President" for a similar bill passed earlier by the Senate. Unfortunately, conferees from the two Houses were unable to strike a compromise and no legislation was passed. I voted for the House bill and feel this issue will be debated again in the next Congress so that there is no repetition of a prolonged undeclared war such as the one we have fought in Indochina.

3. FISCAL AND ECONOMIC POLICY

The landmark State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972, better known as the Revenue Sharing bill, received final House approval on October 12. Despite reservations about the Federal deficit, I supported this key domestic program.

Under the formula worked out by a House-Senate Conference Committee, Kentucky will receive $87.3 million during the first year of revenue sharing and $95.9 million in the second year. Jefferson County's first year allocation will total $17.1 million distributed among the various units of municipal and county government.

On October 14, the House completed action on another important domestic economic measure, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1972, to provide new jobs and business opportunities in chronically depressed areas. This legislation, which would have been particularly beneficial in rural areas of Kentucky suffering from outmigration of their young people, drew my support. However, it was among the bills vetoed after the Congress had adjourned.

Another key measure affecting our overall domestic economy, the Rural Development Act of 1972, was signed into law by the President. This legislation provides funds for the development of water and waste disposal projects and other community facilities in rural areas. It should do much to achieve a better distribution of population throughout our vast nation.

In August, and again in October, I voted to try to break the deadlock which developed in the House over legislation to increase the Federal minimum wage standard.

Both the House and Senate voted to increase the minimum wage from its present level of $1.60 an hour, but a majority in the House was able to prevent a Conference to resolve differences between the two versions of the bill. I voted in favor of going to Conference so that a compromise bill might be passed. A new attempt to raise the minimum wage can be expected early in the next Congress.

4. DEFENSE AND FOREIGN POLICY

The historic S.A.L.T. agreement, limiting Soviet and United States offensive nuclear weapons, received final approval from the House on September 25. The President accepted a Congressional amendment specifying that future, permanent treaties must assure rough numerical equality of forces.

Coupled with the permanent Soviet-U.S. treaty restricting development of anti-ballistic missiles (ABM) systems, the interim S.A.L.T. accord represents a major thaw in "Cold War" international relations.

The interim agreement on strategic offensive arms freezes U.S. and Soviet land-based missiles and nuclear submarines at existing levels. I wholeheartedly supported this momentous step to halt the senseless nuclear arms race.

As I have in the past, I voted on August 10 in favor of legislation to impose a fund cutoff for the war in Indochina, subject to the release of our prisoners of war and the accounting for our missing. This version of the "end the war amendment" would have been included in this year's foreign aid bill. However, it was defeated by a vote of 228 to 178.

Two issues related to the development of an all-volunteer Army—and elimination of the draft—gained House passage. In September, after a lively floor debate, an appropriation allowing the Army to hire civilians to perform "KP duty" was approved. In October, the Uniformed Services Special Pay Structure bill was passed by the House. Both these measures are intended to increase incentives for voluntary, career military service. I supported both.

5. OLDER AMERICANS

The Social Security Amendments of 1972, described by Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Elliot L. Richardson as "the most significant piece of social legislation enacted since the original Social Security Act of 1935," gained final passage on October 17—the day before adjournment.

It has been estimated that more than 7 million Americans will benefit favorably from this legislation, including 220,000 who will be lifted out of poverty.

The new law will provide equity in Social Security cash benefit program—through increased benefits to widows, liberalization of

the retirement test and making the method of computing benefits the same for men and women at age 62.

It will provide for a direct attack on the high cost of health care through provisions designed to encourage physician peer review and utilization of health maintenance organizations.

Effective January 1, 1974, current state-administered welfare programs for the aged, the blind and the disabled will be replaced by a uniform Federal program of supplementary security income, including progressive features allowing, rather than discouraging, additional earnings.

Similarly, the new Social Security provisions—which take effect January 1, 1973—contain greatly liberalized "outside income" allowances for retired beneficiaries. Under the new standards, an individual can earn up to $2,100 a year—rather than $1,680—without any reduction in benefits. Above $2,100, an individual loses only one dollar in benefits for every two dollars earned.

These provisions will provide our older citizens with much greater incentive to remain productive and stay involved in life.

Two other bills affecting the elderly—the Comprehensive Older Americans Act and legislation to establish a National Institute on Aging—were passed by the House in July, but fell victim to post-adjournment vetoes. I supported both measures and hope these objectives can be incorporated into our domestic legislative priorities in the near future.

6. ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

Federal legislation to control strip mining, for the very first time, was brought to the floor of the House on October 11 and was passed by an overwhelming 265 to 75 vote.

As a co-sponsor of this bill, I was delighted by the degree of support it drew in the House—but disappointed by the Senate's failure to take it up prior to adjournment.

In a related matter, legislation to promote needed research into environmentally sound mining and reclamation techniques—the Mines and Minerals Policy Act Amendments—gained final House approval on October 10, but was among the bills vetoed following the session.

Other important Congressional actions in the area of environmental protection include; the overriding of the veto of the $24.6 billion Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments which set a national goal of eliminating pollutant discharges by 1985, the Coastal Zone Management Act to protect our seashores, legislation providing for the accelerated reforestation of national lands, and several measures tightening controls over the use of pesticides and other toxic chemicals. I supported all of these important new laws.

The question of increased Federal support for public mass transportation was the subject of intense debate during consideration of the Federal Aid Highway Act. On a key parliamentary vote, taken October 5, I voted in favor of opening up the bill for consideration of proposed amendments to provide funds for mass transit. Since final action was not taken on this bill, the question will be debated anew early in the next Congress.

7. HEALTH LEGISLATION

During the closing months of the Session, the House completed action on new laws to strengthen the school lunch program and expand it to include a nutrition program for nursing mothers. Also enacted were bills to beef up the U.S. Public Health Service's Communicable Disease Programs and to increase efforts to combat Cooley's Anemia and diseases of the heart, blood vessels, lungs and blood.

In addition, I took an active interest in the development of legislation to expand Federal support for emergency medical services. During committee deliberations, I presented a panel of witnesses who testified about the need for improved ambulance service in Louisville.

On October 2, the House passed the Emergency Medical Services Act, which I co-sponsored. This bill authorized $255 million in grants over the next three years. Unfortunately, the Senate passed a differing version and agreement between the two Houses could not be reached.

Another disappointment to me was the veto of the Veterans Medical Act, which received final House approval on October 11. This legislation would have improved care for our wounded veterans returning from Vietnam.

8. CONSUMER PROTECTION

One major piece of consumer legislation—the Consumer Product Safety Act—was enacted during the final months of the 92nd Congress.

This law, establishes Federal safeguards against hazardous consumer products and creates an independent Product Safety Commission to enforce them. This bill drew the support of 319 House Members—including myself—when it came up for passage on September 20.

Another issue of interest to consumer advocates was a bill authorizing compensation to businesses and individuals who suffered losses due to the government's ban on cyclamates. I voted against this measure because I feel it might encourage the utilization of other risky food additives.

9. EDUCATION

On October 11, the House completed action on the Vietnam Era Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act, which increased GI educational benefits by more than 25 per cent. Under the new law, the basic monthly rate—payable during the nine-month academic year—for a single veteran enrolled in a full-time program is increased to $220 from the former rate of $175.

I feel that a great debt is owed to the Veterans of this unfortunate conflict, and I believe they will make a great contribution to the educational institutions they choose to attend. I voted for this legislation with considerable enthusiasm.

Because of educational television's great potential for reaching all segments of our society, I have voted for continued full funding of the sometimes controversial Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

The original C.P.B. authorization for fiscal 1973 was vetoed, but the House acted in August to renew the authorization and appropriate funds at a somewhat reduced level. Subsequent vetoes of the Labor-H.E.W. appropriations bills resulted in a further reduction in C.P.B. operating funds this year.

I co-sponsored legislation to establish tax credits for parents paying private school tuition. This legislation was never reported out of committee. If passed, it would have to be subjected to testing by our courts. However, I feel this is an important area in which some means of fiscal relief should be afforded.

10. LAW ENFORCEMENT

Groundwork was laid during the closing months of the Congress for stringent new legislation to deal with the escalating problem of aircraft hijacking. I co-sponsored a bill to impose sanctions against nations which harbor or provide sanctuary for hijackers. Another bill dealing with this problem gained House passage on October 2, but agreement was not reached with the Senate. Further action in this area can be expected early in the new Congress.

The Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act, which I co-sponsored, was passed by the House in July and has been enacted into law. It provides for in-school programs to reach youngsters before they become established delinquents.

I also joined with members of the House Judiciary Committee in sponsoring a major proposal for much-needed reform of the Federal Parole System. I am hopeful that action will be taken on this legislation during the upcoming Congress.

DEWEY DANIEL OF PERRY COUNTY, KY.

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, one of the great men of Kentucky, Dewey Daniel, of Hazard, Ky., died on January 22 of this year.

Born in the hills he loved, he spent his entire life in the county of his birth, Perry County, and became its outstanding banking, business, and political leader. His friendships extended across Kentucky, as did his leadership in many civic causes, but always his chief concern and work was for the advancement and progress of his beloved eastern Kentucky.

He was an accepted and respected leader of the Republican Party, serving as chairman of the Republican State central committee during the 1950's when the party achieved its great success, and was also delegate to many national conventions. He was devoted to his very wonderful wife, Clarine, and to his sisters and brothers and their children.

One of the privileges of my life was to have known Dewey Daniel, his warm and generous personality, and to have enjoyed his friendship. I am grateful for my association with him. His death was a great loss to me, to all who knew him, and to Kentucky.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following articles:

An article from the Hazard Herald, January 26, 1972, "'King of the Mountains,' Dewey Daniel Dead at 73"; also, an article from the Louisville Courier-Journal, January 23, 1972, "Advocate for Progress, Dewey Daniel, Civic, Business, and Political Leader Is Dead"; also, an editorial of the Louisville Courier-Journal of January 25, 1972, "Eastern Kentucky Loses Its 'King'"; and an editorial from the Lexington, Ky., Leader, January 28, 1972, "Dewey Daniel's Contribution"; and also an article by the esteemed columnist of the Louisville Courier-Journal, Joe Creason, on January 25, 1972, "Dewey Daniel: A Man Who Was Far Ahead of His Time."

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the memorial sermon given by Rev. E. Tipton Carroll of Hazard, Ky., at the funeral service for Dewey Daniel.

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

[From the Hazard, Ky., Herald, Jan. 26, 1972]

"KING OF THE MOUNTAINS" DEWEY DANIEL DEAD AT 73

The "King of the Mountains" is in his final resting place.

Dewey Daniel of Hazard died at 6 a.m. Saturday at the Hazard Appalachian Re-

gional Hospital and was buried in the old D.Y. Combs Cemetery here Monday after funeral services at the Hazard Christian Church.

He has been hospitalized since suffering a stroke 6½ years ago.

He is survived by his wife, Clarine Ross Daniel; a brother, J. M. Daniel of Hazard; a sister, Mrs. Alie Daniel of Hazard.

He is also survived by the following nephews and nieces: Joe Pat Gorman, William D. Gorman, L. D. Gorman, Richard D. Cooper, C. Vernon Cooper Jr., Mrs. Margaret Gorman Martin, all of Hazard; Mrs. Susan Daniel Henry of Lexington; Mrs. Neva Cooper Hassanein of New York City, and Perry Lee Gorman of Dallas, Tex.

Daniel's legacy of involvement and his rise to statewide prominence as a business, civic and political leader began humbly in the Big Leatherwood section of Perry County, where he was born March 15, 1898.

During his rise to wealth and esteem among the mountain men and women of the area, Daniel proved that his region offered opportunities for those who would pursue them.

He entered the fire and casualty insurance business when few underwriters would accept risks in the coal country, and his agency became the largest in Kentucky.

He entered the banking business during the Depression when banks were going broke in large numbers. His Peoples Bank in Hazard became an institution of unusual soundness.

He bought coal land and mineral rights at a time when coal men were losing faith in the industry and moving out. Later, he induced mining men to reenter the business because the need for jobs in Eastern Kentucky had grown acute.

The successes that followed these ventures provided Daniel with the foundation on which he could build his role of benefactor.

He was an especially soft touch for young men and women needing jobs and money for higher education.

But Daniel's influence began to be felt far outside his native hills. He was interested in upgrading all of Kentucky.

As an example, he was co-founder and president of the Kentucky Better Roads Council, an organization that strove for upgrading of roads in Kentucky. One victory was passage of the first $100 million road-bond issue. Daniel and former-Gov. Keen Johnson together led the campaign for its passage in 1956.

Daniel also fought for a modern constitution. Although weak from surgery after having suffered a stroke on July 2, 1965, Daniel attended an important meeting of the Constitution Revision Commission in Frankfort in 1966. He was stricken again at the meeting and his health began to decline steadily.

Despite his other accomplishments and contributions, Daniel was best known on the political scene.

As chairman of the Republican State Central Committee from 1954 to 1959, he reorganized his party behind its two chief standard bearers, U.S. Sens. John Sherman Cooper and Thruston B. Morton.

From 1924 onward, he missed just one Republican National Convention, and, in 1932, became a regular as a delegate to the conventions.

Being a Republican in a Democratic state did not, however, hinder Daniel politically. He played his politics deftly and developed some important friendships in high Democratic circles. He was thus able to win for Hazard and Perry County their full share of public works and patronage favors. He soon became known as "Mr. Republican."

The turn of events that produced Daniel's remarkable career came early in his life.

Of most significance was a decision of his father, Leo Daniel, to move from Big Leatherwood to Hazard where the five Daniel children would have better schooling opportunities. Since that meant finding a new livelihood, the father ran for and won the office of Perry circuit clerk in 1904. He held the post until 1916.

Another event that shaped young Dewey's destiny came at the age of 16. He was offered an appointment to West Point. He left on one train for a preparatory school in North Carolina and returned on the next one. Homesickness, or more so a love for his native heath, prevailed over ambition.

The lack of an advanced education didn't deter Daniel. He liked to boast of a "courthouse education," because much of his time was spent in his father's office. He learned there about business and fiscal affairs and dealing with people.

After his schooling at Hazard Baptist Institute, he went to work in a coal commissary at Domino, now Combs, near Hazard. He advanced quickly to store manager and, while just 23, he accepted his first political challenge.

His first and last political race was for Perry County clerk in 1921. Victory seemed assured, but he withdrew from the race to accept appointment as Hazard postmaster. The job was in "acting" capacity at first because he was too young for a fullfledged appointee. He remained postmaster until 1936.

His business instincts began asserting themselves in 1924, when he helped establish the insurance firm. Four years later, he bought a small block of capital stock in a bank at Vicco. He influenced its removal to Hazard when other banks failed. As time passed, he became the largest stockholder of Peoples Bank and became its president in 1952.

Other business enterprises have included one of the first home cable television systems in Kentucky. His antenna tower was erected on a high mountain, and it brought better television reception to hundreds of Hazard homes.

Modesty and a desire to stay out of the spotlight prevent a full accounting of Daniel's contributions to his people. His forte was organization. He pressed others into responsible undertakings, such as in charitable and civic work, and let them take the credit.

It is known, though, that the responsibilities that Daniel took for himself would overburden many another civic giant. In addition to the positions and promotions that brought him prominence, his energies were applied to worthwhile causes of countless varieties.

Red Cross and Boy Scout work, for example, were aided by Daniel. He worked for the Buckhorn School and Orphanage, serving as treasurer of the Buckhorn Foundation. He was a trustee of the E. O. Robinson mountain Fund, started as a $1 million trust by a lumberman who, like Daniel, wanted to help mountain youth.

Daniel was a member of the Hazard Masonic Lodge and Kosair Temple in Louisville. He was a charter member of the Hazard Lions Club, and a member of the Pendennis Club in Louisville. He was a director of the Hazard Chamber of Commerce and treasurer of Perry County since 1950.

Shortly before his first stroke, Daniel and Mrs. Daniel moved into a home that has been a Daniel dream. He married Clarine Ross of Cynthiana in 1926, and their life had been lived in the lower section of Hazard, known as Woodland Park. Their new home sits on the point of a ridge high over Hazard.

His fondest dream of all was realized while he still lay in a hospital bed. The University of Kentucky announced its selection of Hazard as a location for a community college.

Daniel had pushed energetically for this objective. His sincerity, including an offer of 75 acres of choice campus land, apparently swayed university officials in favor of Hazard.

[From the Courier-Journal & Times, Jan. 23, 1972]

ADVOCATE FOR PROGRESS

(By Kyle Vance)

HAZARD, KY.—Dewey Daniel, a man who devoted a lifetime to promoting the cause of his native Eastern Kentucky, is dead at 73.

Daniel, who was known to many in the region as the "king of the mountains," died at 6 a.m. Saturday at Hazard Appalachian Hospital. He had been hospitalized since suffering a stroke 6½ years ago.

He is survived by his wife, Clarine Ross Daniel; a brother, J. M. Daniel of Hazard; a sister, Mrs. Allie Daniel of Hazard.

He is also survived by the following nephews and nieces: Joe Pat Gorman, William D. Gorman, L. D. Gorman, Richard D. Cooper, C. Vernon Cooper Jr., Mrs. Margaret Gorman Martin, all of Hazard; Mrs. Susan Daniel Henry of Lexington; Mrs. Neva Cooper Hassanein of New York City, and Perry Lee Gorman of Dallas, Tex.

The body was taken to Engle Funeral Home in Hazard. The funeral will be at 10:30 a.m. Monday at the Hazard Christian Church. Burial will be in the family cemetery in Hazard.

Daniel's legacy of involvement and his rise to statewide prominence as a business, civic and political leader began humbly in the Big Leatherwood section of Perry County, where he was born March 15, 1898.

PROVED REGION'S WORTH

During his rise to wealth and esteem among the mountain men and women of the area, Daniel proved that his region offered opportunities for those who would pursue them.

He entered the fire and casualty insurance business when few underwriters would accept risks in the coal country, and his agency became one of the largest in Kentucky.

He entered the banking business during the Depression when banks were going broke in large numbers. His Peoples Bank in Hazard became an institution of unusual soundness.

He bought coal land and mineral rights at a time when coal men were losing faith in the industry and moving out. Later, he induced mining men to reenter the business because the need for jobs in Eastern Kentucky had grown acute.

The successes that followed these ventures provided Daniel with the foundation on which he could build his role of benefactor.

He was an especially soft touch for young men and women needing jobs and money for higher education.

HIS INFLUENCE WAS STATEWIDE

But Daniel's influence began to be felt far outside his native hills. He was interested in upgrading all of Kentucky.

As an example, he was co-founder and president of the Kentucky Better Roads Council, an organization that strove for upgrading of roads in Kentucky. One victory was passage of the first $100 million road-bond issue. Daniel and former-Gov. Keen Johnson together led the campaign for its passage in 1956.

Daniel also found for a modern constitution. Although weak from surgery after having suffered a stroke on July 2, 1965, Daniel attended an important meeting of the Constitution Revision Commission in Frankfort in 1966. He was stricken again at the meeting and his health began to decline steadily.

Despite his other accomplishments and contributions, Daniel was best known on the political scene.

As chairman of the Republican State Central Committee from 1954 to 1959, he reorganized his party behind its two chief stand-

ard bearers, U.S. Sens. John Sherman Cooper and Thurston B. Morton.

From 1924 onward, he missed just one Republican National Convention, and, in 1932, became a regular as a delegate to the conventions.

Being a Republican in a Democratic state did not, however, hinder Daniel politically. He played his politics deftly and developed some important friendships in high Democratic circles. He was thus able to win for Hazard and Perry County their full share of public works and patronage favors. He soon became known as "Mr. Republican."

The turn of events that produced Daniel's remarkable career came early in his life.

Of most significance was a decision of his father, Lee Daniel, to move from Big Leatherwood to Hazard where the five Daniel children would have better schooling opportunities. Since that meant finding a new livelihood, the father ran for and won the office of Perry circuit clerk in 1904. He held the post until 1916.

Another event that shaped young Dewey's destiny came at the age of 16. He was offered an appointment to West Point. He left on one train for a preparatory school in North Carolina and returned on the next one. Homesickness, or more so a love for his native hearth, prevailed over ambition.

The lack of an advanced education didn't deter Daniel. He liked to boast of a "courthouse education," because much of his time was spent in his father's office. He learned there about business and fiscal affairs and dealing with people.

After his schooling at Hazard Baptist Institute, he went to work in a coal commissary at Domino, now Combs, near Hazard. He advanced quickly to store manager and, while just 23, he accepted his first political challenge.

KEEN BUSINESS INSTINCTS

His first and last political race was for Perry County clerk in 1921. Victory seemed assured, but he withdrew from the race to accept appointment as Hazard postmaster. The job was in "acting" capacity at first because he was too young for a full fledged appointment. He remained postmaster until 1936.

His business instincts began asserting themselves in 1924, when he helped establish the insurance firm. Four years later, he bought a small block of capitol stock in a bank at Vicco. He influenced its removal to Hazard when other banks failed. As time passed, he became the largest stockholder of Peoples Bank and became its president in 1952.

Other business enterprises have included one of the first home cable television systems in Kentucky. His antenna tower was erected on a high mountain, and it brought better television reception to hundreds of Hazard homes.

Modesty and a desire to stay out of the spotlight prevent a full accounting of Daniel's contributions to his people. His forte was organization. He pressed others into responsible undertakings, such as in charitable and civic work, and let them take the credit.

DREAM FULFILLED

It is known, though, that the responsibilities that Daniel took for himself would overburden many another civic giant. In addition to the positions and promotions that brought him prominence, his energies were applied to worthwhile causes of countless varieties.

The Red Cross and Boy Scouts, for example, were aided by Daniel. He worked for the Buckhorn School and Orphanage, serving as treasurer of the Buckhorn Foundation. He was a trustee of the E. O. Robinson Mountain Fund, started as a $1 million trust by a lumberman who, like Daniel, wanted to help mountain youth.

Daniel was a member of the Hazard Masonic Lodge and Kosair Temple in Louisville. He was a charter member of the Hazard Lions Club, and a member of the Pendennis Club in Louisville. He was a director of the Hazard Chamber of Commerce and treasurer of Perry County since 1950.

Shortly before his first stroke, Daniel and Mrs. Daniel moved into a home that had been a Daniel dream. He married Clarine Ross of Cynthiana in 1926, and their life had been lived in the lower section of Hazard, known as Woodland Park. Their new home sits on the point of a ridge high over Hazard.

His fondest dream of all was realized while he still lay in a hospital bed. The University of Kentucky announced its selection of Hazard as a location for a community colege.

Daniel had pushed energetically for this objective. His sincerity, including an offer of 75 acres of choice campus land, apparently swayed university officials in favor of Hazard.

[From the Louisville, Ky., Courier-Journal, Jan. 25, 1972]

EASTERN KENTUCKY LOSES ITS "KING"

Eastern Kentucky, a land badly in need of friends, lost one of its best Saturday when Dewey Daniel of Hazard died.

He devoted his life to the proposition that the Appalachians offer opportunities to both investors and workers who wish to pursue them, and his own achievement of wealth and esteem in his native land was the highest testimony to the truth of his belief.

Even his 6½-year sojourn in a hospital after his first stroke didn't dampen his interest in his land and his people. Whether his goal was to attract industry to Eastern Kentucky, to find money to send mountain youth to college, or to promote better government for the Commonwealth, his pursuit of it was characterized by toughness, persistence and generosity.

If his power made him "king of the mountains," his benevolence made the title an affectionate one.

[From the Lexington, Ky., Leader, Jan. 28, 1972]

DEWEY DANIEL'S CONTRIBUTION

The people of Eastern Kentucky have lost a great friend in the death of Dewey Daniel, 73, of Hazard.

A shrewd Republican businessman who knew the ways of free enterprise, Mr. Daniel also was a workhorse for a number of excellent causes to enrich the people of the Commonwealth, particularly those living in his beloved mountains.

His guidance as co-founder and president of the Kentucky Better Roads Council, his efforts as a delegate trying to modernize Kentucky's antiquated Constitution and his success in bringing a University of Kentucky Community College to Hazard are but a few of the many civic projects he gave himself to unselfishly.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Jan. 28, 1972]

DEWEY DANIEL: A MAN WHO WAS FAR AHEAD OF HIS TIME

(By Joe Creason)

Eastern Kentucky lost its No. 1 booster and champion of good roads last week when Dewey Daniel, a big man who stood as tall as the hills where he was born and where he lived his 73 years, died in Hazard.

For Eastern Kentucky was his consuming interest. One of the area's most successful men, with a long string of successes in banking, insurance, real estate and national politics to his credit, he worked tirelessly to open up and improve the economic and civic life of his hill-studded home land.

Through good times and bad, he never lost confidence that Eastern Kentucky has a golden future if only it could be unlocked and tied to the rest of the state by good roads.

"With good roads, this section can bloom," he said the first time I met him more than 25 years ago. "Without good roads, we'll never get industry to balance out our coal economy or be able to take advantage of our potential in tourism.

"The day is coming," he continued prophetically, "when Kentucky must meet its road problems squarely with bond issues for new construction only. Perhaps the best method for paying off such bonds would be to build toll roads."

Which, of course, is the method Kentucky in time came to employ in building its vast network of pay-as-you-ride roads. Appropriately, one such road taps Hazard, while another under construction begins there.

If "self-made" ever is a safe phrase to pin on a man, then it certainly fitted Dewey Daniel. Everything he did, he did on his own in what, for lack of better words, has been called the good old All-American tradition of hard work and perseverance.

When he ventured into the insurance business in Hazard in 1924, Eastern Kentucky was off-limits to most firms. Fire insurance companies shied away because of the great number of frame buildings, while life firms weren't interested because so many residents were involved in coal mining, a high-risk occupation.

But through relentless searching, Daniel finally was able to find one company willing to write fire insurance and then scored a major breakthrough when, for the first time in the area, a firm agreed to write coal-mine compensation type policies. All of which turned his agency into one of the largest in Kentucky.

And that wasn't bad for a boy who grew up on Leatherwood Creek and who cared so little for formal schooling he gave it up at age 17.

MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR DEWEY DANIEL, HAZARD, KY., JANUARY 24, 1972

(By E. Tipton Carroll, Minister)

OPENING SCRIPTURAL SENTENCES

The dwelling place of God is with men, and he shall dwell with them, and they shall be his people. We are now children of God, and it is not yet manifest what we shall be. We know that we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. We now see through a glass darkly; but then face to face; now I know in part; but then I shall know even as I also am known.

God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. For as the heaven is high above the earth, so great is his mercy toward them that love him. I will lift up my eyes unto the hills, from whence comes my help. I will say of the Lord, He is my refuge and strength; in him will I trust. Therefore we will not fear, though the earth changes, and though the mountains be shaken into the seas. Nothing shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus. He will fulfill the desire of them that love him; he also will hear their cry, and will save them. Our help is in the name of the Lord, who made the heaven and the earth, and Christ Jesus our Lord.

INVOCATION PRAYER

Our Father, whose love is infinite and in whose will is our peace; enable us to so hear your Holy Word, that through patience and comfort of the Holy Spirit and the Scriptures we may hope. And grant us the consolation of your presence, that we may be raised above the shadows of mortality into the light of your countenance and the joy of your eternalness.

Enable us to put our trust in you and see that you are touched with the feeling of our emptiness; that we may come boldly unto your throne of grace and obtain mercy and find grace to help us in this time of need.

Father, in all of your dealings with us, whether of joy or pain, of light or darkness, let us value no treatment of yours simply be-

cause it makes us happy or because it makes us sad; because it gives us or denies us what we want; but may all that you send us bring us to yourself; that knowing your perfectness we may be sure in every disappointment, that you are still loving us; that in every darkness you are still enlightening us, and giving us eternal life.

Reveal yourself to Dewey's family, and cause them to hear you saying: "My peace I give unto you." Cause them to abide in you through living faith; that, finding now the comfort of your presence, they may also have a sure confidence in you for all that is to come. Hear us for your great mercy's sake, Amen.

COMFORT THROUGH SCRIPTURE

Lord, a thousand years in your sight are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch in the night. The days of our years are three score and ten; and if by reason of strength they be fourscore years; teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom. Let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us.

The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The Lord is my strength; of whom shall I be afraid? One thing have I desired of the Lord, that will I seek after; that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the beauty of the Lord. For in the time of trouble he shall set me up upon a rock. Therefore I will sing praises unto the Lord. Be of good courage, and he shall strengthen your heart. Wait on the Lord.

Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or anguish, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? No, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor powers, nor things present, not things to come, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

So the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.

So as I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I fear no evil; for you are with me; your rod and your staff, they comfort me. You prepare a table before me in the presence of my enemies; you anoint my head with oil; my cup overflows. Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I shall dwell in the house of the Lord for ever.

REMARKS

Words, at any time, are poor tools to express the real feeling and emotion that one has for another human being whom he loves, and who in return is loved. What does one say at a time like this, when Dewey Daniel, my friend and partner, (as he called me), as close to me and I to him, as human beings can possibly be? What does one say about a man of his caliber and character, a man full of conflicting emotions and actions? A man who loved deeply, but mountain-like unable to express verbally his love; attempting to fill the gap by doing things for these whom he loved. What does one say about a man with whom one had shared the innermost hopes, dreams, successes, failures and feelings? What does one say when a family, friends, and community have lost a towering mountain peak man, known as Mr. Eastern Kentucky? What does one say about a man who made rib-rock friends and unceasing enemies, because he went ahead with what he believed should be done in any given situation? What does one say about a man who climbed to the top of Peter's Peak, looked out over the undulating mountain peaks, saw people in the valleys and dreamed dreams of what could be done for them? What does one say about a man who swept the lobby floors of a mountain hotel as a mere led and rose to where he wanted every mountaineer to go "first class"? What does one say about a man with whom one has shared all these things and more, as his minister and friend, when that man is no more with us?

I don't know! What I do know is that I loved Dewey Daniel and that he loved me. Our love for one another cannot be expressed with words, or can it be understood by those who have never experienced it. I knew Dewey Daniel, as perhaps no man knew him. Others knew him as friends through politics, business, finance, projects, as one whom he loved, trusted implicitly, and to whom he turned when he needed assistance in determining the rightness or wrongness of an action taken or contemplated. I knew his goodness and his badness, and respected him because I knew he wanted always to do what was right, even though at times he failed to do so. I knew him so intimately that he wanted to build me a house in Hazard, his home town, so that we could grow old together, and be buried together in his family cemetery.

We had such a mutual respect for one another that when conditions required it, his private office in the bank, became the sanctuary where I tore into him, and when the set-to was over, had a deeper understanding and respect for him than before, and he for me. Our love and respect for one another was greater than anything that could tear us apart, because it was in the context of this kind of friendship that all of our relationships were conducted. I knew Dewey Daniel and he knew me. I have lost a loved one and friend just as every member of his family has.

Dewey was a complex man, yet simple in his complexity. To understand him one had to go beneath the exterior the public saw. The public often saw a man who appeared direct, powerful, and devastating; especially if he believed he was being taken advantage of. Others saw a generous, tender-hearted person, who was unashamed to shed a tear, if someone was in need or had suffered a tragedy. Whatever side of Dewey the public saw, inside himself he was a simple person—a person who was proud of being a mountain man and all the connotations involved in being one. Outwardly he changed with the changing times and conditions, but inwardly he remained the mountain boy who came to town from far off Leatherwood Creed, seeking to make his lot better in order that he might do more for his family, people, and friends. He felt a responsibility for anyone who was worse off than he.

His public deeds need no elaboration. These are known not only in Eastern Kentucky but throughout the state. A review of these deeds are well chronicled in newspapers, both locally and statewide. His political contemporaries know his power in politics. Those in the field of education know his efforts in this direction. Businessmen know his helpfulness in this category. The man on the street and up the hollow or down the river, know his personal interest in them. And his family know many sides of life and character. I am confident that each member remembers much to be grateful for. His name was seen or known throughout the Commonwealth.

But underneath all that I have said, I believe that two words tell us what made Dewey the man he was "Mountain-Man." To understand a Mountain Man one has to be one. There are few left in the Eastern Kentucky mountains today. Many who have been born in the mountains are not mountain men, because they were born of parents who came into the mountains from the outside, or have been born since the outside influences penetrated into the original mountain way of life. Dewey saw what the influx of outside influence did to his people. They brought monetary prosperity for a time, but in the long run they took away the heritage of a people who had been self-reliant for centuries. A man could live in a cabin, with few material possessions, but he was a person in his own right, a person who was loved, who was a part of a family and place, and a way of life that brought happiness in spite of hardships. The outside world stripped the mountain man of all of this and gave him instead material possessions, so that he was no longer of worth as a person but because of what he possessed materially. Dewey resented all this, and used his money, power and influence to turn the material prosperity into helping people remain persons in their own right. He made money and accumulated power so that he could do this.

A Mountain Man possesses vision, ideals, and convictions. The foundation for his life in his inate conviction that he is an individual, a person, of value, no matter what his physical environment may be. His vision sees beyond the mountains that seemingly hem him in, to the extent that nothing can completely enclose him. His vision enables him to be a free person no matter what devastating conditions he must live amidst. This vision he inherited from his ancestors who came into these mountains in order to be free and strong as the mountains themselves. His ideals enable him to rise to whatever heights he chooses. Unlike ideals molded by a materalistic society, that colors every aspiration with things and creature-comforts, mountain ideals pertain to the soul of man. A Mountain Man can rise to heights unfettered by materalism and class society. He can keep company with the great souls of the past and present, knowing that real manhood consists primarily in lifting his life upward toward the Supreme Being who created all things, including the towering mountains, the flatlands and the great oceans. So he climbs the highest peaks and feels a kinship with God and his fellow man in the valleys below.

Dewey Daniel was a Mountain Man from the day he was born until the day he died. God is always good to a Mountain Man!

PASTORIAL PRAYER AND BENEDICTION

Our heavenly Father, you who are waiting to receive and answer each sincere and simple prayer, we turn to you in our need, asking for light in our darkness and deliverance from our doubts and fears. You know us better than we know ourselves, so we look to you for the healing of our hearts which are wounded.

You have strengthened your people with your light and power in all ages, and with your love that will not let us go. Your tender mercies remind us that we are not alone. As we have suffered, so have you suffered in the giving of your Son. As we have loved, so have you loved more and loved first. If there is pain and sorrow in our lives, so there has been a cross and a crown of thorns in yours. You are ever near when we are afflicted, for you have suffered with us.

You have never failed us or left us alone and helpless. You will not fail us now. We believe the promise of your Son, who said: "I will come to you." Come to us now, Father, with all your strengthening power! Whisper to each troubled person those assuring words which Jesus spoke to those who needed assurance, "I am come that they might have abundant life." Help us to realize that his word is life.

Through this experience draw our hearts closer to your great Father-heart of love. May it serve as a discipline to train our eyes more steadfastly upon you who are Lord over all. Even as our joy is turned into sorrow, so you are able to turn our sorrow into joy, as we again receive your divine assurance of the eternal destiny which you have prepared for the faithful. May we hear again the promise

of life eternal, given us by our Savior and Redeemer: "I am the resurrection and the life, he that believes on me, though he die, yet shall he live."

Father, we thank you for the life of Dewey, for his years upon earth, for those things in his life which he did to make other lives better. For his deep love and concern for the people of the mountains surrounding us. For his untiring effort and the expenditure of his means generously to bring into their lives better opportunities to improve themselves physicially, mentally, and spiritually. For his devotion to members of his family, relatives and friends. For his allegiance to his country and loyalty to his political party. For his willingness to support financially institutions that work for the betterment of people. For his bearing of prolonged illness, solitude and pain, and now at least for his release from the burden of the flesh and entrance into the peace reserved for those who love you, we give you our thanks. May all his aspirations and loveliest wishes come to pass in glorious fulfillment, for all his loved ones left behind and for the benefit of your people everywhere.

We thanks you Father, for all those who cared for him during his illness. Especially do we thank you for Clarine, who gave of herself unselfishly through the years, to his improvement and care. We know, Father, there were times when it was trying and discouraging, but in those times she remained loyal and faithfully rendered unto him every assistance possible within her power. Bless her now and in the days to come.

And Father, may all his family and friends know that deeper than the pain and mystery of death are your everlasting arms of tender love and mercy. As they continue their lives here on earth, grant to them steadfastness of purpose, faith in you, and willingness to perform the duties and responsibilities which come their way under your guidance and direction. Grant to us all to walk this day in dignity and to face the tomorrow with courage. Lead us in your paths until our life's journey brings us to your eternal kingdom, through our faith in your Son.

The Lord bless you and keep you; the Lord make his face shine upon you; and be gracious unto you; the Lord lift up his countenance upon you, and give you peace, now and forever more. Amen.

AT THE CEMETERY

A statement

Dewey knew the days when kerosene lamps lighted railway passenger coaches. He knew the days, when I as a lad, took my first train trip from Harlan, Kentucky, to Pennington Gap, Virginia. The man in a blue suit and cap came through the coach I was riding in, placed a board across the arms of the seats, separated by the aisle, got on the board and lighted the lamps hanging from the ceiling. I wondered what the man was doing, lighting lamps in broad daylight. Soon I was to find out. After a little while the train plunged into a tunnel. All was dark outside, but inside the coach it was light. The man had prepared us for the darkness by lighting the lamps before the darkness came. When we had passed through the tunnel, the lamps were extinguished, for there was no longer any need for them to give us light; the sunlight flooded the coach. So it is with one who puts the light of Christ in his life. That light shines in his life as he passes through the darkness of death, until he comes out on the other side in the broad sunlight of Gods' eternal morning. Dewey, may God's eternal morning already have broken out upon you.

Benedictory Prayer

God of life, we thank you that we were privileged to know Dewey Daniel as a friend and to be his minister. Through this experience, which is just as much a part of the cycle of life as birth, draw our hearts closer to you great heart of love. We seem to give him back to you, who gave him to us. Yet as you did not lose him in giving, so we have not lost him by his return. So sanctify to each of us the memories of this sacred experience. Here in this place, with its tender associations, may we re-dedicate ourselves anew to your service, that we may return to our homes and to the duties that await us, in full confidence that all shall be well for us.

Support us all the day long of this troublous life, until the shadows lengthen and the evening comes, and the busy world is hushed, and the fever of life is over, and our work is done. Then of your great mercy grant us a safe lodging and a holy rest, and peace at last.

Now our Lord Jesus Christ, and God, our Father, who have loved us and have given us everlasting consolidation and good hope through grace, comfort our heart and establish you in every good word and deed. In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, Amen.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE ALTON A. LENNON

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1972

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as a colleague and longtime admirer of the Honorable ALTON A. LENNON of the North Carolina Seventh District, I am saddened at the news of his impending retirement at the close of the current session, and I would like to express my admiration for his years of service to his country and the people of his district.

Throughout his tenure in the Chamber—indeed, throughout his entire political career—ALTON A. LENNON has done the job as it ought to be done, and for so doing is admired by everyone familiar with the facts. A sixth-ranking member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and as 10th-ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, he has fought long and hard in the interest of his constituents, and with profound effect.

Trained as a lawyer at Wake Forest College, ALTON LENNON established a law practice at Wilmington, and in 5 years' time was recognized as an outstanding member of the legal profession in the State. In 1934 he became judge of the New Hanover County Recorder's Court, which post he held with distinction through 1942. He was a member of the State senate for two terms, from 1947 to 1951, and in 1953 was appointed to the U.S. Senate, to fill the seat left vacant by the death of Senator Willis Smith. Failing of renomination, he resumed his law practice for the moment, but in 1956 was successful in securing the Democratic nomination for Congress in the Seventh District, and was duly elected.

Economic success of the fishermen of the Cape Fear region, Onslow Bay, and Long Bay in part attest to his success as a legislator in their behalf, as does the prosperous condition of the Defense Department installation in his district. He has served the district, the State of North Carolina, and the United States with equal intensity and devotion, and his record is one of hard work and deep concern.

I am surely sorry to see him go.

STATUS OF GRANTS OF FEDERAL LANDS TO CERTAIN RAILROAD COMPANIES

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, 6 weeks ago, I joined with Senator FRED HARRIS and 11 other Senators and Congressmen in urging the Secretary of the Interior to report to the Congress the status of grants of Federal lands to certain railroad companies. Accompanying our letter was a list of questions concerning those grants. As yet, Mr. Morton has not responded. The National Coalition for Land Reform and the California Coalition of Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers filed an administrative complaint with Secretary Morton in June of 1972, and the Southern Pacific Transportation and Land Co. asked for time in which to respond to the complaint. They did so, and the National Coalition for Land Reform on October 18 sent me a brief that was in response to the reply brief filed by the Southern Pacific. As yet, the Interior Department has not acted on the issue. I urge Secretary Morton to reply to our questions and to the issues raised in the administrative complaint.

Mr. Speaker, Senator HARRIS is placing the first half of the brief filed by the National Coalition for Land Reform and the California Coalition of Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today. I insert the second half of that brief into the RECORD at this time:

SECOND HALF OF BRIEF BY THE NATIONAL COALITION FOR LAND REFORM AND THE CALIFORNIA COALITION OF MIGRANT AND SEASONAL FARMWORKERS

The mortgage that Southern Pacific relies on to relieve it of any obligations under the mandatory sale proviso and which was dealt with in the Speyer Agreement, was not executed until more than a year *after* the completion of the right of way. (S.P.Br.27.) Since this mortgage was executed only after the road was completed, its purpose in all likelihood was to finance the *operation* of the railroad rather than the *construction* of the right of way as required by the *Platt* decision. Furthermore, this mortgage was subsequently satisfied under the payment terms agreed to in the Speyer Agreement. And presumably any pre-Speyer Agreement mortgages have long since been paid off. Since the land is no longer subject to any mortgage which could be remotely construed as a "construction" mortgage, the *Platt* decision simply is not relevant to the present day situation.

A further and perhaps even stronger reason why the *Platt* decision is not relevant today is the holding of the Supreme Court in the second *Oregon and California* decision (243 U.S. 594). Some 39 years after *Platt* the Court there specifically found that the railroad could not use a mortgage to wash its grant lands of any of the original conditions.

The Court rejected "the contention of the railroad company that an implication of the power to mortgage the lands carried a right to sell on foreclosure, divested of the obligations of provisos." 243 U.S. at 555. If a sale by a third party mortgagee on foreclosure does not expunge the land grant conditions, it is difficult to see how the grantee-mortgagor can accomplish that sort of sleight of hand by simply mortgaging the land and then paying off the mortgage. If it could, the intent of Congress in every grant could have been readily subverted.

Even more compelling is the decision of the Supreme Court in *U.S. v. Northern Pacific Ry. Co.*, 311 U.S. 317. The Court was there construing a Conressional Resolution empowering the railroad to issue bonds in aid of construing a Congressional Resolution empowersame by mortgage on its property and rights of property of all kinds and descriptions, real, personal, and mixed, including its franchise as a corporation." The Resolution further provided:

"That all lands hereby granted to said company which shall not be sold or disposed of or remain subject to the mortgage by this Act authorized, at the expiration of five years after the completion of the entire road, shall be subject to settlement and preemption like other lines, at a price to be paid to said company not exceeding $2.50 per acre." 16 Stat. 378.

The company contended that under the Resolution the only lands it was required to open for settlement five years after completion of the road were those not then subject to a mortgage. (311 U.S. at 338–339). The Court rejected that contention and held that:

". . . the proviso of the Resolution of 1870 required the company to open the lands granted by the Resolution to preemption and settlement at the expiration of five years from the completion of the entire road in 1887, whether the lands were then subject to mortgage or not; that its failure to do so was a breach of its contract with the United States. . . ." 311 U.S. at 368.

The only reasonable interpretation of the Court's holding is that upon satisfaction of "the mortgage by this Act authorized" the lands are to be sold pursuant to the mandatory sale-to-settlers proviso.

For all of these reasons the *Platt* decision has no implications for the present situation.

The same is true of the Speyer Agreement. Southern Pacific explains that the United States advanced substantial funds to the railroad, taking a mortgage on the grant lands as security. (S.P.Br.29–31). Apparently the Central Pacific fell behind in its payments and in 1898 Congress enacted legislation calling for a settlement of the transaction. The result was the Speyer Agreement, from which Southern Pacific quotes a passage under which it claims the United States relinquished *all* rights with respect to the granted lands (S.P.Br.30–31.)

Petitioners do not have a copy of the Speyer Agreement and cannot determine whether the portion relied upon by Southern Pacific is quoted out of context. Petitioners do, however, have a copy of the Act of 1898 30 Stat. 659), which authorized the Agreement. That legislation clearly indicates that the Secretaries of the Interior and Treasury and the Attorney General were authorized to settle *only* the rights of the United States under the mortgage. In relevant part, the Act of 1898 provides as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Attorney General, and their successors in office be, and they are hereby appointed a commission with full power to *settle indebtedness to the government growing out of the issue of bonds in aid of the construction of the Central Pacific and Western Pacific bond-aided railroads. . . .*" (Emphasis added.)

Thus, no officer of the United States had any authority under the 1898 legislation to compromise, alter, waive or in any way affect Congress's right to enforce land grant conditions or any other interest of Congress in the land *which did not arise out of the mortgage*. The wording cited by Southern Pacific could be interpreted to do no more than that. If in fact the Speyer Agreement purports to compromise the rights of the United States further than authorized under the 1898 legislation, such wording has no effect.

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution gives Congress and only Congress the right to dispose of the Federal Government's interest in land. Nor can the acts of any administrative agency estop Congress from asserting its rights. In *United States v. The City and County of San Francisco*, 310 U.S. 16 (1940), the Federal Government brought suit to enforce a grant condition on a land grant to San Francisco under the Raker Act of 1913.

This land was given to the city for the purposes of providing water and generating electricity for the use of the residents of San Francisco. A specific proviso in the grant prohibited the city from selling water or electricity to anyone other than a municipal utility or water district. The city disregarded the proviso and sold its electrical power to Pacific Gas and Electric. Between 1913 and 1935 the Department of the Interior in a number of administrative interpretations and rulings found that such a sale was consistent with the condition of the grant.

Finally in 1935 the Secretary of the Interior declared that the city's sale of power to Pacific Gas and Electric was a violation of the condition and demanded the discontinuance of the practice. The city argued that the United States was bound by these previous decisions of the Department. The Supreme Court found to the contrary that *"the United States is neither bound nor estopped by acts of its officers or agents in entering into an arrangement or agreement to do or cause to be done what the law does not sanction or permit."* 310 U.S. 16, 32, citing *Utah Power and Light Company v. United States*, 243 U.S. 389, 409. (Emphasis added.) See also *United States v. State of California*, 332 U.S. 19, 39–40 (1947).

Again, the first *Oregon and California* decision illuminates this issue:

"We may observe again that the Acts of Congress are laws as well as grants and have the constancy of laws as well as their command and are operative and obligatory until repealed. *This comment applies to and answers all the other contentions of the railroad company based on waiver, acquiescence and estoppel and even to the defenses of laches and the statute of limitations.* The laws which are urged as giving such defenses and as taking away or modifying the remedies under review have no application." 238 U.S. at 427. (Emphasis added.)

Any claim that Southern Pacific or its predecessors were somehow entitled to rely on their own interpretation of the Speyer Agreement, an interpretation which went beyond the scope of the commission granted the signatories to the Agreement—in short, a claim of estoppel—must be rejected.

In respect of the Central Pacific lands, Congress authorized only the settlement of its interest in a mortgage on the railroad's grant lands. Any further arrangements entered into by agencies or other officials of the United States are of no force and effect. The Speyer Agreement can have no application to railroad land grant conditions.

Southern Pacific further claims that the repeal of the Preemption Act in 1891 (26 Stat. 1097) renders meaningless the condition relevant to settler's rights to railroad grant land. (S.P. Br. 28.) Southern Pacific's assertion is based on the fact that the mandatory sale proviso says that grant lands "shall be subject to settlement and preemption, like other lands." 12 Stat. 492, Section 3. The railroad, straining more than a little, argues that when other lands are no longer subject to preemption, neither are the railroad lands.

In raising this issue, the Southern Pacific is assuredly attempting to draw an old red herring across the tracks. The repeal of the Preemption Act is irrelevant to the validity of the mandatory sale proviso. Congress's statement subjecting the unsold lands to settlement and preemption "like other lands" is a general condition incorporating and contemporaneous rights of, and procedures for, settlement which existed at the time of the enactment. Such rights and procedures included in addition to those under the Preemption Act, those enumerated in other acts such as the Homestead Act, 12 Stat. 392 (1862), which is still good law.

Thus, the repeal of the Preemption Act, absent a specific reference to a repeal of the preemption and settlement provisions of the railroad land grants has no affect on those land grants. The text of the repealing legislation clearly affects only settler's rights in public land and not in railroad land:

"Sec. 4. That chapter four of title thirty-two, excepting sections twenty-two hundred and seventy-five, twenty-two hundred and seventy-six, twenty-two hundred and eighty-six of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and all other laws allowing *pre-emption of the public lands of the United States*, are hereby repealed. . . ." 26 Stat. 1097. (Emphasis added.)

In every other context the Southern Pacific has argued that their lands are not public lands. Even the Petitioners admit the lands at the moment are privately owned though subject to certain enforceable covenants. If the railroad lands are not public lands, they cannot be affected by the repeal of the Preemption Act cited above.

Even if there is ambiguity with regard to the status of the preemption provisions of the original land grant, such ambiguity must be resolved in favor of the sovereign. *Caldwell v. United States*, 250 U.S. 14 (1919); *Great Northern Railway Co. v. United States*, 315 U.S. 262 (1942); *United States v. Union Pacific Railroad*, 353 U.S. 112 (1957).

Finally, on the apparent theory that a distinction without a difference is better than no distinction at all, Southern Pacific seeks to distinguish *United States* v. *Northern Pacific Ry. Co., supra*, 311 U.S. 317 (1940), on the grounds that no "release" (presumably, the Speyer Agreement) was involved there and because there was a "somewhat differently worded" mandatory sale proviso. (S.P.Br.32.) Petitioners submit that for all the reasons detailed above, it is palpable that the Speyer Agreement cannot be construed as a "release" of any claims or rights of the United States to enforce the Central Pacific granting statute. The only differences between the provisos is that the Northern Pacific's mandatory sale obligation matured five years after completion of the road, while Central Pacific's matured three years after completion; and the Northern Pacific proviso expressly relieves it of the sale to settlers obligation on lands which "remain subject to the mortgage by this Act authorized" at the end of the five year period, while the Central Pacific's does not.

It is difficult to understand how these differences help Southern Pacific, especially when the Northern Pacific granting statute expressly includes the "mortgage" language and the Central Pacific's does not. The logical inference to be drawn from the fact that Congress chose in one statute to expressly except lands which "remain subject to . . . mortgage" from the sale-to-settlers obligation and did not choose to do so in another, is that under the latter, the existence of a mortgage would in no way relieve the grantee of the sale obligation. Even with language

which would appear to exclude mortgaged land from the mandatory sale-to-settlers proviso, the Supreme Court held that such land was still subject to settlement pursuant to the proviso at some point, presumably after satisfaction of the mortgage. (See, *supra*, pp. 18–19.) Clearly where the proviso does not explicitly exclude mortgaged lands from those subject to settlement, the railroad has no argument that such lands are exempt from the claims of settlers. The differences between the sale provisos weaken rather than bolster Southern Pacific's arguments.

In sum, neither the McLaughlin affair, nor the *Platt* case, nor the Speyer Agreement, nor the repeal of preemption, nor the *Northern Pacific* case help Southern Pacific. On the contrary, they reinforce Petitioners' view that the mandatory sale proviso is an enforceable covenant and that the Administrative Complaint raises serious questions which deserve a full and complete investigation and report.

4. Notwithstanding language in the granting statutes reserving mineral lands to the United States and the holding of the U.S. Supreme Court in the second *Oregon and California* decision (243 U.S. 549), land grant railroads are free to commercially exploit grant lands in any way they see fit. . . .

Relying on *Burke v. Southern Pacific R.R. Co.*, 234 U.S. 669 (1914), Southern Pacific asserts there is no limit to exploitation by a railroad of grant lands once those lands have been patented to it. Petitioners submit that the *Burke* case does not support their contentions.

The *Burke* case was brought by an individual attempting to lay claim to mineral lands patented by the Southern Pacific. Burke had registered mining claims on those lands under the mining laws of the United States, claiming the lands were still in the public domain. As mineral lands, he asserted, they could not pass to the Southern Pacific where its patent contained a clause reading "excluding and excepting all mineral lands should any such be found on the tracts aforesaid . . ." The Court held that the issuance of the patent to the Southern Pacific established title to land in the railroad so long as the railroad was not aware of the mineral deposits at the time of patenting. Subsequent discovery of minerals on the land could not give a third party a right to declare the patent void.

The *Burke* case does not dispose of the issue raised by Petitioners for at least two reasons: 1) Petitioners' contentions are based both on the mineral lands exclusion and on other land grant conditions which limit the interest of the railroad in the land grant lands, and 2) the scope of the *Burke* decision has been narrowed by subsequent cases and no longer accurately reflects the state of the law.

The land which was the subject of the *Burke* case is in the San Joaquin Valley and was presumably patented to Southern Pacific under the Act of July 27, 1866, providing for a rail line between Needles and San Jose, California (14 Stat. 292). This grant does *not* contain the mandatory sale to settlers proviso.

The Supreme Court's opinion in the second *Oregon and California* case makes it abundantly clear that grantee railroads holding lands subject to the mandatory sale proviso are interdicted from commercial exploitation of those lands. The mandatory sale proviso in *Oregon and California* provided that settlers had the right to purchase the grant lands in parcels no larger than one-quarter section (160 acres) and for a price not to exceed $2.50 per acre. The Court, in discussing the right of the railroad to harvest timber from grant lands subject to the mandatory sale proviso, noted that "the interest that the granting acts conferred upon the railroad company was $2.50 an acre," that the right to receive that amount was " 'all the value the granting acts conferred,' " and that the rights of sale, selection of time and settler were "aids to the duty of transmitting the land to settlers." 243 U.S. at 559–560. The rationale of the Court was that Congress intended grantee railroads to have a limited use of the grant lands: to sell them to finance construction; and that was *all* that Congress intended to give the railroads. Thus, lands were to be transmitted intact, with all resources in place.

The lengthy quote from the second *Oregon and California* decision which appears at pp. 36–37 of Southern Pacific's brief only supports Petitioners' view. Southern Pacific's effort to limit the holding of that decision to the Oregon and California case for the reason that the mandatory sale proviso at issue there is not found in other grants (S.P. Br. 37) is less than convincing. What Southern Pacific again fails to tell us is that its grant lands from the Oregon border south to Roseville, California are subject to *precisely* that mandatory sale proviso.[1] In addition, Southern Pacific fails to tell us why any distinction should be made for purposes of this issue between the proviso construed by the Court in *Oregon and California* and the proviso which is found, for instance, in the Central Pacific grant. Certainly Petitioners can think of no logical basis for making such a distinction. Both provisos evidence Congressional intent that the grant lands be transmitted to settlers. There is, therefore, nothing in the Central Pacific proviso which provides any basis for reading it differently on the issue of commercial exploitation.

The Southern Pacific citation of the *Burke* decision similarly does not dispose of Petitioners' contentions because the decision was originally a narrow one and has been further narrowed, and perhaps undercut, by subsequent cases.

The first point to note is that *Burke* was a suit by an individual against a railroad. It was not brought by the United States to protect its rights in the land. The Court found:

"If the patent has been issued irregularly, the government may provide means for repealing it. But no individual has a right to annul it, to consider the land as still vacant and to appropriate it to himself." 234 U.S. at 692–693, citing *Hoofnagle v. Anderson*, 7 Wheat. 212, 214–215.

If this is so, everything else in the decision is dicta. As far as Petitioners can determine, no case brought by the United States fully resolved all of the issues here raised. In two cases brought by the United States subequent to *Burke* the Court has found that the United States can successfully challenge the railroad's exploitation of minerals in respect of right of way lands.

In *Great Northern Ry. Co. v United States*, 315 U.S. 262 (1942), the Court found that as to railroad right of ways granted after 1871, the interest conveyed was only an easement not a fee simple. As to these lands the railroad not only cannot extract minerals, but it is prohibited from commercially exploiting timber or putting the land to any use other than providing rail service.

In *United States v. Union Pacific Railroad*, 353 U.S. 112 (1957), the Superme Court found that even right of ways granted prior to 1871 conveyed less than a fee simple interest. The Court referred to the clearly expressed policy of the Federal Government of excluding mineral lands from all of its grants, in finding that the railroad was not entitled to extract minerals from under its right of way lands. To reach this decision the Court had to distinguish a number of earlier cases. It did so by noting that:

"In none of them was there a contest between the United States and the railroad grantee over any mineral rights underlying the right of way. The most that the 'limited fee' cases [the ones to be distinguished] decided was that the railroads received all surface rights to the right of way and all rights incident to a use for railroad purposes." 353 U.S. at 119.

The same argument shows the irrelevance of the *Burke* case to Petitioners' claims. *Burke* was not brought to challenge the railroad's extraction of minerals, but only to establish the plaintiff's right to do so. All the Court found was that the railroad did have title to the land. It was never asked to determine whether the railroad could exploit the minerals that lay beneath the surface.

Thus, the Southern Pacific's citation of the *Burke* case brings into focus the need for the investigation requested by Petitioners. Rather than showing that all the questions have been answered, it points out how many of the Federal Government's rights remain to be resolved.

5. An investigation would be fruitless since no remedies are available to the U.S. . . .

Southern Pacific would have the Department of the Interior abandon its responsibilities in this area because "in the absence of a special authorizing statute a breach gives the government no power to retake the land." (S.P.Br.39.)

Even assuming that to be a correct characterization of the present state of the law, it is undeniable that one of the functions of the Department of the Interior is to conduct investigations with a view to proposing legislation. And indeed, it may well be that at the conclusion of the investigation sought by Petitioners the Department will deem it appropriate to suggest remedial legislation. In that connection, it is worth noting again that the *Northern Pacific* and *Oregon and California* litigation grew out of reports to the President and through him to Congress. The same is true of the two score or so forfeiture acts passed by Congress. (See, *supra*, at pp. 13–14.) The point is that the Department has an obligation to place the facts before Congress.

As for the claim that the statute of limitations embodied in 43 U.S.C. § 900 bars any remedial action by the Congress (S.P.Br.39–40), the very fact that the *Oregon and California* and *Northern Pacific* cases were brought puts that argument to rest. Again, it is worth quoting *Oregon and California* on this point:

"We may observe again that the Acts of Congress are laws as well as grants and have the constancy of laws as well as their command and are operative and obligatory until repealed. *This comment applies to and answers all the other contentions of the railroad company based on waiver, acquiescence and estoppel and even to the defenses of laches and the statute of limitations.* The laws which are urged as giving such defenses and as taking away or modifying the remedies under review have no application." 238 U.S. at 427. (Emphasis added.)

Finally, Southern Pacific asserts that by passage of the 1940 and 1945 Transportation Acts, Congress "indicated its satisfaction with the retention by the railroads of the land grants." (S.P.Br.41.)

[1] At page 37 of its brief, Southern Pacific says "since none of the *other* Southern Pacific grants contained this peculiar covenant [the *Oregon and California* covenant] . . . the Supreme Court's remarks . . . have no application whatsoever to any other railroad land grants, Southern Pacific or others." (Emphasis added.) It is difficult to understand whether the underscored word indicates Southern Pacific's concession that the Oregon border to Roseville line is covered by the same proviso as the Supreme Court dealt with in *Oregon and California*, or whether it was simply attempting to obscure that critical fact. In any event, greater candor might have been helpful in illuminating the issues.

It would have the last sentence of Section 321(b) of the 1940 Act mean much more than it says. What the land grant railroads got from the 1940 Act was relief from part of their obligation to carry government traffic at reduced rates. What they gave up was claims to lands, patents to which had not been issued or approved. The language relied on by Southern Pacific and underscored in its brief (S.P.Br.41) says only that *nothing in the Transportation Act* requires reconveyance of patented lands to the United States. Nowhere does it say that covenants or restrictions in the granting statutes are repealed or that Congress waives any rights it may have to enforce those statutes. And Acts of Congress are not repealed merely by implication. *Oregon and California R.R. Co. v. United States, supra*, 238 U.S. at 427.

Finally, it is suggested that Congress in 1945 relinquished the rights of the United States under the covenants and conditions of the original grants. (S.P.Br.41.) The issue was raised in the context of an amendment to the Transportation Act of 1940 relinquishing the government's right to free transportation of military goods over land grant railroads. At that time a strong case was made for a contemporaneous return to the government of remaining land grants. Congress ultimately avoided the issue, choosing solely to relinquish its claims to future gratuitous military transportation. The sole change which resulted from the issue was made, therefore, in Section 321(a) of the Transportation Act, excising the free military transportation provision.

Had Congress intended to go beyond this concession and relinquish any further right of reliance on land grant conditions, further amendments would have been necessary either to the identical section of the Transportation Act or to the original land grants themselves. Since neither of these steps were taken, it is obvious that Congress put off any further actions which would alter the status quo regarding the retention of the railroad land grants by the railroads. Since the conditions still remain in effect and since Section 321(b) of the Transportation Act had by its own language no effect on patented lands, it remains for Congress to determine whether or not the railroads have over the last decade recouped any alleged loss resulting from free military transportation.

Twenty-seven years have elapsed since Congress gave up the right of the United States to free transportation. During that time the land grant railroads have had the use and benefit of millions of acres of grant lands. They have thus had ample opportunity to balance accounts carrying over from World War II free military transport.

While the information is not presently available to Petitioners, it is believed that hundreds of millions of dollars have been earned by the railroads during that time; revenues deriving from mineral and oil leases, timber harvesting and agricultural uses, among others.[2] All that is required of the Interior Department is an updating of the account so that Congress will be in a better position to determine whether railroads have been sufficiently compensated for World War II. If they have, certainly Congress will be reluctant to permit further income to accrue to the railroads and most certainly it would disagree with the retention by the railroads of lands valued at hundreds of millions of additional dollars under Acts of Congress which have been violated in the past and continue to be violated today.

6. The equities justify overlooking violations of the granting statutes. . .

Petitioners do not for a moment deny the vital impact that completion of the transcontinental rail lines had upon the development of the west. By the same token, the land grant railroads cannot deny that retained grant lands are now being used solely to generate revenues, a purpose never contemplated by Congress when it enacted statutes granting land to railroads "to aid in construction." Nor can they claim that the land grants were the sole assistance they received from the government. In point of fact, hundreds of millions of dollars were lent (in some instances the proper term would be "given") to the western railroads to assist in construction of precisely the same lines that the land grants were intended to finance. But with all that, the fact remains that the granting statutes are still on the books, that retained lands are being used for purposes never contemplated by Congress, and that there is substantial evidence to indicate that railroads have violated those grants in the past and continue to do so today.

* * * * *

Petitioners submit that the very prolixity of Southern Pacific's brief demonstrates that a mountain of questions remain unresolved. With legislation pending before Congress to extend still more public aid to railroads, it is especially vital that those questions be answered.[3]

The Department of the Interior has an obligation to facilitate Congressional resolution by a full and complete investigation and report.

---

[2] In the case of Southern Pacific, the Interior Department should determine the cost to the taxpayers which resulted from the government's need to purchase lands originally granted to Southern Pacific gratuitously, because of the construction of Federal Interstate Highways 5, 80 and 66, extensive portions of which run through Southern Pacific grant lands.

[3] It may be, for instance, that Congress would want to require that land grant railroads be compelled to sell their remaining grant lands before being eligible for further taxpayer-financed assistance.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE WILLIAM CURLIN

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my respects to our colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM P. CURLIN of the Kentucky Sixth District, on the occasion of his retirement from the Congress. His period of service has been brief—one of the briefest of record, I believe. But in the time he has been here among us on Capitol Hill, he has impressed just about everybody with the power of his opinions, his conviction, and his lack of concern for anything but truth and the dictates of his conscience.

BILL CURLIN came to Washington on the strength of a remarkable showing in the Kentucky Legislature, in which he served as chairman of the house appropriations and revenue committee. He was voted the outstanding representative of the session by the capitol press corps, after which he was selected to run for Congress by the Democratic county chairmen of his district, to fill the seat left vacant by the death of Representative John C. Watts. He was duly elected, and presented himself for service in the House where, in short time, he established himself as a man of remarkable attainments.

As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency he has revealed a talent for solving money problems that has rendered him of momentous importance over the past session. And as a member of the Commission on the Review of the National Policy Toward Gambling, he has brought to light many problems and solutions to problems attending the investigations involved.

BILL CURLIN is, among other things, a critic of the Congress, and there are those who object to this. But I do not. Indeed, the Congress is far removed from a state of perfection, and in need of constructive criticism of the kind Representative CURLIN provides. He objects to the lack of electronic voting devices, utilized in many State legislatures. He objects to the absence of an effective computerized information system, and congressional reliance on executive departments for statistics of any kind. He objects to the preoccupation of many Congressmen with casework, in the hope of insuring reelection. He objects to many things, and his objections are generally justified.

I am only sorry he is leaving so soon, instead of staying around to transform his objections into congressional policy.

In any event, it has been a great pleasure to work with this outstanding Congressman throughout his brief stay in Washington, and I would take this occasion to wish him all the luck in the world in his future endeavors.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS TO PIKEVILLE COLLEGE

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the commencement address I made at Pikeville College, Pikeville, Ky., on May 7, 1972.

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

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS, PIKEVILLE COLLEGE

(By Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER)

It is a great honor to speak to this graduating class of Pikeville College on the 83rd anniversary of its founding.

It is a proud day for the class, yet one tinged with sadness as you break old ties and move on to new endeavors. It is also a day of satisfaction for your teachers, and for your parents and families, for they see in you the realization of their sacrifices, their love and their hopes.

May I say that I am glad to be here for another reason. It is that I have been linked with Pikeville College and the people of this community during my service in the United States Senate. We have worked together to control the floods which has devastated the Big Sandy Valley for years and prohibited its progress. I was glad to introduce with Senator Jennings Randolph of West Virginia, the first bill to establish the Appalachian Regional Development Commission. It has pro-

vided funds to construct the necessary corridor highways, vocational schools, health services and clinics, recognizing the need for the development of the great physical and human resources of Eastern Kentucky. And, only recently, this College has embarked on a new and unique program of mining education.

In all human efforts, governmental and private, it is essential that there be a source of ideas, of plans, of inspiration and leadership. Pikeville College has provided this central source and it has sent into Eastern Kentucky, West Virginia and Virginia, and even beyond the hills, the young men and women who found here the knowledge, the disciplines and the creativity to give life meaning.

While it is an honor to speak to you and one which I appreciate very much, I must say to speak in general terms at commencement exercises has seemed always trite to me and I can imagine, considering the difference in our ages, it may appear so to you. Such training and experience as I have had make it easier for me to speak about issues, and of conclusions that may be logically drawn from them.

I doubt that there has ever been a time in the world when such vast uncertainties did not cloud, in some degree, the life and future of an individual. There are difficult problems which lie heavily upon our minds. The war in Vietnam, the threat of war, violence, crime and intolerance at home, social problems, lay very heavy burdens upon you.

I suspect that many of you are asking yourselves, as I have asked myself, in times of confusion and discouragement, if it is not an illusion that we can order our lives on earth; and if we are not, in fact, being carried along upon an uncontrollable stream of events, and all that we can really do is try to survive as best we can. But, despite this recurring doubt, the power of men's minds has made a difference in the past, and that it is more true now than ever that the fate of our lives will be determined by the way we apply the unique gifts of knowledge and reason given to us by the Creator.

With all of us, confidence may break down, at times, when abstractions are not linked to practical realities, and faith and belief may seem empty dogma when pronouncements about how life should be led, when not supported by evidence of the goodness and decency of life. It gives strength to faith and belief if the grand concepts and the abstractions we speak of, of life, death, fate and free will, are given meaning by concrete example.

I have chosen today to speak upon a subject which may seem complex and unrelated to this commencement exercise. My subject is the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, seeking to control and limit nuclear weapons in which the United States and the Soviet Union have been engaged for several years, which are taking place today in Helsinki, Finland, and which I have every reason to believe will reach a successful conclusion during President Nixon's visit to Moscow beginning May 27.

I speak upon this subject because in the background of the difficult and seemingly insoluble problems we face, these talks represent a rational application of mind to fact, danger and reality. They may open up a range of reason and hope for the peoples of the United States and the Soviet Union, and the world. In my view, they are the most important negotiations that have taken place in the span of our lives.

My interest in these negotiations arose when I became a member of the Subcommittee on Arms Control of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This assignment gave me the opportunity to learn the facts concerning the nuclear weapons of both the Soviet Union and the United States, the terrible destructive power of their armaments, and the terror they hold over the fate and life of mankind. It was the facts that led me to initiate and engage for three years in the debate over the anti-ballistic missile system, and led me to attend, on three occasions, the meetings of our negotiators with the Soviet Union, twice in Vienna and once in Helsinki.

Those of you who are old enough will remember that in 1945, at the close of World War II, the United States dropped from bombers, atomic bombs upon Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan. Those bombers carried the equivalent of 200,000 tons of TNT. Thousands of Japanese were killed, and thousands more were maimed, or sickened for life by the deadly radiation which emanated from those war heads striking the earth.

Let us look at the nuclear strength of the United States and the Soviet Union today; it is the factual base upon which the concept of negotiation and limitation of nuclear weapons has been formed. The details are not secret. They are based upon the reports given to the Congress a few months ago by the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The U.S. possesses 1,054 Intercontinental Ballistic missiles, the Soviet Union possesses 1,500. There are the missiles deployed on land in our country and in the Soviet Union, and when fired, they are capable of reaching the other country in approximately 25 minutes. In addition, the U.S. has 41 nuclear submarines equipped with 656 nuclear missiles. The Soviet Union has 28 submarines with a smaller number of missiles. The United States has over 500 long range bombers, the Soviet Union 150, which if they could reach safely the territory of the other, could drop their nuclear bombs as at Hiroshima.

But, reciting the number of ICBM's, submarine launched missiles, and bombers does not tell the exact story of the nuclear power of the two countries. For each of the missiles, whether launched from land or under the sea, can be armed with three to ten warheads, and the warhead is that component of the system which would actually strike the United States or the Soviet Union. Both countries have the technology to fire these warheads—at least three—from their carrier missile in the pattern of an artillery salvo, and the United States has developed the technology of firing the war heads and guiding them to specific targets. The United States and the Soviet Union are approximately equal in the number of land and submarine based missiles, but the United States has approximately twice as many war heads—5500 to 2500 of the striking weapon. Only two or three war heads of this total could destroy New York, Moscow, Los Angeles or Chicago, and one could destroy any other city in the United States or the Soviet Union.

The U.S. and the Soviet Union have now the existing capability to destroy the other, even though the victim of a first strike or attack, and a full scale exchange would destroy civilized life on earth as we now know it. The nuclear arsenals of the United States and the Soviet Union are so vast that their destructive power amounts to the equivalent of 15 tons of TNT over the head of every living being on the face of the earth.

Thus, the SALT Talks directly concern the question of our survival, of human survival, if either purposely, or by accident, a nuclear war started. It was in recognition of this awesome force—in recognition that if this terrible power were ever used that life on earth could be ended—that the two great super powers agreed to try to stop the further escalation of the nuclear arms race, an arms race which would only lead to increasing the nuclear forces of both sides, and increasing the probabilities that such weapons would be used. And, all this was being done at vast crippling costs, billions of dollars, to the economies of both nations without any security advantage to either side.

The economies, the populations, the resource bases and the technological capabilities of both the U.S. and the Soviet Union are of such a nature that neither side can achieve any significant nuclear military advantage over the other. When new nuclear weapons are deployed by one side they will inevitably be matched by the other. To deploy additional weapons would only contribute to the dust of mankind's ashes.

No bargains have been struck at SALT or will be—Each nation through its satellite systems can observe what the other is doing in the deployment of nuclear weapons. What is taking place at SALT is the identification with as much precision as possible, of a balance of nuclear power, and the recognition of two nations with different objectives and systems that man must learn to rationally reduce the risk of the annihilation of each other and the world.

Perhaps it is only when nations are at the brink of destruction that issues are seen with clarity. We are at such a moment of clarity now.

The importance of the SALT talks for the future is so great that the issues in Vietnam are small in comparison. It will be a test of the vision and quality of our leadership, and the leadership of the Soviet Union to keep the overwhelming importance of the SALT talks firmly above the distractions of all other less vital issues. In my view, nothing should be permitted to prevent the SALT talks from coming to a successful conclusion. It is my expectation that President Nixon and the Soviet leadership will agree at Moscow to limit the arms race, with an agreement on the number of defensive ABM nuclear sites, and limitation upon some offensive systems.

Ten years ago the SALT talks were not possible, though the destructive power to destroy all of life was then possessed by both the U.S. and the Soviet Union. That mankind has come to the present hopeful situation through the use of reason, gives me confidence that we can control technology so that it will benefit mankind, and not destroy the green earth.

This change of attitude from that of a few years ago is a result of education and rational discussion. Until the last three years, the questions of strategic policy and nuclear weapons decisions were the province of a small group who possessed unique scientific knowledge. But in the last three years, during the ABM debate, largely through the assistance of the scientists who developed nuclear weapons, we in the Congress and an increasing body of the people, have become aware of the fundamental questions raised by the nuclear arms race, of the billions of dollars it costs our country and the danger it entails. This country owns an enormous debt of gratitude to the scientists and learned men from colleges, universities and laboratories throughout the United States who educated the Congress and the country about powerful nuclear forces which they had brought into the world.

Their education of the Congress, and I regard myself as one who has profited from their teaching, was an act of great public service and an exemplary demonstration of the constructive uses of the mind. Better than anyone else, they understood that the forces they had developed and brought under control, if unleased, could destroy life on earth. Because of their scholarship and responsible teaching, we were able to, with assurance, urge that every possible effort be made to limit further nuclear weapons deployments and to achieve an agreement with the Soviet Union to halt the mad momentum toward nuclear destruction and to turn these forces toward making the lives of all peoples more fruitful and rewarding.

This new prospect is a very exciting and hopeful one. I offer it to you today as a concrete example of the uses of knowledge and

as exidence of the truth that if reason and experience are applied to the problems of life, it can make a difference in the world you face.

In closing, I speak of the education you have attained in this College, and must continue to attain throughout your life. Education is the result of many influences—of home, of church, of experience and of some inborn wisdom and judgment which man develops through his own efforts. But you must know that the one, continuing, steady and rewarding influence will be your insistence on a spirit of inquiry for truth, and the attainment of excellence, that can only come from discipline and determination to develop to the ultimate your capabilities and qualities. As graduates of this College, this sense of discipline and determination should be well rooted in you.

As you leave Pikeville College, you can be proud of its excellence and its traditions. You stand today in the place of hundreds who have come here, who have enjoyed the advantages of great teachers and the support of a devoted body of alumni and citizens. I join with you in admiration for the work of President Robert F. Cope, former President A. A. Page, the faculty, the Board, and the officials and teachers who have served this College.

You have been taught to respect all that is best in scholarship, character and religion. There is a great deal of bitterness, recrimination and hatred among our people, and it is difficult to see how these unhappy characteristics can be removed from our lives unless all of us show simple tolerance, respect and love for others. Be faithful to your trust in the years that lie ahead, and you will be worthy of, and enjoy, and good fortune which all here—your parents, your teachers, your friends and the alumni—wish for you with all their hearts.

VOTING RECORD OF LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, to insure full and prompt public access to the votes I have cast in Congress, I now insert in the RECORD the following preliminary compilation of my voting record in the second session of the 92d Congress. This should be read as a continuation of my voting record for the first session of the 92d Congress, published in the RECORD for April 25, 1972:

VOTING RECORD OF LAWRENCE J. HOGAN, 92D CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

(Passed (P) or Defeated (D) by House of Representatives)

BUSINESS

For increasing loan ceilings under Small Business Act (H.R. 10792) (P).

For excluding corporations and labor organizations from prohibitions against employees of Government contractors making political contributions (H.R. 15276) (P).

Against prohibiting trading in Irish potato futures on commodity exchanges (H.R. 7287) (D).

CIVIL RIGHTS

For promoting equal employment opportunities for American workers (H.R. 1746) (P).

For extending Commission on Civil Rights for five years; expanding jurisdiction to include sex discrimination; and authorizing appropriations (H.R. 12652) (P).

CONSUMER PROTECTION

For promoting competition among motor vehicle manufacturers in design and production of safe motor vehicles having greater resistance to damage (H.R. 11627) (P).

Against providing payment of losses incurred by growers, manufacturers, packers and distributors as a result of barring cyclamates in food (H.R. 13366) (P).

For protecting consumers against unreasonable risk of injury from hazardous products (S. 3419) (P).

CRIME, DRUG ABUSE, LAW ENFORCEMENT

For establishing a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and concentrating nation's resources against problem of drug abuse (H.R. 12089) (P). Against an amendment to exempt Veterans Administration from Director's authority (D).

For providing for evidentiary use of prior inconsistent statements by witnesses in trials in District of Columbia (H.R. 12410) (P).

For authorizing Attorney General to provide care for narcotic addicts on probation, on parole, or mandatorily released (S. 2713) (P).

For establishing a commission on revision of judicial circuits (H.R. 7378) (P).

For providing expanded protection to foreign officials (H.R. 15883) (P).

ECONOMICS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

For authorizing payments and appropriations to Fund for Special Operations of Inter-American Development Bank and Asian Development Bank (S. 748 and 749) (P).

For increased U.S. participation in International Development Association (S. 2010). (P). For amendment to reduce annual U.S. contribution by $480 million (D).

Against temporary increase in public debt limit (H.R. 12910) (P).

For special payments to international financial institutions (H.J. Res. 1172) (P).

Against four-month extension of public debt limitation (H.R. 15390) (P).

For improving economy and living conditions in rural America (H.R. 12931) (P). Against amendment to limit grants to public bodies (D).

For providing minimum federal payments for relocation assistance and for extension of the effective date of the act (S. 1819) (P).

For paying 60% of worker's former weekly wage so long as worker is unemployed; and providing that the Secretary shall not establish any system of priorities for kinds of assistance authorized (H.R. 16071) (P).

For extending and amending Export Administration Act of 1969 to afford more equal export opportunity, and for establishing a Council on International Economic Policy (S. 3726) (P).

For continuing programs under Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (H.R. 12350) (P).

Against a bill to enable wheat producers, processors and end-product manufacturers of wheat foods to work together to establish, finance and administer a coordinated program of research, education and promotion to maintain and expand markets for wheat and wheat products for use as human foods within the U.S. (H.R. 13514) (D).

For temporary increase in public debt limit and placing limitation on expenditures and net lending for fiscal year ending June 30, 1973 (H.R. 16810) (P).

For an amendment to bill continuing Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which would have limited continuation to two years (D) and did not vote on passage to continue for five years (H.R. 12350) (P).

EDUCATION

For conveying federal land to State of Tennessee for use of University of Tennessee (H.R. 9676) (P).

For instructing conferees to insist on anti-busing provisions in amendments to Higher Education Act (S. 659) (P).

Against Higher Education Act (lacked anti-busing provision as passed earlier by House) (S. 659) (P).

For assisting elementary and secondary schools, community agencies and other public and nonprofit private agencies to prevent juvenile delinquency (H.R. 15635) (P).

For furthering achievement of equal educational opportunities, including anti-busing amendments (H.R. 13915) (P).

For expanding and strengthening National School Lunch Act to conduct summer food service programs in poor areas with high concentrations of working mothers (H.R. 14896) (P).

ENVIRONMENT, POLLUTION CONTROL, CONSERVATION

For increases in appropriation ceilings and boundary changes in certain units of national park system (H.R. 10086) (P).

For establishing the Tinicum Environmental Center in Pennsylvania (H.R. 7088) (P).

For strengthening penalties imposed for violating Bald Eagle Protection Act (H.R. 12186) (P).

For extending Federal Water Pollution Control Act through June 30, 1972 (H.R. 12741) (P).

For controlling emission of noise detrimental to human environment (H.R. 11021) (P).

For protecting marine mammals and establishing Marine Mammal Commission (H.R. 10420) (P).

For providing interim licensing of operation of thermoelectric generating plants (H.R. 13752) (P).

For accelerating tree-planting programs on national forest lands in need of reforestation (H.R. 13089) (P).

For establishing Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge (H.R. 10310) (P).

For prohibiting shooting at birds, fish and other animals from aircraft (H.R. 14731) (P).

For increased appropriations to Water Resources Planning (H.R. 14106) (P).

For appropriations for public works for water and power development for fiscal year ending June 30, 1973 (H.R. 15507) (P).

For appropriations for environmental and consumer protection programs (H.R. 15690) (P).

For authorizing Secretary of Interior to assist States in controlling damage caused by predatory animals; establish a program of research on control and conservation of predatory animals; restrict use of toxic chemicals as method of predator control (H.R. 13152) (P).

For authorizing Secretary of Commerce to transfer surplus Liberty ships to States for use in marine life conservation programs (H.R. 5741) (P).

For establishing a national policy and developing a national program for management, beneficial use, protection and development of land and water resources of nation's coastal zone (H.R. 14146) (P).

For establishing Sawtooth National Recreation Area in Idaho (H.R. 6957) (P).

For establishing Gateway National Seashore in New York and New Jersey (H.R. 1121) (P).

For amending Federal Water Pollution Control Act (S. 2770) (P).

For regulation of strip coal mining and for conservation, acquisition and reclamation of strip coal mining areas (H.R. 6482) (P).

For amending Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (H.R. 10729) (P).

For amending Federal Hazardous Substances Act to give Environmental Protection Agency authority to protect health and the environment from hazardous chemical substances (S. 1478) (P).

For overriding President's veto of amendment to Federal Water Pollution Control Act (S. 2770) (P).

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

For appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for fiscal year ending June 30, 1972 (H.R. 12067) (P).

Against providing foreign military and related assistance authorizations for fiscal year 1972 (S. 2819) (P).

For appropriations for U.S. participation in The Hague Conference on Private International Law and International (Rome) Institute for Unification of Private Law (H.R. 11948) (P).

For providing grants to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty (S. 3645) (P).

For giving President discretion to determine whether U.S. in required to observe UN sanctions against importation of chrome ore (H.R. 16029) (P).

For appropriations for foreign assistance for fiscal year ending June 30, 1973 (H.R. 16705) (P).

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

For a bill relating to age requirements for appointment to certain positions in executive agencies and in competitive service (H.R. 8085) (D). (It was felt that age requirements are appropriate in jobs such as police, astronauts, firefighters, etc.)

For increasing federal contribution to costs of health benefits to 55% now and 5% annual increments to 75% (H.R. 12202) (P).

For revising methods of computing wages under Service Contract Act of 1965 (H.R. 15376) (P).

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Against establishing Office of Technology Assessment for Congress as aid in identifying and considering technological application (H.R. 10243) (P). (It was felt that a new agency was not needed.)

For appropriations for legislative branch for fiscal year ending June 30, 1972 (H.R. 13955) (P).

For establishing positions and fixing compensation in Department of Treasury. (H.R 13334) (P).

For establishing advisory committees throughout federal government to advise officers and agencies (H.R. 4383) (P).

For appropriations to Department of State and U.S. Information Agency (H.R. 14734) (P).

For appropriations to Department of Housing and Urban Development; for Space, Science, Veterans and other independent executive agencies, boards, commissions, corporations and offices for fiscal year ending June 30, 1973 (H.R. 15093) (P).

For appropriation for Department of Transportation and related agencies for fiscal year ending June 30, 1973 (H.R. 15097) (P).

For financing acquisition, construction, alteration, maintenance, operation and protection of public buildings. (S. 1736) (P).

For appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission. (H.R. 14990) (P).

For appropriations to Department of Interior and related agencies for fiscal year ending June 30, 1973 (H.R. 15418) (P).

For appropriations to Departments of Labor; Health, Education and Welfare; and related agencies (H.R. 15417) (P).

For appropriations to Treasury Department, U.S. Postal Service, Executive Office of President and independent agencies for fiscal year ending June 30, 1973 (H.R. 15585) (P).

For appropriations for legislative branch for fiscal year ending June 30, 1973 (H.R. 13955) (P).

For establishing federal policy concerning selection of firms and individuals to perform architectural, engineering and related services for the federal government (H.R. 12807) (P).

For authorizing Public Printer to designate library of highest appellate court in each State as depository library (S. 2227) (P).

For further continuing appropriations for fiscal 1973 (H.J. Res. 1278) (P).

Against overriding President's veto of Labor-HEW appropriations bill (H.R. 15417) (D). (In protest against excessive spending.)

For appropriations for Department of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare for fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, as amended (H.R. 16654) (P).

For appropriations for Departments of State, Justice and Commerce, the Judiciary and related agencies for fiscal year ending June 30, 1973 (H.R. 14989) (P).

For appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia (H.R. 15259) (P).

For appropriations for National Science Foundation (H.R. 14108) (P).

HEALTH, WELFARE, SAFETY

For extending and revising authorization of grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services and for vocational evaluation and work adjustment; and authorizing grants for rehabilitation services to those with sensory disabilities (H.R. 8395) (P).

Por providing for prevention of sickle cell anemia (H.R. 13592) (P).

For changing designation of National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases to National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases (H.R. 13591) (P).

For extending "black lung" benefits to orphans whose fathers died of the disease (H.R. 9212) (P).

For enlarging authority of National Heart and Lung Institute to advance national attack against heart, blood vessel, lung and blood diseases (H.R. 15081) (P).

For extending and revising program for control and prevention of communicable diseases (H.R. 14455) (P).

For providing assistance for programs for diagnosis, prevention and treatment of, and research in, Cooley's anemia (H.R. 15474) (P).

For establishing a Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences and providing scholarships for education in medicine, dentistry and other health professions (H.R. 2) (P).

For authorizing assistance for planning, development and initial operation, research and training projects for effective health care services under emergency conditions (H.R. 15859) (P).

For amendments to Social Security Act providing increases in benefits, improved computation methods, raised earnings base, improvements in medicare, medicaid, maternal and child health, employment and training incentives and other improvements (H.R. 1) (P).

LABOR AND UNEMPLOYMENT

For increasing the minimum wage and extending the coverage and to establish procedures to relieve domestic industries and workers injured by increased imports from low-wage areas. (H.R. 7130) (P).

For authorizing Speaker of House to appoint representatives to attend International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva in June (H. Res. 965) (P).

For six-month extension of emergency unemployment compensation program (H.R. 15587) (P).

For extending coverage and protection of National Labor Relations Act to employees of nonprofit hospitals (H.R. 11357) (P).

For amending Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to increase benefits and to extend coverage to piers, wharves and terminals (H.R. 12006) (P).

MILITARY AND SECURITY

For providing funds for Committee on Internal Security (H. Res. 849) (P).

For appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments, and authorizing average annual active duty personnel strength for Coast Guard (H.R. 13188) (P).

For extending authorization for appropriations for Arms Control and Disarmament Act (H.R. 13336) (P).

For tabling resolution requesting information from President and Secretary of Defense on U.S. military involvement in Indo-China (H. Res. 918) (P).

For a memorial honoring Seabees of U.S. Navy (H.J. Res. 55) (P).

For repealing Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 and establishing a Federal Employee Security and Appeals Commission to make determinations of subversive organizations and also to serve as an appeal board for federal employees dismissed on loyalty or security grounds. Its function would be performed only in connection with the administration of an executive branch civilian employee screening program and not for general disclosure purposes as under the present system. Also prohibits President from appointing any person other than Attorney General with respect to inquiry of subversive organizations. (H.R. 9669) (P).

For authorizing treatment and rehabilitation program for drug-dependent members of Armed Forces (H.R. 12846) (P).

For military appropriations, including Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system (H.R. 15495) (P).

For appropriations for military installations (H.R. 15641) (P).

For four-year extension of period during which number of Air Force majors, lieutenant colonels and colonels may be increased (H.R. 14542) (P).

For making rules governing use of Armed Forces in absence of declaration of war by Congress (S. 2956) (P).

For approving Interim Agreement Between U.S. and U.S.S.R. with respect to Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (SALT agreements) (H.J. Res. 1227) (P).

For appropriations for Department of Defense (H.R. 16593) (P).

For appropriations for military construction for Department of Defense for fiscal year ending June 30, 1973 (H.R. 16754) (P).

For amending section 4 of Internal Security Act of 1950 (H.R. 16742) (P).

For revising special pay structure for members of Armed Forces (H.R. 16924) (P).

SENIOR CITIZENS

For providing grants to States to establish, maintain, operate and expand low-cost meal projects, nutrition training and education projects, and opportunity for social contacts for senior citizens (S. 1163) (P).

For strengthening and improving Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide much-needed opportunities and supportive services to promote independent living, better nutrition, transportation and health (H.R. 15657) (P).

For establishing a National Institute of Aging (H.R. 14424) (P).

For increasing annuities to widows of Supreme Court Justices (H.R. 12101) (P).

For increasing Railroad Retirement benefits by 20% (H.R. 15927) (P).

For overriding President's veto of increased Railroad Retirement benefits (H.R. 15927) (P).

TRANSPORTATION

For extending act relating to high-speed ground transportation and authorizing enlarged research and development (H.R. 11384) (P).

For providing financial assistance to National Railroad Passenger Corporation for purchasing railroad equipment (H.R. 11417) (P).

Against providing public assistance to mass transit bus companies in District of Columbia (H.R. 14718) (D).

For guaranteeing obligations issued by Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority and authorizing increased contribution by District of Columbia (H.R. 15507) (P).

For appropriations for highways (H.R. 16656) (P).

For acquisition by Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority of mass transit bus systems in National Capital area. (Defeated on first attempt as H.R. 16724; passed on second try as S. 4062.)

VETERANS

For increasing allowances for vocational rehabilitation, educational assistance and special training; providing advance educational assistance payments; and improving educational assistance programs (H.R. 2589) (P).

For establishing a National Cemetery System within the Veterans Administration (H.R. 12674) (P).

For increasing maximum grants for special housing for disabled veterans (S. 3343) (P).

MISCELLANEOUS

For providing that Guam and Virgin Islands shall be represented in Congress by a Delegate to the House of Representatives (H.R. 8787) (P).

For promoting fair practices in election campaign for Federal political officer (S. 382) (P).

For striking medals commemorating bicentennial of American Revolution (H.R. 7987) (P).

Against establishing Select Committee on Privacy, Human Values and Democratic Institutions (H. Res. 164) (D).

For providing procedure for settling dispute on Pacific Coast and Hawaii among shippers and employees (H.J. Res. 1025) (P).

Against providing funds for Committee on Education and Labor (because of excess spending) (H. Res. 847) (P).

For authorizing funds for international aeronautical exposition (H.R. 11624) (P).

For allowing option in adoption of advanced time (H.R. 4174) (P).

For amending cruise legislation of Merchant Marine Act to provide greater flexibility and increased opportunity to carry cargo and mail (H.R. 9552) (P).

For a resolution to seek relief from restrictions on Soviet Jews (H. Con. Res. 471) (P).

For appropriations to National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities and research and program management (H.R. 14070) (P).

For supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1972 (H.R. 14582) (P).

For authorizing Secretary of Interior to plan and design memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt (H.J. Res. 812) (P).

For establishing mining and mineral research centers (H.R. 6788) (P).

For improving financing for Corporation for Public Broadcasting (H.R. 13918) (P).

Against amending American Revolution Bicentennial Commission (H.R. 13694) (D).

For providing payments to localities for high-priority expenditures, encouraging States to supplement revenue sources, and authorizing federal collection of State individual income taxes (H.R. 14370) (P).

For reducing interest rate on Small Business Administration disaster loans (H.R. 15692) (P).

For supplemental appropriations for disaster relief (H.J. Res. 1238) (P).

For amending section 509 of Merchant Marine Act (H.R. 11300) (P).

For appropriations for Corporation for Public Broadcasting for fiscal year 1973 and for grants for construction of noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting facilities (S. 3824) (P).

For a resolution expressing the sense of the House on the tragic killings of Israeli Olympic team members at the Twentieth Olympiad at Munich (H. Res. 1106) (P).

For implementing Convention for Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft; and authorizing President to suspend air service to any foreign nation encouraging "skyjacking" (H.R. 16191) (P).

For extending duration of copyright protection (S.J. Res. 247) (P).

For appropriations for certain maritime programs (H.R. 13324 and H.R. 16987) (P).

SAMUEL VANARSDALE NOE

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, Louisville and its schools and the entire educational community of Kentucky lost a most valuable citizen in the death of Samuel VanArsdale Noe, former superintendent of the Louisville schools.

I had the opportunity of knowing him since we were students together at Centre College. His interest was always preeminently in education, but he was respected also in Louisville and throughout Kentucky for his participation in civil affairs, his church work, and for his warm personality and great integrity.

I ask unanimous consent that an article appearing in the Louisville Courier Journal on January 29, 1972, entitled "Noe Dies; Was Head of Schools" be inserted in the RECORD.

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

NOE DIES; WAS HEAD OF SCHOOLS

Samuel VanArsdale Noe, former superintendent of the Louisville schools, died at 5:05 a.m. today at Methodist Evangelical Hospital. He was 70.

Noe was admitted to the hospital on Dec. 5 with a ruptured esophagus.

He had been in serious condition since that time.

Noe served 40 years with the city school system. He headed the system nine years, retiring in 1969.

He lived at 414 Club Lane.

Noe's career with the city school system began in 1928 when he left Eminence, Ky., where he had been a teacher, coach, principal and superintendent, to become principal of Strother Elementary School.

Before it ended with his retirement in 1969, he had also been principal of Eastern and Highland junior high schools and Halleck Hall (Louisville Girls High School).

He had served as administrative assistant to Supt. Omer Carmichael, and was acting superintendent in charge of instruction and assistant superintendent in charge of general administration.

When he moved into Carmichael's old office in 1960, Noe reportedly told his associates it was "the longest walk I perhaps will ever take this side of eternity."

In an era when racial problems, financial strains and belligerent pressure groups of teachers, parents and students spelled trouble for school systems across the country, Noe won praise from fellow educators.

"He's run a good, sound school system," said one state Department of Education official when Noe retired. "I have the greatest respect for him."

Noe's legacy includes his signature on the bottom of thousands of diplomas earned by Louisville schoolchildren—and more.

COOPERATED WITH CATHOLICS

Evaluating his term as superintendent, associates and newsmen praised his ambitious building program—including 12 new schools and 21 school additions; increased cooperation with city Catholic schools and a generally good relationship with city teachers at a time when most other big school systems were being torn apart by strikes.

Noe was born April 26, 1901, in Springfield, Ky. His father, James Richard Noe, was publisher of The News Leader in Springfield and was a city judge.

In 1922, Noe graduated from Centre College in Danville, Ky. He attended Columbia University Teachers College during summers to earn his master's degree in school administration in 1928.

He married the former Elizabeth McDonald, of Eminence, in 1930.

During World War II, he left the city schools to serve in the Army. For his reorganization of the Italian school system as part of the Allied Military Government, he earned a citation as Knight Officer of the Crown from Italy and the U.S. Bronze Star.

HAIR HAD TURNED WHITE

An associate, who remembered that Noe's hair was graying a bit when he entered the Army, said, "The first thing I noticed when S. V. came back from the war was that his hair had turned white."

White hair was also the hallmark of Noe's most famous relative, his first cousin James Thomas Cotton Noe, Kentucky's poet laureate from 1926 until his death in 1953.

Samuel Noe had been a member and past president of the Louisville Kiwanis Club, director of the Metropolitan YMCA of Louisville and Jefferson County, and vice-president of the Jefferson County chapter of the National Foundation for Medical Scientific Research, Professional Education and Medical Care.

Surviving in addition to his wife are a son, Samuel V. Noe Jr., of Cincinnati, two grandchildren; and four sisters, Mrs. John O'Brien, Miss Marianne Noe, Miss Sara Noe and Miss Corinne Noe, all of Louisville.

The body was taken to the Nunnelley Funeral Home, 4327 Taylor Blvd.

The funeral will be Monday afternoon, at a time to be announced, in Central Presbyterian Church, Fourth and Kentucky, with burial at Eminence. The body will be at the church after 1:30 p.m. tomorrow.

The family requests that expressions of sympathy take the form of gifts to the Samuel V. Noe Scholarship Fund, 5th District Parent-Teacher Association, J. Graham Brown Education Center.

WHAT KIND OF JUSTICE IN THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, U.S. District Court Judge William D. Murray held in Yellen against Hickel that the residency requirement in section 5 of the 1902 Reclamation Act must be enforced.

I hailed that decision as a great victory for the family farmer in California and in those other areas of the country where large corporate interests are currently being subsidized by Federal water projects in contravention of established law.

Now I understand that there is every indication that the Justice Department intends to appeal this case and ask that Judge Murray's order be vacated.

Such a policy would be in stark con-

trast to the Justice Department's earlier failure to appeal, without comment, the decision in United States against Imperial Irrigation District, where the courts declined to enforce the 160-acre limitation of the Reclamation Act in the Imperial Valley. At that time the Justice Department said that what was needed was not appellate review, but rather congressional clarification of the intent of the Reclamation Act.

Now, if the Justice Department insists on appellate review of the Murray decision, then what it is really saying is that when the administration's policy of interpreting the Reclamation Act in a manner favorable to corporate interests is upheld at any judicial level, then such decisions will be embraced. But when the intent of the law is held to be inimicable to those powerful interests, then the Justice Department will pursue the case to great lengths, seeking a reversal, and rendering the decision meaningless in the interim.

I am aware of how difficult it must be for Justice Department attorneys to rationalize and justify such policies to themselves and outsiders. But I am afraid that such actions are becoming so commonplace as to escape notice both within the Department, and with the general public.

I am embarrassed that private parties have had to assume what should be the proper role of the Government in seeking judicial enforcement of the Reclamation Act.

I will do whatever I can to bring pressure upon the Justice Department in this matter, and to bring to the public's attention what I consider to be law enforcement for the privileged few.

At the very least we want this administration to know that somebody is watching. Hopefully, Congress will soon recognize its responsibility, as well, and reaffirm in clear language its intent and policy as enunciated in the Reclamation Act of opening up the West to the family farmer.

PROJECT ENTERPRISE—BUSINESS GOES TO CLASS

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, year after year, Junior Achievement of Union County, N.J., has been a pacesetter among JA organizations throughout the country in devising innovative, imaginative, and effective methods of introducing high school students to the meaning, the operation, and the opportunities of the free enterprise system.

For several years, it has been my privilege to acquaint our colleagues and other readers of the RECORD with the ideas and activities of JA of Union County in the confident expectation that success breeds further success and that what has worked so well in Union County can serve equally well elsewhere to dispel the myths of American business and to enhance youthful understanding of the realities of this critically important area of our society.

This year, Mr. Speaker, Junior Achievement of Union County has developed an especially promising technique of economic education which I am sure our colleagues will find most interesting and valuable. The following press release from JA of Union County describes "Project Enterprise" fully and I include it as a part of my remarks:

PROJECT ENTERPRISE—BUSINESS GOES TO CLASS: JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT OF UNION COUNTY EXPANDS ECONOMIC EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

The case study, problem-solving teaching technique of economic education has come to New Jersey high schools via a dynamic new program launched by Junior Achievement of Union County in cooperation with professors of the Harvard Business School and Northeastern University, a team of businessmen including members of Young Presidents Organization, and principals of seven major high schools in the Union County, New Jersey area. Teachers and students in other similar pilot projects have had high praise for the case study technique pioneered by the Harvard Business School on which the new Project Enterprise is based.

The challenge of the new project is as enticing to the adult educators and businessmen who will be involved as to the high school students because, inevitably, what American teenagers and their parents don't understand they seldom support.

When applied to the American business system, it follows that the future rests heavily upon how well private enterprise is understood, especially by young men and women who will be the voters, consumers and government and business leaders of tomorrow. Businessmen have sought ways to communicate effectively the fundamental principles and economic facts about their enterprises to young people. Enthusiasm of young people is the key in the stiff fight to preserve our market enterprise system and to keep it vital and alive for the American people and future generations worldwide. Business History and Economic Life Program, Inc. has pioneered in preparing case studies for teaching economic concepts to teenage students and demonstrating these teaching methods, involving businessmen in the classroom.

MYTHS

Misconceptions about business clearly abound beginning with distortions in the entertainment media of what really goes on in the executive suite. Not only teenagers but the public at large believe that after-tax corporate profits average 28¢ on the dollar of sales. The actual figure is 4c. One-third of the public believes Washington should set ceilings on profits. Another one-third believe that the most practical and equitable way for workers to improve their standard of living is to get more of the money companies make rather than to work at top efficiency and increase productivity.

REALITIES

Many high school students who have thought only of careers in education, government and the professions are switching to business administration and the wide variety of careers open in industry. Why? Because of their participation and exposure to Junior Achievement's "learn by doing" business training program where, working with volunteer businessmen from sponsoring industries they operate junior companies under exactly the same profit-motivated fundamentals of any modern corporation.

CASE STUDY TECHNIQUES

Now, under the auspices of Junior Achievement, businessmen will take business into the classroom. Junior Achievement of Union County, assisted by Professor Ralph W. Hidy of the Harvard Business School and Professor Paul Tedesco of the College of Education, Northeastern University, and local high school principals has launched an exciting expansion of its economic education program and calls its effort Project Enterprise. Using case studies of actual business situations, they will take business into seven local high schools where businessmen will join with teachers in conducting analytical discussions. The technique gets the students to develop ideas, insight and problem-solving skills. Instead of textbooks, their source material is especially prepared case studies presenting real business situations and problems in condensed form. Early in December, Professor Tedesco will teach a demonstration class in economics with the pilot project teachers participating.

H. W. Fraser, President of Junior Achievement of Union County, and his associates on the Junior Achievement Board of Directors, believe that using case studies of such well-known corporations as Ford, United Fruit, STP and Standard Oil will put new life into economics and history courses, which too many students now rate as dull. A history class, for example, may get deep into the realities of early American colonial life by studying the Virginia Company that established Jamestown in 1607. An economics class can struggle with modern production and mass merchandising by taking up a case study on Andy Granatelli and STP Corp. As teachers gain expertise in the method, they and their students may work together developing new case studies of local businesses, bringing to life with on-the-scene research the history of their own communities.

Students, high school principals, teachers and businessmen in the area have enthusiastically endorsed this new Junior Achievement approach to dynamic, effective economic education because to many high school students the business community is a world apart from them even though their parents may support the families through jobs in business and industry. Says Professor Tedesco, "The business case study and problem-solving technique helps them to see the values, benefits and rewards of the competitive business system and to overcome misunderstandings and even suspicions about the private enterprise system.

Says Herman Mopsick, Principal of Linden High School, "We are excited about our participation in Project Enterprise. The great teachers are those who never put the student down. They are the ones who make vigorous efforts to diversify their teaching techniques, posing problems solvable only through deep understanding and logic. The teachers who will be involved in Project Enterprise look forward to a new cooperative approach which will enable them to discuss economics and the history of corporate enterprise in greater depth and breadth, and more meaningfully, than ever before. The Project will be challenging to teacher, student and businessman alike. The difference in student performance in these classes should be dramatic."

Public and parochial high schools participating in the pilot project are Linden, Cranford, Roselle Catholic, Hillside and the David Brearley, Arthur L. Johnson and Jonathan Dayton Regional High Schools.

PERSON TO PERSON

A further step in bridging the communication gap and explaining the economic facts of life to young people will be informal, unstructured face-to-face discussions between top businessmen, government and professional leaders and small groups of Junior Achievers, boys and girls who will be junior company officers as well as production workers. Subject for discussion, at the discretion of the individuals involved, are expected to range from the proposed Burke-Hartke Bill to Industry Week Magazine's "Impact Re-

port", ecology, ethics in business and government, or any other subject which concerns today's teenagers. According to Mr. Fraser, the Junior Achievement President, 26 top business, government and professional leaders have already agreed to participate in these informal, person-to-person discussions.

CYANAMID PRESIDENT HOSTS FIRST GROUP

As this issue of New Jersey Business goes to press, the first meeting of management and teenagers is taking place. Dr. James G. Affleck, President, American Cyanamid Company and several of his top management executives had a luncheon meeting with six Junior Achievers in the executive dining room of the corporate headquarters at Wayne, New Jersey. Participants were:

Dr. Affleck, Dr. Harvey R. Russell, Manager, Educational Services; Herbert Hofmaier, Manager, Warners Plant; John M. Fasoli, Director of Public Relations. The Junior Achiever guests of Dr. Affleck were: Ann Marie Behm, Secretary of Excelsior; Alex F. Czopek, Jr., Purchasing Agent, Bel-Craft; Sharon A. Holloway, President, Jam Co; Pamela G. Kniazuk, Director, Bosco; Joseph J. Laskowski, Treasurer, Rejaco; and Joseph Shanahan, President, Scher-Craft.

All thirty Junior Achievement company sponsors in the Union and Middlesex County areas will hold similar face-to-face unstructured discussions involving the approximately 900 boys and girls who are members of this Junior Achievement "learn by doing" business training program, mostly scheduled for the month of January 1973.

Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc., 1203 East Broad Street, Elizabeth, N.J. 355–1002.

Industrial Sponsors, 1972–73:
Airco Welding Products.
Arthur Andersen & Co.
Bell Laboratories.
Bristol Myers Products.
Burry Biscuit Division, The Quaker Oats Company.
Chevron Oil Company.
CIBA–GEIGY Corporation, Pharmaceuticals Division.
E. I. duPont De Nemours & Co., Inc.,
Enjay Chemical Company.
FMC Corporation.
The Daily Journal.
GAF Corporation.
General Electric Company.
GM Assembly Division, General Motors Corporation.
Humble Oil & Refining Company.
International Business Machines Corporation.
Merck & Co., Inc.
New Departure-Hyatt Bearings Division, General Motors Corporation.
New Jersey Bell Telephone Company.
Phelps Dodge Copper Products Company.
Public Service Electric & Gas Company.
Purolator, Inc.
Regina Corporation.
Schering Corporation.
Peter J. Schweitzer Division, Kimberly-Clark Corporation.
Simmons Company.
The Singer Company.
Thomas & Betts Co.
Weston Instruments, Inc.
WJDM Radio.

COMMENTS CONCERNING THE COASTAL ZONE OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 is now awaiting the President's signature. If it is signed, it will inaugurate a new era of Federal concern and assistance for the wise management of that invaluable resource, the coastal zone of the United States. That act will be a catalyst to those States and communities which have not developed coastal zone management programs; and encouragement for those which have already started to continue.

Mr. Speaker, Nassau and Suffolk Counties began their mutual efforts to develop a coastal management program over 4 years ago. They had to. Long Islanders are never more than 10 miles from the sea or Long Island Sound when at home. The sea and the sound play an integral part in their well being—their weather, their health, the quality of their water, their recreation, often their livelihood and untold other ways.

Through the Regional Marine Resources Council of the Nassau-Suffolk Regional Planning Board, and with the aid of the national sea grant program, studies have been sponsored which shortly will lead to the Marine Resources Council's proposed coastal management guidelines for Nassau and Suffolk counties. They will concentrate on four principal areas: water supply and waste water disposal; wetlands; dredging; and coastal erosion and protection.

In order to reach their management proposals, the Marine Resources Council has held a number of seminars on these problem areas, drawing on some of the finest talent available in the United States to discuss the critical issues. In September they cosponsored with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration a conference on the management problems of wet lands.

The Honorable John V. N. Klein, the county executive of Suffolk County, set the stage and the tone of the proceedings in his introductory remarks at that conference. And by including his farsighted thoughts in the RECORD today, I want to highlight what are undoubtedly key issues confronting not only Long Island, but also all coastal States as they begin their quest for sound management of the coastal zone. First is the management orientation focused upon both the council's studies and the wetlands conference. Second is the need for science/technology information transfer to management, to provide clear and unmistakable information needed for sound management decisions. Third is the need for a well-funded Federal program to assist States and local governments in their coastal zone management programs, a need that the new Coastal Zone Management Act begins to meet.

Mr. Klein's address to the Long Island Wetlands Conference is an important insight into the problems and perspectives of government officials at all levels who must make management decisions. I urge that his statement be studied carefully by all who are concerned for the preservation, enhancement, and development of our coastal zones.

ADDRESS BY JOHN V. N. KLEIN

Gentlemen, my allotted portion of this auspicious seminar, I have been informed, in addition to extending a cordial welcome to this distinguished assemblage of officials, scientists, and concerned citizens, is that of a "stage setter."

I have, according to the advance copies of the day's program, been granted 30 minutes to "set the stage" for this seminar. And I want you all to know that I made very sure that the lights were turned on; that the public address system is in fair working order for a change; and that the place was dusted properly as befits a seminar of this importance. So by my calculations, by getting here early this morning, I have gotten the jump on my assignment. I hope you are pleased with the accommodations. If you are not, please direct your grievances to the county legislature, not to me. Its their hall, not mine, you see.

So much for the first part of my assignment here this morning. I am very pleased to extend Suffolk County's welcome to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Interior, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, their consultants; the scientific community; planners; conservationists and representatives of industry here today.

Our focus today on the problems of wetlands management is unusual, I feel. It will home in on these problems from the point of view of elected and appointed officials of all levels of government, the men and women vested with the authority to make decisions on the use and conservation of wetlands. What knowledge of wetlands must officials have to make wise decisions? What research should be fostered that will best aid the decision-maker? What guidelines should be applied for sound management of wetlands? These questions are at the root of our objectives today. And finding answers to them couldn't be more timely.

What we are experiencing on Long Island is a microcosm of a global phenomenon. A high percentage of the world's population is concentrated in a thin strand surrounding the global seas and oceans—upwards of 70%. Serious environmental problems related to man's life and use of this narrow land area have been created by such population concentrations. Thus, I was pleased to see the resolution adopted by the Second International Parliamentary Conference on the Environment last June in Vienna, the operative part of which said:

"Governments should enact legislation and prepare and implement programs to manage more wisely man's habitation and use of urban, rural, and coastal areas. Particular attention should be given to the interaction of urban and rural land uses with the marine environment, notably wetlands and living resources dependent on the world's coastal zones for sustenance."

I will make my formal presentation brief and to the point. We meet here today at what is practically the center of a Nassau-Suffolk region encompassing an island 120 miles long and 20 miles wide, where no one in this entire region is ever more than 10 miles from a magnificient, but fragile, marine environment. And, we meet in an area that is acutely aware and very sensitive to the myriad of ecological perils which confront modern man in today's society.

More than four years ago, threatened by unprecedented population, housing and industrial growth, the counties of Nassau and Suffolk dedicated themselves to a quest for long-range planning to enhance, preserve and restore our priceless marine environment. Long Island pioneered, first on its own, then with the support of the National Sea Grant program; zeroing in our four specific areas. These include: wetlands management; fresh water resources and wastewater disposal; dredging and dredge spoil disposal, and beach protection.

The federal aid we have received in these fields is and continues to be immeasurable,

not only from a funding standpoint, but also from the expertise and brainpower that has been made available to us. The problems of wetlands management are so complex and so perplexing that we on a local level must have the cooperation and coordination of every level of government and science if we are to succeed.

We in Suffolk are voting this year on a shoreline zoning review proposal which will take place in the expert hands of our fine Suffolk County Planning Commission the right of review of any change of zoning, variance or special permit by any municipality of any land within 500 feet of our shoreline and estuaries. Thus, I sincerely believe, will give this county a landmark breakthrough in protecting our shorelines. Of course, you are all aware of the continuing threat of offshore oil drilling, which we have mounted a drive against, and which remains quite uncertain, but no less a dangerous threat to us.

I know that this is an age of specialization. I know that scientists must be free to conduct their studies in their own manner and by their own means. But there is a dangerous gap developing here. And I raise my voice at this hearing as a warning against it.

There is today a crisis need for any federal program which will result in scientific findings being handed to those elected and appointed officials charged with preserving our environment in such a manner that they can be readily understood. This is not the time to get muscle-bound trying to decipher some scientific jargon into everyday, layman's language.

It is the job of government to understand what the scientists are saying and take the kind of positive, quick action needed to keep us on course in our fight for survival. Conversely, it is a responsibility of the scientists and technicians to speak to us in government in clear and unmistakable language.

If there is one point that I would like to leave with you gathered here today it is just that. To the scientists, we look for your expert advice and interpretation of the specific problems whatever the area or region of this nation. Give us that kind of tool, and we in government will respond with appropriate action. But anything short of that will, I am sorry to predict, only help to further confuse government into inaction.

I thank you for the opportunity for being able to talk with you briefly. I hope I have made myself and my position clear. I look forward to a new kind of scientific-governmental future relationship.

ACTIVITY REPORT OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, 92D CONGRESS

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I think the record of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries during the second session of the 92d Congress has been an outstanding one—earmarked by significant and long-range contributions to the maritime industry and to the environment.

Although a more thorough and complete account of all the committee's activities will appear at a later date in an official committee print, I would like to insert an abbreviated report into the RECORD at this time.

MERCHANT MARINE

There are many indications, Mr. Speaker, that 1972 will be a landmark year for the American maritime industry, and the other members of the committee and I are proud of the role our committee has played in the regeneration of that industry.

Two of the most important pieces of maritime legislation acted upon by our committee during the last session of this Congress were H.R. 13324, the maritime authorization bill for fiscal year 1973; and H.R. 16987, the so-called supplemental maritime authorization bill.

Our committee held 2 days of hearings on H.R. 13324, in order to determine how much funding was necessary to continue the momentum of the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, which calls for the construction of 300 modern American-flag vessels in the next decade. H.R. 13324 subsequently passed the House and the Senate, and it was enacted on August 22, 1972. As enacted, it called for a total of $556,044,000 for the following maritime activities: Construction subsidy, $280 million, of which $30 million is for the purchase of modern or reconstructed U.S.-flag vessels for layup in the national defense reserve fleet; operating subsidy, $232 million; research and development, $30 million; Reserve fleet expenses, $3,900,000; maritime training at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y., $7,854,000; and State marine schools, $2,290,000.

H.R. 16987, was equally important to the overall maritime program, because it called for an additional $175 million for ship construction to supplement the $250 million already authorized for ship construction for fiscal year 1973.

The significance of this additional $175 million cannot be stressed too strongly, because it is indicative of the success of our long-range program to rebuild the American merchant marine. This significance was emphasized by Robert J. Blackwell, Assistant Secretary for Maritime Affairs of the Department of Commerce, when he testified before our committee. In commenting upon the fact that American ship operators are responding to the incentive provided by these subsidies by building bigger and better ships, Mr. Blackwell said:

> None of these vessels would have been built in the United States without the expanded dimension given to our federal maritime policies by the Merchant Marine Act of 1970. Because of these subsidy construction orders, American shipyards today have the largest peacetime orderbook of merchant ships in their history in terms of gross tonnage and contract value.

Under the subsidy program, the Maritime Administration had already contracted for a large number of new ships just at the close of fiscal year 1972; these included 18 tankers and six of the technologically new LNG's—or liquefied natural gas carriers. The supplemental fund of $175 million will provide for at least five more LNG's. These ships, which cost an average of $80 million each to build, will not only help meet our Nation's ever-increasing energy needs—they will also help make the American merchant marine a more dominant force in world trade. Mr. Blackwell also stated at our hearings that American shipyards—through technological know-how—may actually be able to build and sell LNG's to foreign interests. If this does happen, it will indeed be a momentous turning point for the American maritime industry, in addition to providing a tremendous and beneficial impact on our Nation's economy and to our balance-of-payments status.

The committee has, of course, long been aware of the need for the American-flag merchant fleet to be in the forefront of the newly developing LNG technology and market. As a matter of fact, prior to the initial contracts signed for the construction of the first LNG's in this country, our committee held hearings on legislation which proposed to authorize the Federal Government to build a fleet of up to 40 LNG's, which would then be sold or chartered for operation under the American flag.

The committee held 3 days of hearings on a number of similar LNG bills during June 1972. Testimony presented at those hearings documented the fact that the United States faces an impending energy crisis, and that vast amounts of LNG will be imported to meet our Nation's escalating energy requirements. The committee is glad to note that American operators did not wait for the outcome of this legislation, but seized the initiative instead, and are moving ahead in this new and exciting field which contains so much hope for the American maritime industry.

During the early part of the second session, the committee held 7 days of hearings on H.R. 12324, which would require that not less than 50 percent of all oil imported into the United States under the quota system be carried in American-flag vessels. Since the demand for petroleum imports is heavy now, and is expected to increase dramatically in the next decade, such legislation—if enacted—would have a beneficial impact upon the American merchant fleet by stimulating new tanker construction, providing more sea-going jobs and aiding our balance-of-payments situation.

In addition to those benefits, proponents of the legislation argued during committee hearings that the United States cannot depend upon foreign-flag vessels to transport our vital oil supplies in times of national emergencies. The major argument of opponents of the legislation was that it would cause an increase in costs to the American consumer.

Following the extensive hearings, the committee met in executive session and ordered the bill reported, with the following amendments: First, residual fuel oil was removed from the provisions of the bill; second, No. 2 fuel oil was removed from the provisions of the bill; and, third, petroleum refiners with inputs of 30,000 barrels per day were excluded from the provisions of the bill.

In the closing days of the 92d session, I introduced H.R. 17176, which is designed to create more stringent controls over the activities of foreign-flag passenger ships operating out of the United States. This legislation, was cosponsored by Mr. CLARK.

H.R. 17176 evolved from 2 days of hearings our committee held when American steamship representatives complained that the Bureau of Customs was not properly enforcing our cabotage laws with respect to foreign-flag cruises from American ports. Testimony produced at the hearings indicated that certain foreign-flag vessels circumvent our cabotage laws by various devices, ostensibly including superficial calls at foreign ports, when the real destination is a second American port. As a result of the hearings, the committee had directed the Maritime Administration to work with the Bureau of Customs, to help the latter agency strengthen its regulations with respect to the activities of these foreign-flag passenger vessels. Since it now seems apparent that the Bureau of Customs is not moving in the direction recommended, H.R. 17176 was introduced to correct—through legislation—a situation which is not being corrected through administrative action.

Although a number of other maritime bills were acted upon in the second session of the 92d Congress, those discussed above were considered the most important to the industry.

OCEANOGRAPHY

Enactment of two major pieces of environmental legislation, which should become milestones to the committee and to the Nation, occurred in the second session of this Congress as a direct result of the legislative work of our Subcommittee on Oceanography. The two bills referred to are the ocean dumping bill, and the coastal zone management bill, both of which required House-Senate conference action in the closing days of the 92d Congress.

The conference report on the coastal zone management bill passed the House on October 12, 1972, and became Public Law 92–583 on October 27, 1972. Basically it calls for establishment of a comprehensive national policy and the development of a national program for the management, utilization, protection and development of the waters and land resources of the Nation's rapidly disappearing coastal and estuarine zones.

Under this new law, $200 million in Federal money will be provided to the individual States to help them make intelligent, long-range plans and decisions on how best to utilize the Nation's invaluable coastal zone resources. Since this is a complex law, no attempt will be made to discuss it in detail at this time, and more specific information can be obtained from House Report 92–1544.

It should be noted, however, that the coastal zone bill will probably be one of the most important pieces of environmental legislation to come out of the 92d Congress, or any Congress. As enacted, it represents the first real attempt to control the reckless and indiscriminate growth and urban sprawl in our coastal areas; and, for the first time, it provides real aid to the coastal and Great Lakes States, which are faced by insurmountable financial problems in assuming responsibility for dealing with the continuing onslaught against the total coastal environment.

The committee is justifiably proud of the role it has played in the enactment of the very first law which bans the dumping of harmful waste materials into America's coastal and offshore waters.

H.R. 9727, the so-called ocean dumping bill, was the product of the joint efforts and hearings of our Subcommittee on Oceanography, chaired by Congressman ALTON LENNON, and the Subcomittee on Fisheries and Wildlife, chaired by Congressman JOHN D. DINGELL. After extensive hearings and comprehensive executive sessions, the committee reported out an ocean dumping bill in the first session of the 92d Congress, and although the legislation was passed by the House in the first session, House and Senate conferees could not agree on differences. Three additional conference meetings were held in the second session, and both Houses accepted a conference report on October 13, 1972. H.R. 9727 became Public Law 92–532 on October 23, 1972.

In addition to placing a total and absolute ban on the dumping of radiological, chemical or biological warfare agents or of any high-level radioactive waste into the oceans, the ocean dumping act—officially referred to as the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972—also seeks to control the dumping of dredge material which could be harmful to the environment. The final act retains the authority to issue permits for dumping of dredged material to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, but it requires the Corps to follow environmental guidelines set by the Environmental Protection Agency—EPA—if dumping of such material is to be performed, in areas considered to be of critical environmental importance, however, EPA would have the final word on disposition of such waste material. Under this act, violators would be subject to a maximum fine in each case of $50,000 per offense.

The Oceanography Subcommittee also was active in a number of other areas, including hearings on legislation to provide for the orderly development of hard mineral resources from the ocean; oversight hearings concerning the functions and activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—NOAA—and House passage and final enactment of legislation to increase the annual authorization of funds for the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere, from $200,000 to $400,000.

FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

As usual, the activities of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation were extremely broad and productive under the able chairmanship of Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL. Since the bills acted upon by this subcommittee were so voluminous—and, in many cases, so complex—it would be impossible to provide a detailed account in this brief report. A committee print, which will contain a complete and detailed report of all the committee's activities, will be forthcoming.

One of the most significant pieces of conservation legislation to be considered by this subcommittee for a long time—the Marine Mammal Protection Act—became Public Law 92–522 on October 21, 1972. This controversial and complex legislation has many important provisions, but one of the most principal ones provides for the establishment of a moratorium on the taking of marine mammals—with certain exemptions. Development of management programs, creation of a Marine Mammal Commission and penalties against offenders are also called for in this act, which is long overdue and badly needed if humanity is to protect and assure the humane treatment of these wild creatures.

Other bills which emanated from this subcommittee and became public law in the second session of the 92d Congress provide for: insurance to America's commercial fishermen for storm damage, or damage caused by illegal seizures; creation of wildlife refuges for seals, migratory waterfowl and other wildlife; creation of additional recreational areas; protection of the bald eagle; extension of the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act; prohibition against hunting from aircraft; extension of the Jellyfish Act; and funding programs for restoration of sockeye and pink salmon stocks.

Additional hearings were held on a wide variety of subjects, such as legislation to: establish predator control programs and eliminate inhumane methods of elimination of predators; provide for management of game on Federal lands; and to provide for protection for the fish resources of the United States against the introduction and dissemination of diseases.

COAST GUARD

The Subcommittee on Coast Guard Coast and Geodetic Survey, under the able chairmanship of the Honorable FRANK M. CLARK, continued to make significant gains toward the national goal of making our ports and waterways more navigable, safer, and less polluted. The significant gains made during the first session of Congress, examples of which were the passage of the Radio Telephone Bridge to Bridge Act and the Small Boat Safety Act, were complemented by legislation which is integral to the achievement of the goals outlined above.

The annual Coast Guard authorization bill, which is of paramount importance, contained a total of $158,380,000 for fiscal year 1973. This figure included: $81,740,000 for acquiring new vessels and improving existing ones; $18,200,000 for procurement and extension of service life of aircraft; $46,040,000 for the establishment or development of installations and facilities; and $12,500,000 for bridge alterations.

This session also saw the passage of H.R. 8140, commonly referred to as the Port and Waterways Safety Act. This legislation has received considerable attention by the subcommittee and efforts in this regard date back to the 91st Congress. Its passage into law has dual significance in that it makes a major contribution from the standpoint of both marine safety and pollution prevention. Under the act, the Secretary in the Department in which the Coast Guard

is operating has the authority to establish vessel traffic services and systems for ports, harbors, and other waters subject to congested vessel traffic or other hazardous conditions. Indicative of the need and importance of this legislation is the fact that, although it was signed into law as recently as July 10, 1972, vessel traffic systems have been initiated in San Francisco and Puget Sound.

Although these systems were originally on a voluntary basis, the new systems will be mandatory. In addition, a vessel traffic system is planned for the Houston Ship Channel, with an installation date of January 1974. The legislation also authorizes the Secretary to establish rules and regulations setting forth minimum standards of design, construction, alteration and repair to vessels engaged in the carriage of certain liquid bulk cargo, the spillage of which creates substantial hazards to life, property, and the navigable waters of the United States.

The subcommittee was also happy with the passage of H.R. 6479, the Towboat Operating Licensing Act, the legislative history of which is even more extensive than the Port and Waterways Safety Act cited above. This act authorizes the Secretary to require licensed operators on towing vessels 26 feet or over in length. The Secretary is further authorized to prescribe rules and regulations stating the requirements for that license, as well as geographical limitations particular to that license. The act also restricts the working hours of the person licensed to 12 hours in any consecutive 24-hour period, except in case of an emergency. In addition the Secretary is required to conduct a study on the need for licensed engineers on these vessels and submit his report and any recommendations within 10 months after the enactment of this act.

This session also saw the enactment into law of various pieces of legislation which might be described as housekeeping, in that they apply themselves to the orderly administration of the Coast Guard and the programs for which it is responsible. H.R. 13697 applied itself to the Coast Guard flag officer structure and provided for the establishment of periodic continuation boards which would review the proficiency of rear admirals and make recommendations with respect to their continuation in the service of the U.S. Coast Guard. Heretofore, no review of this type was authorized. The legislation also establishes statutory positions of commander, Atlantic area and commander, Pacific area; and it authorizes the grade of vice admiral for these two positions.

H.R. 10486 applied itself to the rank of master chief petty officer and the lighthouse service employees who are under the jurisdiction of the Coast Guard. The purpose of the legislation was twofold: First, it made the basic pay of the master chief petty officer of the Coast Guard comparable to the basic pay of his counterparts in the other armed services. Second, it corrected another pay inequity which has existed since 1969. This inequity, which developed with the enactment of Public Law 91–93, permitted civil service employees to compute their retired pay on the basis of their highest average salary over a 3-year period vice a 5-year period. This act now provides that lighthouse employees may compute their retirement using the same formula as the civil service. In addition, the act enables lighthouse employees who were forced into involuntary retirement due to cutbacks to compute their retirement on a reduced basis, based on a formula presently used by the Civil Service under similar situations.

PANAMA CANAL

With the opening of the second session of the 92d Congress, the Subcommittee on Panama Canal resumed hearings on the proposed canal treaty.

Several days of open hearings, as well as executive hearings, were held on this important subject because of the apparent impasse of the treaty talks by State Department officials and by elements of the Panamanian Government.

In February of 1972, the subcommittee made an inspection of the Canal Zone and the city of Panama in order to receive first-hand information to determine the current problems facing the United States in operating the canal in view of the highly volatile political situation in Panama. An ambitious schedule of meetings with officials, leaders, civic groups, union groups, members of the judiciary, and individuals were conducted in addition to the status of the treaty talks with the officials of the U.S. Canal Zone Government. A myriad of important topics was discussed in great detail with the proper individuals and agencies charged with that responsibility.

On July 1, 1972, the Provisional Junta Government of Panama seized the Panama Power & Light Co., called Fuerza y luz, owned by the Boise Cascade Corporation of Boise, Idaho. Hearings were held on this matter in July and August 1972, in order to investigate the apparent, as well as the underlying reasons for the takeover of American-owned enterprises by the Panamanian Government.

At the moment, negotiations between the Panamanian Government and Boise Cascade are continuing, and it is hoped that an amicable solution is in the making.

The subcommittee will continue to investigate and receive information on this very important matter with a view toward protecting the interests of citizens and American-owned corporations of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, attached at the end of this report is a statistical table depicting the legislative activity of this committee during the second session of the 92d Congress. As I said earlier in this report, a more detailed account of all committee activities during that period will be found in a formal committee report to be printed at a later date:

STATUS OF BILLS REFERRED, 92D CONG., 2D SESS.

	Total	Full committee	Subcommittees: Merchant Marine	Fisheries and wildlife	Coast Guard	Oceanography	Panama Canal	Education and training
Bills referred:								
House bills	98	1	13	56	8	7		3
House joint resolutions	2		1	1				
House Congressional resolutions	2		1		1			
House resolution	1		1					
Senate bills	4		1	2		1		
Total referred	107	1	17	59	9	8		3
Bills reported:								
Public laws	32	9	7	11	6	1		
Private law	1		1					
Reported to House	36	11	7	12	5	1		
Open hearings (days)	70		21	28	11	5	4	1
Bills considered	199	55	18	59	6	14		1
Executive meetings (days)	24	14		3		3	4	

COMMUNIST NEGOTIATORS WITH AMERICAN PASSPORTS

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Daniel Berrigan, in "Night Flight to Hanoi," said:

> The other preflight visit, just before we drove out to Kennedy Airport, was from a State Department man in Averell Harriman's office. He offered to validate our passports for travel to North Vietnam, an officially forbidden destination.

I have often remarked that there is nothing wrong with the Jesuits that a good inquisition would not cure. And when a man of Berrigan's known sympathies is given what amounts to official sanction to negotiate with our enemy—whom he very obviously does not regard as the enemy—it suggests that our Government needs an inquisition.

Following the recent return of David Dellinger and Cora Weiss from Hanoi, I have been making inquiries into how the Vietcong front in the United States is allowed to send representatives almost continually to North Vietnam, with no hindrance whatsoever from our Government, but rather with its special permis-

sion. This is clearly related to the question of why the "Lady Haw Haw" of the Vietnam war, Jane Fonda, could make broadcasts urging members of our Armed Forces to refuse to do their duty—which is specifically identified as a crime under Federal law—and get away with it.

Dave Dellinger is another case in point. This self-confessed Communist spent 2 years in a Federal penitentiary in Lewisburg, Pa., beginning in 1943, after refusing to report for a medical examination for the draft in World War II. In 1949, he was apprehended while performing a lewd act in a men's room in New York City, was convicted and received a suspended sentence. In hearings before the then House Committee on Un-American Activities, Dellinger testified on December 5, 1968, that he had "intimate contacts with both the NLF—National Liberation Front, the Vietcong—and representatives from North Vietnam. Now the sole purpose has not been to secure the release of American prisoners, but this has been a very important aspect of my contacts with these people. It is a very touchy and delicate area, as I am sure you recognize."

It is bad enough that this man was ordered released to go to Hanoi at the behest of the State Department even while under indictment on conspiracy charges in connection with the disruption of the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago. It is even more indefensible that the State Department gave this convicted felon a passport valid for travel to North Vietnam. This came to light when my research assistant and a staff investigator of the House Internal Security Committee interviewed Robert Johnson, Deputy Director and Chief Counsel of the Passport Office of the Department of State, following hearings on September 19, 1972, to find ways of better safeguarding the security of the United States by preventing abuses of the passport. Mr. Johnson stated that in 1968 he and members of his staff were called in on a Saturday morning for the specific purpose of giving a very arrogant David Dellinger his passport for travel to North Vietnam.

How much more rotten could a situation be than this one of a self-confessed Communist traveling to Communist North Vietnam with our official permission, at the insistence of the State Department, while brave members of our Armed Forces were fighting against that same Communist enemy and giving their life's blood to hurl back Communist aggression?

It is well known that the Pentagon papers, released by Daniel Ellsberg, contained descriptions of the offensive and defensive posture of U.S. forces and those of all our allies in Southeast Asia—including all the clandestine capabilities of our Green Berets and Air Commandos. These have been published and made available to our worldwide enemies. What is not so well known is that four volumes of the Pentagon papers have not been released and remain classified. This is because, Assistant Secretary of State David Abshire stated in a memorandum to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee March 9, 1972:

To disclose these secret channels and official communications relating to them would constitute a unilateral violation of confidentiality in diplomatic intercourse without which the diplomatic process cannot function effectively.

Senator FULBRIGHT accordingly decreed that these volumes would be "made available only to committee members as a classified committee print." However, the table of contents was released, and it contains a title "Private Trips to Hanoi (Three Clerics, Ashmore-Baggs, and Others)."

So it would appear that to let the American people know more about these private trips to Hanoi by "clerics" and others would constitute a disclosure of "secret channels and official communications without which the diplomatic process cannot function effectively." It does sound very much as though the Dellinger-Weiss-Berrigan types had official recognition and sanction by our negotiators in what they were doing.

For such persons in any way to represent America in the capital of the enemy is a supreme insult to our fighting men, living and dead, who gave so much to save South Vietnam from Communist aggression.

RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE ON THE VIETNAM SITUATION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I recently reported to my people on the Vietnam situation. My guest was the Second Secretary of the Vietnam Embassy, Mr. Hoc.

I insert a transcript of this report for inclusion in the RECORD at this point:

Mr. RARICK. South Vietnam and the commitments that our nation has made under the South East Asia Treaty Organization, SEATO, to stop Communist aggression in Vietnam have long been of interest to our people.

During the past few days the news media has been dropping suggestions that between now and the November 7th election. President Nixon will somehow bring instant peace to that troubled land and reconcile the differences between the free people of South Vietnam and the Communists to the north. This "putting the toothpaste back into the tube" operation is being handled by the President's top international advisor, Doctor Kissinger.

Because there is confusion resulting in political appeals from reality and fact and because I am sure many of our listeners would like another source of information other than simply American news sources, I had invited the Vietnam Ambassador to the United States to be on our program. Unfortunately the Ambassador is in Saigon, but we are indeed happy today to have as your guest, Mr. Hoc, Second Secretary of the Vietnam Embassy, to give us some evaluation of the present events from the viewpoint of a South Vietnam citizen and a representative of his government.

Mr. Hoc, we are happy to have you with us today and welcome you into the homes of our many Louisiana viewers, many of whom have served in the armed forces of our country fighting in your country and have a great interest in what is going on in South Vietnam.

Mr. Hoc, most Americans, like your people, want peace, but after all these years of fighting, they are today being told that there is somehow a formula for instant peace that can be brought about. Will you give us your country's feelings on the present peace talks and negotiations?

Mr. Hoc. Mr. Congressman, as you know since the Paris peace negotiations were enlarged to include four parties, there have been three years and ten months and over 150 weekly sessions, but we have seen no progress at all. Our side has made many concessions at the Paris peace table. We have proposed an Indochina-wide ceasefire to end the killing in all Indochina. We have proposed free elections in South Vietnam to give the South Vietnamese people a chance to choose freely their own leaders, but unfortunately all our proposals have been rejected by the other side. The other side continues to insist on their irrational position; that is, to overthrow the present elected government in South Vietnam, to replace it with a coalition government and to disband all democratic institutions in South Vietnam. And these demands are unacceptable, but we have a strong belief that the war could be ended only through a negotiated settlement so we have not withdrawn our participation from the peace talks in Paris. For the past few months, the intensive traveling of Dr. Henry Kissinger to Paris and to other countries has been evidence that the peace negotiations are in a very crucial stage and our people of South Vietnam fervently hope that a fair political settlement can be reached to restore a genuine peace, a peace with honor and freedom, a peace that meets the aspirations of the South Vietnamese people.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Hoc, from here in Washington I try to keep abreast of the situation in the world. It appears to me that the aggressor in your part of the world is the North Vietnamese Communists. The aggressor in Thailand is the North Vietnamese Communists; the aggressor in your country is the North Vietnamese Communists; the aggressor in Cambodia, in Laos, you name the place of aggression, and it always ends up being traceable to the North Vietnamese Communists. As you have said, the solution for peace would seem very simple—simply tell the Communists to go back north, to go home, disarm themselves, and to work to make their country a better place to live. I notice that you mentioned that your government is willing to have free elections. You have had free elections, have you not?

Mr. Hoc. Yes, we have.

Mr. RARICK. And President Thieu was elected. Some people in our country for some reason or other might not have approved of it; but he was elected, and I don't recall any definite charges of election irregularity. But have you ever heard of any free elections in North Vietnam?

Mr. Hoc. No, I haven't heard of any free elections in North Vietnam.

Mr. RARICK. I don't even believe the Communist Party in control of North Vietnam has had elections, have they?

Mr. Hoc. Well, let me clarify this point. As a matter of fact the Constitution of North Vietnam provides that elections be held every five years; however the Communist leaders refuse to abide by the provisions. They have postponed many times the elections on the pretext that the war situation does not permit elections to be held. Recently, in early 1971, North Vietnam did hold one election in which 521 candidates competed for 420 seats in the National Assembly. The election was held hastily with virtually little choice of selection for the people. South Vietnam is different from North Vietnam because South Vietnam is an open society, whereas North Vietnam is a very strictly closed society. In

such a closed society, free elections, as we know them, are unheard of. Election is only a means used by the Communist leaders in North Vietnam to consolidate their powers, in other words, to ratify the decisions of the ruling, which is the Communist Party, circle; while in South Vietnam, we hold elections every four years and the people are given a wide choice of candidates. For instance, during the senatorial elections of 1970, there were 160 candidates campaigning for 30 seats in the Senate, and in the elections for the lower House, 1172 candidates campaigned for 137 seats, representing a real choice for the voters.

Mr. RARICK. But again, in these so-called peace talks that are being negotiated by our country and North Vietnam and we don't know who else, I have never heard it even suggested that the negotiated peace terms call for elections in North Vietnam to see if the people who live in that area really endorse and support the Communist Party dictators or their rulers. At the last negotiations, the North Vietnamese demand for a coalition government was abandoned only to be replaced with what is termed a national concord. Would you tell our viewers what a national concord is? How does it differ from a coalition government?

Mr. HOC. There is no difference at all. A national concord or coalition government is the same thing. The Communists use another word in order to confuse or just to have a better name for a coalition government, which we are firmly opposed to. The advocate of the coalition government says that peace may be restored through a coalition government, but we see otherwise. There are two reasons why we are firmly opposed to a coalition government. First, the lesson of history as the events in Eastern Europe after World War II and recently in Laos and especially after our own bitter experience in Vietnam in 1946.

In Laos, the coalition government was installed as a result of the Geneva Agreement of 1962, but, since the initiation of that government, peace has not been restored to the people of Laos as war still continues in many parts of that country. In Eastern Europe Communists took power by means of coalition governments. We had the same bitter experience in Vietnam in 1946. When a coalition was formed, the Nationalists held four places in the 12-member Cabinet as against four for the Communists and four for the Neutralists. The new Cabinet took office March 2, 1946. The Neutralist and Nationalist ministers were denied any opportunity to contribute constructively in any way and finally were forcibly removed from office. The same fate befell the Nationalist Assembly. The membership had initially 444 delegates, but it was decreased to a total of 291 at the opening session. The purges continued and on November 8, 1946, the date of the vote on the new Constitution, only 240 delegates were present. Finally, the Communists were in complete control of the government.

The second reason concerns the right of self-determination for our people. We have fought for many, many years for the right of self-determination. To impose or install a coalition government upon our people is to deny them that right. And that would be tantamount to a betrayal of thousands and thousands of our people who sacrificed their lives for the right of self-determination.

Mr. RARICK. I might add that some 50,000 American men who stood with your people in their struggle to be free also gave their lives. Mr. Hoc, as I understand this theory of coalition government or national concord, it would, in effect, disregard any elections. The Communists would be given a certain number of seats or so much voice in your government. Isn't that the way it is to run? These other groups would be guaranteed some voice in your government?

Mr. HOC. Well, we proposed in Paris that free elections would be held in South Vietnam in which all political parties and groups can participate. And any government which emerges from that election would be respected by our present government and the people.

Mr. RARICK. But the Communists would be assured of having a certain number of seats in your government, even though the people might not elect them if they had an open choice and this is in the proposed peace talks being offered to your people.

Mr. HOC. Most definitely we would oppose the coalition government that is pre-fabricated, but we do not oppose any government that emerges from free elections.

Mr. RARICK. Would you tell our listeners what you feel would happen to your country, your people, if your country accepts peace under a coalition government. Would they be able to continue free as they now live? Would there be law and order? Would there be safety for the individual?

Mr. HOC. Certainly not. Our country will not enjoy a genuine peace or freedom under a coalition government. If such a coalition government is installed in our country, the Communists will continue to fight for power through other methods—terrorism, assassination, and liquidation. Four months ago we captured documents from the Communist leaders which clearly revealed their tactics. It proposed for a coalition government. The apparent coalition will be only at the central government level. At the village and hamlet level the Communists would seize control by violent means such as terrorism, liquidation, and assassination.

Mr. RARICK. And, by *liquidation* you mean killing people who oppose Communism?

Mr. HOC. Yes, and one of our representatives, Mr. Van Dien of Binh Dinh province, described that situation: "that heads will be rolling, blood will be spilling in every village and hamlet."

Mr. RARICK. And of course, as the better citizen is intimidated or required to keep his mouth shut, trading repression of freedom of speech for a false safety, the Communists will develop even more power in your country. Is that right? It could become so bad that many of your people would be forced to either flee for their lives or take the chance that they would be liquidated or killed by the Communists.

Mr. HOC. Yes; probably they would have no opportunity to flee the country and would be killed by the Communists, or perhaps sent to labor camps.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Hoc, I wish we had more time, but unfortunately, time has run out. We are very happy for your appearance on our program today. I'm sure that our listeners in Louisiana have enjoyed the straightforward answers that you have given them.

Mr. HOC. Thank you, Mr. Congressman.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TRANSISTOR

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1972

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take official note of a scientific anniversary soon to be observed in Union County, N.J., which is part of the congressional district I am privileged to represent.

It is one deserving of more than passing attention, because it marks an event which has been of tremendous significance to the rest of the Nation, and to many other parts of the world as well.

I am referring to the 25th anniversary of the invention of the transistor at the Murray Hill, N.J., facility of Bell Laboratories, the research and development unit of the Bell System.

Shortly, I will say more concerning its significance to our modern communications system, to our space adventures, to the computerized services in our society, and to our health and well-being. Also I will speak of its significance to less advanced areas of the world.

But first I would like to suggest why the event merits our particular attention.

At a time when advances in science and technology are often called to account; when it is said, by some, that these advances are in conflict with the "human" values, and aspirations, and goals; I believe the invention of the transistor is particularly representative of the way good science can serve the cause of humanity in the broadest possible sense. Fortunately, in the case of the transistor, we have the benefit of hindsight, in assessing its impact over 25 years. Nevertheless, the point is that science with foresight, innovative science, properly directed, can be good science, of benefit to all.

The anniversary merits the attention of the young, many of whom have been "turned off" by technology when considering future pursuits. The anniversary demonstrates that technology has great value in human terms, if we can but look beyond the mere creation of hardware, and see the ways in which it can enhance the lives of our people.

The invention merits our attention, because it demonstrates the ability of American industry to solve our problems in our way with a superlative measure of success.

And from a personal viewpoint, I believe the anniversary merits attention, because it typifies the contributions being made by many individuals and organizations in my home district.

The anniversary of the invention, December 23 of this year, also would seem to be an appropriate time for us to offer a heartfelt, public, "thank you" to the three Nobel Prize winning inventors, John Bardeen, William Shockley, and Walter Brattain. We also would like to express our appreciation to those others who assisted or guided them, and to the organizational structure and foresight which made possible their achievement. The contributions of the inventors certainly did not end with that act of invention. William Shockley is a professor of engineering sciences at Stanford University; John Bardeen teaches graduate physics at the University of Illinois; and Walter Brattain teaches undergraduate physics at Whitman College. Many others and the organization, Bell Laboratories, continue to contribute daily to improved telephone services and facilities for the nationwide telephone network.

Consider, if you will, what the world would have been like if scientists had not identified the transistor effect in semiconductor materials, if the transistor had not been invented, and if the directed, team followup to devise new

technology based on the transistor had not been carried out.

Computers would be much less reliable, bulkier, slower, and would not have the information-handling capability they now possess. They probably would have been too expensive for wide use. We probably would never have landed a man on the moon. Space exploration and communications satellites would not have achieved their present degree of sophistication.

The electronics industry, as it is constituted today, and with the many jobs that it provides, is being shaped by the transistor and other solid-state devices spawned by the transistor, such as microwave and light-emitting devices, and especially integrated circuits. The people employed within the United States alone by business and industries engaged in solid-state technology number in the millions.

Solid-state devices have had an impact on a multitude of markets including commercial equipment and systems, education, medicine, broadcasting, military, musical instruments, automobiles, navigation, test and measuring instruments, industrial control and automation, aerospace, and certainly not last or least, telephone communications.

In hospitals and doctors' offices, solid-state equipment monitors and maintains our health and provides new insights into the working of the human body.

The hard-of-hearing have been helped by solid-state hearing aids built in eyeglasses or concealed behind the ear. Persons with heart conditions are kept alive by pacemakers. Electrocardiograms can be sent from the bedside of a heart attack victim via the telephone to a heart specialist almost anywhere. The blind use semiconductor-operated devices to warn them of obstacles in their path.

Count the everyday things that would be much larger or completely impractical without the technology that arose from the transistor. Cameras with automatic exposure control either would not exist or would require a knapsack of electronic equipment. Fast, safe jet travel owes much to compact, lightweight sophisticated navigation and radar systems.

To the most isolated corners of the world, low cost transistor radios have brought the spoken word and music, and have become a powerful social force in bringing entertainment and educational programs. In fact, hand-sized radios, in popular conversation, have frequently assumed the name of the invention that made them possible. They are called transistors.

And, of course, solid state technology has also meant better and more reliable telephone service. More long-distance and overseas calls can be made faster and at lower cost than in the past. In the Bell System, transistors and integrated circuits have replaced vacuum tubes in a variety of applications such as electronic switching systems, switchboards, power systems, and microwave, coaxial cable and undersea transmission systems.

All this, and more, started 25 years ago in Union County, N.J., when scientists searched for a "solid-state device" to boost and switch electrical signals. To our benefit, and certainly worthy of our thanks, they found it in the transistor.