

Does Dr. Stein regard the full employment budget as "more propaganda than a guide to policy"?

The Joint Economic Committee was entirely serious when it again recommended in its midyear report last summer that 4 percent remains an appropriate interim target for unemployment. We are equally serious in repeatedly recommending that our longrun goal should be an unemployment rate no higher than 3 percent.

Unemployment remains our most serious economic problem. The unemployment rate for teenagers was over 15 percent in November. For blacks it was about 10 percent. The willingness of the administration to continue to tolerate rates like these can only be described as heartless.

INFLATION

Let me turn to the facts on inflation. Inflation, unlike unemployment, is a problem which administration officials purport to take seriously. They talk a lot about the importance of controlling inflation. They claim to be making progress. Let us examine that progress.

In the last 6 months the consumer price index has risen at a rate of 3.6 percent. In the last 3 months this rate of increase has accelerated to 4.2 percent. We are far from the President's goal of bringing the inflation rate below 3 percent, and worse yet, we seem to be moving in the wrong direction.

The wholesale price index suggests even worse news ahead for the future. Wholesale prices have risen at a 5.7 percent rate in the past 6 months.

Much publicity has been given to the increases in food prices, but the continued rise in wholesale industrial prices may be an even more basic problem. These industrial prices should not be rising at all. From 1959 to 1964 the industrial price index was completely stable. In the last 6 months wholesale industrial prices have risen at a 3.2-percent rate.

Some of the largest increases have been in the prices of raw materials and of goods in the early stages of processing. Thus, these price increases may still take many months to show up at the consumer level. Furthermore, recently announced price increases for automobiles and for steel have yet to show up in the price indexes. Some of the most serious inflationary problems seem to be in those basic industries where the control program ought to have been most effective.

In his year-end statement, Dr. Stein expressed confidence that inflation could be reduced in 1973 because:

Wage decisions will be made in a climate of much more confidence in the price level and less need for big wage increases to make

good previous lags than has existed for many years.

Mr. Stein is surely aware that in recent months real hourly earnings have been rising at an annual rate of 2 percent or less. This limited growth of real wages is the result of a control program which has succeeded in keeping money wage increases within the 5.5-percent limit but has failed to reach its goal on prices. Unless quick progress on prices can be made in the next few months, labor negotiators will feel a need to "make good previous lags" and certainly their "confidence in the price level" will be limited.

With respect to both unemployment and inflation, Mr. Stein is glossing over some serious problems. This is no service to the public.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of proceeding in a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of counting the electoral votes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. NUNN). Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senate will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Pursuant to the previous order, at 12:51 p.m., the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of attending a joint session for the counting of the electoral votes.

At 1:58 p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. NUNN).

COUNTING OF THE ELECTORAL VOTE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, on behalf of the tellers on the part of the Senate, I wish to report on the counting of the vote for President and Vice President.

The state of the vote for President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 538, of which a majority is 270.

Richard M. Nixon, of the State of California, has received for President of the United States 520 votes.

GEORGE MCGOVERN, of the State of South Dakota, has received 17 votes.

John Hospers, of the State of California, has received 1 vote.

The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for Vice President of the United States is 538, of which a majority is 270.

SPIRO T. AGNEW, of the State of Maryland, has received for Vice President of the United States 520 votes.

R. Sargent Shriver, of the State of Maryland, has received 17 votes.

Theodora Nathan, of the State of Oregon, has received 1 vote.

ADDITION OF COSPONSORS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, in accordance with the procedures that were followed during the 92d Congress, I ask unanimous consent that for the remainder of the first session of the 93d Congress, Senators may submit signed requests at the rostrum to add the names of coauthors to bills, joint resolutions, concurrent resolutions, and simple resolutions, without having to make such requests from the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER ON PRINTING CONFERENCE REPORTS AS SENATE REPORTS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—as was done during the 92d Congress—that during the first session of the 93d Congress, notwithstanding the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act, conference reports and statements accompanying them not be printed as Senate reports when the House of Representatives acts first on such reports, or conference reports and statements have been printed as a House report, unless specific request is made in the Senate in each instance to have such a report printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, JANUARY 9, 1973

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock meridian.

The motion was agreed to; and at 2:01 p.m., the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, January 9, 1973, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

H. S. T.—AMONG THE TOP 10

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, some Presidents seem to shrink in stature as

the years pass following their term in office.

With others it is to the contrary. From the vantage point of a few years' perspective, they loom much larger than they did while in office. Harry S. Truman belongs in this category.

Of all the many thousands of words that have been uttered and written since

Mr. Truman's death, I have seen none more apt than those of Mary McGrory in the following column, which appeared in the New York Post of December 29, 1972:

THE LESSON OF HIS LIFE

(By Mary McGrory)

WASHINGTON.—In death, as in life, Harry Truman did not impose.

His funeral, like himself, was plain, prayerful and to the point.

He had planned it that way.

Except for the gold braid and the ceremonial firings, it could have been the funeral of any man from Missouri who had been a war veteran and a Mason.

Only family and old friends were invited.

There was no eulogy. He was not one to stain rhetoric or extort emotion. Besides, history, always his guide, had become a friend. He had never needed anyone to tell him who he was. The library was there to remind the world of what he had done.

The funeral repeated the lesson of his life—that any American can get to be President, and get over it.

He had assumed office amid universal lamentations, in which he humbly joined. He was patronized as "a little guy." But by the time he left the White House, the country and the world thought he had been big enough for the job.

What he brought to the White House was a quality sadly lacking in his two most recent successors, that is a sense of perspective. He was the only President of this generation who had an eye-level relationship with the country. Eisenhower was the revered patriarch who could do no wrong; Kennedy was the idolized prince. Lyndon Johnson, a Gargantuan figure, demanded to be loved, and was not. The present occupant is an emperor, vindictive secretive, mirthless.

Truman was a man without pretense, who happened to be President. Neither he nor the country ever seemed to lose sight of the fact. He was not a hero or a magician or a chess player, or an obsession. He was a certifiable member of the human race, direct, fallible and unexpectedly wise when it counted.

He did not require to be loved. He did not expect to be followed blindly. Congressional opposition never struck him as subversive, nor did he regard his critics as traitors. He never whined.

He walked around Washington every morning—it was safe then. He met reporters frequently as a matter of course, and did not blame them for his failures. He did not use the office as a club or a shield, or a hiding place. He worked at it.

He had a sense of what was due the presidency if not to himself. People were so unawed by him that they considered him insubordinate when he fired General MacArthur. It was not personal pique. He understood the Constitution, he understood the principle of civilian control of the military. He never said war was peace.

He dropped the atomic bomb, a fact much recalled this week when American power is being used savagely over another Asian country. The decision is still disputed, but at least he gave the country plausible military reasons for what he did. His present successor has dropped the equivalent of two Hiroshima bombs and has yet to give the public the first syllable of explanation. Harry Truman believed the public business was the public's business.

All week, the television has been bringing him back as he was, the twanging voice, the forthrightness, the humor. Was it only twenty years ago that we had a President who explained his actions, who admitted his mistakes and could imitate a commentator?

Truman was not a "splendid misery" sort. Since his time—it began with the Cuban missile crisis—we have been given hour-by-hour accounts of Presidential agonies.

Nothing to it, according to the man from Independence. "You get all the facts and you make up your mind," he explained briskly to an audience.

He brought to his retirement the same unwavering perspective that had marked his presidency. He actually went home to his old house in Independence. He came to the door for his morning paper.

He took, as long as he was able, his daily

walk, and zestfully built his library. He sounded off a time or two but as reluctantly as he had taken power, as readily he relinquished it.

"Three things ruin a man," he told a reporter on the occasion of his seventy-fifth birthday. "Power, money and women."

"I never wanted power," he said. "I never had any money, and the only woman in my life is up at the house right now."

He is buried in the courtyard of his library. He said he lived by the Bible and history. So armed, he proved that the ordinary American is capable of grandeur. And that a President can be a human being. At the present grim moment, there is some doubt on both points. We mourn for him as we mourn for lost certainties.

I cannot improve on what Mary McCrory said, but I should like to add a few words about two of Harry Truman's great qualities.

One was his honesty. He was forthright with the American people, and they trusted him when he said something, we knew he was telling the truth. The contrast these days is obvious and painful.

The other quality I want to single out was his understanding of the tripartite nature of the American Government. An avid student of American history, Mr. Truman had just as much respect for the legislative and judicial branches as he did for the Presidency. He fought with the Congress, but he never ignored it or downgraded it.

I am intensely proud of the fact that I was appointed to office by President Truman. History will rank him, I believe, among the top 10 of our Presidents.

A TRIBUTE TO ADOLPH ZUKOR

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1973, the motion picture industry and people throughout the world will join in a tribute to Mr. Adolph Zukor, motion picture pioneer and founder of Paramount Pictures Corp., on the occasion of his 100th birthday.

Mr. Zukor's life represents those qualities which have been admired and exalted throughout the history of the American people.

Adolph Zukor was born in Riese, Hungary, on January 7, 1873. In 1889, at the age of 16, he came to America, arriving in New York with just \$25 sewn in the lining of his clothes.

His first work in his new country earned him \$2 a week. He spent his evenings at night school learning English and concepts of American business.

By the turn of the century, this enterprising young man had established himself as a successful businessman. It was at this point that he turned his energies toward the entertainment industry.

He began by investing in penny arcades and other amusements. But he sensed that the infant movie industry was not being responsive to the needs of the American audience as it should be. During that time when only two-reel escapist novelty films were being made,

he became convinced that narrative films of greater length would provide the public with more meaningful entertainment.

So Adolph Zukor decided to become a producer. He haunted D. W. Griffith's sets, watching the companies at work. He evolved scenarios from the classics. He was determined that his company would present actors and actresses of standing in the theater, in full length plays. And long before the company was actually organized, he decided upon the motto which was to announce his product for many years, "Famous Players in Famous Plays."

At this time, he was able to obtain the American rights to "Queen Elizabeth," a four-reel picture starring Sarah Bernhardt which had been produced in France. Many in the entertainment industry in our country believed this film was too highbrow to gain popular acceptance here, but Zukor's judgment was vindicated.

Thus it remained for "Queen Elizabeth," the first really artistic, full length screenplay show in America, to pave the way for the abandonment of two-reelers and the adoption of feature-length subjects in which form the motion picture has continued to this day. Adolph Zukor's vision and daring with this new medium resulted from that point in the establishment of the modern motion picture industry.

Launching his production plans, Adolph Zukor formed the Famous Players Film Co. in 1912, in association with Daniel Frohman.

The first three pictures released by the new company were James Hackett's "The Prisoner of Zenda," "The Count of Monte Cristo," with James O'Neill, and "Tess of the D'Urbervilles," with Minnie Maddern Fiske. Ethel Barrymore was won over from the theater temporarily. Then Mary Pickford came into the fold. After her came a long line of famous stars through the years.

The success attending Famous Players' first picture gave impetus to other new production companies entering the field. Adolph Zukor's conviction that the public would respond to better pictures was being proven. And among the new companies were the Jesse Lasky Play Co. and Bosworth, Inc., for the distribution of whose pictures the Paramount Pictures Corp. was formed.

In July 1916 the Famous Players Film Co. and the Jesse L. Lasky Feature Play Co. were combined under the name of Famous Players-Lasky Corp. Later the same year, the Oliver Morosco Photoplay Co. and Pallas Pictures, the output of Bosworth, Inc., were absorbed, as were the Paramount Pictures Corp. on January 1, 1917.

Although the last named corporation disappeared as a separate entity, the name "Paramount" has been preserved, thanks to the sagacity of Adolph Zukor, and since that time Paramount Pictures have literally encircled the globe.

To this producing and distributing organization which has grown from so humble a beginning, scores of the world's leading screen personalities owe their success.

When World War II broke out, Mr. Zukor aided the war effort as a member of the coordinating committee of the War Activities Committee. In this way he participated in the vast cooperative program devised by Hollywood to aid the war on the home front, in Europe and in Asia.

In 1947, Adolph Zukor was honored by the Motion Picture Pioneers, an organization of film men having 25 years or more in the industry, for his contribution to motion pictures during the past decades.

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday at the Beverly Hilton Hotel in Beverly Hills, friends and admirers of Adolph Zukor will gather once again to honor this great leader of the motion picture industry for his 100 years of life and, most important, for making that life so productive. It will be a tribute in which Congress and the Nation can be proud to participate.

MEMORIAL TO HALE BOGGS

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is sad that this 93d Congress finds absent, for the first time in 24 years, our former colleague Hale Boggs. We, who are fortunate to serve in the Congress will miss the face and friendly manner of our friend from Louisiana. We are all saddened by his untimely loss and shocked, indeed, by his disappearance on October 16 in an airplane in Alaska. I am sure all his colleagues are deeply saddened with the knowledge that his able leadership as majority leader will be no longer.

During his years in the Congress, since he first joined the 77th Congress, he rose to eminence and power in the House of Representatives. First came his election in 1949, to the Committee on Ways and Means on which he served until 1970. As the second ranking Democrat Mr. Boggs helped with numerous pieces of legislation and was a cosponsor of the 1962 Trade Expansion Act. He was appointed deputy Democratic whip in the 85th, 86th, and the first session of the 87th Congress, then he became the Democratic whip, and in 1971 he became majority leader.

In the House of Representatives, Hale Boggs had an unusual position because he stood as a truly effective human bridge between the many competing qualities and interests of the Members. He served to sustain a link for tolerance as well as for common action among them. Under his leadership political divergencies of all kinds—regional, cultural, ideological, racial—were more matters for rational discussion and sensible action than reasons for implacable and wasteful infighting.

I was proud to serve with Congressman Boggs and I join with my colleagues, and with the people not only of the Second District of Louisiana, but with the entire Nation, in mourning the death of our

friend, who was such an able legislator and gentleman.

COMMUNITIES NEED FLOOD ASSISTANCE

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, my Texas district is one of many areas in the United States subject periodically to severe damage from floods. For this reason, I have had a special interest, ever since I entered Congress, in trying to help to provide flood insurance for our people.

As my colleagues know, we have made progress.

The National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 for the first time provided insurance coverage for those seeking it. The private property insurance industry felt unable to provide flood insurance on an economically feasible basis—at least during the early years of such a program—without Government assistance.

Congress therefore authorized a flood insurance program to be carried out in cooperation with private insurance companies and through existing agents, brokers, and adjusting organizations. This program enables property owners to buy insurance against losses resulting from physical damage to, or loss of, real or personal property caused by floods. This joint effort of the Federal Government and the insurance industry makes it possible for individuals to purchase policies at premium costs that they can better afford.

However, many homeowners and businessmen have not taken advantage of the opportunity. Efforts have been made to increase the attractiveness of the program, but still the response has not lived up to expectations—or to the need.

More needs to be done.

I am therefore introducing amendments to the National Flood Insurance Act which would expand the program's coverage. It is proposed to double the insurance limits on single family residences and on all residential contents; to triple the limits on all other structures and contents, except nonresidential contents which would increase from \$10,000 to \$200,000; and to raise the limit on the total amount of flood insurance coverage authorized from the present \$2.5 to \$10 billion.

These changes would increase incentives for community and individual participation in the program. The proposed amendments would retain the key concept of the present law, which is to hold to a minimum losses due to flood disaster. Each community will still be required to adopt effective land use measures before individuals in that community may purchase flood insurance.

Mr. Speaker, we have a sound basic program of national flood insurance. The amendments I propose will not detract from its soundness but should have the effect of making insurance coverage far

more widespread. That is an important and necessary goal.

IMPORTS CONTINUE TO THREATEN U.S. BALL AND ROLLER BEARING INDUSTRIES

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, steadily increasing imports continue to threaten the ball and roller bearing industries in this country. The antifriction bearing industry, for example, is in critical condition because of imports, and these bearings are a primary component of many aeronautical and defense products.

Domestic shipments of ball bearings have decreased from \$484.9 million in 1969 to \$426.4 million in 1970 and down to \$390.1 million in 1971. During that same time frame, ball bearing imports have increased from \$45.4 million in 1969, to \$52.1 million in 1970, \$59.4 million in 1971, and up to an estimated \$84.5 million in 1972.

The decline in the domestic production of bearings has resulted in a loss of thousands of jobs in the recent past. According to one survey, the number of jobs in the ball bearing industry decreased 31 percent between 1967 and 1971. Connecticut, a leader in domestic production of bearings, has been especially hard hit. We know that between 1970 and 1971, the work force decreased by 4,600, from 16,100 to 11,500. A number of other States—New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, and New Hampshire—have also suffered. While some of this job loss was due to general economic conditions, imports greatly accentuated the trend.

The manufacture of bearings is a highly skilled trade requiring a well-trained work force. The use of complicated machinery depends upon skilled operators. Once a plant closes, costly retraining must precede increases in output—if the plant reopens. Clearly, we cannot afford to lose craftsmen who have skills essential to the strength and future development of our highly industrialized society.

In addition, these bearings are vital components of missiles, submarines, aircraft, tanks, and other elements of our national defense. Overreliance on imported bearings can, indeed, place increasing strain on the maintenance of an adequate defense posture.

Finally, the continuing rise of imports has affected the ability of U.S. firms to finance research needed to improve technology. Unless the importation of bearings is slowed very soon, the American bearing industry will be unable to narrow the gap between imports and exports.

For these reasons, I am introducing two bills designed to save the American bearing industry from unfair and destructive imports. One bill, which amends the tariff schedule to improve statistical

information on bearing imports, would enable us to measure accurately the impact of imported bearings on the domestic industry. The other bill would provide relief in the form of a specific limit to the number of bearings imported during any one year.

In the past, the Tariff Commission and other administrative agencies have been able to measure the impact of most categories of bearing imports. However, mounted and housed bearings have not appeared on the tariff schedules as separate items. The full impact of these imports on the American bearing industry therefore remains unclear.

To help remedy this situation, one of my bills would create a special provision within the tariff schedules for certain ball and roller bearing units which presently appear in various other provisions of the tariff schedules. Passage of this bill would enable adequate statistical reporting with respect to the flood of bearing imports, but would not result in any modifications of present duty rates.

In the last Congress, I introduced a similar bill, H.R. 10385. Reports on this legislation were sent to the House Ways and Means Committee from the Departments of State, Treasury, Labor, and Commerce, from the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, and from the Tariff Commission. None of these agencies noted any substantive objections to the passage of the bill. The Tariff Commission, however, suggested minor changes in the language. These proposed amendments are found in the language of the new bill. Late last year, the Senate approved H.R. 10385 as an amendment to a trade bill. Unfortunately, Congress adjourned before the House could consider the Senate action.

Enactment of this legislation into law would provide improved statistical data. However, it would do nothing to prevent American bearing manufacturers from being deluged with imports. Therefore, today I am also introducing a bill to help preserve the American bearing industry by the use of multinational agreements similar to those used in other areas.

Briefly, this second piece of legislation contains three major provisions. First, total imports of bearings in any one year shall not exceed the average proportion of imports-to-domestic production during the 1961-66 period. Second, imports in any year shall not be more than 10 percent above the average annual consumption for the 1961-66 period for a particular category. Third, the percentage of total imports in any year represented by imports from any one nation shall not exceed the average percentage of total imports from that nation during the 1961-66 period.

In addition, the bill gives the President authority to adjust the limitation of imports in specific instances, provided this action is consistent with the national interest. Finally, after 5 years, Congress would have the opportunity to modify or repeal this act if trade conditions warrant such action.

Mr. Speaker, the increased importation of bearings into the United States is crippling domestic bearing production.

Assistance to firms which have suffered a decline in employment and earnings is imperative for the survival of a skilled industry that is vital to our national defense.

The two bills introduced today will help accomplish this important goal. I, therefore, urge early and favorable consideration of this legislation by the Ways and Means Committee and the Congress.

END THE WAR

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, since 1965, I have opposed our involvement in Indochina and have voted against military appropriations to fund the war for the past half dozen years. Along with millions of Americans, I looked forward to a successful conclusion of Dr. Kissinger's negotiations with the North Vietnamese and to the peace which we were told was "at hand."

The renewed hostilities and the resumption of bombing in Indochina make a mockery of promises of peace.

At the Democratic caucus meeting yesterday, I supported the Nedzi resolution which has now made it the policy of the majority party in the Congress to oppose the renewed bombing and support an end to the war.

As a Member of Congress I am pledged to continue to oppose military appropriations that perpetuate the war and I will do everything in my power to end the charade of Indochina.

Before the caucus meeting yesterday, I had the privilege of introducing a large and committed delegation of Democratic Party officials from Queens, N.Y., to the Speaker. This group, led by Donald R. Manes, Borough president of Queens, submitted a resolution which calls for an end to the war. The same resolution was adopted by a large group of Nassau County residents headed by Marty Melman.

At this point in the RECORD, I insert the text of that resolution and the names of the officials who signed it:

STATEMENT OF DEMOCRATIC PARTY'S OFFICIALS OF QUEENS COUNTY, N.Y., ON VIETNAM

It has become apparent that the American people have been deceived once again as to the possibility of peace in Indo-China.

We, the elected officials of Queens County are appalled by President Nixon's renewal of the bombing and the mining of Haiphong Harbor.

It is time now that we come together in a united effort to reaffirm the leadership of the Democratic Party by a forthright act to end this war.

We, the Democrats, who work at the local level and in the highest bodies of government, urge that you implement the strong position against the continuation of the Vietnam war enunciated in the National Democratic platform.

The people who elected us are angry and resentful after the pre-election ploy of "an agreement 99 per cent complete", and the cruel and inhumane broken promise of "POW's home by Christmas."

We ask the Democratic caucus to denounce the renewed bombing of North Vietnam; we urge the caucus to pledge that legislation to cut off funding for the war within 30 days after enactment receive the highest priority and support necessary for passage.

We can no longer allow the war to continue while America's moral fiber is irreparably damaged and our cities die.

LIST OF SIGNATURES

Donald R. Manes, Borough President of Queens.

Councilman Matthew J. Troy, Jr., 16th C.D.

Councilman Walter Ward, 17th C.D.

Councilman Morton Povman, 15th C.D.

Councilman Edward L. Sadowsky, 14th C.D.

Councilman Arthur J. Katzman, 13th C.D.

Councilman Thomas J. Manton, 12th C.D.

Councilman-at-Large Eugene Masteropieri.

Senator Karen Burstein, 9th S.D.

Senator Jack Bronston, 12th S.D.

Senator Emanuel R. Gold, 13th S.D.

Assemblyman Herbert A. Posner, 22nd A.D.

Assemblyman Saul Weprin, 24th A.D.

Assemblyman Leonard Price Stavisky, 26th A.D.

Assemblyman Arthur J. Cooperman, 27th A.D.

Assemblyman Alan Hevesi, 28th A.D.

Assemblyman Guy R. Brewer, 29th A.D.

Assemblyman Herbert J. Miller, 30th A.D.

Assemblyman Edward Abramson, 32nd A.D.

George A. McCracken, Executive Member, 22nd A.D.

Helen Leonescu, Executive Member, 22nd A.D.

Seymour Sheldon, Executive Member, 22nd A.D.

Gerdi E. Lipschutz, Executive Member, 22nd A.D.

Mary Bassett, Executive Member, 23rd A.D.

Matthew J. Troy, Jr., Executive Member, 23rd A.D.

Agnes C. Hayes, Executive Member, 23rd A.D.

Rita Green, Executive Member, 24th A.D.

Ralph Sherman, Executive Member, 24th A.D.

Honey Miller, Executive Member, 24th A.D.

John J. Donohue, Executive Member, 25th A.D.

Adrienne C. Braunstein, Executive Member, 25th A.D.

William Friedmann, Executive Member, 26th A.D.

Julia Harrison, Executive Member, 26th A.D.

Ernest K. Koller, Executive Member, 26th A.D.

Leah Gruber, Executive Member, 26th A.D.

Donald R. Manes, Executive Member, 27th A.D.

Nettle Mayersohn, Executive Member, 27th A.D.

John Linakis, Executive Member, 27th A.D.

Gladys R. Borenstein, Executive Member, 27th A.D.

Sidney Strauss, Executive Member, 28th A.D.

Ann B. Schachter, Executive Member, 28th A.D.

Morton Povman, Executive Member, 28th A.D.

Isle Metzger, Executive Member, 28th A.D.

Archie Spigner, Executive Member, 29th A.D.

Isadora Rogers, Executive Member, 29th A.D.

Alvin D. Mack, Executive Member, 29th A.D.

Rose Halperin, Executive Member, 29th A.D.

Norma Keane, Executive Member, 30th A.D.

Marvin Cohen, Executive Member, 30th A.D.

Lillian Katz, Executive Member, 30th A.D.

Anthony Schneider, Executive Member, 31st A.D.

Isabella Brett, Executive Member, 31st A.D.

Walter Ward, Executive Member, 32nd A.D.

Rosina Zanazzi, Executive Member, 32nd A.D.

Fred Wilson, Executive Member, 32nd A.D.
Eva Elsenberg, Executive Member, 32nd A.D.

Charles G. Imperial, Executive Member, 33rd A.D.

Caroline B. Foris, Executive Member, 33rd A.D.

Eugene F. Mastropieri, Executive Member, 33rd A.D.

Cora I. Futch, Executive Member, 33rd A.D.

Ivan Lafayette, Executive Member, 34th A.D.

Veronica Martini, Executive Member, 34th A.D.

Joseph Lisa, Executive Member, 34th A.D.

Norma Cirino, Executive Member, 34th A.D.

Terrance O'Keefe, Executive Member, 35th A.D.

Diane Chapin, Executive Member, 35th A.D.

Ralph F. DeMarco, Executive Member, 36th A.D.

Gloria D'Amico, Executive Member, 36th A.D.

Denis Butler, Executive Member, 36th A.D.

Mary Ann Kelly, Executive Member, 36th A.D.

James P. Barker, Executive Member, 37th A.D.

Gertrude McDonald, Executive Member, 37th A.D.

Robert E. Whelan, Executive Member, 37th A.D.

Marie C. Stroebe, Executive Member, 37th A.D.

Anthony Sadowski, Executive Member, 38th A.D.

Helen T. Reid, Executive Member, 38th A.D.

State Committeeman Norman Silverman, 22nd A.D.

State Committeewoman Florence Kaplan, 22nd A.D.

State Committeeman Irwin Rosenthal, 24th A.D.

State Committeewoman Edith Posner, 24th A.D.

State Committeeman John Costanza, 25th A.D.

State Committeewoman Natalie Gordon, 25th A.D.

State Committeeman Leonard Weil, 26th A.D.

State Committeewoman Claire Waxelbaum, 26th A.D.

State Committeeman Abbott Dickstein, 27th A.D.

State Committeewoman Patricia Israel, 28th A.D.

State Committeeman Irwin Cohen, 28th A.D.

State Committeewoman Cynthia Jenkins, 29th A.D.

State Committeeman Elmer Schwartz, 30th A.D.

State Committeewoman Ethel Wershaw, 30th A.D.

State Committeewoman Frances Bennick, 31st A.D.

State Committeewoman Marie Tamby, 32nd A.D.

State Committeeman Celedonia Jones, 32nd A.D.

State Committeewoman Mary D. McSorley, 33rd A.D.

State Committeeman Warren J. McNally, 34th A.D.

State Committeewoman Marie Mercogliano, 35th A.D.

State Committeeman George Boomgaard, 35th A.D.

State Committeewoman Agnes V. Jennings, A.D.

State Committeeman Joseph Gerrity, 38th A.D.

SIX-YEAR PRESIDENTIAL TERM

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing for appropriate referral a resolution proposing a constitutional amendment limiting any future President of the United States to serving one term of 6 years.

This is a matter that has been under discussion for years. Such important issues are involved that I am convinced the people themselves should make the decision. Submission of a constitutional amendment would give rise, I think, to a nationwide debate on the pros and cons involved in a single 6-year term. There are telling arguments on both sides and they should be advanced for the general public enlightenment.

The question is not new. During the Constitutional Convention of 1787 the most heated and prolonged debate was devoted to arriving at a satisfactory method of electing the President. After more than 60 ballots had been taken, the 4-year term with no restriction on reelection was approved.

Our Nation functioned under the provisions of that decision until 1951. In that year the two-term limitation was adopted as an amendment to our Constitution.

During the time between 1787 and 1951, although the constitutional provision was not changed until the latter year, the debate over presidential terms went on steadily, especially after President Franklin D. Roosevelt broke the two-term tradition. Most of the proposals put forward would have changed the term from 4 to 6 years with the President ineligible for reelection.

That is what my proposed constitutional amendment would do if adopted after full consideration by the people generally of the merits and demerits of a single 6-year presidential term.

VETERANS MEDICAL AID ACT OF 1972

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, last year, the Congress passed comprehensive legislation, known as the Veterans Medical Care Act of 1972, designed to provide improved medical care to the Nation's veterans. Most unfortunately, this important bill was vetoed by the President.

Provisions of the bill included increased funding on a per diem basis to States for domiciliary, nursing, and hospital care for veterans in State homes, such as the Rocky Hill State Veterans Home and Hospital in my State of Connecticut.

State veterans homes in Rocky Hill and across the country are providing essential health care services for our veterans. New funding for per diem reimbursement to States for the operation of these State veterans facilities would allow them to more adequately meet the health care needs of all our veterans.

It is for this reason that I am introducing legislation today to increase the per diem rate for reimbursements from \$3.50 per veteran to \$4.50 for domiciliary care, from \$5 to \$6 for nursing home care, and from \$7.50 to \$10 for hospital care. The legislation would also extend entitlement to Vietnam war era veterans, and would increase the proportionate share of Federal funding for construction and alteration of State home facilities from 50 to 65 percent.

This bill represents an important step forward in responding to the health care needs of our veterans. It is my hope that the legislation will receive prompt consideration by the Congress.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE INDOCHINA WAR

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, as we begin another year of American involvement in the Vietnam war, I would like to share with my colleagues a capsule history of the long conflict as presented by the Washington Post on December 31, 1972:

THE STORY OF VIETNAM: AN INSTANT EDITORIAL

"I fully expect [only] six more months of hard fighting." General Navarre, French Commander-in-Chief, Jan. 2, 1954.

"With a little more training the Vietnamese Army will be the equal of any other army..." Secretary of the Army Wilbur Brucker, Dec. 18, 1955.

"The American aid program in Vietnam has proved an enormous success—one of the major victories of American policy." Gen. J. W. O'Daniel, Official Military Aide to Vietnam, Jan. 8, 1961.

"Every quantitative measurement shows we're winning the war... U.S. aid to Vietnam has reached a peak and will start to level off." Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, 1962.

"The South Vietnamese should achieve victory in three years... I am confident the Vietnamese are going to win the war. [The Vietcong] face inevitable defeat." Adm. Harry D. Felt, U.S. Commander-in-Chief of Pacific Forces, Jan. 12, 1963.

"The corner has definitely been turned toward victory in South Vietnam." Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense, March 8, 1963.

"The South Vietnamese themselves are fighting their own battle, fighting well." Secretary of State Dean Rusk, April, 1963.

"South Vietnam is on its way to victory." Frederick E. Nolting, U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam, June 12, 1963.

"I feel we shall achieve victory in 1964." Tram Van Dong, South Vietnamese general, Oct. 1, 1963.

"Secretary McNamara and General [Maxwell] Taylor reported their judgment that the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965." *White House statement, Oct. 2, 1963.*

"Victory . . . is just months away, and the reduction of American advisers can begin any time now. I can safely say the end of the war is in sight." *Gen. Paul Harkins, Commander of the Military Assistance Command in Saigon, Oct. 31, 1963.*

"I personally believe this is a war the Vietnamese must fight. I don't believe we can take on that combat task for them." *Secretary McNamara, Feb. 3, 1964.*

"The United States still hopes to withdraw its troops from South Vietnam by the end of 1965." *Secretary McNamara, Feb. 19, 1964.*

"The Vietnamese . . . themselves can handle this problem primarily with their own effort." *Secretary Rusk, Feb. 24, 1964.*

"We are not about to send American boys 9,000 or 10,000 miles from home to do what Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves." *President Lyndon Johnson, Oct. 21, 1964.*

"We have stopped losing the war." *Secretary McNamara, October 1965.*

"I expect . . . the war to achieve very sensational results in 1967." *Henry Cabot Lodge, U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam, Jan. 9, 1967.*

"We have succeeded in attaining our objectives." *Gen. William Westmoreland, U.S. field commander in Vietnam, July 13, 1967.*

"We have reached an important point when the end begins to come into view . . . the enemy's hopes are bankrupt." *Gen. Westmoreland, Nov. 21, 1967.*

"We have never been in a better relative position." *Gen. Westmoreland, April 10, 1968.*

"[the enemy's] situation is deteriorating rather rapidly." *Gen. Andrew Goodpaster, White House aide, January 1969.*

"We have certainly turned the corner in the war." *Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, July 23, 1969.*

"I will say confidently that looking ahead just three years, this war will be over. It will be over on a basis which will promote lasting peace in the Pacific." *President Richard Nixon, Oct. 12, 1969.*

"This action [the invasion of Cambodia] is a decisive move." *President Richard Nixon, May 9, 1970.*

"General Abrams tells me that in both Laos and Cambodia his evaluation after three weeks of fighting is that—to use his terms—the South Vietnamese can hack it, and they can give an even better account of themselves than the North Vietnamese units. This means that our withdrawal program, our Vietnamese program, is a success . . ." *President Richard Nixon, March 4, 1971.*

"Peace is at hand." *Dr. Henry Kissinger, Oct. 26, 1972.*

"We have agreed on the major principles that I laid down in my speech to the nation of May 8. We have agreed that there will be a ceasefire, we have agreed that our prisoners of war will be returned and that the missing in action will be accounted for, and we have agreed that the people of South Vietnam shall have the right to determine their own future without having a Communist government or a coalition government imposed upon them against their will."

"There are still some details that I am insisting be worked out and nailed down because I want this not to be a temporary peace. I want, and I know you want it—to be a lasting peace. But I can say to you with complete confidence tonight that we will soon reach agreement on all the issues and bring this long and difficult war to an end." *President Nixon, Nov. 6, 1972.*

"The United States and North Vietnam are locked in a 'fundamental' impasse over whether they are negotiating an 'armistice'

or 'peace,' Henry A. Kissinger acknowledged yesterday." *From The Washington Post, Dec. 17, 1972.*

"Waves of American warplanes, including a record number of almost 100 B-52 heavy bombers, pounded North Vietnam's heartland around Hanoi and Haiphong yesterday and today in the heaviest air raids of the Vietnam War." *From the Washington Post, Dec. 20, 1972.*

"Hundreds of U.S. fighter-bombers launched intensified attacks yesterday on North Vietnamese air defense sites in an all-out attempt to cut down the number of B-52 heavy bombers and their 6-man crews being shot down by surface-to-air missiles." *From The Washington Post, Dec. 30, 1972.*

"The President has asked me to announce that negotiations between Dr. Kissinger and special adviser Le Duc Tho and Minister Xuan Thuy will be resumed in Paris on Jan. 8. Technical talks between the experts will be resumed Jan. 2. . . . The President has ordered all bombing will be discontinued above the 20th parallel as long as serious negotiations are under way." *Gerald L. Warren, White House spokesman, Dec. 30, 1972.*

FORCED BUSING

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the 93d Congress today, I believe there is no more important domestic issue facing the American people than the issue of forced busing.

And I believe we should waste no time in beginning anew our efforts to prohibit the forced busing of schoolchildren simply to achieve an arbitrary racial balance in our public schools.

And so today I am introducing a resolution for constitutional amendment, stating that "no public school student shall, on the basis of race, creed, or color, be assigned to or required to attend a particular school."

Most of my colleagues will recognize the language of this amendment as being identical to the legislation I introduced in April 1971, shortly after the U.S. Supreme Court handed down its decision in the Charlotte, N.C., desegregation case, when the court first approved the use of busing as a desegregation tool.

That amendment won the support of more than 150 of my colleagues in the 92d Congress, but our efforts to see it passed were frustrated by the leadership of the Judiciary Committee.

I am hopeful that this amendment will fare better in the 93d Congress than it did in the 92d. I remain convinced that there is a great and urgent need to restore a better sense of educational and fiscal priorities in the public school system in America by prohibiting the disruptive and wasteful policy of forced busing.

Cosponsoring the bill with me today are great many of my distinguished colleagues, representing constituencies from all across America and sitting on both sides of the aisle.

I urge the swift consideration of this legislation in the appropriate committee, and I look with great hope toward

the day when this amendment shall be passed by the Congress, ratified by the States, and delivered to an anxiously awaiting American people.

WHAT EVER HAPPENED TO DESALTING?

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of addressing the Cooperative Desalting Studies Conference in Anaheim, Calif., at the invitation of the Office of Saline Water, a mistake I am confident that OSW will never make again.

In my prepared remarks, I reviewed the U.S. desalting program—or lack thereof—as I see it, emphasizing in particular the OSW's lack of enthusiasm for building a large-scale demonstration plant despite a congressional directive to do so.

For the information of my colleagues who have labored so long in the interest of advancing U.S. technology in this exciting field, my remarks follow:

EXTRACTS FROM REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE
CRAIG HOSMER

The recent retreat of Westinghouse from the desalting business along with enhanced foreign competition and the paucity of any large scale domestic plans for a U.S. demonstration size plant have kind of hung a pall over this industry which—by now—we had expected to "make the deserts flower" as the saying goes.

In the 20 years I have been associated with it I've seen the name changed from desalination to desalination and lately to just plain desalting. I've seen the great plans for Bolsa Island sink silently into the sea. I've watched the mirage of massive nuclear power—nuclear powered desalting, industrial and agricultural complexes—shimmer and disappear back into the sands of the world's deserts along with the hopes of underdeveloped nations for rescue from poverty and hunger.

During these two decades I have also seen some progress and I feel that most of the engineering and economic advances in desalting which have been made can be traced directly to efforts by the Office of Saline Water and the joint programs it has undertaken with the states and private industry. For at least half-a-century before OSW there hadn't even been one major improvement in ship-board evaporator design—an almost unbelievable record of neglect in this area. Without OSW there probably wouldn't be much progress in the desalting game even today. But by like token, had OSW over these years played a wiser and a stronger role—and been more consistently aggressive—many of the problems bugging the desalting province might be behind us today.

Last year when we renewed the Saline Water Act and gave OSW another five year lease on life there was serious talk around that the office already had run its course and had no further worthwhile contributions to make—and therefore maybe we just ought to give a decent burial then and there.

And, as a matter of fact, if in the future OSW doesn't soon show us some real hope for a U.S. desalting demonstration on a large scale that can give us the technological as-

assessments and the economic data essential to achieve the objectives of this act—and if OSW doesn't rid itself of the stigma of operating as a WPA-type project for a handful of companies interested in government contracts—maybe it has outlived its usefulness. All that remains to be seen.

But it would be kind of sad to see OSW expire and all that know-how lost which was so painfully acquired by a whole succession of OSW directors on reasons for not putting the United States Government in as architect-engineer and construction supervisor for universal design JIDDA desalting plants.

But with the bad there has been the good and one of the brightest spots around is right here in Orange County in the form and substance of the Orange County Water District. With courageous and foresighted leaders like Henry Segerstrom and Don Owen it is no surprise at all to me that OCWD has emerged as the national leader in desalting applications.

Perhaps because we here in Southern California were cursed with so little water and so much land to begin with we have, throughout the State's history, had to be preoccupied with satisfying our water needs. Since gold rush days we have had to beg, borrow, steal, develop and enlarge our ever barely adequate water supply—acre foot by acre foot. Of necessity we had to be statesmanlike, farsighted, ambitious, innovative and courageous. Also we had to be sly, sneaky, underhanded and contentious. But our hearts were pure and our minds were clean and we did get our water. That is why California today can number twenty-two million souls as its citizens.

All that took lots of imagination and engineering genius. Water does not come easily around here, particularly in quantities aggregating many millions of acre feet. We had to be water pioneers and we had to be willing to risk what others would not. So it is logical that Southern California should pioneer and lead in the field of desalting.

It was hardly expected, however, that this would be carried forward with the bold excellence that characterizes water factory-21. I am proud to claim it as one of the unique and extraordinary accomplishments of the congressional district I am honored to represent. My fellow citizens of the Orange County Water District have put a healthy \$13 million of their own public monies into this most advanced prototype, a combination of the vertical tube evaporation and multi-stage flash processes.

And even before WF-21 completed the District is out shopping for another triumph in the form of a 30 to 50 MGD membrane plant which would be the largest municipally operated desalting facility in the country. It would also represent a giant step forward in this important area of water reclamation technology.

These projects, along with OCWD's co-sponsorship of this conference indicates its faith in the future of desalting and evidence the vital role it will play in southern California's future growth. And, if the Good Lord continues to give California men to match her mountains, men like Segerstrom and Owen, that future is assured.

Incidentally, I must make it clear that I do not regard the large membrane plant OCWD is talking about as filling the bill for the large desalting demonstration plant I am calling for. In this game a 30 to 50 MGD membrane plant is a full grown affair—it is not merely an increment of something larger, although, of course, it could be.

For somewhat similar reasons I cannot regard the giant reverse-osmosis plant being talked about as part of the solution for the Colorado River Water Quality dispute with Mexico as the answer to our prayers for a large demonstration plant. Even if that plant should be a go at 175 MGD—and it is quite

likely to be—it won't fill the need for a demonstrator for two reasons:

1) It will clean up brackish water, but it will not create new water desalted from the ocean; and,

2) Membrane plant size and plant costs bear a linear relationship, not a geometric one, therefore they can never offer us that opportunity for economies of scale that we are seeking from truly large volume desalting installations.

Frankly, our problem with Mexico comes mostly from the 65,000 acre Welton Mohawk Canal project and its terrible drainage which runs as high as 3500 ppm in dissolved solids. At \$1,000 per acre we could spend \$65,000,000 and buy it up, shut it down, break it off, float it down the Colorado and sink the whole misbegotten scheme in the Gulf of California. To the same water quality end that would be a lot cheaper in the aggregate than spending \$50 million to build an R-O plant and \$10 a year ad finitum to run it. But I do not expect America's bureaucrats to go for such a simple solution as that. So—

Back to my pitch for the demonstrator—somewhere around 50 mgd is what I think its minimum size ought to be. That size evaporation process plant would start to give the economies of scale a real test. It could point the eventual way to huge amounts of competitive water in the major markets as contrasted to essential amounts of "any cost" crisis water in specialty markets like the Caribbean Islands and Jidda.

In this endeavor I recall that our old friend Bill Warne poured some good advice into this article on water factory-21, written for Dick Smith's weekly desalination report. Warne recalled that one of the extra burdens which helped sink Bolsa Island was trying to interface embryo desalting technology and all the problems of a water utility with all the problems of electric utilities, and those of the new nuclear variety at that.

It is hard enough at the beginning just to build a big water plant and, if it can be avoided, the experiment really should not be saddled with the dual purpose problems and the split-end goals of an electric utility partner.

Bolsa Island taught us that technological marriage before puberty of both partners is not reproductive and we ought to remember that lesson. I hope our friends over in Arizona who keep talking about the world's biggest combination dual purpose atomic power and desalting plant will remember it too. Instead of buying tickets at this point on the Titanic they ought to be helping us put on the heat for the prototype demonstration large desalting plant first—then their dual purpose dreams are a lot more likely to come true.

And, the same probably can be said for Dr. Rex's and the Bureau of Reclamation's geothermal aspirations in Imperial Valley which are even more technologically primitive.

As many of you know, I have been in the nuclear power business even longer than I have been giving free advice—for all its worth—to many of you in the desalting game. There is no doubt that these two technologies are inherently synergistic to an extraordinary degree—but only when time and conditions are right. And that time can come only when we plug the big gap in United States plans and programs represented by the absence of the knowledge from this large plant.

We are a-ok on the nuclear side—but holding on the desalting side for large plant know-how to interface it. It was for that very reason that a requirement was written into last year's renewal of the saline water act for OSW to seriously study the best way of going about this.

But when OSW's report came back to us this fall, in effect it left the whole matter

in limbo. After almost a quarter-of-a-century and more than \$250 desalting megabucks good old OSW still can't see its way clear to get this project moving.

Now, for that I am not blaming the smiling Irishman. For a lot longer than he has been running the show these plans should have been feasibly laid.

What I am blaming Pat O'Meara for is that our congressional instructions on the character of the large plant study told him how to write it, what we wanted and what to check on turned out to be a weightier document than Pat's terse, two-month's late report that he wasn't going to do a damn thing for us—for now at least.

And, I think that smacks of contempt for Congress.

Therefore I must reiterate the point of the large plant and what is so all important about building one. I have already hinted at that by saying that the high cost of water of a 1 MGD plant on a Caribbean island is one thing. Quite another is the economy of scale evolving out of 50-200-500— and even 1000 MGD and bigger plants designed and built to provide base load water supply supplements for major metropolitan area users and the entire load for smaller systems.

The point is, too, that the massive potential for converting seawater for the common good and to quote "serve mankind" end quote and the Madison Avenue baloney about "flowering the deserts" is just a lot of purple prose and cannot even be checked or validated until the big plant is built.

And you can be sure that the U.S.A. public is not going to get a darn thing out of some plant along these lines built in Hong Kong by the Honorable Sasakura Company. All that will give us is another low-blow in the balance of trade groin.

Our water resource planners and potential plant owners such as OCWD in the real world right here in the U.S.A. will not have the data they want and need for use right here in the U.S.A. until we build a plant right here in the U.S.A.

Sometimes I think Pat O'Meara just ought to throw a dart toward a map of the Western United States and start building this big plant wherever it hits. Then we can start getting data on design, reliability, operation and maintenance and all the other things we need to know to demonstrate and prove that desalting is a viable and readily available option to select in meeting future water quantity and quality needs.

This is the kind of thing that Admiral Rickover did to demonstrate that the nuclear alternative was really available to meet our power needs. Rick had the guts and determination to build the first civilian nuclear power plant before its economic success was a sure thing, before anybody else had done it, and almost before anybody wanted it. The cost of his 60 megawatt plant was fantastic.

But because Rickover started things moving in the early 1950s today nuclear is a legitimate and major alternate fuel for meeting the national energy crisis.

Maybe O'Meara is—and maybe he isn't—as big an S-O-B as Hyman Rickover—but when we start to see him acting like it, we'll know the big desalter is on its way. And, we will know that a fruitful marriage after puberty of desalting and nuclear power cannot be far behind. That is worth doubling the Federal Government's effort to get.

Of course, Westinghouse got tired of waiting for this great day and when an American outfit that big gives up the desalting ghost, you start to wonder if maybe the rest of us will get stuck with some kind of a cadaver on our hands. At least I'm glad Environics and Acquachem and others still think the body is warm. Maybe things will be better for them for a while with less competition around. Let's hope so.

But the news of the \$59.6 million turnkey, 48 MGD Hongkong job going to the Japanese is truly disturbing both because it happened and because of how it happened.

Personally I think Sasakura decided to take a \$5 to \$10 million bath to buy into the desalting game. It sure could not have snatched up that job on the basis of any in-house ingenuity or engineering experience of its own. Despite what its ads in the Hongkong newspapers say, it was unknown in-and-to the desalting business just a few short years back. Let's face it—Sasakura is actually no more than a licensee of U.S. distillation evaporator savvy and it is picking American brains for the Hongkong job.

And that's alright with the American licensee—who is on the Arab boycott list, while Sasakura is not—so some things like continuing to do business with both the Arabs and the Israeli's at one and the same time can be accomplished by indirection when they cannot be done directly, that part of it doesn't even offend me, I just hate to see a Japanese competitor slide into a contract using round-eye know-how it got from the United States.

With things like that going on it is little wonder that Westinghouse is waving goodbye even though its chiefs had testified before us numerous times of desalting's great promise and swore over and over again that "we here at Westinghouse are in the water business to stay."

I agree with others that the demise of Westinghouse as a desalting plant supplier can only stack up as a loss for the U.S. when a company that so personified the desalting game as Westinghouse tosses all the experience it has built up right out the window, it inevitably casts a pall over the entire desalting game. I suspect big "W" will be charging back into the ring with us one of these days before long, but meanwhile only one distillation desalting company remains in the U.S. which has actually built and operated a commercial plant.

And, if there isn't much business, I can see why profit making organizations start reconsidering how long they ought to hang around. You all know how Dick Smith single handedly holds us together in the desalting business via his weekly poopsheet. He necessarily keeps close tab on the state of the desalting art as well as the health of the desalting business. Dick tells me it is pretty tough just to stay even, to replace readers getting out with new subscribers coming into the field. I guess Smith's subscription list must be about as accurate a barometer of the business as there is.

All of which again underscores the real need to get going on construction and operation of the first large desalting plant. It will get the ball rolling and regenerate our enthusiasm for this important alternative solution to our overall water resource needs. It might even change some people's minds about giving OSW a quick funeral in Potter's Field.

It would certainly anticipate fulfilling the needs for chemically and biologically pure, sweet and wholesome water to be called for in Federal legislation Don Owen will be proposing to you tomorrow afternoon. Don has pointed out before as he will again the irony of the large foreign aid expenditures we make overseas to help other people get potable drinking water—some \$25 billion he figures during the last 25 years—when at the same time six million American families still lack running water in their homes and about 25% of the population of the United States is served by no community water system at all.

These needs cannot possibly be met in many areas of this country except by the desalting alternative—the moment that its economic feasibility on a large scale is demonstrated. I probably shall not agree with every

word and all the punctuation in Owen's legislative proposal, but my heart and soul is in complete harmony with his xenophobic thesis that needs here at home ought to come first.

While OSW has lagged on the large American domestic prototype, there have been no lack of schemes for giving away big goodies elsewhere in the world. As a matter of fact, this is the first time I recollect ever being asked to talk to a group on the subject of desalting here on American soil. . . . And the reason for that is not simply that I make a lousy speech. A companion reason is that when American desalting leaders do get together, they tend to head for Rome or Vienna or Mexico City or some other exotic spa. Now, of course, things will be different since Anaheim has been discovered.

But if this sounds like sour grapes you are right on. There has been no lack of schemes for spending our desalting money almost wherever around the globe. Over the years we've heard about the plants for the Spanish, the Portuguese, the Sicilians, the Greeks, the Arabs, the Hindus, the Patagonians, you name it. And, closer to our shores, the Hawaiians, Puerto Ricans, and the islands of Culebra and Vieques. You all recall the biggest of the lot—the one billion gallon per day, three thousand megawatt nuclear fired dual purpose plant for the Mexicans, to be built precisely astride the international boundary, but of course, paid for north of the border.

Most recently the ever popular Israeli desalting plant idea has resurfaced. Originally Lewis Strauss wanted it to be a nuplex located in no-man's land in the Sinai Desert between the Egyptian and Israeli battle lines. Gradually it got shrunk down to just a 200 to 1000 MGD desalter safely inside the Israeli Army's protection. Now it is back at a somewhat more realistic 11 MGD size for which the U.S. will put up \$15 million and Israel the remainder.

Since our pressure sensitive State Department is mixed up in it, already they have given in to Israeli demands for an untested and unproven plant embodying horizontal tube evaporators and aluminum tubing. It is commencing to look more and more like the kind of technical disaster that Frank DiLuzio got mixed up in years ago with some crazy Israeli inventor's secret freezing process desalting idea. That was such a debacle that Frank's company had to reorganize and change its name to get out of the mess.

But even if my dire predictions prove erroneous—and I do wish these nice people every success with their sagging horizontal bundles of clogging aluminum tubing—even with all the luck in the world that 11 MGD plant in Israel is not going to demonstrate any U.S. technology—large medium or small—and we've still got this gap to fill, Mr. O'Meara, sir, because building a plant overseas flies in the face of our need for large scale technology here at home.

More than that, to the extent that the Israeli scheme competes for funds to build up water factory 21 from three to its potential 15 MGD, it takes water from our own canteen. Particularly, since in this intermediate size evaporator area, a lot more of the economics need investigating and particularly since we've got a lot of basic hardware here in Orange County already paid for which is sized to support the fifteen million figure.

So in closing let me just put in a plug for another of Don Owens ideas—that for an association which will start caring in an organized way for the needs of desalting users. It is an idea whose time has come and I hope some formal action will be taken to get an association organized. From a Federal legislator's standpoint I certainly would welcome it to assist in formulating our legislative programs for meeting the Nation's needs in this area.

LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY FLOOD PROTECTION

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district the flood problems of the Lower Rio Grande Basin specifically in Willacy, Hidalgo, and Cameron Counties, are of such magnitude and so interdependent that they have to be treated on a basinwide basis.

The area is greater than that authorized to be treated under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 83-566). In consequence, special legislation is needed to provide for a flood control and water and soil conservation program in cooperation between the Federal Government on the one hand and State and local units of government on the other.

I am introducing a bill that would make such a cooperative program possible.

My bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the phase I portion of the Comprehensive Study and Plan of Development, Lower Rio Grande Basin, Tex., dated July 1969. This plan was prepared by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the Texas Water Development Board, the Texas Soil and Water Conservation Board, and the Texas Water Rights Commission.

The bill contains authorization for the appropriation of \$21 million as the estimated Federal share of the cost of this important and necessary project. It provides that non-Federal entities must install an adequate land treatment program. These entities also must acquire all land rights needed in connection with the project. After installation of the improvement works, they will be operated and maintained by the non-Federal entities.

Mr. Speaker, the area under discussion has long been subject to periodic floodwater damage and continuing soil erosion of a very serious nature. The recommendations in the Comprehensive Study and Plan of Development for the Lower Rio Grande Basin sets forth a blueprint for action that would be greatly beneficial from both an economic and human standpoint. The need for implementation of this plan is evident and immediate, and I earnestly solicit the support of my colleagues for my bill.

A TRIBUTE TO TORRANCE

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to commend the city of Torrance on the completion of the new city hall complex, the largest public

facility to be constructed in the city's history.

The progress that Torrance has made in its relatively brief history since incorporation in 1921 can well serve as a model for similar advancement in other cities. Torrance now boasts divisions of major companies that manufacture products ranging from steel, to chemicals, to paints, and to oil. It also houses so many successful brokerage and financial institutions that the city has been dubbed the "Wall Street of the West."

As the 12th largest city in California and the third largest in Los Angeles County, Torrance is also a major center for several governmental agencies.

The new civic center will accommodate expanding county court facilities, a county probation office, public defenders' office, city hall complex, newly constructed main library facilities, a modern police station, and two separate recreational facilities.

The population of Torrance has grown from a mere 1,800 52 years ago to a daytime and transient population that presently approaches 450,000. A city that has experienced such phenomenal growth certainly needs such a useful, multi-purpose complex that will undoubtedly enhance the community's further expansion and development.

THE GREAT LAUGHTER

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the poem I submit today was sent to me over the Christmas recess by Joseph V. Plucks of Racine, Wis. Although the poem was written many years ago, it still has relevance today.

I do not need to remind my colleagues of the events that transpired over the recess. The peace talks failed to produce the promised settlement, massive bombing was resumed, many more lives were lost on both sides of the conflict in Southeast Asia. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Mr. Plucks' poem about the ultimate victor in any war is particularly timely, and I enter it in the RECORD at this point:

THE GREAT LAUGHTER

(By Joseph V. Plucks)

I am Death! Men great and small
I take them all, and cover with the pall
Of Death!

While men, weak and puny, do fight
For what they hold is dear and right
I—Death—laugh!

Some time ago, men did fight
But they were fools.
Did they not know they were but tools
Of man's insatiable greed?
The greed which turns man into a raving
beast

And does not end until the least is satisfied!

I am Death! Commander-in-chief!
My aides stand about me, they are the dead,
Don't you see, of the last World war.
My legions are many—my force is strong.
I can do no wrong.
For I am Death!

Fools are men who must fight.
Who think that might does make the right.
Fools—Fools!
Life itself is too short—too sweet
To be curled and warped by the heat
Of War!

As I stand and look below
Upon the marching men, scores of thousands
of them.

I—Death—laugh!

Aye! Laugh to think of those

Who in the short time to come, will the
gauntlet of time have run.

Fools! Fools!

It does not matter to me

What they do in their time, for they are mine.
Mine!

Let them kill, slaughter and maim.

Let them pile up the heaps of slain.

While I—Death—laugh!

SALARY COMMISSION

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, we all hear a great deal of criticism about Congress, its actions and the complicated procedures it follows. Of course, many of these criticisms are simply the arguments of unplaceable dissenters, but the unfortunate fact is that there are some very legitimate criticisms which can be leveled against the operations of Congress.

An example of what I mean has resulted from the Federal Salary Act of 1967. This act established the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries. The duty of the Commission is to review and study the salary needs of the Members of Congress, the Federal judiciary, and top personnel in the executive branch and then, after proper deliberation, the Commission has an obligation to recommend such salary adjustments as they deem proper. Under the existing law, these salary recommendations are then transmitted to the Congress by the President in his budget message every fourth year.

Once these recommendations are sent to Congress we find justification for criticism. That is because the Commission's salary proposals automatically go into effect within 30 days after they are referred to Congress, unless one of the Houses of Congress passes a resolution disapproving the salary proposal. The flaw in this existing law is that there is no procedure whereby such a resolution of disapproval may be forced to a vote.

This leaves us with a situation that can best be described by referring to the first instance when the law was put into operation. That was January 1969, salary increases had been recommended by the Salary Commission and sent to Congress. Resolutions of disapproval were introduced in the House of Representatives, but no action was taken on them, and there was no parliamentary means to compel action to be taken. All of us here know how simple it is to tie up resolutions of disapproval in committee until

the statutory 30-day period has elapsed. Such a delay was used and the pay raises went into effect with Congress having taken no public position on this important matter.

Quite obviously the current law provides an effective way for Congress to avoid the embarrassing prospect of voting itself a pay increase. However, these salaries are a congressional responsibility, and any adjustment increasing them can serve as an important pattern-setter throughout the economy. Because of this it is inimical to the best interests of the country for Congress to hide behind procedural formalities to keep from taking a public position.

Another salary recommendation from the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries is due shortly. It is therefore important that our current procedures be modified to avoid a repetition of the 1969 abdication of congressional responsibility.

For this reason I am introducing today a bill to amend the Federal Salary Act. My amendment would effectively force Congress to take a public position on such pay increases.

Under my bill the committee assigned to consider any resolution disapproving the salary increases has 10 days to act. If it does not act, the resolution automatically becomes a motion of high privilege by any Member in favor of the resolution so that he may move to discharge it from the committee. If, however the committee does report the resolution within the 10-day period, the resolution then becomes a motion of high privilege on the part of any Member of Congress to move to proceed to consideration of the resolution.

So, the actual effect of the bill is to cut around all the delay that can presently be used to prevent a vote. Thus, my bill enhances the prospects that the voters will know how Congress votes on its own salary increases.

I think this bill is an important element of congressional reform. It makes Congress more open in its actions, and more accountable for them.

It is a pleasure for me to say that 32 Members are joining me in the introduction of this bill. They are: JIM COLLINS, Texas; WILEY MAYNE, Iowa; GLENN DAVIS, Wisconsin; LAMAR BAKER, Tennessee; BARBER CONABLE, New York; VERNON THOMSON, Wisconsin; CALDWELL BUTLER, Virginia; KEITH SEBELIUS, Kansas; RICHARD SHOUP, Montana; LOUIS WYMAN, New Hampshire; BILL ARCHER, Texas; ROBERT HUBER, Michigan; WILLIAM STEIGER, Wisconsin; JAMES CLEVELAND, New Hampshire; BURT TALCOTT, California; JOHN WARE, Pennsylvania; BOB MICHEL, Illinois; JOEL PRITCHARD, Washington; W. M. KETCHUM, California; WILLIAM SCHERLE, Iowa; SAM STEIGER, Arizona; WILMER MIZELL, North Carolina; SILVIO CONTE, Massachusetts; JOHN CONLAN, Arizona; CLARENCE MILLER, Ohio; JAMES BROYHILL, North Carolina; PAUL CRONIN, Massachusetts; J. KENNETH ROBINSON, Virginia; JOHN ANDERSON, Illinois; C. W. (BILL) YOUNG, Florida; JACK KEMP, New York; PAUL FINDLEY, Illinois.

LOCAL CONTROL OVER FIRE REGULATIONS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that each of you was as shocked as I was by the occurrence of two tragic fires in high rise buildings on consecutive days in New Orleans, La., and Atlanta, Ga. As I read the news accounts and editorials, I began to feel more and more strongly that the issue of fire safety in high rise buildings, which affects thousands of my own constituents in the San Francisco Bay area, is very much a national concern.

Of the fire prevention and protection methods feasible for use in high rise buildings, the one generally recognized and recommended is the installation of an automatic sprinkler system during the construction of the building. According to a recent editorial by KNTV of San Jose, Calif., however, the Department of Housing and Urban Development not only excludes the use of these systems from their minimum building requirements, but also prohibits their use in buildings constructed with the help of Federal funds.

I hope my colleagues will find the December 18, 1972, editorial by Bob Hosfeldt, the talented vice president and general manager of KNTV in San Jose, Calif., as valuable as I did; and the full text is printed below. I further urge them to join me in protesting this outrageous policy of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The editorial follows:

LOCAL CONTROL OVER FIRE REGULATIONS

Local control over fire regulations are not required by law. Automatic sprinklers are not required by law.

In a 36 hour period, earlier this week 14 persons lost their lives in fires in high rise buildings in three of the nation's larger cities. None of the buildings were equipped with automatic sprinkler systems that fire investigators say would have saved those 14 lives. The question is simple—why aren't automatic sprinkler systems required by law? The answer is not so simple.

A case in point is a development in the city of Oakland. The developers included automatic sprinklers in the building. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, who were providing quite a bit of the money for the project, found out about the sprinklers and refused to pay their share of the costs. HUD's minimum requirements do not include sprinkler systems. HUD doesn't allow the developers of projects involving Federal monies to deviate from their minimum standards . . . even to make them better.

Developers, and even entire cities, stand to lose HUD money if they impose stronger fire codes than the Government requires. Every fire marshal and fire chief will tell you that they would like to be able to exercise a local option to decide how much fire protection buildings must have. In this area, Central Fire District Chief Curtis Kirby says every building over 20 thousand square feet or over 5 stories high should be required to have automatic sprinkler systems. The fire protection for city buildings is now geared to avoid property loss.

We at Channel 11 feel we must adjust our priorities and gear our fire protection to save irreplaceable lives. We urge all citizens to approach city councils and county boards of supervisors to write letters to congressmen and urge them to pressure the Department of Housing and Urban Development to amend its fire safety regulations, giving local fire officials the option to enforce stricter fire protection regulations. Local fire chiefs say if they get to decide on stricter fire regulations they'll get tough.

QUEENS OFFICIALS PROTEST AGAINST THE WAR

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, on January 2 the Honorable Donald R. Manes, president of the Borough of Queens, and a delegation of my constituents came to Washington to present you with a petition signed by the elected officials of Queens County, which called on the Democratic caucus to pledge to cut off funds for the war. I am pleased that the caucus responded affirmatively to this petition and the pleas of others. At this time, I would like to place in the RECORD the text of the petition and a list of the signers:

STATEMENT OF DEMOCRATIC PARTY'S OFFICIALS OF QUEENS COUNTY, NEW YORK, ON VIETNAM

It has become apparent that the American people have been deceived once again as to the possibility of peace in Indo-China.

We, the elected officials of Queens County are appalled by President Nixon's renewal of the bombing and the mining of Haiphong Harbor.

It is time now that we come together in a united effort to reaffirm the leadership of the Democratic Party by a forthright act to end this war.

We, the Democrats, who work at the local level and in the highest bodies of government, urge that you implement the strong position against the continuation of the Vietnam war enunciated in the National Democratic platform.

The people who elected us are angry and resentful after the pre-election ploy of "an agreement 99 per cent complete", and the cruel and inhumane broken promise of "POW's home by Christmas."

We ask the Democratic caucus to denounce the renewed bombing of North Vietnam; we urge the caucus to pledge that legislation to cut off funding for the war within 30 days after enactment receive the highest priority and support necessary for passage.

We can no longer allow the war to continue while America's moral fiber is irreparably damaged and our cities die.

Donald R. Manes, Borough President of Queens.

(Signed)

Councilman Matthew J. Troy, Jr., 16th C.D.

Councilman Walter Ward, 17th C.D.

Councilman Morton Povman, 15th C.D.

Councilman Edward L. Sadowsky, 14th C.D.

Councilman Arthur J. Katzman, 13th C.D.

Councilman Thomas J. Manton, 12th C.D.

Councilman-at-large Eugene Mastropieri.

Senator Karen Burstein, 9th S.D.

Senator Jack Bronston, 12th S.D.

Senator Emanuel R. Gold, 13th S.D.

Assemblyman Herbert A. Posner, 22nd A.D.

Assemblyman Saul Weprin, 24th A.D.

Assemblyman Leonard Price Stavisky, 26th A.D.

Assemblyman Arthur J. Cooperman, 27th A.D.

Assemblyman Alan Hevesi, 28th A.D.

Assemblyman Guy R. Brewer, 29th A.D.

Assemblyman Herbert J. Miller, 30th A.D.

Assemblyman Edward Abramson, 32nd A.D.

George A. McCracken, executive member, 22nd A.D.

Helen Leonescu, executive member, 22nd A.D.

Seymour Sheldon, executive member, 22nd A.D.

Gerdi E. Lipschutz, executive member, 22nd A.D.

Mary Bassett, executive member, 23rd A.D.

Matthew J. Troy, Jr., executive member, 23rd A.D.

Agnes C. Hayes, executive member, 23rd A.D.

Rita Green, executive member, 24th A.D.

Ralph Sherman, executive member, 24th A.D.

Honey Miller, executive member, 24th A.D.

John J. Donohue, executive member, 25th A.D.

Adrienne C. Braunstein, executive member, 25th A.D.

William Friedmann, executive member, 26th A.D.

Julia Harrison, executive member, 26th A.D.

Ernest K. Koller, executive member, 26th A.D.

Leah Gruber, executive member, 26th A.D.

Donald R. Manes, Executive Member, 27th A.D.

Nettie Mayersohn, Executive Member, 27th A.D.

John Linkais, Executive Member, 27th A.D.

Gladys R. Borenstein, Executive Member, 27th A.D.

Sidney Strauss, Executive Member, 28th A.D.

Ann B. Schachter, Executive Member, 28th A.D.

Morton Povman, Executive Member, 28th A.D.

Ilse Metzger, Executive Member, 28th A.D.

Archie Spigner, Executive Member, 29th A.D.

Isadora Rogers, Executive Member, 29th A.D.

Alvin D. Mack, Executive Member, 29th A.D.

Rose Halperin, Executive Member, 29th A.D.

Norma Keane, Executive Member, 30th A.D.

Marvin Cohen, Executive Member, 30th A.D.

Lillian Katz, Executive Member, 30th A.D.

Anthony Schneider, Executive Member, 31st A.D.

Isabella Brett, Executive Member, 31st A.D.

Walter Ward, Executive Member, 32nd A.D.

Rosina Zanazzi, Executive Member, 32nd A.D.

Fred Wilson, Executive Member, 32nd A.D.

Eva Eisenberg, Executive Member, 32nd A.D.

Charles G. Imperial, Executive Member, 33rd A.D.

Caroline B. Foris, Executive Member, 33rd A.D.

Eugene F. Mastropieri, Executive Member, 33rd A.D.

Cora I. Futch, Executive Member, 33rd A.D.

Ivan Lafayette, Executive Member, 34th A.D.

Veronica Martini, Executive Member, 34th A.D.

Joseph Lisa, Executive Member, 34th A.D.

Norma Cirino, Executive Member, 34th A.D.

Terrance O'Keefe, Executive Member, 35th A.D.

Diane Chapin, Executive Member, 35th A.D.
 Ralph F. DeMarco, Executive Member, 36th A.D.
 Gloria D'Amico, Executive Member, 36th A.D.
 Denis Butler, Executive Member, 36th A.D.
 Mary Ann Kelly, Executive Member, 36th A.D.
 James P. Barker, Executive Member, 37th A.D.
 Gertrude McDonald, Executive Member, 37th A.D.
 Robert E. Whelan, Executive Member, 37th A.D.
 Marie C. Stroebel, Executive Member, 37th A.D.
 Anthony Sadowski, Executive Member, 38th A.D.
 Helen T. Reid, Executive Member, 38th A.D.
 State Committeeman Norman Silverman, 22nd A.D.
 State Committeewoman Florence Kaplan, 22nd A.D.
 State Committeeman Irwin Rosenthal, 24th A.D.
 State Committeewoman Edith Posner, 24th A.D.
 State Committeeman John Costanza, 25th A.D.
 State Committeewoman Natalie Gordon, 25th A.D.
 State Committeeman Leonard Weil, 26th A.D.
 State Committeewoman Claire Waxelbaum, 26th A.D.
 State Committeeman Abbott Dicksteen, 27th A.D.
 State Committeewoman Patricia Israel, 28th A.D.
 State Committeeman Irwin Cohen, 28th A.D.
 State Committeewoman Cynthia Jenkins, 29th A.D.
 State Committeeman Elmer Schwartz, 30th A.D.
 State Committeewoman Ethel Wershaw, 30th A.D.
 State Committeewoman Frances Bennick, 31st A.D.
 State Committeewoman Marie Tamby, 32nd A.D.
 State Committeeman Celedonia Jones, 32nd A.D.
 State Committeewoman Mary D. McSorley, 33rd A.D.
 State Committeeman Warren J. McNally, 34th A.D.
 State Committeewoman Marie Merco-
 gliano, 35th A.D.
 State Committeeman George Boomgaard, 35th A.D.
 State Committeewoman Agnes V. Jennings, 35th A.D.
 State Committeeman Joseph Gerrity, 38th A.D.

TENNESSEE SCOUTS RECEIVE HIGHEST RANK

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest organizations in this country for young men is the Boy Scouts of America. I know much about this organization first-hand since my sons were Scouts and because I maintain an adult membership.

I am always proud of boys from my district who achieve high goals in scouting. In fact, on several occasions, I have had the privilege of participating in cere-

monies where the rank of Eagle Scout is bestowed on worthy recipients.

Recently, I took part in a court of honor held at the Mascot United Methodist Church which awarded the rank of Eagle Scout to four members of troop 34. Scoutmaster Billy Holt, his assistants, and the Holston Kiwanis Club—troop sponsor—all are to be congratulated for making this ceremony an unforgettable part of the lives of these outstanding young men.

I would like to place the names of these new Eagle Scouts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order to pay them tribute for the excellence which they have attained. The young men listed here are a great source of pride to those of us who deeply appreciate the contribution being made to our State and the Nation by the Boy Scouts of America:

FOUR NEW EAGLE SCOUTS

James Berry, Route 1, Mascot, Tennessee.
 Randy Foust, Route 5, Knoxville, Tennessee.

William McDaniels, Route 1, Mascot, Tennessee.

William Taylor, Route 5, Knoxville, Tennessee.

A PLEA TO PRESBYTERIAN MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, this morning it was my privilege, along with other Presbyterian Members of Congress, to be present at the National Presbyterian Church for the traditional prayer for the new Congress. A distinguished group of Presbyterian leaders have joined in the following statement which was made at the National Church this morning:

A PLEA TO PRESBYTERIAN MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

We come before you as a group of Presbyterian ministers and lay members of the local Presbytery. We do not claim to represent the whole Presbytery. We do not know how many others share our opinions and feel our agony.

As fellow Presbyterians we feel compelled to plead with you to exercise your influence in Congress to stop the bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong and other centers of civilian population now and in the future. We believe the active involvement of our country in this war should be brought to an immediate end and our prisoners of war brought home.

We believe that such a representation is entirely fitting at this sacrament of the Lord's supper. We believe in remembering Christ in the saving power of His crucifixion long ago but also believe that He is being crucified afresh in Vietnam.

While we are aware of military, political and diplomatic reasons which might justify this plea, we confine ourselves to the moral aspects of our tragedy. We believe our nation is in the midst of one of the most serious moral and spiritual crises of modern times.

The nature of the Christian Gospel and our interpretation of the will of God for us in these present circumstances have led us to the following convictions:

(1) We believe the pride of our nation is keeping us from making a reasonable and possible end to our involvement in the con-

flict. As Christians we know that pride is the very essence of original sin. The only remedy for it is a broken-hearted repentance and reliance upon the grace of God. We, therefore, call upon all of us to approach our personal, civic duties in this spirit. It should enable us to think more clearly and to act more courageously.

(2) We believe it is morally wrong for us to use our advanced technology to engage in the most savage and destructive bombing in the history of the world. We are not fighting for the survival of our nation and cannot claim a situation which might conceivably justify such action.

(3) We believe a spirit of racism is present in our attitude toward the Vietnamese people. We do not believe that the American people would support such an attack upon a small European nation. The Vietnamese have a different culture and color of skin. Racism appears in all nations and races. It is always contrary to the will of God.

(4) We believe that even Communists are made in the image of God and are our fellow-men. Some of them who are being killed are Christians. The Christian faith is not identical with anti-Communism. The obligations of love and mercy are to be extended to all men in the spirit of Christ who prayed when He was being crucified, "Father forgive them for they know not what they do."

(5) We believe this war and other factors in our society and in our common human nature have combined to create an insensitivity to the noblest humanitarian values in our history. They must be recovered. If this moral erosion continues, we will not deserve to be regarded as among the defenders of the most precious qualities of life which are the true signs of national greatness.

(6) Finally, we believe in the sovereignty and justice of God. Thomas Jefferson in his "Notes on Virginia" in reference to slavery said, "Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just: that His justice cannot sleep forever."

It is because we tremble for our country today that we respectfully present our prayer for your consideration.

May God help you and have mercy upon us all. Amen.

MINISTERS

Richard W. Blice, Jr.
 Orville E. Chadsey.
 Charles L. Cureton III.
 Lincoln S. Dring, Jr.
 George M. Docherty.
 Warner DuBose, Jr.
 Paul T. Eckel.
 James C. Fahl.
 Karl W. Gillmeister.
 Arthur R. Hall.
 Albert G. Harris.
 Joseph G. Holt.
 Gerald W. Hopkins.
 Harold L. Hunt.
 Walter Hunting.
 Cecil M. Jividen, Jr.
 Carroll Kann.
 LeRoy G. Kerney.
 Richard J. LeForge.
 Robert I. Long III.
 James G. Macdonell.
 John G. Marvin.
 Jack E. McClendon.
 Stephen P. McCutchan.
 David W. McKee.
 Willard C. Mellin, Jr.
 Herbert Meza.
 David M. Milbourn.
 Larry C. Miles.
 Edgar W. Mills, Jr.
 Filbert L. Moore, Jr.
 A. Thomas Murphy.
 John L. Pharr, Sr.
 Gary G. Pinder.
 Carl R. Pritchett.
 Bruce L. Robertson.
 John M. Salmon.

William R. Sengel.
Robert W. Simpson.
Russell C. Stroup.
Julius E. Scheidel, Jr.
William J. Tatum.
J. Marvin Taylor.
William E. Thompson.
Tom L. Torosian.
T. Dennis Walker.
Dewey D. Wallace, Jr.
Laurean H. Warner, Jr.
Antonio R. Welty.
Edward A. White.
Robert I. White.
John R. Wilcox.
George H. Yount.

LAY PEOPLE

Mr. and Mr. Richard Anders.
James A. Barker.
Lucia Barley.
Mr. and Mrs. E. Martin Blendermann.
Richard A. Carpenter.
Mr. and Mrs. J. Ralph Davis.
Dr. and Mrs. Warren Evans.
Mrs. Caleb Hathaway.
Madeline Jacobs.
Sandy Jividen.
Elsie Karo.
Dr. and Mrs. David Lean.
Joan Macdonell.
Eric Paul Macdonell.
Dr. and Mrs. Robert Mecklenburg.
Virginia Kelley Mills.
Patricia A. Milone.
Avis Moussavi.
Sharon P. McKee.
Carol Ann Pinder.
Anna M. Pritchett.
Dr. and Mrs. Richard Reese.
Dr. McDonald Rimple.
Dorothy Sanazaro.
Roy Sewall.
Claire Sewall.
Mary Lee Tatum.
Peggy Torosian.
Mr. and Mrs. Enoch J. Vann.
Suzanne Walker.
Marion Wallace.
Mr. and Mrs. Donald F. Webster.
Raquel Welty.
Louise White.
Virginia White.

OVERSPENDING MUST BE
CURTAILED

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, rarely if ever has there been more concern in Congress—and, I think, among the American people generally—about the expenditures of the Federal Government.

In the last 4 years, the United States has added \$74 billion to the deficit. President Nixon has announced his intention of holding spending to \$250 billion during the present fiscal year, but even if that aim is realized, another deficit of \$15 to \$25 billion is in prospect for next year.

Federal spending, to be blunt about the matter, has gone out of control. It is high time that control be reestablished.

I believe that this can be most effectively accomplished through a constitutional amendment providing that appropriations shall not exceed revenues of the United States, except in time of war or national emergency.

I am accordingly introducing a joint resolution proposing such an amendment.

The amendment is simple and direct. Under its provisions, as soon as practicable after the end of each calendar year, the President would determine and proclaim the estimated total revenues of the United States, exclusive of borrowed funds, for the succeeding fiscal year. The estimate would be revised at least quarterly.

This proposed constitutional amendment would bar the Congress from authorizing the withdrawal of any funds from the U.S. Treasury in excess of the total amount of revenues for that fiscal year. The only exception would be if each House of Congress, by a two-thirds vote of its membership, suspended its application during war or a grave national emergency.

Mr. Speaker, submission of this amendment would give the people of the United States an opportunity to decide whether they want realistic control exercised over Federal spending. It is their money that is at stake—and the future of their country, and ours, is also at stake, for continued heavy Federal deficits can lead only to a ruinous situation.

I ask the support of my colleagues for the resolution proposing a spending-control amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

A RETURN TO REASON

HON. L. A. (SKIP) BAFALIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. BAFALIS. Mr. Speaker, 19 years ago the Supreme Court of the United States decreed that segregation of the public schools of this Nation was an unconstitutional practice. That decision firmly established freedom of choice for all Americans.

In recent years, however, the Federal courts and certain departments of the Federal Government have pushed dangerously beyond the 1954 decision and developed a strange doctrine of compulsory integration, a doctrine as unconscionable as that which it replaced.

If it is wrong to deny admission to public schools because of race, it is equally wrong to compel admission because of race or to bus pupils far outside their neighborhoods simply to create arbitrary and artificial racial proportions.

The Congress of the United States itself recognized the danger of "reverse segregation"—that is, mandatory integration—in its passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, when it forbade, in extremely clear language, the assignment and busing of pupils on the basis of race. Quoting from this bill which is now public law:

Desegregation means the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion or national origin, but desegregation shall not mean the assignment of students

to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance.

*** nothing herein shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another or one school district to another in order to achieve such racial balance.

Nevertheless, the Supreme Court of the United States and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have willfully disregarded this expression of what is lawful, just and—more important—democratically believed to be the correct stance for public education.

It should be obvious to all that the Supreme Court in years past has been unwilling to respect the traditional American belief that our Government is of, by, and for the people. Instead, the courts seemingly are embarked on a course which allows them to act as a second legislative branch of the Federal Government one superior to the Congress and, tragically, unrestrained by the will of the people.

In addition, HEW appears to be dedicated to the proposition that arbitrary and bureaucratic determination of racial quotas in public education is desirable regardless of facts and feelings to the contrary.

Such official mischief will not be tolerated by the American people. In a straw vote at the polls in my home State of Florida last March, the people recorded their support of a constitutional amendment to prohibit forced busing by a 3-to-1 margin. On the issue of equal educational opportunities, the vote was nearly 4 to 1 in favor, thus demonstrating that Floridians, despite conjecture by some, are genuinely concerned about the quality of education received by all schoolchildren. Obviously, these people are simply calling for an end to the forced busing which has brought so much disruption into the lives of their children.

Because statutory action—that is, law—has very little restraining influence on the Federal Government, and because the folk wisdom of our people is so difficult for the same Government to comprehend, it is necessary to put into motion the complicated but sovereign machinery of constitutional reform.

Therefore, today I am introducing a constitutional amendment which, in 35 words, guarantees freedom of choice for all Americans and compels government at all levels to abandon racially inspired schemes for assignment and busing of pupils. The amendment reads:

The right of citizens to attend the public schools of their choice shall not be abridged or denied by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, religion or national origin.

Unless reason triumphs in public education, I sincerely believe our Nation may be irreversibly damaged—its citizens, of all races, left without faith in their Government's ability to restrain itself.

I, therefore, urge Congress to expeditiously consider this crucial legislation. America, having purged its soul of an older racism, must not allow the rise of a newer racism.

BARBARA JORDAN

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a reception in honor of Representative BARBARA JORDAN, a new Representative from Texas. This reception was full with people from Houston, who have supported Ms. JORDAN often, and with some of the real big names of Congress and the media. Such a reception can only be a tribute to past works and future expectations for a truly remarkable woman from Houston.

I assure this body that Ms. JORDAN will make her mark. In order to dispel anyone's doubts about the validity of my beliefs, I ask that an article about Ms. JORDAN from the Washington Post's Sunday, October 22, 1972, edition be reprinted in the RECORD.

BARBARA JORDAN

(By Molly Ivins)

HOUSTON.—Forget the pink-curtains-in-the-bedroom bit, the favorite recipes and the touching vignettes. Barbara Jordan has a personality like slate rock. She's as cozy as a pile driver, though considerably more impressive.

"Can't you just see it?" remarked one of her colleagues in the Texas Senate with anticipatory glee. "Barbara will go up there to Washington and all those white, Eastern liberals will try to gush all over her. Hooah! Over Barbara!"

Anyone who tries to dump butter on Barbara Jordan gets a dead, cold steel stare like a slap alongside the head from Joe Frazier. Once when she was in the hospital, the Senate Ladies (wives of state senators—popularly considered a fusty bunch of old prudes) sent her flowers. They never received any thanks by word or note. Jordan has no social chitchat, she is not given to greeting people in passing. She speaks only if she has something she wants to say, never simply to be polite. She is occasionally droll, but her humor tends to the satiric.

Jordan has been a First and an Only for so long that the words seem like part of her name to Texas newspaper readers. She was the only woman in her law school class; the first and only woman ever elected to the Texas Senate! the first black in the Senate since 1882; first woman, first black ever to serve as president pro tem of the Senate; first black ever to serve as governor of Texas (for a day). She decided to give up her seat in the state senate to run for Congress and will face a weak Republican opponent in a section that is 42 per cent black, nearly 15 per cent Mexican-American and 70 per cent Democratic.

She has immense dignity, composure and a deliberate manner. No one can recall anytime, ever, when she was not in perfect control of herself. The day her father had a stroke in the middle of her governor-for-a-day ceremonies, she was kept informed of his deteriorating condition throughout the day but never gave any sign of being under strain. He died the next day. Perfectly composed at his funeral, she even told a friend she thought that, in a way, it was beautiful he had died like that.

Even her size is part of her impressiveness: she seems not fat but big. (She is 5 feet 8 but never weighs herself.) And she has a notorious habit of knowing more about what she is talking about than anyone else.

"Doing her homework is practically a religious obsession with Barbara," said a Hou-

ston reporter who has followed her career.

One of her eternal dicta, delivered at every high school assembly, church gathering or civic club meeting she has ever addressed, goes, "There is no obstacle in the path of young people who are poor or members of minority groups that hard work and thorough preparation cannot cure." Another is, "Do not call for black power or green power. Call for brain power."

Before Jordan went to the Texas Senate in 1967, she studied the rules, one of the most arcane sets of parliamentary procedure on earth. On her first day, she knew the rules better than many senators who had been there for decades.

The "thang," as Texans say, about Jordan is that she has always been the way she is. Barbara Charline Jordan, 36, was born and raised in Houston's Fifth Ward, a typical black Southern low-income neighborhood. Her daddy was the Rev. B. M. Jordan, a Baptist preacher who supported his family by working as a warehouse clerk. Barbara was the youngest of three girls in the family.

"We were poor," she recalls, "but so was everyone around us, so we did not notice it. We were never hungry and we always had a place to stay."

Trying to analyze her own self-control, Jordan remembers, "My father was a strict disciplinarian and I always had to keep the lid on, no matter how angry I got. It did not have to do with his being a minister: it was my respect for him as a person. I had great respect. It was unthinkable to have a hot exchange of words with him, for me or my mother or any of us. So one does develop quite a bit of control that way. I suppose the kids now would say that was not good."

Jordan was always a straight-A student, or nearly so.

"I would bring home five As and one B," she said. "And my father would say, 'Why do you have a B?'"

"I always wanted to be something unusual," said Jordan. "I never wanted to be run-of-the-mill. For a while I thought about becoming a pharmacist, but then I thought, whoever heard of an outstanding pharmacist?"

Jordan decided to become a lawyer in the 10th grade when Edith Sampson, a black lawyer from Chicago, later a judge, came to address the Phyllis Wheatley High School Career Day assembly.

Jordan confided her ambition to A. C. Herald Jr., now principal at Wheatley and then her homeroom teacher.

"I encouraged her," Herald said, "and then one day her father came to see me. He said, 'I understand you have been interfering in my family, encouraging my daughter to become a lawyer. That is no place for a girl. I will thank you to stop.' I asked her afterward, 'What are you going to do now, baby?' She told me, 'I am big and black and fat and ugly and I will never have a man problem. The only way I will ever get to college will be if my father pays for it. So I will do exactly what he tells me until I am 21 years old and then I will do what I damn well please.'"

"I think Barbara accepted 98 per cent of what her father taught her, but that 2 per cent rebellion made her a stronger person. It takes strength of character to rebel, too."

Jordan recalls the story differently. "It was my mother who was against my being a lawyer," she said. "She thought it was not the right thing for a girl. My father said I should do whatever I thought I could."

From Wheatley, Jordan went to all-black Texas Southern University in Houston. She lost her first election there—for freshman class president—to Andrew Jefferson, now a Houston judge.

"She claims I stole that election to this day," laughed Jefferson. "All I can say is that I think she is one of the most brilliant

lawyer/politicians I have ever seen, black or white. She was a great orator, even in high school. And she was a champion debater at T.S.U. We won all the prizes then, every year Barbara was on the team and we even debated Harvard. T.S.U. has never had a team. We won all the prizes that good since and Barbara tells the debate coach that all the time."

Jordan's father put her through T.S.U.—she graduated magna cum laude—and then through Boston University law school.

"There were no scholarships or fellowships available in those days," says her childhood friend, Mary York. "I really don't know how he did it. I think for law school especially, it was very hard for them."

Jordan's practice is general civil work, largely probate and domestic relations. She ran unsuccessfully for the House of Representatives in 1962 and again in 1964. Defeat fazed her not one whit. "I just thought I had run a very good race, and next time I would probably win," she said.

In '66, she ran again, this time for the Texas Senate, and won. She first won a two-year term and then, without opposition, was reelected to a four-year term. And that was the beginning of the Jordan political legends.

Jordan's major committee, of which she is chairman, is Labor and Management Relations and her best work has been in this field. She was instrumental in getting the state's first minimum wage passed in 1969. She is also a specialist in the field of workman's compensation.

Her other priority area is urban affairs. She carries the bill to establish a state department of community affairs and has also done work in the field of intergovernmental contracting as it affects cities.

Her self-confidence is regarded by some as overweening ego. Her absolute reserve and dignity is considered evidence of lack of humor. She runs her committees like a martinet: the meetings start on time, bills are presented, witnesses heard, discussion is to the point, there is no fooling around, vote and adjourn.

There are endless tales of Jordan's coldness, vanity, or rudeness. Most of them stem from her distinct style. Texas politics is a slap-on-the-back, good-ole-boys together kind of process. A woman and a black, Jordan was never going to be accepted as "one of the boys." Instead, by sheer force of personality and incredible competence, she got herself recognized as a senator. Almost no one in the Capitol loves her. Some like her, some fear her, but everyone respects her. Her pragmatism has won her liberal enemies.

State Rep. Curtis Graves, whom she defeated in this spring's Democratic primary with a handy 80 per cent of the vote, has openly accused her of selling out. Everybody, but everybody in Texas politics, including her fan Lyndon Johnson, now shows up at dinners honoring Jordan. The fat cats and the lobbyists come, and to Texas liberals, eternally out, such appearances signal the corruption of one of theirs. Conventional wisdom around Austin holds that Jordan had to "deal" in order to get her congressional district. She denies it. When Jordan denies something, in her weighty, absolute fashion, even the most persistent reporter doesn't feel like bringing it up again.

"Of course she is very, very smart and incredibly competent and has good instincts," says a liberal state senator who speaks of Jordan with deep regret. "Maybe it goes back to the old tale of the talents. God gave Barbara so many talents, I expected more of her."

"Several times, just in this last session, I got to the point where I didn't want to go to her for nothin'. It was like going to a member of the Establishment. She'd listen to me, she'd smile and pat me on the back and tell me it was too far out. I'd carry a bill on some problem, a strong bill. Barbara would carry

one too, but it would be weak. And it would get through. The trouble with passing a weak bill is that you won't get another crack at strengthening it for 25-30 years. Whereas, if you just hold firm, you'll get a tough one through this session or next. It was so great for the Establishment to have her on their side. Whenever we tried to do anything, they could say, 'But Barbara doesn't think it needs to be that strong and if Barbara doesn't think so . . .'

"I'm waiting to see the good things I know she's capable of doing now that she's going to Congress. But the truth is, I'm afraid. Afraid she was seduced. I think Barbara fell for the in stuff. Having Barnes say all the good things about her and Lyndon putting his arm around her, getting the big honors, being close to power, everybody flattering her. Maybe I'm wrong. I hope so. She's got more than most politicians to keep her on the right track. She's got the color of her skin."

Despite the persistent "sell-out" charge, she has never been noticeably over-awed by power. At the Democratic Convention in Chicago in 1968, Jordan was the first, and for a while only, person in the 104-member Texas delegation to refuse to vote for John Connally as a favorite-son candidate. She was later joined by four other delegates.

In 1970, Gov. Preston Smith wanted her to serve as secretary of the state convention. He also wanted Ben Ramsey, a conservative who was identified with segregationist and anti labor legislation in the 1950s, as chairman of the convention. Jordan told the governor she wouldn't serve as secretary under Ramsey. She served as secretary, Ramsey didn't serve as chairman.

In Houston, Jordan still works out of her second-floor office in a little building on Lyons Avenue in the heart of the Fifth Ward. With a salary of only \$4,800 a year, she has to be a working lawyer. There's a print shop downstairs with a sign on the door that reads, "Knock & Holler." Upstairs, there is red carpeting, air-conditioning and pine-paneled walls, but the place is not plush. Old copies of "Ebony" are neatly stacked on an early-motel coffee table. There are color photos of JFK and LBJ on the walls.

She is busy, very busy, but always calm and almost always deadly serious. She wears no rings or other jewelry, only a tiny wrist-watch. Getting her to talk about anything but politics is not easy. Does she like to cook? No. Her favorite dish? "Whatever my mother prepares for supper at night," she replies, lighting up a filter king.

Jordan lives with her mother at 4910 Campbell, not far from her office. The neighborhood is poor. Their house stands out only because it is painted hot pink. She invited her mother to move to Washington with her, but her mother prefers to stay in Houston.

She has no interest in decorating, but does like good clothes and will spend some time shopping for them. She wears no make up, but gets her hair done. Fun is getting together with friends to sing. She also reads for pleasure—mostly political histories. She particularly likes biographies of Presidents and remains fascinated by Kennedy. Which promptly leads back into a political discussion with Jordan defending Lyndon Johnson. "Despite what some of my friends say, and I am aware of his mistakes, I believe he was a great President."

Charlotte Phelan, a Houston Post reporter, once invited Jordan over for a night of poker. Jordan, a good Baptist, was obviously unfamiliar with cards.

"You know how most people who've never handled a deck before will drop the cards all over and fumble around?" asked Phelan. "Not Barbara: She gripped each card firmly and carefully set it down in front of each

player. Not one of those slippery little things was going to get out of her control."

But in a very real sense, it is irrelevant to write about Jordan singing with friends, Jordan playing poker, Jordan talking about clothes. Mary York can say, "She is a beautiful person." A. C. Herald can say, "She was just a big, ol' lovable girl." But that is not the Barbara Jordan most people will ever be lucky enough to know.

For the rest of us, the best, most impressive Jordan is seen in action on the Senate floor, in the heart of a parliamentary thicket, verbally browbeating some opponent, figuring the odds on a certain bill, finding a way to scrounge an extra vote, dripping contempt on some hapless dunderhead appointed to the Air Pollution Control Board.

"I have heard your statement and it is full of weasel words," she sneered. Peter Lorre couldn't have improved on the way she said, "weasel words."

About her future? "Where would I go after this?" she asked sarcastically.

"The U.S. Senate? Barbara Jordan can run statewide in Texas? A black woman can win in Texas?" She was reminded that Sissy Farenthold got 45 per cent of the vote in this spring's Democratic primary.

"Sissy's white," Jordan snapped. "It does still make a difference you know."

MSGR. CLEMENT KERN AND THE ECCLESIASTICAL SHAKEDOWN SOCIETY

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, long before I ever came to this House, I came under the influence of one of the few truly great men I have known. Father Clement Kern, of Detroit's Holy Trinity Parish, showed me what a young lawyer ought to be doing with his spare time to help those most in need. I am sure I have not lived up to the ideal that Clement Kern set before me and some of my contemporaries. But to the extent that I have tried, it has been due to his influence and his example.

In the January 1, 1973, issue of Newsweek magazine, there appears an article about Father Kern, or Monsignor Kern, as he is now more properly addressed. The article tells how "everyone from automobile executives to bookies and barkeeps can expect a twist of the arm from the 'Ecclesiastical Shakedown Society' a small army of volunteers who help Msgr. Clement Kern go broke each Christmas by giving away whatever he has to the alcoholics, drifters, and other 'undeserving poor' who show up at Most Holy Trinity Catholic Church."

The article referring to poverty-stricken Holy Trinity Parish's economic status, is entitled "Priest at the Bottom."

Mr. Speaker, if this saintly man who has helped the helpless, befriended the friendless, enriched the poor, clothed the naked, fed the hungry, and fought the good fight for so many years—if he is the "priest at the bottom," then the world is truly upside down.

The Newsweek article follows:

THE PRIEST AT THE BOTTOM

Christmas is the season when churches have carte blanche to take from the rich and give to the poor. In Detroit, this means that everyone from automobile-company executives to bookies and barkeeps can expect a twist of the arm from "The Ecclesiastical Shakedown Society," a small army of volunteers who help Msgr. Clement Kern go broke each Christmas by giving away whatever he has to the alcoholics, drifters and other "undeserving poor" who show up at Most Holy Trinity Catholic Church.

This Christmas was no exception. After Mass at the church in Detroit's rundown Corktown district, some 300 poor people—deserving and undeserving alike—were invited to sit down to a meal of stuffed turkey and baked hams, prepared and served by Catholic nuns. A Jewish delicatessen owner donated a 20-foot Christmas tree decorated by his employees. And before the afternoon was over, Monsignor Kern planned to personally dispense the last \$4,000 raised this year by the Shakedown Society.

From Skid Row to Grosse Pointe, the 65-year-old Kern is regarded as something of a saint. His parish is among the poorest in Detroit, and his rectory is the last refuge for drunks—including priests—who can't dry out anywhere else. "I want the people that no one else wants," says Monsignor Kern. "The street is a gold mine for lost souls."

Like many worthy Catholic organizations, Monsignor Kern's Shakedown Society was born in a pub. When regulars at the Anchor Bar, a popular watering hole for newsmen and politicians, heard that Kern was in financial trouble fourteen years ago, they decided to take up a collection for his penniless parish. Since that night, the ESS has acquired considerable expertise in extracting donations and volunteer work from both labor and management. "One Christmas Eve," recalls the graying, wispy priest, "the former Mrs. Henry Ford II and her two daughters were down here at 11:30 at night helping out delivering packages."

Within union circles, Kern is regarded as "labor's padre" (he even owns a gleaming white hard hat bearing that inscription) because of the 34 schools for workmen that he administered before coming to Holy Trinity as a curate nearly three decades ago. Earlier this month, hundreds of unionists, politicians, businessmen and judges paid \$25 each to honor Monsignor Kern at a pre-Christmas dinner sponsored by Leonard Woodcock, president of the United Auto Workers, Frank E. Fitzsimmons, president of the Teamsters union, and other labor dignitaries. Kern was pleased by all the attention but slightly embarrassed. "I wish I could be in the back room at the Anchor Bar," he confided, "talking to the guys."

PICKETS

Kern's ties to labor sometimes get him in trouble with his contributors. Once, after the Shakedown Society persuaded a midtown hospital to provide free medical services at his church, Kern almost blew the deal when he showed up outside the hospital to picket with striking service workers. Catholic clergymen in Detroit were ruffled when the feisty monsignor showed up on a picket line with voluptuous bunnies who were picketing the Playboy Club. Today, Father Kern admits that he is in "deep trouble" with some members of the Teamsters union because of his support for Cesar Chavez, who is wrestling with the Teamsters in California for the right to represent farm workers.

Despite his elevation to monsignor in 1962, Kern has no fears that he will move up the ecclesiastical ladder—and away from his parish. "I suppose a younger man could do this job," he says, "but it really calls for a

beat-out guy like myself." Besides, he figures, Holy Trinity parish is the bottom of the barrel. "A.d. no priest," he concludes, "wants to start at the bottom."

THE WAR CONTINUES

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, we had all hoped that by the time the 93d Congress convened the war in Indochina would be ended. Two weeks before the election we were informed that "peace" was "at hand." In the ensuing weeks, far from seeing the final achievement of peace, we witnessed anew the arrogance of power: American reescalation of the conflict and the most brutal bombing campaign in the history of war—all without the slightest explanation to the people or the Congress. Since the beginning of American combat involvement in Vietnam, we have frequently been told that peace was just around the corner. The events of the past 10 weeks should have made it finally clear that the only way we shall ever be sure that peace is at hand is for the Congress to act to end the war.

My feelings at this time are the same as those of one of my constituents who wrote:

I have written to you over the years about our involvement in Vietnam. I have felt anger, frustration and despair. But now I feel rage, disgust and shame.

Mr. Speaker, I have opposed appropriations for this war since 1967 and have asked the courts to declare our involvement unconstitutional. In the 92d Congress I supported and voted for legislation designed to cut off funds for the war. When the President began the latest bombing campaign I sent the following telegram to him on behalf of myself and 16 other Members protesting his action:

It is with a deep sense of despair that we must once again urge you to halt immediately the resumption of United States military activity in North Vietnam. The frustrations of the American people over this continuing war and their confidence in the integrity of government, are being strained to the breaking point by the renewed bombing and mining by U.S. forces. The American people and their representatives in Congress cannot be told that "peace is at hand" two weeks prior to the election and that full-scale military action is necessary two months later. A singularly important lesson of this tragic war is that escalation only strengthens the resolve of the enemy to fight on and further entangles us in a fruitless, never-ending quagmire.

Your election in 1968 and reelection last November were due in large part to your commitment to end the war. If our efforts toward a negotiated settlement were 99% successful, as Dr. Kissinger maintained, then surely the return of our POWs and the sacrifices of all Americans justify our adjusting that 1% differential.

We urge you to stop the bombing and mining and to sign a settlement with the North Vietnamese now. If you cannot or will not get us out of Vietnam, then the Congress will have to exercise its obligation to do so.

In the Democratic Caucus on January 2, I voted for the resolution introduced by Congressman NEDZI calling for a cut off of all funds for U.S. combat operations in Indochina as soon as our prisoners are returned and arrangements are made for the safe withdrawal of our forces. In order to effectuate the will of the caucus I have cosponsored a bill to accomplish this purpose, introduced by Congressman KOCH. I am also preparing a similar bill of my own which, I hope, will be referred to and immediately considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of which I am a member and chairman of its subcommittee on Europe.

The American people are frustrated and angered over our immoral participation in the conflict and they want to see it finished. It has poisoned our personal relations with one another and soured our political dealings with other nations. Let us finally draw together and put an end to this miserable chapter in our history. The time for peace is now.

MINNESOTA MORAL LEADERS APPEAL FOR VIETNAM BOMBING HALT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in the flood of mail and telegrams I recently received opposing the intensified bombing in Vietnam, was one signed by 11 prominent Minnesota religious leaders. I ask permission to reproduce this particular message in the RECORD. These men are not only leading the public conscience in my State on this issue, they are also reflecting the deeply felt views of their constituencies on the continuing Indochina war.

The message follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
January 3, 1973.

Congressman DON FRAZER,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We feel a moral obligation to appeal urgently to our Nation's leaders to stop the Vietnam bombing immediately and we urge the resumption of serious negotiations working toward a permanent peace.

LIST OF SIGNATURES

Archbishop Leo Byrne, St. Paul-Minneapolis Catholic Archdiocese.

Dr. Alton M. Motter, Executive Director, Minnesota Council of Churches.

Rt. Rev. Philip F. McNairy, Episcopal Bishop of Minnesota.

Rev. Wayne K. Clymer, Bishop of the United Methodist Church of Minnesota.

Dr. Carl A. Hansen, Executive Minister, United Church of Christ of Minnesota.

Dr. Melvin A. Hammarberg, President, Minnesota Synod of the Lutheran Church in America.

Rev. Harry Lichy, Associate Executive, Presbyterian Synod of Minnesota.

Rabbi Herbert Rutman, Associate Rabbi, Temple Israel, Minneapolis.

Rev. John Martinson, American Friends Service Committee.

Rev. Vincent Hawkinson, Co-chairman Clergy & Laity Concerned.

Bishop J. Elmo Agrimson, Southeastern Minnesota District, American Lutheran Church.

A HISTORIC MOMENT IN AUSTIN

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, on December 11 and 12 of last year, a truly remarkable and prestigious gathering was held at the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library in Austin, Tex.

These were the days of the Civil Rights Symposium, marking the opening of the papers dealing with civil rights of President Lyndon Johnson's administration.

I was fortunate enough to attend the symposium. The meeting was a meeting of leaders—strong leaders of a good cause.

During the 2 days, one figure dominated the mood, dominated the resurgence of commitment to create a society of equal opportunity.

This man was President Lyndon Johnson.

It is appropriate that the last issue of Life of December 29, 1972, carried the best account of those 2 days in Texas.

In his last column on the Presidency for Life, Hugh Sidey caught superbly the moment—its dignity and vitality.

Mr. Speaker, I include the Life article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, in order that my fellow Members might share those days in Austin:

ONE MORE CALL TO REASON TOGETHER

(By Hugh Sidey)

Lyndon Johnson savors each day for its meaning and joy, his battered heart frequently sending out signals of pain to let him know that it can't keep up. In the past year he has finally adjusted to this twilight world, melting off about 20 pounds, carrying a pouch full of nitroglycerin tablets and holding that restless soul of his in check. Well, almost in check.

Several months ago, when Johnson and his staff began planning symposiums for the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library at the University of Texas, it was Johnson himself who insisted on a session dealing with civil rights.

So a fortnight ago they came by jet and auto and bus through an ice storm to be in Austin with "the President" again, one of the few times in the last four years that the men and women who carried the civil rights banner for two decades had assembled. There were some new faces among them, but the focus was on men like Hubert Humphrey, Roy Wilkins, Clarence Mitchell and former Chief Justice Earl Warren. They showed up with more wrinkles than they used to have, more gray hair and a lot more discouragement. From the beginning of the two-day meeting it was plain that civil rights no longer had a clear national leader. Nor could anyone perceive any sympathy for the cause in the White House.

L.B.J. put on his tan rancher's twill and his cowboy boots and came in from the country, sitting silently through the first day's meetings, the fatigue growing on him. That night he went to the reception for the 1,000 guests. The strain took its toll. For Johnson the rest of the night was filled with pain and restlessness. His doctors suggested, pleaded, ordered him to give up his sched-

uled address the next day. He ignored them. He put on his dark-blue presidential suit and those flawlessly polished oxfords and came back the next morning.

He didn't take a seat in the auditorium but, with a worried Lady Bird at his side, watched the first two hours' proceedings on closed-circuit TV in an anteroom. Near noon he walked slowly to the podium. In a low but steady voice he talked eloquently for 20 minutes. "Until we overcome unequal history, we cannot overcome unequal opportunity," he said. "But to be black in a white society is not to stand on equal and level ground. While the races may stand side by side, whites stand on history's mountain and blacks stand in history's hollow. . . . So I think it's time to leave aside the legalisms and euphemisms and eloquent evasions. It's time we get down to the business of trying to stand black and white on level ground." Even in that short plea there was pain, and Johnson reached for one of his pills, munching in front of everybody. It was something he rarely does.

When he was done he acknowledged the applause and stepped off the stage to take a seat in the auditorium. Then squabbling broke out among the black factions, and one of the participants read an indictment of Richard Nixon and his administration.

Lyndon Johnson sat for a few minutes in the midst of it. Then, just as if he were back in Washington, he moved. The fatigue of the night before seemed to drop away, the old adrenalin machine pumping back into action. Going to the microphone, with his hands molding the air, he delivered one of his sermons on brotherhood and reason, flavoring it with one of those marvelous stories about a backwoods judge and the town drunk, reminiscences of when he arrived in Hoover's Washington and the bonus marchers were driven down Pennsylvania Avenue.

"Now, what I want you to do is go back, all of you counsel together," he said, "that soft, kind way, just cool and push off wrath, indulge, tolerate, and finally come out with a program with objectives. . . . There's everything right about a group saying, 'Mr. President, we would like for you to set aside an hour to let us talk,' and you don't need to start off by saying he's terrible, because he doesn't think he's terrible. . . . While I can't provide much go-go at this period of my life, I can provide a lot of hope and dream and encouragement, and I'll sell a few wormy calves now and then and contribute."

When all that human juice clattered out over the wire, the memories began to rise, of the lean, youngish Lyndon Johnson in 1957 leading the United States Senate to pass the first Civil Rights Act in 82 years. It was near midnight, and the tension was so thick you could slice it, but the majority leader just stood there on the floor, calmly counting his votes.

Then there were those later nights, when L.B.J. was President. He would talk about how he ceased to be just a man from the South and had become a leader for all of America. The old tales would roll out—about what it was to be a black and never sure as you traveled if you could find a decent place to eat or go to the bathroom; or how he knew what it was like to be a Mexican-American child in the Depression, rummaging in the garbage cans for food.

Another night: it was in New Orleans during the 1964 campaign when Johnson stood on a street corner in the harsh neon glare, white Louisiana state officials clustered around him, and shouted out his message of hope and equality to the blacks who stood below him. And then in his 1965 civil rights address to Congress, in the place he loved most, among the men he liked best, he sounded the most poignant refrain of the time: "We shall overcome."

No wonder his heart is scarred today. It has been a long and anguished journey, with a long way left to go.

In the auditorium in Austin, the ovation that followed Johnson's appeal washed away the controversy, for a moment. People came to the stage and crowded around him as he tried to leave. They were all reaching for a bit of the old magic. But nobody got so much of it as Mr. Youngblood, a thin, aging black who used to wait on tables in Austin's ancient Driskill Hotel, where Johnson sweated out election night returns. The former President and the former waiter stood there for a few seconds gripping hands, and if any questions lingered about what Lyndon Johnson had tried to do for his country, they were answered right then.

PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN—IN MEMORIAM

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker—

I want you to succeed in whatever you undertake. To do that you must give it all you have. . . . Right must always prevail. Do not let glamor get you. There are decent, honorable people among the very rich, just as there are among the very poor. Honor knows no class. . . . Remember always to keep your balance no matter how great you may become in your own time. Your Dad will never be reckoned among the great but you can be sure he did his level best and gave all he had to his country.

The above counsel has been extracted from a letter Harry Truman wrote to his daughter, Margaret. The statement reveals the words of a man who had the courage, the spirit, and the tenacity to stick to his convictions, to carry forward the strength of his decisions and to uphold, always, the principles of his family code:

To do the right thing, to do the best we could, never complain, never take advantage, don't give up, don't be afraid.

Simple words—but words forceful and dynamic in their simplicity.

President Harry Truman possessed an immense capacity for making up his mind to do what had to be done. He welcomed and encouraged the views of others, no matter how far they differed from his own initial impressions. Yet, he never forgot that the final responsibility for all decisions rested solely on his shoulders. When the "buck stopped," he answered and he acted with a full and biting awareness of his accountability to the American people. Gen. George C. Marshall, looking back upon the 33d Presidency stated—

There never has been a decision made under this man's Administration that has not been made in the best interest of his country. It is not only the courage of these decisions that will live, but the integrity of them.

Mr. Truman, himself, addressing a crowd of workers in Grand Rapids, Mich., explained:

I don't want you to vote for me, I want you to get out on election day and vote for yourselves—for your interests.

On his return to Independence at the close of his arduous campaign, he concluded:

We have told the people the truth and the people are with us. The people are going to win this election.

Harry Truman remained a man of the people. To his countrymen and to the world, he came to symbolize the potential, when history demands it, of the common man. Neither as a public not private figure did he ever pretend to be anything but what he was. As a farmer, his resourcefulness, his independent spirit, his ability to solve the everyday practical problems served him well. As a timekeeper, bank clerk, and bookkeeper, his thorough and meticulous approach became a most valuable resource. And, as a Senator, his inquisitive and retentive mind, his dedicated and conscientious manner were known to all. Mr. Truman's successful efforts as Chairman of the "Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program" remain as an example for all of us in this body of the importance of our ideas, programs, and actions in directing and influencing governmental policy and in serving the men and women of this Nation.

Courage, compassion, concern, strength, selflessness, honesty, and a dedication to get the job done and to accomplish this task the best he could—these are the qualities Harry Truman brought with him to serve as F. D. R.'s Vice President and these are the qualities with which, on April 12, 1945, less than 3 months later, he faced the American people as their leader.

We remember well the European recovery program, the Truman doctrine, the creation of NATO, the birth of the U.N., the impact of the atomic bomb, the Korean intervention, the point 4 plan. All, when judged in the context of their times, stand as a symbol of the commitment of America and of the West to the cause of freedom. Truman refused to compromise with injustice. From his insistence that all captured Nazis be given a fair trial, to his unprecedented order to desegregate the Armed Forces, Harry Truman firmly believed that—

Each man should be free to live his life as he wishes. He should be limited only by his responsibility to his fellow countrymen. The only limit to an individual's achievement should be his ability, his industry, and his character.

Meeting with opposition in every quarter, Truman recognized the State of Israel 11 minutes after she declared her independence. He told Chaim Weizman:

You more than made the most of what you received and I admire you for it.

Harry Truman believed there was no limit to man's ability to learn. He once stated—

A person learns as long as he lives.

And, Harry Truman worked, questioned, studied, investigated, discovered, and grew. In later years he loved to speak with schoolchildren on the meaning of democracy and was looked upon by many of us as a kind of roving teacher.

The years I served under his adminis-

tration as Congressman and the meetings and discussions I held with Mr. Truman remain most special for me. It is not enough for us to remember and honor his memory and to speak in eloquent words of his deeds and his service to the American people and to the world. For Harry Truman struggled to insure that the principles and precepts of America's ideals be preserved and carried forward. We must, therefore, continue this struggle and this dream for peace, justice, and freedom for this generation and for all generations to come.

BILL TO AMEND LAND AND CONSERVATION ACT OF 1965

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill designed to enable State and local governments to expand their efforts in establishing new park facilities. The need for legislation of this type is obvious when viewed in light of the inability of existing parks to accommodate the ever-increasing number of citizens desiring to experience the pleasures of the outdoors.

The legislation I propose amends the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 by providing a more equitable distribution of Federal funds among the various States. At the present time, 40 percent of the total available funds are allocated equally among the 50 States, with the remaining 60 percent being dispersed among the States and territories on the basis of need. While on the surface, this method appears to be quite valid, a closer scrutiny of this procedure discloses that the most heavily and densely populated States, those with the greatest need for park facilities, are not truly receiving their proper share of these funds.

Those individuals who reside in our densely populated urban centers have been for too long unable to enjoy the unmatched assets of nature. The great majority of outdoor park facilities have been located in those areas that are inaccessible to the average city dweller. To help insure that this situation is immediately remedied, the bill I introduce today would redirect the flow of Federal funds to the States largely on the basis of proportional population and urban concentration. Specifically, this bill would allow 20 percent of the total fund to be divided equally among the States and permit 75 percent of the available grants to be expended in the States and territories on the basis of overall population, population density, and the use of the individual State's park facilities by citizens from outside that State. The remaining 5 percent would be made available to States to meet special and emergency needs.

While this legislation would still somewhat favor the States which already have

the greatest number of park facilities, it does move the entire program closer toward distributing Federal dollars on a per capita basis. This approach is certainly more than just the formula currently in use, and it is one that will help to guarantee that the greatest benefit is derived from each dollar spent.

Under the existing program the average per capita apportionment for 1972 for the State of California was \$0.89 compared with the per capita amount of \$6.50 received by the State of Wyoming. This example aptly illustrates the need for effective and prompt reform, and the need to channel funds into those areas where there has heretofore been insufficient assistance.

The most populated States are not only restricted in the sum they can receive under the requirement that 40 percent of all funds be divided equally, but also by the provision that limits each State's ability to participate in the available funds to 7 percent of the total. This proposed legislation would increase the ceiling from 7 to 10 percent, thereby substantially increasing the opportunity of the heavily populated States to establish new parks.

As was mentioned earlier, one of the vital factors in determining the amount of money to be distributed to each State is the extent to which that State's parks are used by out-of-State residents. It is my firm conviction that this factor is worthy of intense consideration.

In California, for example, it is estimated that on weekends 50 percent of the State's camping facilities are occupied by nonresidents. Moreover, it has been approximated that over 20 million tourists visit California annually, an extremely high percentage of which utilize State recreational and park facilities. In addition, a good many of these tourists visit the major urban centers within the State often finding nowhere to camp or being forced to tolerate the overcrowded conditions existing at the State park facilities. The establishment of new facilities in and around these urban areas will serve the dual purpose of alleviating the existing overcrowdedness as well as providing areas of recreation and relaxation for the citizens of the area. It seems quite logical, therefore, to insist that this consideration be heavily weighed in the evaluation of which States should be recipients of Federal grants.

President Nixon, in his environmental protection message of February 8, 1972, noted that—

The need to provide breathing space and recreational opportunities in our major urban centers is a major concern of this Administration.

It is my belief that the concepts embodied in this bill are consistent with the stated objectives of the President, and with the desires of the millions of Americans who wish to make use of this country's most valuable possessions, its land and water.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation and to assist in bringing about its passage and enactment.

The bill follows:

H.R. 289

A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-4 et seq.), is further amended as follows:

(a) In the first sentence of subsection 5(b), delete paragraphs numbered (1) and (2) and substitute the following:

"(1) 20 per centum shall be apportioned equally among the several States;

"(2) 75 per centum shall be apportioned on the basis of need to individual States by the Secretary in such amounts as in his judgment will best accomplish the purposes of this Act. The determination of need shall include, among other things, consideration of population density and urban concentration within individual States, the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of the United States, and the use of outdoor recreation resources of individual States by persons from outside the State; and

"(3) 5 per centum shall be made available to individual States to meet special or emergency needs, as determined by the Secretary."

(b) In the third sentence of subsection 5(b), delete "7" and substitute "10"; at the end of the fifth sentence of said subsection, change the period to a comma and add "without regard to the 10 per centum limitation to an individual State specified in this subsection."; and delete the last sentence of said subsection.

(c) In subsection 5(d), delete paragraph numbered (2) and substitute the following:

"(2) an evaluation of the present and future demand for and supply of outdoor recreation resources and facilities in the State;"

(d) After the third paragraph of subsection 5(f) of the existing law, insert the following new paragraph:

"The Secretary shall annually review each State's program to implement the statewide outdoor recreation plan and shall withhold payments to any State until he is satisfied that the State has taken appropriate action (1) toward insuring that new recreation areas and facilities are being located to satisfy the highest priority of unmet demands for recreation especially in and near cities, particularly with respect to the resources that have been acquired or developed with funds apportioned to the State under section 5(b) (2) of this Act; (2) to consider preservation of small natural areas, especially near cities; (3) to consider preservation of scenic areas through the acquisition of development rights, scenic easements, and other less-than-fee interests in lands or waters; and (4) to provide for appropriate multiple use of existing public lands, waters, and facilities, to help satisfy unmet demands for recreation resources."

MEMORIAL TO NICHOLAS JOSEPH BEGICH

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the tragic loss of two Members of the 92d Congress in an Alaskan storm that enveloped their airplane, and in all probability took them forever from us, gives me cause to rise now and point to the

footprints they left for us in the sands of time.

Nick Begich was a young man of 40 with a zest for living and with maturity that belied his years. Although he served only one term in the U.S. Congress, he left his mark with his efforts for the passage of the Alaskan Native land claims legislation and his appeal for the construction of the Trans-Alaska oil pipeline. He was a tireless, dedicated worker, and answered 99 percent of all the House rollcalls during his first year in office. The future years that death deprived him of is a loss to all mankind.

He was not a native of Alaska but certainly he earned the right to be acclaimed one of Alaska's most distinguished sons. Mrs. Burke and I had the pleasure and the excitement of his company with his wife not too long ago in New York. His loss seems personal to me as I am sure it does to so many of us all.

I mourn with his wife Peggy, and with his children, the passing of our friend who had such great potential.

STONEY STUBBS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the December issue of *Wheels* published by the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., carried an article on my good friend, Stoney Stubbs, chief executive officer of the Frozen Food Express Co. headquartered in Dallas. He is a graduate of Texas A. & M. University, one of the finest schools in the Southwest and this year is serving as chairman of the American Trucking Association.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the *RECORD*, I include the article entitled "Stoney Stubbs—He's From Texas."

STONEY STUBBS—HE'S FROM TEXAS

(By Jane Graham)

"I don't ask much of my drivers," said the big man in the Western hat. I just want them to have the soul of a gypsy, but be stable enough to head up the PTA!"

The robust laughter that accompanied the remark was unique, the product of a genuine original: Stoney M. Stubbs, chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Frozen Food Express, and new chairman of the American Trucking Association.

Like many Texans, Stoney Stubbs is larger than life. A farm-bred graduate of Texas A&M, he departed from the pattern of his upbringing by taking his degree in accounting.

After a slight detour to fight a war in the Pacific, he began his career as an accountant for the Humble Oil Company, about the time that Cy Weller, a lawyer from San Antonio, was founding Frozen Food Express, in Dallas. Bitten by the trucking bug during World War II and impressed with the future of frozen foods, which were just then beginning to appear on the market in quantity, Weller had scraped up a few trucks and trailers, and was beginning the hard climb toward solvency.

The company was still young when Weller persuaded Stoney Stubbs that trucking had it all over the oil business, and a long and profitable relationship was born. It continued

until just a few years ago, when Weller decided to sell his share of the company to the other officers. At that time Stubbs became chief executive officer.

Reflecting his individualism, Stubbs asserted: "I believe deeply in private enterprise. More than anything else, a truck-driver has to be self-reliant. That's why, in our particular branch of the trucking industry and in our company, we encourage as many of our men as possible to own their own rigs. We even help them with financing the \$23,000 or so that it takes. Then we lease the rig and the man for a combination price. It's a good deal all around: the man makes more money and keeps more of what he makes, takes better care of the equipment and is more conscious of customer relations; the company saves capital investment. We now have about 120 driver-rig combinations in our fleet of over 300, and are encouraging more all the time."

There are sharp limits to Stubbs' rugged individualism, however. He is adamantly opposed to the current trend toward de-regulation in the industry, which he feels can only lead to irresponsibility. "And it isn't only shippers who will be hurt by de-regulation," he said. "Reliable carriers will be hurt, financially, while customers are sorting out the reliables from the unreliable."

Stubbs feels that one of his most important responsibilities as chief officer of a major trucking line—a responsibility that will be even greater as ATA chairman—is making public appearances on behalf of the trucking industry.

Besides de-regulation he speaks regularly on three other pet subjects.

The first of these is maintaining the integrity of the Highway Trust Fund. He points out—emphatically—that not only would the highway network deteriorate if safeguards on this fund were relaxed, but that any use of the fund for other purposes would be a betrayal of the highway users who supported it in the first place. "It's just plain dishonest not to live up to the original bargain," he insists.

Another concern of the ATA's new chairman has to do with antiquated regulations covering sizes and weights of carriers. "Our technology is so advanced over what it was when size and weight regulations were put in that they have become not only obsolete but almost irrelevant," he declared. "We could put more load on the highway with less stress on it, if they'd just let us use the expertise we've gained."

The third subject on which Stubbs likes to speak out is the soundness of investing in motor carriers. He points to the financial record of his own Frozen Food Express as a good, but by no means unique, example. Organized on a shoestring in 1947, it began to show a profit in 1950, and by 1958 was really rolling. In 1962 it grossed \$9.25 million, and by 1971 had grown to a \$23-million organization. In 1972 the company will gross somewhere between \$25.5 and \$26 million, and from there on the sky's the limit.

Frozen Food Express is recognized by the ICC as the third-largest refrigerated carrier in the United States, and the largest in its service area, which comprises 23 Central, Southwestern and Western states. Stubbs took the company public last year, selling about one-third ownership for enough to retire \$2,334,526 in long-term debt. Since last November, when the company went public, its stock has climbed steadily, from around \$15 per share at that time to—in May of this year, as this was written—around \$20 per share. Not bad—up 33 1/3 per cent in a little over six months!

The next step in the company's long-term growth plan is diversification. Asked what fields FFE plans to enter, Stubbs smiled. "I'm not ready to tip my hand yet," he said, "but you can bet we've got some exciting plans on the boards."

While the company's executive offices are in Dallas, it recently completed a service center and office building in the outskirts of Lancaster, a suburb 10 miles to the south. There, in the middle of rolling farmland, is a long row of busy cubicles in which tractors are serviced and trailers kept in tip-top condition. Word has spread about the skill of FFE mechanics, and many other companies now send their equipment to be serviced at the new facility.

Frozen Food Express pioneered the "less-than-truckload" concept among refrigerated carriers, utilizing trailers of its own design. These trailers are equipped with movable partitions, so that shipments can be separated according to type and temperature requirements. The innovation has two advantages: the higher rates of LTL and the creation of major new customers—small-lot shippers who grow into full-truckloaders.

The new ATA chairman is a strong advocate of schools for truck drivers. He feels that the "knight of the road" image is a tremendous asset for the industry, counteracting to some degree the irritation felt by the private automobile driver when he finds himself behind a truck on a two-lane stretch of mountain road. And he insists that the truck driver's reputation for skill and courtesy must be backed up by continuing training programs.

The man practices what he preaches—on a large farm near Waco, with a long-abandoned private airfield. There, what once were runways are now "highways"—or maybe they should be called "how-ways"—where company instructors take young men who have never driven anything larger than a pickup and turn them into skilled truck drivers.

"Trucking is a great career for a young man of the right temperament," Stubbs declared. "A driver can earn anywhere from \$8,000 to \$18,000 a year, depending on skill and experience, and that's not bad for any field not requiring a college education."

"And besides, it's the kind of work that's fun for a certain type of guy. It gets into your blood!" (As Stubbs' tanned skin wrinkles around his twinkling eyes, it's clear that here is a man who actually loves the trucking business. His son and son-in-law evidently share his enthusiasm, for both have followed him into the business.)

Although there are eight million people in the trucking industry (FFE's share of them is 800), and although all-night disc jockeys like to play songs about the rolling wheels, Stubbs doesn't believe the romance of the industry compares with that of railroad driving half a century ago.

"It's a different thing," he said thoughtfully. "Today's trucker is a businessman, and he works hard at it. He plays hard, too, but his play isn't connected with the industry. A driver doesn't talk about trucking during his off hours. He talks about hunting, and fishing, and maybe about the farm he's buying outside of town. It's one of the last truly masculine professions. Yes, I know there are women in it, but the field itself is masculine. You don't find many fluttery fellows driving trucks!"

Like most other truckers, whether they're driving a rig or driving a desk, Stoney Stubbs is an outdoorsman. On weekends he and his wife Florence, their son and daughter, daughter-in-law, son-in-law and five grandchildren gather around the huge swimming pool at the Stubbs home in North Dallas.

He loves to fish, but most of all he loves to hunt: his office walls are lined with trophies, and he usually has plans afoot for a trip to Canada, Mexico or the Big Bend Country of Texas. He has the hearty look of a man's man. His sunburned skin, piercing eyes, iron-grey hair and authoritative handshake all give the assurance that the American Trucking Association has a strong and capable hand at the wheel for the coming year!

PHYSICIAN SHORTAGE IN RURAL AMERICA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I recommend to the attention of my colleagues the following practical advice from a doctor with much experience in trying to get doctors in rural areas:

THE PAOLI PROJECT

(By Dr. Merritt O. Alcorn, Madison, Ind.)

The physician shortage in rural areas is a very real problem that will continue to get worse until the basic causes are understood and corrected. There are very important reasons why a maldistribution of our physicians has occurred, and these reasons can be understood and eliminated. It is true that this is a problem of health personnel shortage rather than just physicians but it is also obvious that the health team must begin with doctors.

There are many misconceptions that have come to be believed and have interfered with an understanding of the real problems. Our young physicians are accused of not wanting to come to the culturally deprived areas, can make more money in the cities, or are accused of seeking resort areas. These are simply the wrong impressions and the fact is they do not come to rural communities because medicine cannot be practiced properly in these areas. They are conscientious enough to want to give their patients the best health care that they are capable of rendering. Medical schools are accused of luring students into specialties and discouraging them from the general practice of medicine. This is true and should be true, because with the enormous growth of medical knowledge it became important to practice medicine as teams rather than as individuals.

I believe that the restriction of admissions to medical school with the elimination of a large number of talented applicants was a grave mistake, and I also believe that the emphasis of the Federal Government on supplying more and more financial aid to buy a product in short supply is the incorrect approach. Adequate competition for providing medical services would have done more to help relieve the current problems than anything else, but nevertheless, we cannot correct these problems of the past, we can help to overcome them for the future.

THE PROBLEM

Twenty years ago, after completing a one-year rotating internship, I entered the General Practice of Medicine in a rural community. Seven years later I left that practice in complete frustration, even though I had enjoyed my work very much and though it was the profession I had hoped for ever since I was a boy. The principal reasons that I had to leave this practice are the following:

1. The developing medical knowledge made the general practice of medicine too broad. I was doing anesthesia, orthopedics, obstetrics and gynecology, pediatrics, and medicine. And even though I frantically tried to take short courses in these fields the knowledge grew and grew to the point that I could not possibly do a good job of the total area. Medicine properly practiced must be done by a team of cooperating specialties with one specialty being that of Family Practice which has been narrowed down to a reasonable area and for which a young physician takes three years of preparation instead of one.

2. Inadequate assistance. Office and personnel problems became increasingly complicated with the advent of insurance and governmental programs of assistance. There were no well trained nurse-practitioners available nor did I understand how valuable they could have been. Assistants can only properly be utilized with a group practice where it is feasible to have an office manager, clerks, physician's assistants, nurse-practitioners, and social workers.

3. Availability for emergencies and time requirements interfered with my family life, social life and recreation, and with my desire to study and develop interests. The only protection against this is through a group practice which also provides protection for the community by having emergency service available at all times.

4. Lack of good services. Good laboratory, X-ray and cardiograph services can best be obtained by having a group preferably located adjacent to the hospital and combining the volume so that they can operate more efficiently. If a group practice is located away from the hospital these services are available through specialty groups and laboratory corporations from regional locations.

5. Lack of good available consultants. To practice medicine properly, consultants in major specialties need to be available for consultation and referral of patients, and this availability needs to be relatively easy. This does not mean that every group practice must have all specialties, but it does mean that more attempts should be made to have the specialties available in rural communities on a regional basis. Pathologists, radiologists and surgeons have developed this concept of a practice involving several community hospitals in rural areas and it needs to be developed further for all specialties.

6. Lack of continuing education on a regular basis. Again, a group practice has all of the advantages. It can have regular journal club meetings and television tape programs with planned intervals of time available to each member for refresher courses.

7. Public misconception often causes physician abuse. The public remembers the family physician that was available day and night when called. They do not realize the changes that have occurred and often become frustrated and rather bitter when the system doesn't work as they expected it to. There is a need for public involvement and public education in these changes in the delivery of good health services.

THE PAOLI CLINIC

If communities are to understand why they are losing their physicians and what must be done to attract physicians there are two things that seem necessary. One is a good example of a modern group practice in a rural community and the other a need for citizen's groups in communities to study and understand the problem and its solutions and then organize a recruitment program on a coordinated regional basis. To fill the first need a cohesive group of five young physicians in training was found and contacted concerning the concept of establishing a group practice in a rural community and providing medical care of the same excellence as could be provided in a metropolitan medical center. Fortunately, this group of young men had previously decided that this was the type of practice they wanted. The city of Paoli was picked because it is a very attractive rural location with people who are very cooperative and interested in their health needs. Through an unfortunate series of events, many physicians left the community and a very definite shortage existed. The hospital census, which is dependent on the physicians rather than the total population, is dramatically low and the hospital is in danger of having to close for financial reasons. The community under-

stands that for industrial and commercial growth a total community including good health care services must be available, and that the future economic life of the community is at stake as well as the need for the close availability of health services.

Our role was simply one of introducing the physicians and their wives to the citizens of Paoli, and then trying to supply as much information and assistance as possible to help them work out the best arrangements for a group practice of medicine in that community. We established a committee composed of the local hospital administrator and a local physician, two of the group of physicians planning to go to Paoli, a university professor who is head of the nurse-practitioner program and who has made an indepth study of the rural health problems, an accountant, the executive director of the Comprehensive Health Planning Region, and myself as chairman. This committee has attempted to find resources to implement the desires of this group in establishing their practice with the other physicians in the community of Paoli. It has been important to emphasize that our committee is not setting up a clinic, but that we simply desire to be available to help as resources for this group that is establishing a private practice. It is important that physicians who are currently doing an excellent job in the community of Paoli understand that this group is not a threat, but that they wish to become integrated into the current health care of that community.

There are many important features that this group of physicians have incorporated into their planning. (1) One is their plan to design a facility that will be adjacent to and probably connected with the hospital. In this way, they will be immediately available to hospital patients and will also be able to share laboratory, X-ray and cardiograph services. The availability of a physician for emergencies is greatly enhanced by having the offices in the immediate proximity of the hospital. (2) They intend to provide space for other health agencies such as a dentist and a pharmacy. (3) They hope to hire a health administrator that will be responsible for community health educational programs, family planning programs and other programs which the community and its physicians desire but lack the proper resources to implement. (4) They are very carefully planning for extensive use of nurse-practitioners in areas such as medicine, obstetrics and pediatrics. (5) Time-motion engineers from Purdue University that have made studies of clinics are available to them to help in planning office management, bookkeeping and the flow of patients. (6) Their group is composed of a psychiatrist and four physicians in Family Practice and they are currently looking for a surgeon to join them and perhaps will later add an internist and other specialties. In the mean time they will seek out specialties in adjacent communities and make arrangements to allow for consultations and referrals as needed. (7) There are many potential programs of continuing education for the group with one suggestion being that each member may wish to return to the university for one month each year, and during that period be replaced by a resident in Family Practice. Specific programs for continuing education will be developed by them as their group develops and should be coordinated with the other physicians on the hospital medical staff.

Community help will be needed, and there appears to be sufficient interest to supply this help although the exact mechanism has not been decided upon, there is currently a consideration that the group form a standard corporation for the purpose of building a facility and that the corporation issue stock to be purchased by the citizens of the community for raising the necessary funding. These public shares of stock should be purchased from the public by the clinic as their

practice becomes profitable and money is available to repay the community.

One of our disappointments has been the inability to obtain funds to assign one individual to this project on a full time basis to assist these young physicians and the community in getting their plans accomplished. We have submitted a grant request to the Regional Medical Program and this request has been approved, however, it is very questionable as to whether funds will be released from Washington for use. Once so many resources have been assembled and all that is needed is some assistance, it seems unfortunate that this is not available. I believe an important principle which this particular problem demonstrates is that the only good solution to local problems are those found by local citizens using local resources, and I also believe it is important that communities faced with a physician shortage problem recognize that their future lies in their own hands and not in the hands of the Federal Government or some other agency.

This clinic group practice being established has many features that can be adopted in other communities as a way of developing the right environment in a community to attract physicians. This practice will show the regional nature of the use of services and consultants and the necessity for adjacent communities to forget last Friday night's ballgame and begin working together to find a solution. Our Comprehensive Health Planning Region is trying to get representatives from each of the area communities together to understand the needs for recruitment and plan a recruitment program. Perhaps most important is that the clinic group will demonstrate that once a community has overcome the problems and has established a functioning group practice with a complete team for excellent health services then it is this group that will be able to take care of recruitment of health personnel in the future. They can identify the needs and recruit personnel as no other community agency can possibly do. The important feat for the area with declining physician population is to break the barrier that stands between the general practice of medicine of the past and the group practice of medicine of tomorrow. We are recommending to communities:

1. To form a single responsible committee with broad representation for physician recruitment. Rely heavily on present practicing physicians if they will cooperate.
2. Become informed on the changes occurring in medical practice and seek the future not the past. I believe the future practice will be some type of coordinated "team" practice, preferably, a formal group practice. Young physicians in training are an excellent source of information.
3. Eliminate those members that are intent on criticism and complaint rather than positive action.
4. Determine the health care needs of the area and the community resources available to help attract physicians. This will include an attractive working arrangement with other physicians, financial resources available if needed, and perhaps most important a good community environment for family life.
5. Find local young men and women in medical training and let them know they are wanted. This often neglected resource can be very valuable in providing guidance to study committees and in recruitment of other young physicians.
6. Then go to medical students (may be several years from completion of training) with a regional plan showing the need for physicians, offering specific practice opportunities and presenting an attractive community life to these aspiring young physicians and their spouses.

HUD'S URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAMS: HOW THEY HAVE HELPED

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, at this critical time, when many of the programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development are under fire in certain quarters, when funds are being impounded and there is talk of moratoriums and discontinuations, I thought it would be useful to bring to the attention of my colleagues some of the urban renewal programs which have been particularly helpful to the city of Portland, Maine.

The following news clippings tell of new schools, housing, and industry for Portland. They have been selected from many such stories which have appeared in the last few months. I insert them so that my colleagues might see how HUD programs can be translated into better education, healthier family living, more jobs, and improved tax bases for our cities. I hope these clippings, and the programs they describe, will be given the consideration they deserve:

[From the Evening Express, Sept. 20, 1972]

URBAN RENEWAL AT BAYSIDE NETS \$47,000 MORE FOR CITY

(By Brian Arsenaault)

Property taxes in one urban renewal area of the city have jumped by \$47,000 annually since completion of renewal efforts there.

One of the main arguments always advanced in favor of undertaking renewal in a city is that it will strengthen the city's tax base.

Thomas F. Valteau, executive director of the Portland Renewal Authority, believes that the site in question, bounded by Franklin, Pearl, Oxford, and Somerset Streets, sharply illustrates the validity of that argument.

The city commenced renewal efforts in that area, referred to by PRA officials as Bayside West, in 1967 without the benefit of federal funds. The project cost the city \$580,000.

When the project began the buildings located on the site were mostly substandard residential ones with a high percentage of vacancies, most were considered, according to the PRA, to be beyond "economic feasibility" to repair.

The property was acquired by the PRA, the buildings demolished, and the vacant land sold.

The result was that three firms, Earl W. Noyes and Sons, C. H. Robinson Co. and the Semloh Co., now occupy major new buildings on the site.

Before the renewal effort the city collected about \$9,000 annually in property taxes from the area. As a result of the new business operations there the city now receives \$56,910 annually in property taxes from that area.

Valteau said that the means by which the project was financed, through the Capital Improvements Program, coupled with the new tax return level results in the city receiving an 8.5 per cent return annually on its initial investment.

The PRA director termed the project one of the most successful "of its type" in the state.

"The additional tax funds which come from the project each year could, for ex-

ample, pay for the cost of educating 52 high school students or pay for the wages of eight policemen," Valteau said.

The project also had the distinction of being completed for a cost well under what was budgeted for it.

The city originally budgeted \$796,000 for the project and, as noted, it was completed for nearly \$200,000 less.

The project was geared to and successful in stimulating light industrial development.

If there is a controversial aspect to it, it is that some Bayside residents fear that the city has earmarked the entire area for light industrial development to the exclusion of residential development.

Many city officials feel that bringing back Bayside as a flourishing residential area may be impossible while others favor industrial development there even if residential improvements are possible.

Many of the residents of Bayside, though, despite the long decline of their neighborhood, still cling to hopes that the area will not be abandoned completely to industrial uses.

They have some support in City Hall, particularly among some Planning Department officials who feel residential development is possible in the area at least on a limited basis, and this year the City Council agreed to include in the Neighborhood Development Program a one-year effort to see if any interest can be stirred in the private sector for residential development there even though most councilors feel it is unlikely.

MAINWAY PLAZA DESCRIBED AS BIG TAX BOON TO CITY

[From the Press Herald, July, 1972]

The proposed \$14 million Mainway Plaza project should produce about \$250,000 a year in property taxes for the city, developer Richard L. Herriott said Monday.

Mainway Plaza will be built in and around the so-called "Golden Triangle" bounded by Temple, Middle and Federal Streets.

Herriott was careful to point out that tax payments to the city will depend on several variables and will be subject to valuations and rates established by public officials.

The complex will include a hotel, office buildings, shopping levels, restaurants, parking and a plaza with a variety of attractions from summer band concerts to winter ice skating.

Work on office, retail and plaza facilities in the triangle area is expected to begin next summer.

Herriott said he hopes to have news about tenants for the project in from 90 to 120 days.

He described Mainway Plaza as "a modern mini-city."

Herriott, the president of The Herriott Co., Inc., of Boston, and several associates met with city officials and downtown businessmen and bankers at a champagne luncheon at the Gaslight restaurant a couple of blocks from the project area.

The triangle area would include a 12-story office building with roof restaurant, three-story retail building and a landscaped plaza.

Adjoining the triangle will be an office, hotel and retail building and a parking facility for about 460 cars.

The entire project is scheduled for completion in the summer of 1975.

To make sure the enterprise does no visual damage to its environment, the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities will counsel the developers on how the design can best be related to the historic local area.

"Obviously we recognize that other new buildings in Portland will absorb many office and retail tenants who need modern space," Herriott said, "but our initial studies

indicate that these buildings cannot meet the full need over the next five or 10 years.

"That doesn't mean we're going to sit back and wait until the other buildings are all filled up before looking for tenants. We're going to undertake a strong leasing program."

Herriott said his company will establish a subsidiary, Mainway Plaza Associates as a legal entity for ownership of the project.

Completion for tenant space will come from the Canal Plaza project, where 10-story and four-story buildings are under construction, and from a Congress Street project involving Main Savings Bank, with the Codman Co. of Boston as developers.

WORK, EAT, SLEEP THERE

If you wanted to, you could spend all your time in the proposed Mainway Plaza project, according to the president of the firm developing the project.

"You could sleep in the hotel, work in an office, shop in the stores and relax and be entertained in the plaza," said Richard L. Herriott.

"We don't really expect anyone to live like that but the fact that it could be done demonstrates the comprehensive nature of Mainway Plaza."

SUN FEDERAL PLANS \$2 MILLION BUILDING (By Frank Sleeper)

The Sun Federal Savings and Loan Association announced today that it will build a \$2 million, three-story building in the \$15 million Mainway Plaza project in the heart of downtown Portland.

The building will be next to the new Casco Bank Building. The company becomes the first announced tenant of the project.

Phillips F. Lewis, Sun Federal president, said The Herriott Co. will build the building, which will total about 25,000 square feet, near the point of the so-called Golden Triangle, bounded by Middle, Federal and Temple Streets and facing on Monument Square.

At a press conference held on the site today, Richard L. Herriott, president of The Herriott Co., said that a national hotel chain has shown "very strong interest" in a 120- to 150-room hotel which would be across from the Golden Triangle on Temple Street. He wouldn't name the chain.

A parking garage for 750 cars on the same block as the hotel and facing on Federal Street also is planned.

Herriott said that construction of the Sun Federal building, the hotel and the parking garage plus any other buildings for which tenants have been found would start in the spring.

Parcel No. 2 with the hotel and parking garage, is now "about filled," Herriott said.

Still to be tenanted are a proposed 12-story high-rise office building and another three-to-five-story building proposed for the Golden Triangle area.

"I think our project is going very, very well," Herriott said. "Our beliefs about Portland are coming true. We are contributing to needed development here."

Lewis pointed out that Sun Federal, Maine's largest savings and loan association, now doesn't have a building identified with it.

"This will really give us building identity," he declared. "This will be a semi-free standing building and Sun Federal will occupy all of it."

A model of the proposed project is probably not accurate for the Sun Federal structure. Size and shape of the Sun Federal building will depend somewhat on the tenants for the other buildings in the Golden Triangle.

Completion of the Sun Federal building will be in mid-1975, Lewis said. By that time, it's projected that Sun Federal's total assets will be close to the \$100 million mark.

Sun Federal's headquarters now is at 561 Congress St. That may be retained as a branch, its president said. However, the branch at Monument Square will probably be closed after its lease runs out in 1977, he reported.

Sun Federal will work with The Architects Collaborative of Cambridge, Mass., on design of its building. Its space and personnel needs have already been identified in a survey. But the work on the building architecture has just begun, Lewis said.

The Sun Federal president assumes that the new building won't be at the exact tip of the Golden Triangle. The tip will be part of a mall which will extend down part of what is Middle Street.

"We feel the Herriott concept is good for downtown Portland and is a wonderful location," Lewis said.

Herriott said the area might be a good location for headquarters of national companies. He said a company whose name he can't divulge is now seeking 50,000 square feet of space in the project.

Lewis said location of Mainway Plaza in the center of Portland's financial district, affords the best opportunity for providing outstanding services to Sun Federal depositors and borrowers. He feels customer service will be greatly enhanced by superior parking and easy pedestrian access to downtown shopping and other services.

Lewis and Herriott met at the site with members of the city government, the Portland Renewal Authority and directors of Sun Federal.

The proposed Herriott over-all project also includes shopping levels, restaurants and a public plaza which will attract such community activities as ice skating in the winter and concerts during the summer.

[From the Evening Express, Aug. 9, 1972] GROUND BROKEN FOR 12 UNITS OF HOUSING AT DERMOT COURT

(By Brian Arsenault)

There was a groundbreaking today for 12 units of housing at Dermot Court.

The units are being constructed under the direction of Housing Opportunities Inc., a nonprofit housing agency established in 1969 by the Greater Portland Chamber of Commerce to "fill the gap" in the construction of housing for low and moderate income families. Model Cities funding of HOI thus far totals \$289,217.

Twelve units of housing are not many for an area of the city with an almost desperate need for as much good quality, reasonably priced housing it can get, but the project is significant for two telling but very different reasons.

First, the 12 units, with a mix of three, four and five-bedrooms, are significant just in terms of the good housing they will apparently provide for families who need it.

"Somebody," according to HOI Executive Director William R. Frost, "in the West End neighborhood is going to get a hell of a deal." (Dermot Court is located between Brackett & Clark Streets near Gray Street.)

He may be right. The units will sell for probably about \$25,000, which on the face of it would seem to put them beyond the means of moderate income families in the area, and certainly low income ones.

However, the units will be sold under the so-called FHA 235 Program which will mean the buyer, if his income is within certain limits, will be able to purchase the homes with a small downpayment and carry a mortgage on which the interest charge can be as low as one per cent.

Such advantages may bring the housing within the reach of some of the area's moderate income families, if not the low income ones.

If Frost's prediction is true the units, even

though there are only 12 of them, will be a plus in improving the housing scene in Portland.

The second, and probably more crucial reason, why the 12-unit project is significant, is that it is a reminder that providing housing for low and moderate income families is still a tough nut to crack even though two years have passed since the time when the word crisis was used almost daily to describe Portland's housing problems.

For when the project is completed, HOI will have managed to build only 16 units of housing in over three years of operation with nearly \$300,000 in Model Cities funds.

HOI formerly constructed four units, also in Dermot Court, which were supposed to be marketed under the 235 program but because of marketing and site problems were eventually turned over to the Portland Housing Authority for use as public housing.

Frost has indicated he's not particularly pleased himself with the situation and was particularly disturbed about the problems of getting the current 12 units under construction.

"You can't believe how many bureaucrats have been involved in getting a dozen units constructed," Frost said. "We plan to publicize our concerns about the institutional hassles involved in getting some housing built."

When HOI gets around to publicizing its concerns some good points will probably be made about the difficulties his organization faces and such difficulties should be openly aired.

However, many observers can't help but feel "we've been this way before".

Organizations like HOI were formed to try to deal with the "institutional hassles" Frost referred to, and if such organizations are finding themselves crippled by such problems rather than cutting through them, then serious questions are raised about how much real progress has been made in the past few years.

Such questions are being raised nationally and in Washington Congress is reviewing such programs as 235 and 236, a rent subsidy-construction subsidy program, with an eye to reforming those programs or dumping them in favor of new programs.

As to the nature of the 12 units under construction, they will be conventionally built, wood frame units with wood exteriors.

The units were originally designed to be modular, masonry units, but cost factors forced a change.

They will be heated electrically and according to Frost there will be four 3-bedroom units, six 4-bedroom ones, and three 5-bedroom units.

APOLLO 17

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a recent New York Times editorial written just prior to the launch of the Apollo 17, states well the significance of the last of the great lunar missions. This editorial aptly points out that a lunar expedition is still a breath-taking concept. It is significant not only in the accomplishment of flying to the Moon but in the human and technological developments that will serve us long after the Apollo missions have become history.

The editorial praises our astronauts and their exceptional skills, points to their pioneering effort, and recognizes

their contribution to the future. The editorial follows:

APOLLO 17

Apollo 17 and its three brave, highly trained astronauts are about to begin their great adventure. For days they will cruise through interplanetary space in their artificial cocoon; then two of the astronauts will land on and explore an area of the moon never before visited by man while the third astronaut circles earth's natural satellite waiting for his comrades to rejoin him. Finally the men on the moon will blast off to return to the mother ship and begin the quarter-of-a-million-mile homeward trek.

It is still a breathtaking concept, though five teams of astronauts have successfully accomplished similar feats since Apollo 11 made its historic breakthrough in July 1969. The near-catastrophe which forced abortion of the Apollo 13 mission provides a useful reminder of the dangers involved despite all the experience that has been accumulated and despite all the exquisitely painstaking care taken before blast-off.

Until Apollo 17, the Government had acted on the theory that only highly trained professional pilots could cope with the problems and possible emergencies of space flight. Now, on this last Apollo flight to the moon, the first professional scientist, Harrison H. Schmitt, has been made a crew member. An article in *The Times Magazine* section on Sunday pointed out that Apollo astronauts are not supermen stamped from a uniform mold but human beings with individual idiosyncrasies, virtues and failings.

Yet it cannot be denied that these men have special qualities which set them apart. Some day in the distant future, no doubt, taking a rocket to the moon will be as common as taking a plane to London is today. But the Apollo pioneers who have blazed the way had to have a special degree of competence and courage to embark on this extraordinary journey. We wish them a safe return.

THOMAS W. ALLEN REALIZES DREAM

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, while we were in recess a constituent of mine, Thomas W. Allen of Janesville, Wis., graduated from college at age 45—a fulfillment of a lifelong dream. I believe Mr. Allen's inspiring story should provide hope to all who continue to pursue a goal despite setbacks and discouragement. I am proud that Mr. Allen is a resident of the First District, and I submit at this time a newspaper story which details Mr. Allen's accomplishments:

[From the Janesville Gazette, Dec. 14, 1972]

THOMAS W. ALLEN'S LIFETIME DREAM WILL BECOME REALITY

(By Ruby Walton)

Thomas W. Allen, 479 N. Washington St., is getting his Christmas present early this year, but it won't be wrapped in gay paper under the Christmas tree.

Mr. Allen, 45, will receive his bachelor's degree in secondary education from UW-Whitewater during commencement Saturday.

"It took me 25 years to finish," he said. "It's just a lifetime dream. You think it'll never come, but it's here. I'm real happy about the whole thing."

Mr. Allen left high school in 1945 to serve in the Army and transferred to the Air Force

in 1946, where he remained until 1950. In 1951, while he was attending UW-Madison, he was recalled because of the Korean crisis and served in the Marines until 1957.

Mr. Allen earned his high school diploma while in service the first time but it was not recognized by the university in 1950. In order to qualify for college, he worked at Fairbanks Morse nights and went to Janesville High School mornings.

At that time the high school was located where Marshall Junior High School is now. "I got out of the plant at 2:30 a.m.," he recalled. "By the time I got home and to bed, I didn't get much sleep before school. Mr. Kitefinger used to let me out of his class early so I could run across the street to Wobig's to get some coffee and smoke a cigarette to keep awake."

"The first day back in school, I forgot and went into the boys' room for a smoke. Mr. Horswill caught me and sent me to Mr. Bick for smoking in school."

The son of Mrs. Lawrence Allen, 409 E. Milwaukee St., and the late Mr. Allen, has a great deal of praise to offer people who helped him. Kenneth Bick, then high school principal, Ralph Mitby, guidance director, and Miss Helen Taylor, history teacher, all encouraged him to go back to school.

"If it weren't for people like that helping me, I probably wouldn't have made it," he said, and added "I think my wife should pick up the diploma."

Mrs. Allen has been an executive secretary at Parker Pen Co. for the last 17 years. "She's typed I don't know how many papers," Mr. Allen said. "It's been a big plus for me to have her experience in typing, shorthand and research papers."

Following his second stint in service, Mr. Allen took nurse's training at St. Luke's Hospital, Racine, and became a licensed practical nurse. He worked in Mercy and Beloit hospitals.

He said he liked nurse's work but after the birth of his son, Shawn, now a 3rd grader at St. William's School, it was difficult working weekends and holidays. Then a back injury from a car accident forced him to give up nursing.

Mr. Allen started back to school at UW-Rock in 1968 and said he was impressed with the caliber of teaching there, which makes transition to another university easy.

He transferred to UW-Whitewater for his last two years. In the summer of 1971, he received a Ford Foundation grant and studied at Schiller College, Bonningheim, Germany.

He has been student teaching in English at Milton High School and will teach there until the end of the semester in January, then probably do substitute teaching in the area during the second semester.

Although he would prefer to teach German, he said he enjoys teaching English just as much and hopes for a combination position. "I find teaching very rewarding," he remarked, "and I feel my age is an asset."

Mr. Allen emphasized that veterans should take advantage of the GI bill to continue their education. The bill has enabled him not to have to work during college.

"My scholastic background before college was so poor I had to work hard in school to accomplish my goal," he stated. "I carried a reduced load when I began until I got into the study habit and then went to summer school. I couldn't have made it and worked too."

"Many veterans think they couldn't make it," he said, "but they should try. People tend to underestimate what they can do. If you want it bad enough, you can do it. I'm not a bright person, but I have a 3.6 grade point average in English and 3.2 in German. I got down to business and it has paid off for me."

Since he never really graduated from high school, this will be his first graduating ceremony.

"I'm going to wear that cap and gown

Saturday, you can bet on that," he said with a grin.

PEOPLE SHOULD HAVE PRIORITY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, pursuit of peace in the Middle East is the most difficult and delicate task facing diplomats and governments. Certainly, a thorough knowledge of the area and the conflicting views which abound there are helpful to all of us who share the belief that lasting peace is long overdue in that historic area.

A very fascinating and hopefully to some readers a somewhat provocative article was carried by the Copley News Service recently in a report from its Washington Bureau chief, Ray McHugh, after a recent visit of his to Europe and the Middle East. The specific article I am inserting into the RECORD was carried in the *Joliet Herald News* of Sunday, December 24, 1972.

Mr. McHugh has made a number of trips to the Middle East in an effort to be thoroughly familiar with the problems there and has extensive contacts in government and private circles in the Arab world as well as in Israel. He writes with an obvious sensitivity for the gravity of the problems there.

The article follows:

SAYS PEOPLE SHOULD HAVE PRIORITY

(By Ray McHugh)

BEIRUT, LEBANON—People, not boundaries, must have priority in the hoped-for American peace initiatives in the Middle East, says the boss of the largest private enterprise in the Arab world.

"There is no doubt that a solution in the Middle East lies with the United States; it is our only hope," says Sheikh Najib Alamuddin, chairman and president of Middle East Airlines.

One of the most respected Arab business and financial leaders, the sheikh says "another war will settle nothing."

The burden of peace, however, he adds "lies with Americans, I am afraid."

"You have an 'association' with Israel, but you also have traditions of democratic fair play, old friendships in the Arab world and obvious national interests."

"The Russians won't pursue peace—nor will the Chinese. Europe doesn't have enough weight."

The sheikh has felt the heat and flame of Arab-Israeli hostility like few businessmen of any nationality. Four Decembers ago Israeli commandos swooped into Beirut Airport and virtually put MEA out of business, destroying a half dozen planes including Boeing 707 jetliners.

Though MEA is a private company with no subsidy from the Lebanese government it was singled out by the Israelis for reprisal against Palestinian guerrilla raids from southern Lebanon. Some saw it as a warning to Lebanon's prominent financial and business community not to underwrite Palestinian forces.

The memory is vivid again this December as Israeli forces and Lebanese army units battle Palestinians only 100 miles south of Beirut.

In 1968 MEA rallied, largely because of the sheikh's personal standing in the international airline community. By renting planes, telescoping flights, the airlines resumed its schedules from Scandinavia to India as soon as Beirut Airport reopened. Since then it has reported three consecutive profit-making years—one of the few airlines in the world that has been able to operate consistently in the black.

"That crisis taught us a lesson about the importance of people," the sheikh said in an interview. "They were challenged and they were magnificent. Employees offered us money from their own pockets. Union waived overtime for six months." (In his 21 years with MEA the airline has never had a strike.)

MEA's recovery is reflected in a 9.7 per cent \$8 million-profit for 1972 and a growing reputation as one of the best-managed smaller airlines in the world. The sheikh increasingly is looked upon as a principal spokesman for smaller airliners in international air transport negotiations. Fifteen Boeing 707s make up the backbone of MEA's fleet.

The same "people" element that the British-educated sheikh stresses in his airline must be paramount in any Arab-Israeli settlement, he says.

Gesturing toward Palestinian refugee camps that lie close by his Beirut Airport offices, the sheikh said:

"The central issue of any peace negotiation must be the future of these Palestinians. They have lived in squalid huts and tents for 25 years. They must be resettled and helped to find a worthwhile life. Too many today live only on hatred—hatred for Israel, hatred for the Arab countries who they think have done too little—hatred for the Americans and the other powers who they think have abandoned them.

"When men live on hate alone, no one can predict the results.

"The attack on the Munich Olympic village was a tragedy; it reflects the desperation we know exists. The Israeli reprisals, I'm afraid, only accentuate this desperation.

"Someday someone must answer this problem with compassion and understanding.

"Why don't the Israelis remember what happened to them in Germany? Then it was them who were denied their homes, their birthrights, the simple claim to exist. Now they are denying it to half a million Palestinians.

"They talk of 'secure frontiers.' What is secure today in a time of missiles and rockets? The only security Israel will know as a state must come from an understanding with the Arab nations. Time is not on the side of Tel Aviv. It has military superiority now, we all know that. But unless it agrees on a modus vivendi with today's Arab leaders, I'm afraid it will be faced with a much more militant, much more radical and new generation of leaders a few years from now."

Arab-Israeli hostility, the sheikh says, has thrown the Middle East into a kind of economic limbo. Oil and related interests continue to generate business activity, he said, but even in this area the Palestinian question intrudes at a time when the United States is confronted with major decisions about its future energy supplies.

"Washington should not be looking to Siberia for its fuel," he said. "Despite the events of the past 25 years there is a great residue of friendship for the United States in the Middle East. We like to do business with Americans. Much of our business and political leadership was developed right here at the American university. Our children study in colleges in the United States. It is a natural relationship."

Once a Middle East settlement is reached, he said, the region will literally explode with opportunities. Traditional Holy Land tourism routes will be reopened. Natural resources will be developed. Commerce will flourish.

"Most important," he says, "a successful American peace initiative that takes into account the future of the Palestinians would be a recommitment of American and Western interest and sympathy towards people in this part of the world. We can all partake in an unprecedented prosperity, but an initiative now is important."

Some Arabs, notably younger men, already have begun to seek new horizons on the Persian or Arabian Gulf a few hundred miles to the east.

"That could be our Wild West," the sheikh agreed.

While politicians continue to debate the Arab-Israeli dilemma, many hardy young Beirut-trained businessmen are shifting their sights to oil-rich Kuwait and the tiny sheikhdoms like Oman and Muscat that are insulated by distance from old Arab problems.

"It is there that the world will see an Arab renaissance," says a young Harvard-educated Iraqi architect. "It's like California 100 years ago. It's screened from the war. There is no sense of national failure."

To this young man, Beirut, Cairo and Damascus are symbols of Arab failures in the 19th and 20th Century. For him the new oil lands hold the promise that old dreams can be re-created.

"I agree," says the sheikh. "But if the potential of this new area is to be fully realized, it must draw on the resources and the people of older Arab lands and these cannot be appreciated until we have peace with Israel—a just peace that gives hope and homes to the Palestinians. That is the first order of business."

ROBERTO CLEMENTE

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of professional athletes in this country, and dozens of them at one time or another have been tabbed "superstars." But there are precious few who are both superstars on the field and extraordinary individuals in their private lives.

Roberto Clemente was one of those precious few and I know that everyone in this Chamber joins me in mourning his tragic and untimely death.

The plane flight that brought death to Roberto Clemente and his four companions Sunday night was on a "mercy flight" bringing relief supplies to earthquake-stricken Nicaragua. It is an accurate reflection of the measure of this man that everyone who knew and loved him best stated afterward that such a mission was typical of the man.

I had the privilege of meeting Mr. Clemente a few times during his long and glittering baseball career with the Pittsburgh Pirates. While one had to marvel at the talent of this superbly conditioned athlete, it was the dignity of the man and his concern for others that remain in memory as vividly as his exploits on the diamond.

Roberto Clemente was not the type of superstar who would merely lend his name and prestige to a worthy cause. He cared enough for others to give his time, his effort as well as his talents to help them. It was this quality of active con-

cern for others, as well as his towering reputation as a baseball player, that made him so revered in his native Puerto Rico and throughout the United States.

Reading the sad accounts of his last days leading up to the plane crash, one cannot escape being as impressed by Roberto Clemente the man as millions of baseball fans have been by Roberto Clemente the ballplayer. Immediately after the disaster in Nicaragua, Mr. Clemente assumed leadership of a volunteer committee to gather relief supplies for the stricken country. His Christmas Day was spent working on this effort. Saturday he was at a pier in San Juan helping to load a ship with relief material. And on New Year's Eve he left his home and family to help deliver the much-needed supplies to the earthquake victims.

With the crash of that plane, baseball lost one of its greatest players and people everywhere lost a true friend.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues join me in extending condolences and deepest sympathy to Roberto Clemente's widow, his three sons, and all his family.

CENTER FOR DEFENSE INFORMATION: DECEMBER 1972, MILITARY DIRECTIONS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Gene La Rocque, a retired U.S. rear admiral now heads the Center for Defense Information. Although the center has been in operation for not quite a year, its publications already have earned the respect of Congress. In December 1972, a one-page newsletter, "Military Directions" was published. It contains several brief informative paragraphs on strategic weapons and defense matters generally. I think many of my colleagues who may not have received the newsletter will find it worth reading:

CENTER FOR DEFENSE INFORMATION: DECEMBER 1972, MILITARY DIRECTIONS

Expect a rash of defense department-inspired scare stories with the approach of the new defense budget early next year. Included will be talk of a possible Soviet aircraft carrier and of a new manned bomber. DOD's new budget will ask for hundreds of millions for continued funding of the CVN-70 aircraft carrier and the B-1 bomber. United States already has 16 carriers, the Soviets none, and the United States has more than 500 strategic bombers versus only 140 far inferior heavy bombers for the Soviets.

Fifty-eight percent of voters favor cuts in military spending, according to a September Harris poll.

Military prime contracts of \$33.4 billion were awarded by the Defense Department in fiscal 1972, to 22,000 contractors, up \$3.6 billion from 1971. The top 100 contractors received 72% of the total, the top 50, 63%, and the top 25, 51%. Leading the list were Lockheed, McDonnell Douglas, General Dynamics, General Electric, and Boeing, sharing 21% of all DOD contract business. Lockheed led all other defense contractors for the fourth year in a row.

United States is continuing with strategic weapons programs as the second phase of Soviet-American negotiations on limiting strategic arms begins on November 21. New MIRVed missiles for Minuteman ICBMs and Poseidon submarines are being deployed daily. U.S. bombers are being MIRVed too, with the first B-52 bombers carrying Sram missiles now activated at Loring Air Force Base in Maine. United States bomber-carried nuclear weapons will increase 50% over the next five years because of Sram. Air Force expected to request funds for MIRVing all 1000 Minutemen in next year's budget.

One Poseidon missile submarine could deliver more destructive power than all explosives dropped on Germany and Japan in World War II. A Poseidon submarine carries enough nuclear weapons to strike more targets than the total number of major German and Japanese cities bombed by all the allies in World War II, and each of these weapons is considerably larger than the Hiroshima bomb. Yet one Poseidon submarine carries only a small fraction of 1% of the nuclear megatonnage in the United States strategic arsenal. United States will have 31 Poseidon submarines by 1976.

The Center is associated with The Fund for Peace.

U.S. Navy made 157 ship visits to 20 countries in the Indian Ocean area in 1971. Navy Chief Admiral Zumwalt says "a permanent presence is mandatory" and contemplates rotating aircraft carriers in the region after the Vietnam war. Soviet naval activity at a much lower level; mostly non-combat support ships, oilers and repair ships. Soviet naval ships made only 33 port calls to 7 states in the Indian Ocean area last year.

Since World War II the U.S. spent \$1.3 trillion for military forces, the Soviet Union an estimated \$1 trillion. World military spending in 1971 rose to \$216 billion, up from \$119 billion in 1961. Since 1961, the world has spent \$1.8 trillion for military forces. In 1971 NATO country military outlays exceeded those of the Warsaw Pact countries by nearly 40%; \$106 billion versus \$76 billion.

U.S. weapon sales to foreign governments exceeded \$6.5 billion from 1967 through 1971. DOD military sales estimated to exceed \$2.8 billion per year for fiscal years 1972 and 1973.

U.S. military activities in other parts of Asia stepping up as the Vietnam war winds down. Vietnam military bases being turned over to Vietnamese, but U.S. defense planners examining reactivation of old World War II bases in the Western Pacific Micronesian Islands. The U.S. Army Pacific Command is expanding operations in "civic action" and other security-related programs. Last year Army teams were involved in "civic action" and "security" projects in 26 nations, a 300% increase over previous year.

The Green Berets are busy on the home-front, returning to "domestic action" in the U.S. after withdrawal from Vietnam combat in 1971. Special Forces troops are involved in programs in 29 communities in 7 States, working with juvenile delinquents, mentally retarded children, on Indian reservations, and with Boy Scouts. These community-assistance activities provide excellent training for "stability operations" in foreign lands according to Defense Department spokesmen.

Soviet Union still lagging far behind the U.S. in missile technology. Soviet testing of MIRV missile warhead system has failed to materialize. During October the Soviets carried out several SS-11 ICBM tests in the Pacific for the first time since 1970. Tests indicated little advance beyond the old MRV Technology. U.S. has operationally deployed MRV triplet warheads since 1964 and the more complex MIRVs since 1970. In October the U.S. Strategic Air Command test fired a Minuteman III with MIRV. Each of its three warheads was reported to have dropped within a quarter mile of its aiming point, a level of accuracy far better than Soviet missiles.

TO ESTABLISH THE TOYON NATIONAL URBAN PARK IN THE SANTA MONICA MOUNTAINS

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, on this opening day of the 93d Congress I am introducing a bill to establish in the State of California the Toyon National Urban Park in the Santa Monica Mountains. Initially, the concepts embodied in this bill were introduced by me in the first session of the 92d Congress. While progress has been made toward the realization of this much needed park and conservation facility, the Federal Government has been delinquent in its responsibility to the citizens of southern California in insuring that the currently undeveloped Santa Monica Mountains will be preserved for the enjoyment of this and future generations.

No one can seriously doubt that there exists a great need throughout the entire country and, in particular, in southern California, for additional recreational and park facilities. Each year thousands of individuals are precluded from enjoying the unmatched pleasures of the outdoors because of the overcrowded conditions that prevail in the few parks that do exist. This legislation, while it focuses its attention on the serious needs of California, will represent, if implemented, an increased awareness of the Federal Government of the needs of urban dwellers to experience nature in its most unblemished form.

I am firmly convinced that the Toyon National Urban Park as envisioned by this legislation will become a reality. I am able to say this because of the enthusiasm that the residents of the greater Los Angeles area have displayed in support of this idea. They and I will need your help, however, to hasten the implementation of this park.

Those of you who have visited southern California know of the natural beauty that abounds in the area. It would be an unpardonable sin to permit, by inaction or delay, even the partial destruction of the coastline and/or the partial development of the mountain area.

I urge each and everyone of you to seriously ponder the contents of this bill and support its passage.

The bill follows:

H.R. 290

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in order to preserve a national mountain and coastal resource; to provide for public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment of the Santa Monica Mountains and the shores and waters of Santa Barbara Channel and Santa Monica Bay by present and future generations; to preserve natural, scenic, scientific, historic, and other values contributing to public enjoyment of the lands and waters of the area; to enhance the environment of contiguous communities by multiple use of the resources; to provide green belt open spaces with optimum use and development of the water resources; and recognizing the

need of the Greater Los Angeles area for such an open space and recreational resource, there is hereby established the Toyon National Urban Park. The park, subject to valid existing rights, shall generally comprise that area of the Santa Monica Mountains eastward to the San Diego Freeway along the crest of the Santa Monica Mountains and paralleling Mulholland Drive to Griffith Park and westward from the San Diego Freeway and eastward from Point Mugu and westward from Sunset Boulevard, including portions of the beaches and coastal canyons of Santa Monica Bay. Special effort shall be expended by the Secretary of the Interior to acquire all lands, easements and other necessary rights to create a park that is a contiguous whole and maximizes the benefit of the park for the Greater Los Angeles region.

(b) In preserving the mountains and seashore and stabilizing its development, substantial reliance shall be placed on cooperation between Federal, State, and local governments to apply best principles of land use planning and zoning. The Secretary of the Interior shall give full consideration to the recommendations of the State of California Ventura-Los Angeles Mountain and Coastal Study Commission affecting land use, zoning, conservation and development in Los Angeles County and Ventura County and to the terms of any coastline conservation legislation enacted by the State of California, and shall make every effort to encourage the State of California and local governments thereof to establish stringent land use controls in the entire Santa Monica Mountain area as defined in this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) The lands and waters to be acquired by the United States under this Act shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") through the National Park Service. Under direction of the Secretary, the National Park Service shall administer, protect, and develop the park subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, and the Secretary may apply any other statutory authority available to him for the conservation and management of natural resources to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of this Act.

(b) As soon as practicable after acquisition by the Secretary of an acreage within the boundaries of the park which, in his opinion, can be administered efficiently for the purposes of this Act, he shall establish the park by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register.

(c) The Secretary shall study the land use management needs of the entire defined mountain and seashore region and take whatever actions are determined necessary to preserve the established values of the Santa Monica Mountain area, including additional land acquisition. The Secretary shall take whatever action is necessary in order to assure that special precautions will be taken by the State of California and local governmental entities to guard against land use management of the lands surrounding acquired parklands which are incompatible with the acquired lands, in order to preserve the natural continuity of the regional environment.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary is authorized, subject to the limitations, restrictions, and conditions imposed by this Act, to acquire the land and other property and any interests therein by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or by exchange, except that land owned by the State of California or any of its political subdivisions may be acquired only with the consent of the owner.

(b) When acquiring property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property within the boundaries of

the park, and in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under his jurisdiction which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal. The values of the properties so exchanged either shall be approximately equal, or if they are not approximately equal, the values shall be equalized by the payment of cash to the grantor or to the Secretary as the circumstances require.

(c) In exercising his authority to acquire property under this Act, the Secretary shall give immediate and careful consideration to any offer made by a property owner owning property within the boundaries of the park to sell such property to the Secretary. A property owner owning property within the park may notify the Secretary that the continued ownership of that property would result in hardship to him, and the Secretary shall immediately consider such evidence and shall within one year following the submission of such notice, subject to the availability of funds, purchase such property offered for a price which does not exceed its fair market value.

(d) The Secretary, to fulfill the objectives of this Act shall, from time to time, vest in the United States all right, title, and interest in, and the right to immediate possession of, all real property in specific acquisitions within the Santa Monica Mountain and Seashore area as defined in this Act, except real property owned by the State of California or a political subdivision thereof.

(e) With respect to property which the Secretary is authorized to acquire by condemnation under the terms of this Act, the Secretary shall initiate no condemnation proceedings until after he has made every reasonable effort to acquire such property by negotiation and purchase.

(f) The Secretary is authorized to acquire only such interest in lands as is reasonably necessary to establish and maintain the park.

(g) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit the use of condemnation as a means of acquiring a clear and marketable title, free of any and all encumbrances.

(b) The Secretary may use installment purchase, advance acquisition with leaseback provisions, and conservation, agricultural, access, and scenic easements to accomplish the purposes of this Act.

(i) The Secretary shall explore the possibility of obtaining grants and funds from other appropriate government agencies to further land acquisition for the park, construct the necessary facilities to protect the values for which the park was established, and extend the benefits of the recreation and open space resource of the Santa Monica Mountain and Seashore to the Greater Los Angeles region and to the American public.

Sec. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Toyon National Urban Park Advisory Commission. The Commission shall cease to exist nine years after establishment of the park as provided by section 2 of this Act.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of nine members, each appointed for a term of three years by the Secretary, as follows:

(1) five members to be designated by the Secretary, three of whom shall be residents of Los Angeles or Ventura Counties;

(2) one member to be appointed from recommendations made by the board of supervisors of Ventura County;

(3) one member to be appointed from recommendations made by the board of supervisors of Los Angeles County; and

(4) two members to be appointed from recommendations made by the Governor of California.

(c) The Secretary shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy on the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A member of the Commission shall serve without compensation, but shall be

reimbursed for actual expenses incurred incident to Commission business. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expenses reasonably incurred by the Commission.

(e) The Secretary shall provide such staff assistance as is necessary to the Commission in the performance of its duties.

(f) The Commission shall meet at least twice annually at time and place designated by the Chairman. The Commission also shall meet as necessary at the call of the Chairman upon proper cause and due notice given.

(g) The members of the Commission shall have particular experience or expertise in government, conservation, land use planning and acquisition, natural and environmental sciences, or economics.

Sec. 5. (a) The duties of the Commission shall consist of—

(1) advising the Secretary on proposed land uses, priority of such uses, and development plans within the park, consistent with the recreational and open space aspects of the park region.

(2) advising the Secretary of any activities conducted by the Secretary or proposed to be conducted by the Secretary or through others under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (67 Stat. 462) which would have or are likely to have a material influence on the park environment;

(3) advising the Governor of California of any activities conducted by or proposed to be conducted by the Lands Commission of the State of California directly or through others upon the tidelands and shelf lands and waters which would have or are likely to have a material influence on the park environment;

(4) advising the boards of supervisors of Ventura County and Los Angeles County and the city council of any city contiguous or adjacent to the park as to any proposed land use, land development, public works, mineral development, or zoning outside the park which would have or are likely to have a material influence on the park environment.

(5) holding public hearings on National Park Service proposals for acquisition of land and development and use plans and submitting its findings and recommendations to the Secretary; and

(6) assisting the Secretary in conferring with State and local parks and recreation officials to determine the best possible cooperative management program for the park lands;

(7) assisting the State of California and local government entities to assure that land use in the Santa Monica Mountain area is compatible with and supplements the values of the park established herein; and

(8) any other duties prescribed by the Secretary related to the development, use and management of the park and its resources and the environmental impact of the park on the surrounding communities and the environmental impact of adjacent commercial activity on the park.

Sec. 6. (a) Any owner or owners of improved property situated within the area designated for inclusion in the park on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition of such acquisition, retain, for a term of not to exceed thirty years, the right of use and occupancy of such property for any single-family residential purpose which is not incompatible with the purposes of this Act or which does not impair the usefulness and attractiveness of the area designated for inclusion. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the value of the property on the date of such acquisition less the value on such date of the right retained by the owner. Where any such owner retains a right of use and occupancy as herein provided, such right during its existence may be conveyed or leased for noncommercial residential purposes in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(b) Any improved or unimproved property

situated within the area designated for inclusion in the park which by mutual agreement between the Secretary and the owner or owners thereof is used commercially to serve the needs of the public and enhance their enjoyment of the park shall not be subject to purchase or condemnation during the existence of such agreement.

(c) Any deed or other instrument used to transfer title to property, with respect to which a right of use and occupancy is retained under this section, shall provide that such property shall not be used for any purpose which is incompatible with purposes of this Act, or which impairs the usefulness and attractiveness of such area, and if it should be so used, the Secretary shall have authority to terminate such right.

Sec. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as are necessary to accomplish the purpose of this Act.

IN FAVOR OF DIRECT POPULAR ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, today the Nation witnesses another chapter in the charade that is America's system of selecting its President and Vice President. The votes cast in the Electoral College are being counted, and 538 people were allowed to determine the top elected officials in the United States. These 538 electors do not have to vote for the candidate who received the most votes in their State in the November election. Fortunately, 537 did this year. But what of the one who decided to place his feelings above the feelings of those who put him in the position of elector?

In 1968 another elector similarly chose to ignore the vote of the people of his State. One wonders what would happen if such actions by electors actually changed the results of a presidential election. Why should we live with such risks if we really value democratic government? The so-called faithless electors are not the only way that our electoral system can thwart the will of the people of the United States. It is quite possible for 60 percent of the people to vote for one candidate, while the other major candidate, with only about 40 percent of the vote, wins more than 50 percent of the electoral vote. This can be accomplished merely by winning the 12 largest States. A discrepancy between electoral vote and popular vote has not occurred since 1876, but it could easily happen again.

Even this election in 1972, though a landslide, is an example of how unrepresentative the Electoral College is. President Nixon received about 61 percent of the popular vote, but almost 97 percent of the electoral vote. Senator McGovern received 38 percent of the popular vote, but only 3 percent of the electoral vote.

In 1969, the House of Representatives approved a constitutional amendment abolishing the Electoral College and substituting a system of direct popular election of the President. The Senate, unfortunately, failed to act. But we must try

again. The people must truly be made the source of electoral power.

I have proposed a package of election reform bills designed to give people the real power in presidential elections. I have introduced House Joint Resolution 3, a constitutional amendment abolishing the Electoral College, instituting direct election of the President and a national presidential primary system for selecting nominees of political parties. My bill, H.R. 18, sets up the machinery for the election system. Another bill, H.R. 1250, would close the polls in all parts of the country at the same time, in order to reduce the chances that the results of national elections will be broadcast based on eastern returns prior to closing of the polls in the West.

I want our national elections to be the model of efficient democracy that our idealism would expect them to be. I believe my legislation will achieve that aim, and I urge my colleagues to join me in pushing for early action by the House to reform our electoral process.

STOP THE WAR

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of conversation, one would almost be tempted to say excessive oratory, in the Congress over the situation in Southeast Asia.

One of the more intriguing pieces of correspondence I have received on the subject of Southeast Asia is a letter from the Communist Party of Illinois which I insert into the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks. It is my thought that many Members might wish to read this letter as they analyze all points of view on the subject:

COMMUNIST PARTY OF ILLINOIS,
Chicago, Ill., December 20, 1972.

Senator CHARLES PERCY,
Senator ADLAI STEVENSON,
All Illinois Congressmen:

In the name of all that is decent in the world you must stop the war.

At this point only you and your colleagues have the power to end the crimes being committed in the name of our people by compelling Richard Nixon to sign the peace treaty that he agreed to before the election. For you not to do this is to be an accomplice.

The master trickster has exposed his hand. He has revealed the sham of his peace negotiations, now that he is installed in the White House for four more years. The responsibility for the war continuing is Nixon's; the responsibility for ending it now rests with you. No one but Nixon could call the integrity of Vietnam as a country a "minor detail." No one can believe, after years of destruction, that any more bombs can end the war and bring our boys home, including all the prisoners.

Before the elections we Communists and many others warned that Nixon was campaigning for peace while preparing for greater war, with a cynical contempt for the honor and will of our people. It is now clear that Nixon has not given up his aim of keeping South Vietnam as a permanent base of operations for U.S. imperialism on the Asian

mainland. Such hypocrisy has been denounced by leaders across the country and around the world, including the most recent statement of Pope Paul VI.

As long as this war continues we will forever postpone meeting the crises that scream for relief in our schools, hospitals, homes and in our streets. We can wait no longer.

The Communist Party of Illinois, together with thousands of our fellow citizens, call upon you to call for an emergency session of Congress to:

Prohibit any further expenditure of any funds in Southeast Asia for any purpose except the transportation home of every US soldier and piece of military equipment;

Bring impeachment charges and try them against Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States of America, for gross violation of his oath of office to uphold the U.S. Constitution; for usurpation of the peoples' and the Congress' Constitutional rights and powers; and for crimes of genocide against the Vietnamese peoples.

Most urgently yours,

JACK KLING,

Cochairman.

ISHMAEL FLORY,

Cochairman.

ARNOLD F. BECCHETTI,

State Secretary.

LINDA R. APPELHANS,

Organizational Secretary.

REAR ADM. RUFUS J. PEARSON, JR., MEDICAL CORPS, U.S. NAVY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in retirement ceremonies held in the U.S. Capitol January 3, 1973, the Surgeon General of the Navy, Vice Adm. George M. Davis, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy, presented the Distinguished Service Medal on behalf of the President of the United States to Rear Adm. R. J. Pearson, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy, who retired after more than 26 years' active duty, of which the last 6½ were as Attending Physician to the Congress of the United States. The award was presented to Rear Admiral Pearson "for exceptional meritorious service to the Government of the United States in a duty of great responsibility as the Attending Physician to Congress during the period March 1966 to January 1973."

In October 1966, Dr. Pearson was assigned as the Attending Physician to Congress, a position he held for 6½ years and the second physician to hold that post. Dr. George W. Calver, the first physician to Congress occupied the post from 1928 to 1966.

Yearly, several thousand emergency and first-aid treatments are administered at the first-aid rooms in the Capitol buildings. Dr. Pearson effected many improvements in health care and its delivery in the Capitol.

Dr. Pearson was chosen to accompany the majority leader and minority leader of the Senate on their historic trip to China in 1972.

Appreciation of Dr. Pearson's interest in the welfare of the Members of Congress, their families, their staffs, and the

pages has been expressed repeatedly by the Members.

Dr. Pearson was in private practice in Jacksonville, Fla., for 5 years prior to returning to active duty in the Navy. He served as chief of medicine at the naval hospitals, Charleston, S.C., and Portsmouth, Va., and was chief of cardiology at the Naval Hospital, Bethesda, Md., from 1955 to 1961. Before his appointment as Attending Physician, he served as director of clinical services and chief of medicine at the Naval Hospital, Bethesda, Md. He trained at the King's County Hospital, Brooklyn, and at the Grady Hospital, Atlanta, and had additional training in cardiovascular diseases at the Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, under Dr. Paul Dudley White. He is certified by the American Board of Internal Medicine and by the Subspecialty Board in Cardiovascular Diseases.

Dr. and Mrs. Pearson plan to make their home in Whispering Pines, N.C.

Mr. Speaker, I include a biography of Dr. Pearson as well as copies of the citations he received upon his retirement. I wish him well.

BIOGRAPHY

Rufus Judson Pearson, Jr., was born in Atlanta, Georgia, October 8, 1915, a son of Rufus Judson Pearson, Sr., and Myrtle Padgett Pearson. He attended the University of Florida and received his Doctor of Medicine degree from Emory University in 1938. He entered active duty in the U.S. Naval Reserve in 1942 and resumed his civilian practice in Jacksonville, Florida, in 1945. He returned to active duty in 1950. On March 20, 1967, he was promoted to Rear Admiral.

In World War II, Doctor Pearson served overseas with a Navy Construction Battalion and has since served on the medical services at the Naval Hospitals in Jacksonville, Florida; Beaufort, South Carolina, and Bethesda, Maryland. He was Chief of Cardiology at the Naval Hospital, Bethesda, Maryland from 1955 to 1961, and Chief of Medicine at the Naval Hospitals in Charleston, South Carolina and Portsmouth, Virginia. Prior to his assignment as Physician to Congress, he was Director of Clinical Services and Chief of Medicine, Naval Hospital, National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland.

Doctor Pearson has the American Campaign Medal; WWII Victory Medal; National Defense Service Medal (with bronze star in lieu of second award); Armed Forces Reserve (10 yrs.) Medal; and the European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal.

He was married in 1939 to Miss Emily Timmerman of Atlanta, Georgia. They have a daughter, Virginia (Mrs. H. E. Sudders), who was a Peace Corps Nurse in the Dominican Republic for two years and served as a staff nurse with the American Red Cross. A son, LCDR Rufus Judson Pearson III, CEC, USN is a Naval Academy graduate of the Class of 1963. Doctor and Mrs. Pearson plan to reside at 61-A Pine Lake Drive, Whispering Pines, North Carolina 28389.

Doctor Pearson is a Fellow of the American College of Physicians; Fellow, American College of Cardiology; Fellow, Scientific Council, American Heart Association; Member, American Medical Association; Member, Board of Directors, Washington Heart Association; and formerly Associate in Medicine, Georgetown University. He trained at the Kings County Hospital, Brooklyn, and at the Grady Hospital, Atlanta, Georgia, and had additional training in Cardiovascular Disease at the Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, under Doctor Paul Dudley White. He is certified by the American Board of Internal

Medicine and by the Sub-specialty Board in Cardiovascular Disease.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington.

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Distinguished Service Medal to

REAR ADMIRAL RUFUS J. PEARSON, JR.
MEDICAL CORPS

UNITED STATES NAVY
for service as set forth in the following
CITATION

For exceptionally meritorious service to the Government of the United States in a duty of great responsibility as the Attending Physician to the Congress during the period March 1966 to January 1973.

Rear Admiral Pearson brought to his unique position exceptional skill, innovation, farsighted leadership, and the highest sense of dedication. Through his superlative efforts, Members of Congress and their staffs received the best possible medical care.

Rear Admiral Pearson was instrumental in effecting numerous improvements to the health care delivery system in the Capitol complex. In addition to his role as a physician as advisor, consultant, and confidant to the nation's legislators, earning the respect of all with whom he came in contact.

By his distinguished and inspiring devotion to duty, Rear Admiral Pearson reflected great credit upon himself and the Medical Corps, and upheld the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service.

For the President:

JOHN W. WARNER,
Secretary of the Navy.

THE SURGEON GENERAL OF THE NAVY PRESENTS
THIS CERTIFICATE OF MERIT TO

REAR ADMIRAL RUFUS JUDSON PEARSON, JR.
MEDICAL CORPS
UNITED STATES NAVY

For over twenty-six years of distinguished, loyal and exceptionally meritorious service in the Medical Corps of the United States Navy.

Throughout his naval career, Admiral Pearson dedicated his professional energies, clinical skills, and administrative abilities to providing quality health care. During World War II, he served overseas with a Navy Construction Battalion. Subsequently, he was assigned on the Medical Service at Naval Hospitals, Jacksonville, Florida; Beaufort, South Carolina; Bethesda, Maryland; and was Chief of Medicine at Naval Hospitals, Charleston, South Carolina, and Portsmouth, Virginia. Immediately preceding his present assignment, Admiral Pearson served as Chief of Medicine and Director of Clinical Services at Naval Hospital, National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland. To each of these assignments, he brought a high level of professional competence coupled with dynamic leadership, drive, and imagination.

Such impressive credentials as his certification by the American Board of Internal Medicine in both Internal Medicine and Cardiovascular Diseases, his status as a Fellow in the American College of Physicians and the American College of Cardiology, and his vast professional experience made Admiral Pearson imminently qualified for assignment as Attending Physician to the Congress. During his tenure from July 1966 to January 1973, he continually demonstrated his intense devotion to duty and dedication to purpose by totally administering to the medical needs of the members of both Congressional Legislative bodies. In addition, Admiral Pearson served with distinction as Chairman of the Armed Forces Participation Committee for the Presidential Inauguration in January 1969.

On the occasion of his retirement, it is a privilege and a distinct pleasure to record

here our appreciation and gratitude, and to confer upon Admiral Pearson this Certificate of Merit in recognition of a distinguished career in the service of his country.

G. M. DAVIS,
Vice Admiral, Medical Corps, USN.

WHERE HAVE THEY GONE?

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, it is always most encouraging to receive mail from concerned young people who have thoughtfully analyzed a problem and are seeking solutions. Recently Vivian Stanton, a student from Racine, Wis., sent me an excellent theme describing the seemingly endless drive to develop natural areas into commercial areas. I believe her concern reflects the concern of all of us, and I submit her theme for the consideration of all Members of Congress:

WHERE HAVE THEY GONE?

(By Vivian Stanton)

With the rapid development of more housing units and shopping areas to satisfy today's housing and public needs, former playgrounds, picnic areas, forests and farm lands are vastly disappearing. The need for more housing units is a valid one as each year our population growth is steadily rising. With this population growth, one can see, also, the need for more shopping areas to accommodate the soaring demands of today's citizens. But what do these needs lead to?

By building more housing units and shopping areas, we are denying a family and its children the playgrounds and picnic areas formerly used for safe recreational activities. More playgrounds and picnic areas will be taken away from the community as the need for housing units and shopping areas increases as the necessity for having someplace to build them increases. It may not be long before more and more children will be playing in the streets. Soon families will not be able to hold a picnic outdoors or in parks unless they have a large yard in which to do so.

Our beautiful natural forests are on the decline too as the need for more and more wood is increasing for building purposes and the area will be needed for a place in which to build. Remember how much fun it was to walk along the paths in the forests and see the natural beauty that God had created? After a rainfall, these forests were exceptionally beautiful as the trees shimmer in new beauty and everything smells fresh.

As our farmlands are disappearing, if one reads the science magazines, you will find out that scientists are inventing special food capsules and supplements to aid us in the diets we will have to be following in the coming years. A farmer I know of recently had to sell his wheat crop area because a shopping center will be built there in the near future. If one asks our older citizens what has happened to the many farm areas that used to be in the area you are now living in, they will tell you that many houses and shopping centers have taken over these former areas.

I think it is quite clear what has happened to our former areas of activity and work. Our citizens are quite concerned with this problem and are trying to figure out solutions that will skillfully solve and handle this problem. After all, we don't want the entire disappearance of all of these areas. If they all disappeared, where would we go then for fun and activity? Think about it seriously

and see if you can come up with any alternative solutions.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY OR HIGHER TAXES—A POLITICAL GAME

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, prior to adjournment last fall, fiscal responsibility became a campaign issue. The goal, a budget setting a \$250 billion spending limitation, was originally contained in President Nixon's ninth request for an increase in the national debt. The President later abandoned this ceiling limitation in the legislative proposal amidst controversy over who would determine the programs to be cut.

Since adjournment, the President has used the people's desire to limit Federal expenditures as a tool to compromise or reduce various Federal programs affecting different segments of our population. The President's budgetary actions to control Federal spending have forced a hue and cry from many of the federally subsidized groups in America.

Suits have now been filed contesting the President's power to restrict Federal spending to a level less than that appropriated by the Congress. The lobbyists and pressure groups are mobilizing support and forming public opinion to force action by the Congress to break loose the moneys which were appropriated in legislation designed or molded to some degree by these same lobbyists and pressure groups.

I would remind those of our colleagues so earnestly involved in rhetoric against the President's actions that the President told the American people during the recent campaign that he would not seek any tax increases, but that Congress might.

If the President is found to lack legal authority for his stewardship over the Federal budget, or if he is persuaded or stampeded into releasing full appropriations, additional taxes will be inevitable.

If the President yields—and this appears to be the desire of many of our colleagues—the President will lay the blame for the new and/or increased taxes on those who have insisted on emptying the Federal Treasury to fulfill their campaign promises.

FEDERAL GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION MUST BE ENACTED

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, in this Nation in 1971, 10,000 murders were committed in our homes and streets with firearms, with this figure climbing to 21,000 gun deaths when suicides and accidents are included. Handguns were the

weapons in the vast majority of these deaths.

Today I am introducing two bills which together will greatly strengthen our currently very inadequate gun control laws. The first will prohibit the manufacture and sale of handguns, except for law enforcement, military or licensed pistol club use.

My second bill, "The Firearms Registration Act," deals with the registration of all existing firearms, not just handguns, by making it unlawful to possess or to carry a firearm not registered in accord with the provisions of the act. By banning the sale or purchase of handguns and by requiring the registration of all presently held firearms, this legislation should contribute significantly to the reduction of violent crimes in our cities and in our Nation as a whole.

Nearly all the industrial nations of the world require firearms licensing or registration, and many of them prohibit private possession of handguns altogether. Nowhere in the world is the private ownership of handguns on a per-capita basis as high as it is in the United States. In Canada it is 30 handguns per 1,000 people. And in Finland, the Netherlands, Greece, Great Britain, and Switzerland it is less than 5 per 1,000. But in the United States the figure is 135 handguns per 1,000 people, or an average of 4 handguns for every 10 households. And these handguns were responsible for more than 2 out of 3 of all the Nation's homicides.

Few people will deny the correlation between the availability of handguns and the incidence of violent crimes. In the United States there are 5.7 gun murders per 100,000 persons each year, as opposed to 1.9 in Japan, where it is illegal to own, manufacture, or carry a handgun, and to 1.2 in Great Britain, where handgun laws are almost as restrictive.

In the face of this record, can we afford any further delay in enacting legislation which will help prevent the killing that goes on in our homes, streets, and neighborhoods every single day of the year. Do we have to wait for another major public tragedy to thrust the necessity of strong gun control laws again into our consciousness? It is not enough that in 1971, the last year for which figures are available, 10,000 private citizens were murdered with firearms?

New York City has a strict law governing the registration and licensing of guns, but the impact of that law, which I co-sponsored when I sat in the New York City Council in 1967, has been minimal. The reason is obvious—gun control, to really work, must be nationwide in its application. And I intend to press for this Federal legislation.

SPEEDY TRIAL

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill designed to give

meaning to the sixth amendment right to speedy trial.

The median time interval for the disposition of criminal cases has been steadily rising over the past several years. The situation in courtrooms across the Nation has deteriorated to the point where criminal justice has become a matter of disposing of statistical masses. This aids neither society nor the defendant. This only perpetuates the cycle of crime and increases disrespect for justice under the law. In summary, there can be no argument that we must guarantee all criminal defendants the right to a speedy trial. As stated in the Magna Carta:

To no one will we deny justice, and to no one will we delay it.

This legislation is needed for many reasons. For one, speedy trial is without question an effective deterrent to crime. If a deterrence to crime is to be established, there must be a clear, direct, and swift connection between the commission of a crime and the apprehension, trial, and sentencing of an offender. On the other hand, when trials are delayed for months, as they often are, the connection between the defendant's crime and his sentence is broken.

Delays before trial are also responsible for many crimes committed by defendants who are free on pretrial release. The President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia, reporting in 1966, found that 7.5 percent of the persons released on bail in the District were later indicted for offenses allegedly committed while free and awaiting trial. Obviously, an important step in reducing the danger of criminality by released defendants is to shorten the time between arrest and trial.

Delay in bringing criminal defendants to trial also results in countless lost convictions and reductions of charges for serious crimes to charges for minor crimes. It is a simple fact that the longer the time for trial is delayed, the more memories fade, witnesses die or become unavailable, and cases become stale. It is also fact that clogged court dockets result in increased pressures on prosecutors to give the defendant a lesser charge in return for a guilty plea and waiver of jury trial.

Current delays also lower the esteem that citizens have for the criminal justice system. For if this system is to operate effectively, the citizenry must believe that justice is operating fairly. Unless an attempt is made to head off the disaster that our criminal justice system is headed toward, we may look forward only to increasing disgust, complete cynicism, and popular pressure for radical change.

Anxiety and uncertainty about their fate, experienced by many defendants, is one of the obvious costs of delay. The heaviest burden of all falls on the poor defendant who cannot afford bail or retained counsel, and who faces pretrial incarceration. These are the defendants whose jobs and family are completely interrupted when accused of a crime. These are the defendants who cannot return to a normal life until their trial date has arrived or they have decided to

plead guilty. Clearly, something must be done.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will require the trial of Federal criminal defendants within 60 days of their arrest. Failure to accomplish this will result in dismissal of the charge against the defendant. It is recognized that highly unusual circumstances may require a longer period of time to bring some defendants to trial. Allowance for such cases is made in the bill. However, the overwhelming number of criminal cases will not fall under this category. In these instances, the defendant simply must be given a speedy trial.

My proposal also provides for closer and more effective supervision of persons released on bail prior to trial. This would be accomplished through the establishment of pretrial service officers throughout the entire Federal district court system. These officers would supervise released defendants, recommend appropriate release conditions, aid defendants in finding employment, medical, and other social needs, and perform those functions necessary to insure fair and equitable treatment for criminal defendants awaiting trial. To achieve this goal, \$20 million would be authorized annually for expenditure in Federal districts.

Finally, those States which fail to make the reforms necessary to follow the example of Federal courts will face having funds from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration cut off. Since receipt of these Federal funds is a privilege enjoyed by the States, and not an inalienable right, this provision in the bill is intended only to provide States with an incentive to act. Although this incentive should not be required, this is the only action which the Federal Government may take without infringing upon the integrity and inviolability of State court systems.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the prompt consideration of this bill. The need for this legislation is clear. As stated in the task force report to the 1968 Presidential Commission:

As the backlog of cases becomes overwhelming, clearing the docket comes to be an end in and of itself, and haste rather than intelligent deliberation is the norm of practice. Disposition by dismissal or by guilty plea is often characterized by little attention given to the penal and correctional needs of offender.

The time to act is now. Enactment of this bill into law will be required if the constitutional guarantee of right to speedy trials is to have substantive meaning.

REINTRODUCTION OF NEWSMAN'S PRIVILEGE BILL

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing my bill providing for absolute privilege for newsmen to protect their sources of information from being disclosed upon the order of any governmental body.

This bill was introduced last year in the 92d Congress following the "Caldwell Decision" by the U.S. Supreme Court.

At that time I was alarmed at the chilling effect I thought this decision would have upon the traditional protection news personnel have had under the interpretation of the first amendment.

My fears were fully justified.

May I cite just a few of the cases in which newsmen have been jailed in wake of the Caldwell decision?

Peter Bridge, of New Jersey, Bill Farr, of Los Angeles, and John F. Lawrence, chief of the Los Angeles Times Washington Bureau have all been incarcerated for failure to comply with court-ordered disclosure of news materials or sources.

The recent announcement by the White House Chief of Telecommunications Policy that the Federal Communications Commission will hold local stations accountable when their license is up for renewal as to the content of network news shows is an astoundingly frank attack on the first amendment and works to add to the "chill" that pervades every news room in the country now that the administration is on the attack.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, is simple in content, clear in meaning.

It provides that no person connected with or employed by the news media or press can be required by a court, legislature, or any administrative body, to disclose before the Congress or any other Federal court or agency, any information or source of any information procured for publication or broadcast.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is vitally needed.

Bill Farr of the Los Angeles Times remains in jail today, the victim of an erosion of basic liberties that is being fostered by this administration.

Let us act now, Mr. Speaker, to halt this erosion. Let us act now to protect our most basic civil liberty—the right to free speech and the right to know.

THE DYNAMICS OF THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I bring to the attention of my colleagues an address by Dr. Robert P. Gerholz, chairman of the board of Ferris State College in my congressional district, and a gentleman I believe gives us a great insight into the drive which has brought our Nation to the greatness which it has achieved and points the way for our continued drive to meet the responsibility which that greatness bears.

It is common these days to hear talk of evils of our free enterprise system and the burdens which it has placed on society. I think it is a mistake to overlook the great good which has been brought to society through the operation of the free enterprise system as we look to the future and the solution of

the many problems which we face as individuals and as a nation. The searching nature of man to perfect himself and his surroundings breeds a confidence which is enhanced and fostered by our system of free enterprise and dynamic growth.

I commend to my colleagues a perceptive analysis of this dynamic movement and the future it holds:

THE DYNAMICS OF THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

(By Robert P. Gerholz)

Thank you. Thank you very much. I am greatly honored at this invitation. It is a pleasure to be here.

I believe there is nothing more important in these swiftly changing times than a continuing and meaningful dialogue between the business and academic communities and I am privileged to be able to participate in it.

I welcome this opportunity to share with you some of my observations, experiences, optimism, spade work and above all, my faith in the free enterprise system and my confidence that it is destined to play a vital role in solving society's problems.

A BRIEF HISTORIC FRAME OF REFERENCE

We lack experience with the culture created by the scientific revolution. We have not adjusted our behavior to the knowledge we now have gained. Mankind or his erect relatives have lived on this planet at least four million years. If we consider just the history of the past 50,000 years of mankind's existence, and divide them into lifetimes of 62 years each, we ourselves live in the eight-hundredth lifetime. Now then, mankind has spent 650 such lifetimes in caves. Writing has been possible in only the last 70 lifetimes. Only during the last six has printing been available. We have been able to measure time precisely in only the last four. The electric motor came along only during the last two. In our lifetime we face the revolution in knowledge made possible by electronics, cybernetics, nuclear and biological engineering, and space science. We are going through cultural shock, what the writer Alvin Toffler calls future shock. Because we have such small experience with the culture we have just now created, we are likely to be making some blatant errors in the way we do things which nevertheless our leaders confidently believe are just exactly right for us.

The context of ecology illustrates our proclivity to error. Ecology, Garrett Hardin points out, teaches us that "you cannot do only one thing." Large scale and fundamental technology like ours interacts with the environment to produce unexpected and unwanted results, but these results could be foreseen if we perceived events in broader perspective. Interdisciplinary study and systems analysis in essence mean the broadening of perspective. Our complex systems where everything depends on everything else do not respond to simple solutions. In fact, the chances are that our intuitive and simple solutions are likely to worsen matters. Urban renewal, slum clearance, public housing, farm subsidies and many other such simple enthusiasms illustrate this truth.

In our hyper-critical world, perhaps no country, no system and not set of political, social or economic institutions, come in for a larger share of criticism than the American free enterprise system. This, despite the fact that it is conceived and based on enlightened capitalism and constitutional democracy, and has proved to be the greatest economic system the world has ever known. Much maligned as it is by Communist propaganda, the U.S. nevertheless feeds much of the world—including, at time, Communist Russia.

Can the essence of our great enterprise system be defined, described, and analyzed in a few brief paragraphs? Permit me to try! To

me, the American free enterprise system is "We the people." It is not owned by, or sponsored by, any of the Federal, state, county, or city governments, nor is it designed to serve the interests of a single class, racial group, or political party. Rather, it is owned by, and influenced by, us the people. It is we who make it function for all. It is a system in which more than 82 million people work hard to supply the products and services demanded by millions of people. It is the most highly-developed example the world has ever seen of the immutable law of supply and demand. It can, therefore, best be described as the "freedom-of-opportunity" system. A system in which each person is free to learn as much as he desires; to work as hard as he wishes; to be paid in proportion to his efforts. A system in which the Horatio Alger story is told and retold, every day of every week of every month of every year. For truly it can be said that a man can advance as far as he wants to go, dependent only on his capacity for knowledge, productivity and creativity.

A system which is almost perfect in this virtually continuous availability of freedom of opportunity—but a system which has never been, nor ever will be, perfect in its operation. Perfection is always a desirable goal, but it is unattainable in a system which is so inextricably bound to be an interweaving of checks and balances. Strong local and national unions; strong individual managements and associates; government in the role of a strong moderator and arbitrator—all combine to produce a balanced economy—the strongest the world has ever known. An economy that produced, when I started school in 1901, a gross national product of 20.7 billion dollars; that produced, when I started in business in 1922, a gross national product of 76 billion dollars; that will produce in this year that I am meeting with you, a gross national product in excess of 1130 billion dollars.

The fact that economic growth is not without its social benefits as well as its social costs may seem to many so obvious that it needs no further elaboration. But it may serve a constructive purpose at this stage of national debate to highlight some of the positive attributes of a high and sustained rate of national production. Those who can recall the great depression will well remember that just a generation ago a third of this nation still found itself ill-clothed, ill-housed, and ill-fed. Today, poverty is far less widespread. Even so, nearly a tenth of all families remain at or below the poverty level, as currently defined. Given sustained growth in national output over the two decades ahead, the economy's increased capacity to alleviate poverty could reduce the number with incomes below \$3,000 to 3 percent. No other nation in the world has ever achieved so complete a transformation of its income distribution in so short a period of time.

Still another positive accompaniment of rising economic growth has been our increased investment in human resources in the form of higher education. A generation ago, fully half of all adult Americans had received only an elementary education, at best. In contrast, over half of all adult population in 1970 had completed high school, moreover 20 percent had gone to college as against 7½ percent in 1940. As one of our larger industries, education employs some three million people and is used by 25 percent of our citizens. From 1950 to 1971 the budget for the U.S. school system rose from \$8 billion to \$73.6 billion—an 800 percent increase. During the same period the gross national product rose 250 percent. Tragically, despite massive doses of tax funds doled out in the last 20 years, education is in deep trouble. Its problems are financial, social, philosophical and managerial—problems so great that we cannot expect educators alone to solve them.

Just as our technology is geared to produce better products in the most economical way, we should make education an increasingly more efficient and effective process. Accountability is the keystone to effective education.

Our society needs more goods and services of many kinds; better housing, improved mass transportation, more adequate facilities for health and education, and increased pollution control. It is likely that the funds for such investment will not come from the cutback in the production of cosmetics, for instance, but from an overall increase in national output. Moreover, a reduction in growth would result in a severe blow to the aspirations of the economically disadvantaged, especially minority groups. Looking beyond our shores for the developing and underdeveloped areas of the world and their rising expectations? This is no plea for "economic growth at any price," particularly at the cost of further environmental deterioration. Instead, the emphasis here is upon the positive contribution a more productive society, alter as it now is to the threat of ecological disaster, can make toward the solution of its social and cultural as well as its ecological problems. Thus, looking at the total environment of the nation, it seems probable that direct attempts to reduce GNP growth would create many more problems than they would resolve.

American businessmen today need a revolution in communications. By our silence we are defaulting on our very real responsibility to defend the American system of free enterprise against assault by an increasing host of critics across the land. The recent trend of the public dialogue has been overwhelmingly toward what is bad with America. Dissatisfaction and distrust for so-called establishment institutions have replaced respect and pride in traditional values. The beautiful, the strong, the solid, hopeful and resourceful qualities of America are obscured in the ugly, dispirited, divided portrayal that has become so familiar today.

Many of the adverse opinions of business and its ultimate worth are the products of today's overall negative atmosphere. They are impressions that can be refuted by facts. But business seems to have lost its voice just when it needs it most. On the other hand, the more radical opponents of business are at no loss for words. Unhindered by respect for truth or any sense of responsibility, they hammer away at the system. An increasing number of Americans are listening to them, and believing them, because they hear few other voices. It is hard to see how anyone weighing the accomplishments of the last two hundred years could favor abolishing the system that made them possible. The time has long passed when the businessmen of this nation could afford to let our case before the court of public opinion go by default. We can begin by communicating a vital truth to the sincere critics of American business. That truth is our goals are, mainly, the same as their goals. We are working to abolish poverty in the only way it can be abolished—by providing jobs. We are fighting racial injustice the best way we can—with fair employment practices. We are not blind to urban blight. Environmental pollution is our frustration too. What makes our critics believe that business is less concerned about the national quality of life than is government, or the academic community, or youth?

The alternative to a society based on profit-motivated free enterprise is a society based on compulsion, a government-planned and controlled economy and loss of individual freedoms. We need not look into ancient history to find examples of such societies. They exist today—to the shame and debasement of their people. Business alone has the nearest thing to the right combination of facilities, techniques and talents needed to rebuild our cities, to raise the quality of our

natural environment, to create jobs and abolish poverty, to extend the benefits of the American system to all our people, and to restore the sense of balance and direction we seem to have lost.

Six years ago, my wife and I visited Greece for the first time. Magnificent experience. Poor country, but a wonderful country; wonderful people. I read several books before I went over and we were fortunate in having a young lady interpreter who spoke perfect English and was an historian and an archaeologist. The age of pericles was a "Golden" age. It's called that in the history books and it was. These people over a period of time became largely free from want, illiteracy and disease. Then they tried for the fourth freedom—the so-called "wonderful freedom"—freedom from responsibility and the golden age of pericles was no more. If I had any hope for the future, if I were to make a toast for the future, I would hope we would never arrive at a period when we were free of individual responsibility—not merely for the operation of our family, our churches, colleges and universities, our political machines, our cities, our communities, our country, but the operation of our own individual self, spiritually, politically, culturally, socially, economically.

Our business is on the threshold of an era in which yesterday's problems are becoming today's opportunities. And in the name of corporate social responsibility, we are beginning to turn obstacles into springboards. Today in an age of rising expectations, where improved technology and rapid communication, fuel people's hopes of a job for everybody, a good home for everybody, good health and nutrition for everybody—among the many other egalitarian and humanitarian goals our society has set for itself. But we are just now beginning to look at what is possible as well as what is desirable—to examine what we can realistically expect from ourselves and then establish the order in which we will achieve it. Industry is determined to promise only what it can deliver in areas of social concerns. The primary social responsibility of the economic sector, the business sector, is to generate the wealth—that is, the money, jobs and goods and services—the wherewithal which enables the other sectors of society to carry out their primary social jobs. Whatever else the business corporation can and should do to help solve social problems in the process of making a profit, its first social responsibility is to produce the wealth required by all of society's institutions—public and private—so that they, in turn, can do what they are supposed to do.

Our society today demands increasing participation—and as we participate, we are asked to account publicly for our actions. To provide more of the information that builds confidence and public understanding. In the light of recent international events, it is perhaps not inappropriate to remind ourselves of the ancient Chinese proverb that "The longest journey begins with the first step." This we have taken. What next? Well, we're on the move. We must move expeditiously to integrate social concerns into new and old institutional frameworks of our business. And this returns us to our opening theme—How to harness society's demands for a higher quality of life to the economic generators of business.

As I reflect on the parlous temper of our times and the great gift for mutual understandings which meetings like this afford, I experience a deep sense of faith in the future of our common enterprise. We all recognize dozens of developments even now beginning to take shape on the horizons of the future. We shall pursue them with ingenuity and dedication—the public must be well served. Are we not required to contribute to the blurring of the traditional and historical boundaries which have set off the private

from the public sector? Are we not determined to contribute our share—and more—to improving the quality of life in America? No one, for example, makes news by reminding us of how well our system—even with its flaws—is working. No one makes headlines by recalling that today, as usual, the American people are creating and using one-third of the world's output of goods and services, but have only six percent of the world's population and seven percent of its land area. No one creates a stir by reminding us that today, as usual, most Americans did not go to work; that more than one out of three went to school. Another one out of 10 was over 65 and retired; that only about 87 million of our more than 208 million citizens usually work. No one arouses interest by pointing out that to produce a total national output of more than one trillion dollars a year, about 81 million civilians work a five day week. Yes, 82 million gainfully employed at the highest wages and salaries in history. That one family in six has an income of \$15,000 or more; that the middle family income is about \$10,000, and that only one family out of eight is poor.

But despite the fact these are not exciting truths, the fact is they do exist; these events do take place; the American system has and will continue to work. Refinements may be needed or changes may be necessary. No one claims today's system is the answer to problems fifty years from now, just as the system of the post World War I era would fall to fill the needs of our economy in 1972. For as our nation enters the decade of its 200th anniversary as a nation, we find ourselves seeking longer and clearer perspectives on the programs and directions of our nation and our society. Whatever we undertake—individually, in small or larger groups, in our colleges and universities, or as a nation—will greatly depend on the understanding which we apply to the economic means through which we seek these goals. Our American "system," which has surmounted great challenges in the past, will continue to serve us well in the future if we take pains to explain and to understand its workings, and exercise our every considerable powers of choice in the light of that understanding.

Poised on the tiny planet we call Earth stand the mighty engines, flexing rocket muscles, crammed with computer brains—eager and almost ready for their rumbling journeys to the stars. They measure thrust in millions of pounds, costs in billions of dollars and the man-hours already spent on them are measureless.

On the front of the National Archives Building in Washington is the inscription "What is past is prologue." Much of tomorrow can be predicted with confidence because it has its roots in today. The American businessman has built the most creative and productive economy in all history. But he is oriented toward the future, and thus seldom has a chance to see himself and his work as a product and part of a unique and spectacular historical process. Here is the story, in capsule form of how this Nation's economy and its managers have come to be emulated, envied, deplored and depended upon, around the globe. As you move along the inspiring pathway of American History, you quickly discover the reason for the greatness of this nation. It is the genius of the competent businessman that combines labor, capital and raw materials to produce a vast outpouring of goods for the enrichment of the lives of the masses. It is the genius of the workingman, whose labor, self-discipline and thrift are vital to the creation and operation of modern industry. It is the genius of the great doctor that frees children from crippling disease. It is the genius of the talented architect that creates magnificent buildings. It is the genius of the devoted teacher that inspires youth to greatness. It is the genius of the dedicated public servant that enables good government to survive.

Those who built this nation to its present greatness believed in the invincibility of intelligence, economy and hard work. Guided by providence they entered a wilderness with vision, industry, and courage. They took the forked stick and made a steel plow. They took the rude sickle and made a reaper. They took the wagon and made an engine, an automobile, an airplane, a tractor. They made an iron thread into an ocean cable, rough type into great color printing presses, and steel beams into soaring skyscrapers. They made forest trails into magnificent highways. They put the little red schoolhouse and the little white church on a thousand hills.

America is great because individual men have freedom and equality, because individual men have been given the incentive to create, to produce, and to save, because individual men have been rewarded for their labor with a generous share of the goods, they helped to produce. America has taken its place among the great civilizations of history because the cornerstone upon which the republic rests is the social, economic, and spiritual betterment of individual men.

To men and women of great vision, dedication, courage and faith, I want to share this prayer—God give us men! A time like this demands strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hands; men whom the lust of office does not kill; men whom the spoils of office cannot buy; men who possess opinions and a will; men who have honor; men who will not lie; men who can stand before a demagogue and damn his treacherous flat-teries without blinking; tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog in public duty and in private thinking.—JOSIAH GILBERG HOLLAND, 1819-81.

ADDRESS OF HON. RALPH FALCO,
OF SYRACUSE, AT THE TESTIMO-
NIAL DINNER IN AMSTERDAM,
N.Y., FOR ANGELO "SUSIE" SAR-
DONIA ON NOVEMBER 4, 1972

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last November the people of my home city of Amsterdam, under the leadership of the Columbian Social Club, tendered a testimonial dinner to one of the great leaders of our community, Angelo "Susie" Sardonía, an alderman of the city and long an effective leader in community affairs.

Principal speaker of that affair was the Honorable Ralph Falco, a former Amsterdam citizen, businessman, and community leader, who came from his present home in Syracuse to pay a well-deserved tribute to his longtime friend "Susie" Sardonía.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point the text of the remarks of Mr. Falco, which I am sure will be of great interest:

ANGELO "SUSIE" SARDONIA

Who is this Angelo "Susie" Sardonía being honored this evening? What has he done to warrant this testimonial? This is a question being asked by some.

Well, as a proud native born and devoting most of my 70 years to the 5th Ward, it has been my privilege to observe Sue's actions in our neighborhood. Religious, civic, social, patriotic and family life.

Too many people tend to overlook those who have devoted much of their life through

hard work and sacrifice to themselves and their families to making their community and their country a better place in which to live.

During all of my years in public affairs, it was my privilege to meet many wonderful men and women in all walks of life and one of the men who is "tops" in accomplishments is Sue Sardonía. He lived up to the heritage bestowed by his wonderful parents, I knew them well. This Christian father and mother team—religion was their first priority. True Catholics.

THIS IS YOUR LIFE, ANGELO "SUE" SARDONIA

It all started in a small town—Acerenza, Potenza, Italy. There a young lady, Angelina Monaca (nun) met and married a gallant young man, Sardonía.

With two daughters, Mary and Catherine, they left Italy to settle in Poultney, Vermont where your dad found employment in the slate quarries. His work taught him to become fearless as he climbed up and down the quarry pits. It was in one of these quarries that you and two sisters almost met with tragedy while sliding on ice formed over the slate in the quarry—while the ice was cracking and pulling you downwards, your brave father reached the pit in time to save you from being swallowed beneath the ice and sharp slate. Thanks to your brave father "Sue" or there would have been no "testimonial tonight." I knew and respected him very much.

Now we come to Angelina, your saintly mother. Yes, I can still see her as she clung onto the armory wall, tired but always walking, every morning back and forth to her church with ten children, six girls and four boys. She was quite a busy mother but always managed her attendance at daily mass. Born in Italy were your sisters, Mary and Catherine, and here in America, your sister of happy memory Rose, then the happy occasion their first boy—you! Angelo, then Ann, Betty, Donata, James and then for good measure a couple of more boys, Anthony and John.

Your parents decided to move to Amsterdam a growing community with plenty of opportunities for young people. Your dad was employed by the then New York Power and Light Company where he becomes foreman. Quite an accomplishment in those days. But to make ends meet, it was necessary for team work and so dad and mom would work a garden in the early morning hours and often work until dusk.

While Pa and Ma worked the garden, the children sewed buttons on cards as did most southside children during those "child labor days." I am familiar with this task because together with my sisters, I also joined the child labor market. Even though I always agreed that young people should be kept busy, I personally never enjoyed sewing buttons on cards and became an early drop out. I understand that Sue followed my career as a drop out by continuously losing costly needles.

The Sardonías resided in the 5th Ward where neighbors learned to know and appreciate this most unusual family who always went out of their way to become "good neighbors." During harvest time, Ma and Pa Sardonía always shared much of the fruits of their labor with friends and neighbors. This outstanding trait became a genuine characteristic of the children. Love of neighbor!

Papa Sardonía was known for his love of nature, plants and especially trees and was known as the neighborly "tree surgeon". While trimming one of his neighbor's trees at the age of 64, he fell and was fatally injured losing his life in the service of his neighbors. Mama continued at the helm and lived until age 86.

A daughter, Mary, the first child I knew well during our days as co-employees at the

then Mohawk Carpet Mills. She lived up to her mother's religious faith by quitting work at the factory and becoming a nun now in her 48th year of teaching and currently stationed in Hudson, N.Y.

Sue's young sister, Donata, a beautiful young lady that I thought would end up in Hollywood, finally ended up being courted by a handsome young man and is now the queen at the Chiara household. Under the careful direction and guidance of Ma and Pa Sardonía, the Sardonía children are all happily situated.

With this background of love, hard work and faith it is no surprise to find so many here this evening to honor a young man for a job well done. I have known Alderman Sardonía well for a long, long time and I'm sure happy to join with you in this testimonial to a most unusual man.

Sue married Helen Reichle, a faithful wife and mother of Sue's three wonderful children. I know that this saintly wife, mother and grandmother of happy memory is looking on tonight to say—"You deserve all this Sue, I know."

I need not repeat his many deeds and accomplishments, you know what they are and that's why you are here. I do however, wish to touch on the few outstanding events and deeds that I am familiar with and will list them briefly.

1. Of first priority is his character. He is well bred, loves people like brothers and sisters.

2. One of his finest traits is his sense of humor, always happy, laughing, humorous in every area of his activities—remember the many plays where he portrayed the comedian so well and always for a good cause. "Hia Cumber is his greatest salutation. With a jovial gesture of his arm, I can still hear him—Hia Ralph—Hia Marie—Hia Cumber! He has many more cumbares than any man I have ever known.

Remember him in the ring back of Lanzl's where he received his "Dale Carnegie" course in "public speaking". "And in this corner ladies and gentlemen. We have Mat Perfetti—Measles Rocco, etc., etc.

3. His patriotism is outstanding—you know the greatest, proudest and most notable achievement of his life is his work during the Second World War resulting in the most beautiful memorial in this country honoring our 5th ward boys and girls, those who served and returned and those deceased. A 5-year project.

This great deed alone is worthy of documentation in book form.

4. Recreation—Yes, he promoted recreation, all forms of recreation for young and old.

Remember, Port Jackson Bocci Club—softball league; Fifth Ward Bowling League—Sec., 20 years, Fifth Ward Playground for Children.

5. Church—Sue is a member and a very dedicated parishioner of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church. Has participated in and directed many fund raising events for his church. On parish council.

He is chairman of the building and ground committee. Active member of Holy Name and St. Anthony Society.

Works for the Boy Scout troop and Our Mount Carmel Mardi Gras.

6. Civic activities

I have personally been involved in politics and government for more than 50 years and one of my main concerns over the years had been searching for better candidates and help recruit them for public office. As I watched Sue in his many and varied activities, I suggested that he run for alderman. I thought so much of his ability that I asked the Republican Party to endorse him. They refused. He must be doing an excellent job, he has held the post longer than any other man.

I would suggest that you elect him mayor

so that another person may assume the post as alderman.

Service Men's News

Dedicated to the south side boys.
Managing editor—Angelo Sardonis.
Items from a few of the issues:
For almost three years "Service Men's News" was the media for communications between our service men stationed in all military areas in the world and their parents, relatives and friends.

Items

Service men on leave—Reinforcements on the way.
Wedding bells—Contributors.
Our loss—Father Reidy—February 16, 1945—President Roosevelt—April 12*.
Latest arrivals—Honorably discharged.
Sports column—A request*.
Short shorts—Final issue* victory V.E. Day*.

Masterpieces

Poems
"The Weary Soldier" By Zip Bianchi APO 776.
"A Tribute To Our War Heroes" By Mrs. Priscilla Zumbolo, Mongillo.
"In Memoriam to Father Reidy" by Ralph Melillo.
"In God's Country" By Joseph Greco/Michael Mancini.
"Blood and Guts Is on the Ride" By Peter Beldine.
"Resolutions" By Peter Beldine.
"Mail From Home" By Pvt. Michael Natale.

A PERSONAL TRIBUTE TO HON.
WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

HON. GERALD R. FORD
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we all know of the tremendous service rendered by our former colleague, William M. McCulloch, during the quarter of a century he spent in this House.

It is therefore appropriate that a friend of Bill's, James F. Dicke II, international operations manager for the Crown Controls Corp. of New Bremen, Ohio, should have put into words the feeling that we all have for our retired colleague.

With the unanimous consent of the House, I would like to insert a letter from Mr. Dicke to Bill McCulloch—a letter of personal tribute—at this point in the RECORD for all Members to read. The letter follows:

NEW BREMEN, OHIO,
December 18, 1972.

HON WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: This is a note to thank you for the 1973 Congressional Calendar and for more. Upon receiving the calendar this year, the thought occurred to me that this will be the last Congressional Calendar I will be receiving from your office. It is with sorrow and reflection that the members of your constituency view your much deserved retirement from a life of public service.

You have represented our district in a manner that reflects a sense of honor and pride in us. It has been a representation in our name of views which are not narrowly partisan or narrowly pointed at a constituency. It has been a reflection of what has been best for our nation as a whole; it has been a service that has been greatly appreciated.

For me personally, however, it has been

even more than that. Now corporation executive, I learned many and valuable lessons at your hand. The desire to never ask anything of your staff that you wouldn't do yourself... the approach to each problem with an open mind... the willingness to spend the time to instruct and reflect. It was an honor for me to have once been a part of your summer staff. It was the most constructive and the shortest summer I have ever spent. It was the summer of 1966.

That summer there were the early morning meetings each day with the President... with the Attorney General... with Chairman Celler... with Leader Ford... with the Judiciary Committee... with the entire leadership... and with countless others in an attempt to help further the cause of Civil Rights. That summer the passage of the Civil Rights Bill failed, but you did not. Similar legislation was reintroduced a short time later and was passed.

Much has been said about your Civil Rights efforts. So much has been said in fact, that it would seem to overshadow a career that has been a fiscally responsible string of inspired service. I won't belabor the point with a string of praises. It wouldn't be fair.

Just allow me to say "thanks" to you and to that lovely tower of strength, Mabel, for representing the Fourth District of Ohio and our nation.

With every good wish, I am,
Sincerely,

JAMES F. DICKE II.

ELECTION DAY REFORM BILL

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation declaring election day a national holiday. This holiday bill has been introduced before, but hearings have never been held. The low turnout in this year's election, 55 percent of the eligible voters, clearly demonstrates the need to take some action.

Title I will declare election day to be a national holiday.

Title II will create simultaneous voting hours throughout the continental United States in presidential elections. Simultaneous voting hours should be enacted to prevent projected election results of Eastern States from having an effect on voters on the west coast.

Title III directs the Election Clearinghouse of the General Accounting Office to report to the Congress, 1 year after enactment, on the feasibility of moving the election date to October, and problems relating to voting efficiency such as the number of precincts and ballot size.

By moving election day into October, campaigns would be shorter, less expensive, and the weather would be more conducive to a larger vote. The present election date was established by Congress in 1845.

One disturbing factor in the past election was the paradox of a low voter turnout and reports of long waiting lines at the polls. From 1960 to 1970 the number of precincts dropped while the number of eligible voters increased by 30 million. The extremely long ballots in some States also reportedly discouraged some voters.

The right to vote is the most basic

civil right Americans possess. Each citizen should have the opportunity to vote with the minimum of inconvenience. Declaring election day a national holiday, simultaneous voting hours, and the additional study will better enable all people to exercise their basic right to vote.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer, in an article reviewing the past year, described the election snafu which occurred there. This was the No. 1 news story of the year in the Cleveland area. The article which appeared on January 1, 1973, and a copy of the legislation follows below. [From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Jan. 1, 1973]

MAY ELECTION SNAFU DOMINATED 1972 EVENTS

(By Thomas J. Brazaitis)

If any event of 1972 made even a slight impression on the sands of local history, it was the day the system broke down.

The date was May 2, the time about 6:30 a.m. Telephones jangled incessantly on the second floor of the gray, boxy building at the corner of E. 24th Street and Payne Avenue N.E., headquarters for the Cuyahoga County Board of Elections.

At voting places here and there across the country, grim lines of voters, some of them 18-year-olds waiting to cast their first ballots, stood in front of locked voting machines or at broken-down machines, or at machines bearing the ballot of an election past.

Thus began the election that wasn't, the story of the year.

What was to have been the first totally mechanized election in the county became a fiasco of colossal proportions.

In an unprecedented order, U.S. District Judge Frank J. Battisti extended voting hours to 11:59 that night after thousands of voters were turned away because of logistical failures.

It took a special court-ordered election the following Tuesday in 34 precincts to clean up the badly flawed primary.

George E. Plagman, the voting machine supervisor, tried to shoulder the blame.

"I goofed," he told a nationwide television audience.

But newspaper editors and opposition-party politicians demanded the scalps of the election board members. Before they could be summarily lynched, the board members ordered an investigation of themselves and their operation.

The story dominated headlines for days as red-eyed workers counted and recounted votes. Democrats George McGovern and Hubert H. Humphrey waited impatiently. By the time all the ballots were accounted for, interest had shifted to primaries in other parts of the country.

Just when the investigation by a blue-ribbon panel was heating up, Joseph A. Cipollone, the elections director, resigned. Cipollone thus nominated himself as sacrificial lamb on the political altar. Others were spared.

Secretary of State Ted W. Brown, while on a seemingly innocent visit to Cedar Point, reopened the case by sending telegrams to three of the four board members, notifying them they were fired.

When his action was overturned by the Ohio Supreme Court, Brown settled for putting the board on probation until the November election. The investigators' report said Brown was as guilty as the board members in causing the election breakdown.

Under new Elections Director Virgil E. Brown, who introduced a failsafe system of checks and double checks, the November voting was almost flawless. And, at least for the moment, the election board was off the hook.

EXECUTIVE PROTECTION SERVICE

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, street crime in our cities continues to plague our citizens. Too many feel they are prisoners in their own apartments after dark. While simply having more patrolmen on the beat will not solve the problem, it will ameliorate it. One measure I reintroduced on the first day of this Congress would help in this fight against crime by giving the Executive Protection Service permanent responsibility for guarding foreign missions throughout the country, thus relieving local police of this duty.

The Executive Protection Service was established as an adjunct to the White House Secret Service to protect foreign missions in the District of Columbia. New York City has been particularly hard hit by the demands on its police department for the protection of foreign missions. The drain on the city is felt both in the police manpower not available to patrol the streets and in the nearly \$2 million a year the city pays for this guard service. Crime in the 19th precinct, where most of the consulates are located, has spiraled so that the area is now first in Manhattan in auto theft and second in burglary. Stores keep their doors locked during daylight hours and many businesses and residents have hired their own private security guards.

New York City is not the only city that will receive relief from this bill. It will also assist other major metropolitan areas such as Boston, Chicago, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Detroit, Los Angeles, San Francisco, St. Louis, Richmond, New Orleans, Denver, and Kansas City. Each of these cities has a number of consulates located within it.

It is not fair that we place this burden of police costs and the removal of police from regular duty for the protection of foreign missions on the cities already burdened with financial and police crises. The United Nations and foreign consulates do not serve just the particular city they are located in, but the entire country. It is only appropriate that the Federal Government provide the consulates with the guard service they require as they do in Washington, D.C., and absorb the full cost of special police protection.

I hope this bill will receive speedy and favorable consideration by the 93d Congress.

RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEE ANNUITY INCREASE BILL INTRODUCED

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce what I consider to be one of the major bills to be considered in the 93d Congress by the

House Post Office Committee and its Retirement Subcommittee, which I chair.

This bill, which will increase the annuities of those Federal retirees who need greater benefits the most, is a fair and equitable bill and ought to be adopted as soon as possible.

The bill also contains a provision whereby a minimum level of benefits is created to match that minimum set by the social security system.

Mr. Speaker, the retirees who left the Federal Service prior to October 20, 1969, receive a lesser level of benefits than do retirees who left the Service after that date. This inequity caused by amendments to the retirement law, can be corrected by passage of this bill.

I am very hopeful that these loyal Americans, who dedicated their lives to serving the people of the United States, can be treated justly and fairly and that the Congress will see fit to pass this bill into law.

AMERICA'S GOOD NAME
BESMIRCHED**HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, for the United States of America this was the most miserable Christmas season in memory. I have never known a time when so many people felt too sick at heart, too ashamed of their country, to celebrate.

Even in the depth of the depression in 1932, even in the first grim weeks after Pearl Harbor, there was a sense of challenge, of determination, of unity in the face of deep trouble. In the 1972 Christmas season, however, in spite of all the glitter and surface gaiety and apparent affluence, there was a choking sense for many that our country had reached a low point in its history. Even people who up till now have supported the war, justifying the bombing as a matter of military necessity, have seen the recent phase as the action of a giant bully trying to torture a weak adversary into submission over what had been described as an inconsequential area of disagreement, and had been horrified.

For the benefits of my colleagues, I want to quote from three documents. The first is a letter from a man of 71, a staid, basically conservative historian who for years was not convinced that the Vietnam war was a mistake. The day after Christmas he wrote to me as follows:

I urge that you and your colleagues in the House of Representatives impeach Nixon. You know the grounds better than I.

I believe all wars to be cruel, although sometimes they may seem to be necessary. But our involvement in the Vietnamese civil war was already proved to be a stupid undertaking in Johnson's time. Now under Nixon the good name of this country has been truly besmirched. The useless bombing of a small country whose leaders refuse to bow before us will be a cause for shame for ages to come.

The Democratic party, which has a clear majority in both houses of Congress, must come out against Nixon's Vietnam policy. If we had a parliamentary form of government

(which we do not), the Democratic leadership could call for a division and, if necessary, go to the people in a special election. Under our Constitution you and other leaders in the party cannot do that. But you can bring impeachment proceedings against a president who has so obviously gone against the popular wishes in prolonging our part in the Vietnam civil war.

Nixon probably could not and still cannot "stop the war" between the factions among the Vietnamese. But he has failed the people of the United States by not putting an end to our participation in the conflict in the way he led our people to expect him to do in 1968 and in 1972.

Regardless of what Nixon, Kissinger and company can accomplish in the days ahead, and of course I hope they can bring about a ceasefire, the record of what Nixon is responsible for (loss of life by bombing, etc.) during four years of his presidency should be sufficient for charges against him as severe as those brought against Nazis and Japanese at the trials in Nuremberg and Tokyo after World War II, high crimes justifying impeachment.

The second document I want to quote to you is a statement of protest entitled "We Are All Guilty" written during Christmas week by a journalist-lawyer-author who has long opposed the war:

WE ARE ALL GUILTY

Men, women and children are being murdered in Vietnam—dismembered, crushed, burned, disembowelled—by the hundreds, by the thousands, day by day.

Never in history has the world witnessed a slaughter like this, where the killers sit safely at home wishing each other Merry Christmas and Happy New Year, while the instruments of death they have fashioned and launched lay waste whole cities, exterminate whole populations, on the other side of the world.

All of us, because we are Americans, share the guilt. It is our President whom we have just freely elected by an overwhelming majority, it is our public servants, who are committing this crime against humanity. Yet can we really be blamed?

Germans asked the same question of themselves a generation ago. How can we good Germans, they asked, how can we civilized Europeans, be held responsible if our country is now a by-word for barbarity? We did not know when we gave a mandate to Hitler that he was a monster without a normal moral sense. We did not know when we obeyed his orders that what we were doing would make our children and our children's children ashamed of their country.

But did the Germans not know? Had they not been warned? Were they really unaware of the extermination camps?

We have not even their excuse. We can watch, between commercials and football games, the spectacle of burning cities and the maiming of children. And we were warned in good time that it was something less than an admirable character whom we were about to make our leader for another four years. Even those of us who heeded the warning voted against him without enthusiasm. Cassandras are not popular.

So now we, like the Germans, have a leader who rules from a lonely mountain retreat, whose concept of national "honor" is only his own megalomania, whose tantrums mean genocide. And our ruler, alas, has his hand on the ultimate weapon, which the other only dreamed of.

Is there anything we whose eyes are now opened can do?

We have not yet lost our threatened freedoms. We still have a relatively free press and men of courage to defend it. We still have a Congress with the power of the purse, and the even more fundamental power,

thanks to the Founding Fathers, to impeach and remove a President.

If we still have faith in the basic goodness of the American people we must believe that we can regain control of our country, and regain the decent respect of mankind.

A beginning would be made if a significant number of public figures would boycott the inaugural ceremonies on January 20th, and if Americans of conscience observed the day as a day of mourning for an irretrievable loss.

The third document is an eloquent statement of outrage, written by Pete Hamill, which appeared in the New York Post for December 29:

WHAT TO DO

A few years ago a woman named Kitty Genovese was mugged and murdered on a New York street. There were 38 witnesses, people who heard her screams, heard her pleas for life, and then pulled the window shades down and went back to sleep or the TV sets. The story was widely quoted as an example of the cold-blooded indifference of New Yorkers, and of how this city had become so thoroughly brutalized that it could no longer respond to a simple human plea for help.

Today, a country is being murdered. Its name is North Vietnam. It is being murdered by the U.S. Air Force, acting under the orders of Richard Nixon. There are plenty of witnesses. About 220 million of them in this country alone. And if they remain silent, they will share the guilt for murder of that country. It is like Kitty Genovese; we are inhuman and guilty to the extent of our failure "to get involved."

The U.S. Constitution was designed to prevent and control berserk actions by a President, and by the Executive Branch of government. Presidents are not kings; they have no Divine Right; and when they commit actions that are immoral, or in violation of the Constitution, they must be stopped, or this country will cease to function as a free Constitutional democracy.

Nixon has again chosen a period when Congress is not in session to unleash his most ferocious acts. He has unleashed the most murderous bombing campaign in human history against a country which has no capacity to do the same thing to us. But Congress can stop him, by simply cutting off the funds. It can stop the entire Defense Dept. budget, until such time as Nixon consults Congress and agrees to stop the murder.

The Senate will almost certainly vote to cut off funds at some point after Congress convenes on Jan. 3. But the House of Representatives is another problem. Members of the House run for office every two years, which results in a notoriously soft area in the Congressional spine. Only the people can put some iron into their spine. They can do it by bombarding them with telegrams, letters and phone messages. Indifference or glib despair only feeds their basic cowardice.

Reps. Bella Abzug and Jonathan Bingham have asked the Democratic Congressional Caucus to go on record at its Jan. 2 meeting (the day before Congress convenes) against the bombing campaign and for the immediate signing of the October agreement with the North Vietnamese, which Gen. Thieu had rejected. They have been joined by Reps. Addabbo, Badillo, Carey, Chisholm, Holtzman, Koch, Podell, Rangel and Rosenthal. If the caucus passes such a resolution, it would be a history-making event. The Democrats still, after all, control Congress.

But there has to be more done than that, especially in changing the minds of about 50 of the Congressional hard cases. These are men who are thought of as hawks, and therefore tough; in fact, they are merely the most timid men in Congress. They need to be talked to, to be reminded that it is within their power to act honorably, that it

does not mean much to be a Congressman if that Congress gives away its power over the President.

Since these statements were made, the man who ordered the bombings without explanation and without consultation with the Congress has ordered them stopped. But there is little consolation save for the thought that no more Vietnamese civilians are presently being slaughtered on the ground and no more American fliers being shot down.

We must guard against too great a sense of relief. Unless the Congress acts decisively, the order to bomb can be, and may well be, given again. And so long as Mr. Nixon attempts to achieve a settlement which will satisfy the Thieu regime, no cease-fire will be achieved and the danger of the lethal button being pressed again will be correspondingly great.

The first thing the Congress must do is make clear its outrage at what has happened. The second is to use its power of the purse at the first opportunity to insure that the bombing does not start up again. As for impeachment, it has become for me, for the first time, a possibility seriously to be considered; I personally would now be prepared to vote for impeachment. But a drive for impeachment would have no credibility unless it had some Republican support—otherwise it would look like a forlorn partisan political act by Democrats, still smarting from an unprecedented defeat in the presidential election. I see no evidence as yet of such Republican support.

What should unite the Congress is the threat to its own survival as a co-equal branch of Government. The disdain and disregard of the Congress during the past year by Mr. Nixon has been truly astonishing, especially for a man who often boasts of being a "strict constructionist" of the Constitution.

During the days and weeks ahead we shall see whether the Congress will prove itself equal to the challenge.

An encouraging first step was taken yesterday when the Democratic caucus by a vote of 154 to 75, adopted the following resolution:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the President has ordered extensive military combat operations without notification of, consultation with, or explanation to the Congress, as evidenced by the recent unprecedented and reprehensible bombing of North Vietnam which resulted in killing of civilians and a substantial increase in the number of American POWs and missing; and

Whereas, the U.S. has more than fulfilled any obligation it ever had to South Vietnam and the Thieu regime; and

Whereas, Section 601 of PL 92-156 (the "Mansfield Amendment") established as U.S. policy the withdrawal of all U.S. military forces from Indochina by a date certain pending only release of American prisoners and an accounting of the missing;

Now therefore be it resolved, that the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives hereby declare it to be Democratic policy in the 93rd Congress that no further public funds be authorized, appropriated or expended for U.S. military com-

bat operations in or over Indochina, and that such operations be terminated immediately, subject only to arrangements necessary to insure the safe withdrawal of American troops and the return of American prisoners of war.

This statement was prepared for delivery in the opening session of the 93d Congress on January 3, 1973, but could not be delivered on that day, because the House adjourned immediately after completing the formalities of organizing itself out of respect for Members who died during adjournment after the 92d Congress.

THE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1973

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced, on behalf of Representative FRANK HORTON of New York, the ranking minority member on the Committee on Government Operations and a number of other members of our committee, the Consumer Protection Act of 1973. This bill is identical to H.R. 10835, which passed the House on October 14, 1971, by a vote of 344 to 44, after having been reported by our committee by a vote of 27 to 4.

A related bill was reported by the Senate Government Operations Committee but was filibustered to death in the closing days of the 92d Congress and, hence, we were not able to go to conference.

Our bill will create a Consumer Protection Agency which will provide representation for consumers and consumer interests before departments and agencies of the Federal Government and the courts. Such representation is sorely needed as the extensive hearings which we held amply demonstrated. The bill will also provide a statutory base for the Office of Consumer Affairs, now headed by Mrs. Virginia Knauer and located in the Executive Office of the President. It will also create a Consumer Advisory Council so that consumers themselves and persons familiar with their needs can provide advice and guidance to the two bodies referred to above.

We feel the House-passed bill will provide the best basis for our consideration of consumer protection legislation in the 93d Congress, inasmuch as it was hammered out after considerable study and deliberation on the part of our committee. Of course, the bill as introduced is not frozen and new information and ideas may result in some modifications. I am certain, however, that this Congress recognizes the importance of providing the type of representation that we seek here and of giving further assurance to the consumers of our Nation that the Congress is aware of and responsive to their problems.

We will welcome additional cosponsors and those who desire to join with us may call my office or that of Representative HORTON.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to establish a standing Committee on the Environment in the House of Representatives. One hundred eighteen of my colleagues have joined me in cosponsoring this important proposal.

When I first suggested a standing Committee on the Environment for the House, I expressed the concern that our current method of considering environmental bills is fragmented, and that such fragmentation was preventing Congress from taking a leadership role in the fight for a quality environment. The intervening period has further convinced me that this was a correct assessment.

Environmental bills are referred to a myriad of congressional committees. In each case the committee receiving the bill is chiefly concerned with some other area of legislative activity. While this arrangement was satisfactory before the increased awareness of environmental problems took hold, we have now reached the point where one standing committee should be established to deal with air pollution, water pollution, herbicide and pesticide abuse, noise pollution, solid waste management, and weather modification.

The House has twice recognized the inadequacy of its current committee jurisdictions to deal effectively with environmental legislation. In both the 91st and 92d Congresses, a joint resolution was passed for the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Environment. This joint committee would have served a useful clearinghouse function, but unlike the standing Committee on the Environment, no bills would have been referred to it and it would not have had jurisdiction to report measures to the floor. Unfortunately, even this half-step joint committee failed to become operational since no conference report was ever filed following initial House and Senate approval.

As a result, we now move into the 93d Congress with no committee having general environmental jurisdiction. Yet the problems of environmental quality are not vanishing. The number of bills introduced to upgrade that quality continues to proliferate, and the leadership in the environmental quality crusade continues to slip by default to the executive branch of the Government.

The time has come for the House to act. Creation of a standing Committee on the Environment could be the one step which enables this generation of Americans to leave the earth, its atmosphere, and its waters in better condition than we found them.

Cleaning up the environment is going to be a costly operation. We owe it to the American people to structure the Congress in such a way as to allow environmental restoration to proceed efficiently. The executive branch, through

the reorganization which established the Environmental Protection Agency, has taken the lead in recognizing that environmental problems cannot be solved on a piecemeal basis. The House should do no less.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that action can be scheduled on the standing Committee on the Environment at an early date so that the House might begin to reap its benefits during the 93d Congress.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. du PONT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two pieces of reform legislation that I consider vital to improving the performance of the Congress.

The first deals with the composition of House delegations to House-Senate conference committees. It provides that a majority of the House Members of a conference committee shall have indicated by their votes their support of the bill as passed by the House and their concurrence in the prevailing opinion of the House in matters of disagreement with the Senate.

At least twice during the 92d Congress difficulty was encountered in sending bills to conference precisely, because the votes of the membership of proposed conference committees did not reflect the position taken by the House in voting on the legislation. This difficulty would have been avoided if legislation such as I am proposing today had been in effect. Further, as a matter of fundamental fairness conferees should represent the position of the House. Everyone should be able to agree to that.

I do not ask that all members of the proposed conference committee have agreed with the House position; only that a majority of the conferees have done so. Such a role would have avoided problems in the past, and would be a step toward making the action of House more representative of the will of its majority.

The text of the resolution follows:

Resolved, that the Rules of the House of Representatives are amended by adding at the end of clause 2 of rule X the following new paragraph:

"A majority of the House members of a conference committee shall have indicated by their votes their support of the bill as passed by the House and their concurrence in the prevailing opinion of the House on matters of disagreement with the Senate. The responsibility to insure that a majority of the House members of a conference committee are in agreement with and intend to support the significant provisions of the bill as passed by the House shall rest with the speaker."

The second piece of legislation I have introduced today deals with a Member's right under present House rules to revise and extend his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

That a Member should be able to correct typographical or grammatical errors

in his spoken remarks is proper; that he should be able to engage in wholesale revision of the scope, intent, and substance of his remarks is not. It is also proper that a Member should be able to add material to his oral presentation on the floor of the House if he feels that it would clarify or reinforce his argument. But it is not appropriate that such additions should appear in the RECORD as if he had spoken the written words, when he in fact did not. Such is the case under the present rules of the House.

My resolution introduced today simply provides that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be an accurate, verbatim record of House proceedings, subject to grammatical and typographical correction. It provides further that if a Member chooses to add material to his remarks subsequent to their delivery on the floor of the House, such material shall be printed in a type face distinctive from that used in reporting his verbatim remarks. Such a distinction will clearly indicate which remarks were spoken, and which subsequently added in writing.

The text of this resolution follows:

Resolved, That the Rules of the House of Representatives are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new rule:

"RULE XLV

PRINTED RECORD OF FLOOR PROCEDURES

1. The body of the Congressional Record for the House of Representatives shall contain an accurate and verbatim account of remarks actually delivered on the floor of the House.

2. Members shall be entitled to revise remarks delivered by them on the floor of the House, but such revisions shall be limited to the correction of grammatical and typographical errors; and in no event shall such corrections make any change in the meaning, content, or substance of those remarks.

3. Members shall be entitled to extend such remarks by the addition of statements, tables, statistics, and other supporting data dealing with the subject under discussion. Each such extension shall appear in the Congressional Record immediately following the remarks actually delivered of which it is an extension, and shall be printed in a type face distinctively different from that used for verbatim remarks."

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that the adoption of both of these changes to the House rules would improve the procedures of the House and make it a more responsive and more responsible institution. I urge my colleagues to join me in working for their passage.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

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?

FEDERAL FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE ACT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Federal Financial Disclosure Act. This measure will require full financial disclosure on the part of Members of Congress, judges of the U.S. court system, Cabinet members, policymaking officials of the executive branch, and all officers or employees in the executive branch earning over \$18,000 a year.

We, in the Congress, and in Government, are holders of the public trust—a very fragile trust that is occasionally eroded. We have the obligation to preserve the dignity and the respect for the Government that I feel she deserves, and I can think of no better way than to reveal to the public our holdings, and to report everything in which we might conceivably have a direct or indirect interest.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that the great majority of public officials are much more concerned with the affairs of the public than they are their own. However, we must insure that everyone is above reproach and is not in a position of influence simply for private gain.

The pay scales of those in the executive and legislative branch are at a level where outside income is not necessary to live comfortably. This is the way that it should be, first, so as not to limit Government service to only those wealthy enough to take the time to make our laws, and second, so that those in public office are working for the public and not for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, this act is simple. It calls for full financial disclosure by Members of the House of Representatives, Senators, Justices, and judges of the U.S. court system, the President, the Vice President, Cabinet members, and other policymaking officials of the executive branch as determined by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. Under the act, the following items must be reported:

First. Gross income of principal person and members of his immediate family.

Second. All honorariums and compensation payments, including names of sources and amounts—includes commissions, salaries, fees, and so forth.

Third. Gross income from business enterprises, including amounts, addresses, and names of businesses, and nature of the businesses.

Fourth. Itemization of gains from dealings in property, including names and addresses, and brief description of each transaction.

Fifth. Income from interest, including sources and amounts.

Sixth. Sources of income from rents, royalties, and dividends.

Seventh. Indebtedness, including names and addresses and aggregate amount.

Eighth. Itemization of income from partnerships or membership in profes-

sional groups. Names and addresses for such payment that exceed \$1,000.

Ninth. Itemization of income from estates or trusts in which principal has an interest, and nature of that interest.

Tenth. Report on all gifts exceeding \$100 in value, including names and addresses of donors, amount or value of gift, and description thereof. Report shall also contain a list of gifts to the principal and his family which exceed \$500 in value, including names and addresses of donors.

Eleventh. Report to contain list of assets held by principal and his immediate family. List to include value of each asset and brief description. Household furnishings and personal effects excluded.

Twelfth. Report to include names and addresses of each person or organization to whom the principal and his family owe at least \$5,000. It also includes statement of total indebtedness.

Thirteenth. Report to include all funds used to defray expenses incurred by reason of his being an official member, candidate or judge, including names and addresses of all persons contributing to the funds, the amount of each contribution, the amount of each expenditure, and the purpose of each expenditure.

Mr. Speaker, our Government rests on the theory that the people elect representatives to act in the public interest. To remove any doubt that our decisions are motivated solely by the public interest—not by a special interest, or by private gain—those of us who are fortunate enough to serve in Government should be required by law to divulge the source of our income. Such a reform would be a giant step toward removing any cloud of suspicion that hangs over Government officials and toward reinstating the public's confidence in our system of government.

THE PUBLISHING INDUSTRY AND POSTAL RATES

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the 93d Congress, there are many important issues facing us. One area that we all are keenly aware of is free speech and Freedom of the Press. At no time in my memory have there been so many public attacks from such high levels on the right of the Fourth Estate to publish in a free and open manner. This year we will probably be asked to debate and vote on the right of a reporter to protect his confidential sources.

At the same time, the economic facts of life have begun to create serious problems for these journals of fact and opinion which can also result in the stifling of their publishing ability. I need only mention the recent death of Life magazine to bring this point into sharp focus. While we cannot guarantee that the publishing industry will be eternally healthy for all of its members,

we can support legislation which creates a public policy fostering their continued well-being. One way we can do this is to maintain a reasonable level of costs related to their use of the Postal Service.

To that end, I am today introducing legislation which provides some relief, albeit it partial, in the area of postal rates for magazines and newspapers. This legislation is identical to a proposal H.R. 17129 I introduced in the closing days of the 92d Congress. In the House on September 21, 1972, is a lengthier explanation of this proposal. I hope the House will give this serious and early consideration.

MARIHUANA IS A DANGEROUS DRUG

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, one of my young constituents, Bruce Eric McKenney of Crystal Lake, a student at Northern Illinois University, died recently apparently from an excessive use of marihuana. According to the findings of Dr. Frank Fiorese of the Illinois Toxicology Laboratory at Chicago, young Bruce McKenney's body contained traces of marihuana in his brain, kidneys, blood, liver, and gastric juices. Subsequent to this tragic occurrence, the city of Crystal Lake took steps to try to protect others from the potential dangers of marihuana.

My friend and constituent, Ray Reynolds has composed a most meaningful letter to the major and city council of Crystal Lake demonstrating the dangers of marihuana and the influence of marihuana use in connection with subsequent dangers from harder drugs.

I am attaching Ray Reynolds' significant views as set forth in his open letter, as follows:

OPEN LETTER

Mayor and Council of Crystal Lake:

You are to be complimented on backing the new Crystal Lake Abusive Drug Committee. While the original committee was a good committee, had it continued, the new committee is far superior and should be more effective in guiding the misled young people in Crystal Lake. The most important change was the addition of professional people as a major part of the committee.

It is hoped the residents of Crystal Lake will become aware of what you and the committee are doing. They also should become involved both with their time and money. This project will require years of patience and activity, but in the long run will accomplish a tremendous amount of good for our future citizens.

It is my understanding that the city and the state together will provide two-thirds of the money necessary but that one-third (\$10,000) must come from the generosity of the local citizens. Tell our citizens that one of the enclosed checks is from interested people, out of our nation, in Canada. If they are interested in the youth of Crystal Lake, surely citizens living here should dig into their pockets and make this program of help and education for their youth a success.

The people must realize that the police department with all of their special training are only good in the prevention and elimina-

tion of the distribution of these drugs. Experience has proven that law and order only frighten the misled individuals using these drugs. This is where the committee can help out and it needs the support of the money and time of all good citizens, cooperating with the police department for elimination of the use as well as the sale of drugs.

Atlas Electronics Ltd. of Toronto, Canada, the Canadian representative of Drake Mfg. where I am employed and where my son was part-time employed have asked that you, the council, turn this check for \$100 over to the Drug Abuse Committee in memory of my son who lost his life about a year ago because of the lack of the proper information of help of a similar committee. My wife and I also enclose a check for the same amount for the same purpose.

I know from experience and research that while marijuana in itself may not be too harmful it is the cause of many people getting into the use of a harder drug. I am sure the committee would back me up in this statement.

Today many people in legitimate businesses make money, indirectly, through the sale of harder drugs to our youth. They are fighting to have marijuana legalized and there is a bill in the House of our United States Congress that stands a good chance of being passed for legalizing marijuana. This is Representative Koch's Bill HR 14549.

Let me quote from a letter to Congressman Baker from the father of another intelligent boy who is still in the process of recovering in the Arlington Heights Hospital. His father talked the past two months to many young people that visited his son; this is the quotation: "One thing that has come out is that he (the son) and his friends had been smoking marijuana and had found it dull and had looked for something that would be more stimulating. These youths, in effect, confirmed what I have always believed, marijuana can and does lead to other drugs which can have a lasting effect on the human brain and body", end of quotation.

Yes, pushers visit "pot" parties and find it easy to get someone under the effects of marijuana to try a harder drug, while the person under sober circumstances would not try such a thing. True, the same can be accomplished at alcohol parties but the pushers can't find these so easy. This is one reason why manufacturers of drugs are interested in legalizing marijuana.

Please, on behalf of the youth as well as the memory of my son, your neighbor, pick up a pen and write your United States Congressman to vote NO on this Bill—HR14549. I repeat, Bill HR14549.

THE RIGHT OF AMERICAN CITIZENS TO BUY, SELL, AND HOLD GOLD

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, there has been increasing support throughout the country recently for the restoration of the right of American citizens to buy, sell, and hold gold. In my opinion there never was, and there is not now, any valid reason to prohibit individuals from owning, buying, or selling gold. The right to own gold for protection and/or investment should be fundamental in a free society such as ours. Therefore, I am introducing a bill to repeal sections 3 and 4 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934. I hope that the Banking and Currency Committee will give this bill early and favorable attention.

JUVENILE JUSTICE

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing legislation to create an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice with 56 of my colleagues. I take this opportunity to invite any other Members who wish to cosponsor the bill to notify my office.

Support for the juvenile justice bill has been gratifying. In the 92d Congress over 100 House Members joined Congressman BIESTER and me in introducing this legislation. Twenty-four Senators, led by Senator CHARLES PERCY and Senator BIRCH BAYH, sponsored companion bills. The House of Representatives passed its version, H.R. 45, on April 18, 1972; and this bill was subsequently favorably reported from the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee on September 13. Although no further action could be taken before the 92d Congress adjourned, I feel confident this new Congress will witness the enactment of the juvenile justice bill.

This legislation has been endorsed by some of the best known authorities on the subject of delinquency in the country, including the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, the American Bar Association, the National Council on Juvenile Court Judges, the American Parents Committee, and the PTA. Further support has come from individuals concerned about juvenile justice all across the country.

Briefly stated, this bill creates an independent Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice. The primary functions of the legislation are threefold: First, to provide training programs and facilities for personnel involved in the prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile crime and delinquency, patterned after the highly successful FBI Academy; second, to provide a coordinating center for the collection and dissemination of useful data on treatment and control of juvenile offenders and the juvenile justice system in general; and third, to prepare studies on juvenile justice including comparisons and analyses of State and Federal laws and such model laws and recommendations which will be designed to promote an effective and efficient juvenile justice system.

The Institute would be under the supervision of a director appointed by the President. Overall policy and operation would be set by the director and his advisory commission composed of members of appropriate Federal agencies and experts from the private sector concerned with juvenile justice.

The training program which the Institute would operate is a matter of the highest priority. One of our greatest current problems is the lack of adequate training of those individuals whose function is to deal with young people who have run afoul of the law. The American Parents Committee questioned each of the State directors of juvenile justice programs on their priority needs for de-

linquency prevention and control. Almost without exception it was found that States desperately need trained probation officers for juvenile courts. Judge Everett West of Fowler, Ind., in discussing H.R. 45, said:

I think this is the greatest opportunity to give . . . judges . . . an efficient method to train probation officers.

I have noted that just recently the General Federation of Women's Clubs has recommended the training of more judges skilled in handling juvenile court cases, and the training of more, better qualified professionals for detention setups.

Another serious problem in our present juvenile justice system is the fragmentation of Federal and State agencies and programs dealing with juvenile offenders, and the lack of coordination among them. The legislation I am today introducing provides a center to coordinate and gather information on the various programs. Judge James Gulotta of the National Council on Juvenile Court Judges succinctly put it this way:

Historically, there has been a lack of organization among the states in the areas of coordinated research, planning, communication, and evaluation. Too often the individual child has suffered because his individual state received and processed fragmented information, or lacked—or even completely misunderstood—the resources and knowledge available to only a few.

Hugh Reed of the prestigious National Council on Crime and Delinquency believes that something must be done to insure the maximum effectiveness of the funds that are now being invested in law enforcement programs, principally those of LEAA and HEW. Thomas G. Pinnock, deputy director of the department of institutions for the State of Washington has called for a central clearinghouse for materials regarding the problems of delinquents and some means established for the regular dissemination of the information to those of us directly involved with the problems of youth. H.R. 45 and identical legislation which is being introduced this afternoon provides this clearinghouse.

The Institute established by the juvenile justice bill is also directed to analyze the various statutory provisions, develop model laws and codes, and make appropriate recommendations. This function holds much promise for steps to be taken to clear the existing confusion and create a uniformity in our juvenile justice system that is sorely needed. The American Bar Association and the American Law Institute have achieved striking results with a similar approach.

Many changes are needed in our present system of juvenile justice. By providing training, by gathering and disseminating pertinent data, and by developing model codes and laws, I am convinced we can improve the juvenile justice system substantially.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when juvenile crime is up by 78 percent, and some 100,000 children are deteriorating in jails at any given day, it is clear we must set about the task of reducing juvenile crime. Mr. Speaker, I urge that the legislation being introduced today receive the earliest and favorable consideration by the Congress.

LEGISLATION TO END FORCED BUSING—A HIGH PRIORITY IN THE 93D CONGRESS

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a constitutional amendment with the purpose of halting the forced busing of schoolchildren which is still plaguing parents and students throughout our land.

My proposed amendment states:

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

Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Despite my continuous efforts, and those of many of my colleagues, we were unable to pass any effective legislation to halt court-ordered busing in the 92d Congress. Thus, our communities are still under massive involuntary busing plans which threaten to undermine our neighborhood school system and to destroy educational quality.

I have long believed that a constitutional amendment such as the one I am offering today is the most effective way of permanently halting court-ordered busing.

As the 93d Congress convenes, we must consider the halting of forced busing among our highest priorities. The American people have consistently spoken out against this practice of busing small children across town to attend school. In every region of the country, they have opposed forced busing by overwhelming majorities.

If we are to be truly representatives of the people—if we are to reflect their will on this most important issue—we cannot fail to adopt this Constitutional amendment without delay.

It is interesting to note that many of our young people—those who are or soon will be the parents of small children—are among the most outspoken opponents of forced busing to achieve arbitrary racial quotas. A resolution recently adopted by the Tennessee Young Republican Federation is illustrative. It "requests and encourages" all Senators and Representatives to "put an expeditious end to the unnecessary busing of students for the purpose of racial balance through the process of legislation, if possible, or through the process of Constitutional revision, if possible."

I am happy to insert the entire resolution at this point. I hope all my colleagues will read it and agree with the excellent points it makes against busing. And I wish to thank the members of the Tennessee Young Republican Federation executive board for making this resolution available to me.

The resolution follows:

TENNESSEE YOUNG REPUBLICAN FEDERATION

On November 11, 1972, in Memphis, Tennessee, at the quarterly Board Meeting of the Tennessee Federation of Young Republican Clubs the following resolution on busing was passed.

It was further moved and seconded that copies of the resolution be sent to the Governor, Senators and Congressmen in Tennessee. Motion carried.

RESOLUTION ON BUSING

Whereas, the Tennessee Federation of Young Republican Clubs believes that the primary function of the educational system in the limited states is to give a quality education to all people regardless of race, creed or national origin; and

Whereas, the concept of busing to achieve "racial balance" contributes nothing to the quality of said education and requires the expenditure of large blocks of public funds which could be better utilized to improve the quality of the educational system itself; and

Whereas, the concept of busing to achieve "racial balance" represents a further unnecessary intrusion into the rights of many of the citizens in our nation;

Be it resolved, that the Tennessee Federation of Young Republican Clubs hereby request and encourage all Senators and Representatives to the National Congress to put an expeditious end to the unnecessary busing of students for the purpose of "racial balance" through the process of legislation if possible or through the process of Constitutional Revision if necessary.

PLOVDIV INTERNATIONAL FAIR

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, during the latter part of September, I had the privilege of attending the 1972 Plovdiv International Fair near Sofia, Bulgaria. The American pavilion of the fair was conducted under the auspices of the U.S. Information Agency, and I was the official representative of the United States.

From the number of people who stood in line to see our exhibit, I estimate that the U.S. exhibit was a box office success; and based upon the number of Bulgarian officials who visited the display, it was a political success.

A writer for Parade magazine reported critically on the fair, thus prompting me to write USIA Director Frank Shakespeare of my own impressions. So that my colleagues also may be aware of my impressions, my letter to Mr. Shakespeare follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., November 22, 1972.

FRANK SHAKESPEARE,
Director, U.S. Information Agency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: It was my intention to write you about the Plovdiv Trade Fair immediately after my return from Bulgaria in September, but the pace of Congressional work plus the imminence of the election persuaded me to postpone that letter until later. In the interim, I understand that a critical comment has appeared in Parade Magazine.

I doubt that the writer was at the Fair or, if he was, I believe he chose to comment only on a small part of what he saw.

The American exhibit was made up of three rooms. One small room showed a sampling of conveniences which are common in the United States, such as blenders, steam irons and vacuum cleaners. In another small room was a slide projector showing samples of pollution, resulting mostly from our advanced industrialization.

The large (and main) room of our exhibit displayed some of the larger conveniences and luxuries which we know here, plus the ways we have devised to counteract pollution.

Politically, Bulgaria is not friendly to the United States, probably even more anti-American than the Soviet Union. The Bulgarians are quite sensitive, and would resent any attempt on our part to use the Plovdiv Fair for blatant indoctrination. In my view, our exhibit there avoided this hazard.

Instead, we gave the Bulgarians a message that the United States is an affluent people who enjoy many advantages because of our technology and who are trying to offset the disadvantages brought on by our machines.

From the number of people who stood in line to see our exhibit, I estimate that the United States exhibit was a box office success; and based upon the number of Bulgarian officials who visited the display, it was a political success.

It is my intention to insert these remarks in the Congressional Record when Congress reconvenes.

Yours very truly,

JOHN N. ERLBORN.

VIETNAM: OUT NOW

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak in words harsh enough to describe my feelings of disappointment, betrayal, and outrage at the President's renewed bombing offensive in Vietnam. Over 2 months ago, in what now appears to have been an election-eve grandstand play, the President assured us that a negotiated end to the war was at hand and that our prisoners of war and fighting forces would be home by Christmas. Then, without any attempt to inform the Congress or to solicit its views, the President has initiated the heaviest bombing attacks.

Again and again during the past 4 years the President has proclaimed that just one extra offensive effort—the invasion of Cambodia, the mining of Haiphong Harbor, and most recently the indiscriminate bombing of North Vietnamese cities—would bring the negotiators to their knees at the bargaining table. Instead, these have brought the wanton destruction of the Vietnamese countryside, the razing of its urban centers—including even civilian hospitals—and the severe criticism of several of our closest international allies. In these 2 months, many more of our young men have been killed, wounded, and taken prisoner.

We Members of Congress must not acquiesce any longer in permitting this barbarism to continue. It is Congress prerogative to wage war and we should not permit this unconstitutional waging of war to continue. It is upon our conscience that further death and destruction must lie. We have been deceived time and time again, and it is essential that Congress now pick up the initiative in restoring both the conditions for meaningful peace negotiations and a proper balance of government.

The legislation which I introduced on the first day of this Congress requires the

withdrawal of all U.S. ground, naval, and air forces from Vietnam within 30 days of the bill's enactment. No funds already authorized or appropriated will be allowed to be used for purposes other than the withdrawal of our forces. In addition, this bill prohibits any further U.S. bombing in or over North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos.

The withdrawal of our troops is contingent only on the simultaneous release of our prisoners of war and an accounting of our missing in action. According to news reports, the North Vietnamese have already agreed to these conditions in the October agreement.

The Democratic caucus by a majority vote of 154 to 75 has indicated its support for an immediate ending of the war. My bill would implement legislatively the desires of that caucus.

RUDOLPH CAMMERATA: A RESPECTED AND POPULAR UNION LEADER

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most respected and popular union leaders in the State of New Jersey, Rudolph Cammerata of North Brunswick, will be honored at his retirement dinner on January 13.

Over 1,000 persons—from workers to company executives—will attend that dinner to show how strongly they feel about Rudy Cammerata, who has dedicated the past 30 years of his life to improving conditions for the thousands of textile union members he has served with such great devotion.

Rudy Cammerata's record as a union leader is outstanding: He was president of Local 630—in Johnson & Johnson—for 4 years; was business manager of the Central and South Jersey Joint Board of the Textile Workers Union, AFL-CIO-CLC; was business agent of that joint board for 25 years; and has also been an international representative of that progressive union. That is a remarkable record of achievement, but Rudy Cammerata is a remarkable man—a man of many talents.

He has a good mind, a heart that has that rare blend of courage and compassion, a charisma that effective leaders must have, and a sterling integrity. It is because of these qualities that Rudy Cammerata will be honored on January 13. And it is because of these exceptional qualities that over 300 management officials will attend, from supervisors to company presidents. In a sense, they will be there to say to Rudy Cammerata—and to the public—even though you fought for the rights of union members with great conviction and tenacity, and despite the fact that we have often disagreed on cases and issues, you were fair, and we respect you for your responsible leadership.

So along with the more than 1,000 persons who will be at that retirement dinner, and the thousands of others who

will be there in spirit, I salute Rudy Cammerata. He will not only be remembered, appreciated, and missed by the Textile Workers Union of America, but by management, and perhaps most important of all, by the public that hopes for more union leaders and men like Rudy Cammerata. Officially, he will retire, but what he accomplished and what he stands for, could never retire—they live on as an inspiration to all.

FARMERS PAY FOR THE BOMBS

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, as the sole Representative of a State whose economy is largely based on agriculture, I can only view with alarm the recent actions of the executive department with respect to the rural environmental action program, Rural Electrification Administration, emergency disaster aid, and the increase in dry milk imports.

These programs, supported over the years by both parties, have met the test of time. They were sustained in years when the Federal budget was a fraction of what it now is.

To sacrifice these programs at a time when billions of dollars continue to be expended in a war which is not supported by the majority of the American people only intensifies the tragedy of Vietnam.

I urge my colleagues from all sections of America, urban and rural, to recognize the basic injustice of making agricultural programs pay the price for the war. I insert for the review of my colleagues an eloquent statement of this issue by John Stencel, president of the Rocky Mountain Farmers Union:

DENVER, COLO.,
December 29, 1972.

HON. TENO RONCALIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TENO: I am astounded—as a matter of fact, I am livid with anger—by the administration's recent termination of farm programs that have stood for decades, under both Republican and Democratic administrations. Killing them in the name of balancing the budget is a specious rationalization when tons of bombs are being dropped and more than 15 B-52's have been lost over Vietnam. It seems that the more than sixty billion dollars that has been used to support the war effort could be used for programs in the United States that have, or should have, greater priority. Educational and housing projects need immediate attention, highway funds are being frozen at a time when transportation needs are increasing at unfathomable rates—the loss of nineteen Texas youth in New Mexico is only one instance where highway funds were not available to build a wider and safer bridge—and agricultural programs such as emergency disaster aid for farmers in time of adverse weather conditions needs to be extended instead of deleted.

When farmers and ranchers are still only at 75% of parity compared to other segments of the economy, it is strange that the meat

quotas are suspended completely for 1973, that the cotton program will lose \$110 million in payments, that the feed grains program will lose \$800 million in payments, that the REAP program is killed outright, that emergency disaster aid through FHA emergency loans is killed except when made available by the President, that dry milk imports are increased from 1.8 million pounds to 25 million pounds, and this just seems to be the beginning.

I do not know why farmers have to take the brunt of a budget cut when their need is as great as it has ever been and when other segments of the economy are continuing to receive larger subsidies and increasing their profits on the domestic scene, as well as gaining large profits from an unpopular war.

On behalf of the members of Rocky Mountain Farmers Union, I urge you, as a member of Congress, to exercise those powers given to you by the Constitution to stop the expenditures for the war in Vietnam and divert those funds for use at home. There are domestic needs in every area of our economy that could use the billions of dollars that we are just throwing away on a war that will not be won militarily.

I am enclosing with this letter, portions of the National Farmers Union policy program which emphasizes our stand on those issues that I have mentioned above. Let me remind you that even though farmers and ranchers are a small minority in the United States, they still produce a commodity which everyone needs.

Thank you for your attention and I hope you can and will be of help to the needs of Rural America.

Sincerely,

JOHN STENCEL,
President, Rocky Mountain
Farmers Union.

THE CONGRESS AND ITS WAR-MAKING POWERS

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, for 12 long years, I have watched the shadow of a war creep over this land bringing with it anguish, frustration, and despair as our people endeavor to understand America's involvement on another soil 10,000 miles away in a war we have never chosen to win.

Neither praise nor condemnation of actions, past or present, but rather their unforgettable lessons, will avail us to a sensible direction for the future. One such lesson is that no government dare commit its people to prolonged armed conflict without a clear definition of the purpose of such commitment and the will of the people to pursue them to victory.

How then do we implement the lesson? We best do so by clearly implementing the respective responsibilities of the President and the Congress with reference to the constitutional power to make war.

The resolution which I am reintroducing today, I believe, is a reasonable approach to such implementation. Joining with me are 31 of our distinguished colleagues, most of whom cosponsored this measure during the 92d Congress.

This resolution in no way alters the President's power to initially engage our

troops to repel a sudden attack or to protect American lives and property. It simply requires the President, within 72 hours of committing any of our Armed Forces to action in any armed conflict outside the United States, to report such commitment to the Congress.

If the Congress shall fail to approve or otherwise act on such report within 30 calendar days after receiving it, the President shall within the next succeeding 30 days terminate such commitment and disengage all forces so committed.

This proposal embraces the intent of the framers of the Constitution and the thoughtful declaration of many great Americans after them.

The framers of the Constitution were very deliberate in balancing the powers of this Government and those of the Congress and the President, and they were deliberate for excellent reasons. All too frequently the American colonies were drawn by the King's decree into England's wars. The leaders of the newly independent republic resolved to make certain that their new country would never again be drawn into war at the direction and discretion of a single man. For this reason, it transferred the war power to the legislative branch of the newly created government.

Indeed, the framers of the Constitution recognized that the President, under certain circumstances might have to take defensive action to repel and subdue a sudden attack on this great Nation. But that was the extent of the warmaking power they were willing for him to exercise.

I deeply believe that the Constitution is a living document. The Congress of the United States must activate its responsibilities under this document for determining war and peace. I feel most profoundly that had Congress either declared war or refused to allow our involvement in Vietnam at its outset, a clear-cut attitude would have been established and the national hurt of our people avoided.

The United States is the leader of the free world today. But this is not so because our citizens are anxious that we take the lead in military conquests; nor because our diplomats are the most expert; nor because our policies are the most faultless or the most popular.

The mantle of leadership has been placed upon our shoulders not by any nation, nor by our own Government or citizens, but by destiny and circumstance—by the sheer fact of our physical and economic strength, and by our role as the only real counter to the forces of communism in the world today.

If events in Indochina have taught us to better fulfill that role, then it is not a wholly dark story. While this resolution in no way affects our present involvement, it reminds us that the mistakes of the past must be heeded in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I call for unity in a nation divided. Will we take a giant step for unity today? We must do no less.

We, in the Congress, have the power to assure the American people that never again will we allow a situation like Vietnam to occur. We can begin to unify this

Nation for the future by the adoption of this resolution. By so doing we assure our people that we will totally uphold the Constitution.

Let the Congress play the part our forefathers intended in the delicate exercise of the warmaking power—now!

DANGERS INHERENT IN EUROPEAN SECURITY CONFERENCE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, expressions of hope and optimism about the forthcoming European Security Conference may, unfortunately, be misplaced.

Rather than setting the states for a generation of peace in Europe, that conference may, quite to the contrary, set the stage for the possible Soviet domination of the continent.

Discussing the recent Soviet diplomatic achievements in Europe, New York Times columnist C. L. Sulzberger noted that—

The Kremlin has realized a dream to which all Soviet regimes since Stalin's have aspired: formal acceptance of the political status quo in Europe . . . Chancellor Brandt's victory in the West German elections, based on an Ostpolitik accepting a divided Germany and the Berlin Wall, was widely hailed . . . Yet it was plainly a gain for Moscow since it formalized Europe's de facto split.

The idea of the European Security Conference was first introduced by the Soviet Union in 1954, and has only been met with approval during the past year. The current Helsinki meetings will be followed by exploratory talks in Geneva on mutual and balanced force reductions. At this time, writes Sulzberger:

Communist rule in East Europe is now implicitly acknowledged by American policy and explicitly confirmed by Bonn. The West has also set out along the road to unilateral arms reduction even before tentative MBFR discussions begin . . . the Kremlin is to be congratulated for its patient, shrewd diplomacy.

A recent analysis of the forthcoming European Security Conference was prepared by Dr. Giselher Wirsing, one of the editors of the German weekly magazine, *Deutsche Zeitung/Christ und Welt*, and was published in the September 9, 1972, issue of *To The Point*, the international news magazine.

Dr. Wirsing declared that—

The fear is that the Security Conference will bring the Soviet Union several important steps closer to its prime objective: the liquidation of the American military presence in Europe. . . . Ultimately the Conference is part of the Soviet overall objective of breaking up the already politically weakened NATO alliance.

Discussing those in his own country who have welcomed the forthcoming conference, Dr. Wirsing writes:

This should be particularly obvious in West Germany, where both leftist neutralists and communists are openly predicting that the Conference will lead to the dissolution of military pacts. These Moscow puppets fail to observe that the Warsaw Pact, even if 'for-

mally' dissolved, would live on in the closed society of East Europe, but that NATO cannot continue to survive 'unofficially' on the same basis.

Those who welcome the European Security Conference should carefully consider the warning set forth by Dr. Giselher Wirsing. I wish to share his article with my colleagues, and insert it into the Record at this time, as follows:

NO-COMFORT CONFERENCE

Preparations for the European Security conference—for which the Soviet Union has been pushing throughout the past five years—will begin shortly in Helsinki, the capital of Finland. In fact, the title of this important gathering is misleading. The Kremlin has no real desire to see the security of Europe discussed in Helsinki. Russia has demanded that all questions relating to disarmament and to the reduction of armed forces be left out of consideration and that they be transferred to the agenda of a different, as yet unscheduled, conference. It is doubtful whether this will even take place at all.

It is a feather in the cap for Soviet diplomacy that a Security Conference will take place which negates, at the outset, its principal objective. Washington and London have for years regarded the Soviet Conference proposals with great misgivings, knowing only too well that the Soviet Union's only purpose was to have the Brezhnev doctrine tacitly accepted in Europe, and to obtain recognition for East Germany. At the same time the Western countries were unable to agree on a united approach for the Conference; there was even no unanimity on the demand that Europe's most urgent problem—the massive concentration of armed forces in Western Russia, East Germany and Czechoslovakia—should be discussed. And from the outset it was clear that the Scandinavian countries were labouring under an illusion concerning the objectives of the Conference; Sweden's Prime Minister Olaf Palme distinguished himself with utterances which were as enthusiastic as they were divorced from reality.

In the event, Willy Brandt's Germany became the pacemaker of Soviet planning. At this meeting with Brezhnev in the Crimean holiday resort of Oreanda, the Chancellor agreed completely with the Soviet leader's plans. Indeed, at this time, Brandt still believed that a discussion of Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions (MBFRs) would be on the agenda of the conference—and so walked into a trap prepared by Soviet diplomacy. It was only after Oreanda that Moscow made it clear that MBFRs were not in fact to be discussed at the European Security Conference. In Brussels Belgian Foreign Minister Pierre Harmel urged that at least some military problems be discussed at the Conference; to which Andrei Gromyko replied tersely that the Soviet Government considered the subject of MBFRs "not ripe enough" and rejected even the mild proposal to exchange observers at military manoeuvres.

While in Moscow President Nixon, in turn, endorsed US participation in the Security Conference without a discussion on what "security problems" were actually involved. This was not exactly a highlight in American diplomacy; but the Americans point out that the Europeans had already let them down. The Americans also insist that Nixon accepted the idea, unappealing as it was to him, only because Brezhnev made it a prerequisite for signing the SALT agreement. In Washington it is now whispered that it is still possible to wreck the Conference during the preliminary discussion in Helsinki if it becomes doubly clear that it is not serving, in any respect, basic Western interests. But this looks like an empty threat, as do the

remarks in Bonn that Germany would not take part in the Conference if discussion on MBFRs are completely ruled out. There is nothing to indicate that the Brandt/Scheel Government could find the determination to adopt such a strong stand when it is prepared to relay the establishment of diplomatic relations with China simply to placate Moscow.

Plans for a Security Conference in the past years have greatly interested some East European states. Countries such as Yugoslavia and Rumania had hoped that at such a Conference a formal declaration of non-interference in the domestic affairs of European countries could be achieved, which would protect them from the fate of Czechoslovakia. But the Soviet Union has made it abundantly clear that it is not prepared to allow other communist countries any freedom of discussion at the Conference. This, certainly, was the impression gained by US diplomats in Moscow during President Nixon's visit to Russia. The only hope left is that the US, and some European states whose governments have not allowed their rights to be completely fogged by Soviet diplomacy, will insist that the Conference should discuss in detail the question of free movement of persons and ideas in Europe. However, this entails asking the Soviets and East Germany to permit their citizens to travel freely in Europe and to admit the Western press, and there is virtually no hope that these requests will be met. Most observers believe that it would be worthwhile fighting for them; but considering the discord in the Western camp there is little hope of such a fight developing, and even less of it achieving positive results. In fact, the fear is that the Security Conference will bring the Soviet Union several important steps closer to its prime objective: the liquidation of the American military presence in Europe. President Nixon must be rightly afraid that the Security Conference (with its detente euphoria) will strengthen the unholy alliance between the Kremlin and those American senators, such as Mike Mansfield, who presently demand the withdrawal of all US troops from Europe. Ultimately the Conference is part of the Soviet overall objective of breaking up the already politically weakened NATO alliance. This should be particularly obvious in West Germany, where both leftist neutralists and communists are openly predicting that the Conference will lead to the dissolution of military pacts. These Moscow puppets fail to observe that the Warsaw Pact, even if "formally" dissolved, would live on in the closed society of East Europe, but that NATO cannot continue to survive "unofficially" on the same basis. Bluntly, there is an acute danger that the Security Conference will not only strengthen the status quo, already favouring the Soviets, but in fact change it to Russia's clear advantage.

A BILL RELATING TO THE PRIVATE CARRIAGE OF FIRST-CLASS LETTERS

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years mail service in the United States has grown steadily worse. It seems that the Postal Service is being strangled by its own bureaucracy.

I would like to call your attention to the laws prohibiting the carriage of first-class letters by private agencies. These laws are not only a violation of the spirit

of the free enterprise system, but they are hindering the efficient delivery of mail since it has been demonstrated that private carriers can provide faster service at lower cost than the Federal Postal Service is able to provide. Therefore, I am introducing a bill to repeal certain provisions of the law relating to the private carriage of letters. I hope that the leadership of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will give this bill their early attention.

REFORM IN SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the two legislative measures that boosted social security benefits by 20 percent and included other important improvements to the program have greatly alleviated the problem of poverty among the Nation's aged. But taxes have soared, generating a great outcry for a reform of social security financing.

An article by Louis Hollander that appeared in the New York Times on January 3, 1973, discusses this issue. Mr. Hollander has done a good job. The article follows:

REFORM IN SOCIAL SECURITY

(By Louis Hollander)

The 92d Congress has done a commendable job by putting into effect two legislative measures that boost Social Security benefits by 20 per cent and contain some important improvements in the Social Security and Medicare programs sorely needed by our aged and disabled citizens.

However, the nature of the payroll-tax increases required to finance these improvements raises a most serious question that merits the closest attention of the incoming 93d Congress.

The inadequacies of our Social Security financing on the regressive payroll tax that falls most heavily on low- and moderate-income workers—add a new dimension to the problem that offsets our priorities for tax reform.

The bill recently signed by the President presents a \$5.3-billion tax bill to the American people. This tax boost would be in addition to a \$7-billion tax bill rise already scheduled to go into effect Jan. 1 to pay for the 20 per cent across-the-board Social Security benefit increase voted by Congress. The total cost of these improvements will be raised by increasing the payroll tax on 96 million employed persons from the present 5.2 per cent to 5.85 per cent in 1973 and 6.05 per cent in 1978, together with an increase in the wage base from this year's \$9,000 to \$10,800 in 1973 and \$12,000 in 1974.

For the individual low- and middle-income worker, this dramatic increase in the payroll tax means substantial reduction in his take-home pay. For a wage earner with a \$12,000 wage income, his Social Security tax will increase in a one-year period from \$468 in 1972 to \$631.80 in 1973, or 35 per cent, and to \$702 in 1974, or 50 per cent.

Such enormous increase in payroll tax not only means a substantial cut into the living standards of the average worker but also intensifies and increases the unfairness and regressiveness basically inherent in such a tax. As is well known the tax is a constant percentage of earnings up to the ceiling but

then becomes a smaller and smaller fraction as earnings increase with no personal exemptions, no deductions and no low-income allowance.

Thus the tax violates the fundamental principle of sound tax policy and bears no relationship to ability to pay. For instance, increasing the tax rate to 5.85 would mean for a family of four with one wage earner in the \$3,000-\$4,000 bracket about a 9 per cent increase and for a family earning \$10,000 a 3.4 per cent increase in Federal taxes, but it would increase taxes for a family earning \$50,000 by only four-tenths of 1 per cent and for a family in the \$100,000 bracket by one-tenth of one per cent.

Moreover, the law treats even families of the same income level differently by taxing them unequally. A family with total earnings of \$18,000 earned equally by the husband and wife pays twice as much in payroll taxes as does a family in the same income bracket with one earner. At any given level of family earnings below the ceiling a single-earner family receives larger benefits than does the multi-earner family.

The regressive nature of the Social Security tax can be relieved in two ways: by a higher wage base—raised substantially more than through recent actions of Congress—and by use of general revenues.

The recently enacted wage-base ceilings, though a step in the right direction, are still inadequate inasmuch as they leave a substantial fraction of covered payrolls outside the pale of taxation. About 95 per cent of the persons in the Social Security program had their full earnings covered when the program first began. It would take a wage base in excess of at least \$15,000 to cover the same proportion today. The program should cover the total earnings of the overwhelming majority of workers so that their benefits, which are based on covered earnings only, will be better related to what they have actually earned.

However, since raising the tax base to \$15,000 alone would not provide sufficient funds for needed benefit improvements we must also look to general tax revenues as a most feasible and sensible supplementary source of funds.

There are of course a variety of other alternatives, such as a total removal of the ceiling on wages, refunding the payroll tax paid on wages of workers with incomes below the poverty level, introduction of personal exemptions and so on, but neither of these fragmentary remedies is sufficient to infuse into Social Security enough money needed to deal with the economic plight of our aged and disabled without placing an unfair burden on the low-wage worker. The logical and preferable source of this money is a regular contribution to the Social Security Trust Funds from the general revenues of the Federal Government, the only remedy able to make it a truly social insurance system with the society as a whole assuming responsibility it does not now undertake.

FEDERAL PRIVACY BILL

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, since the accumulation of information on individuals that is being stored in thousands of Government computers and files is still growing with no administrative regulations in sight, it become even more urgent that Congress address itself to the problem. I have reintroduced my Federal

privacy bill in the 93d Congress. The gross collection of data by the Government cannot help but pose a threat to personal privacy and individual liberty. It is time that the Congress act decisively in developing adequate safeguards to balance the Government's legitimate needs with the citizen's right to privacy.

My bill would do the following: first, notify the individual that such a record exists; second, notify the individual of all transfers of such information; third, disclose information from such records only with the consent of the individual or when legally required; fourth, maintain a record of all persons inspecting such records; fifth, permit the individual to inspect his records, make copies of them, and supplement them; sixth, permit an individual on a proper showing to require the agency to remove erroneous or misleading information from an individual's file; and seventh, create a Federal privacy board to supervise the administration of the provisions of the bill.

The board would hear appeals by individuals seeking the removal of erroneous or misleading information contained in their file. It would also hear complaints that an agency had not complied with other requirements of the bill. If the board found that one or more requirements of the Federal Privacy Act had not been met, it would issue a final order directing the agency to comply. Appeals from the board decisions could be taken to the U.S. district court.

Exceptions to the disclosure rule would be made in the case of records that are either expressly required by Presidential order to be withheld in the interest of national security or for purposes of pending criminal prosecution. In the latter case, if the prosecution is not commenced within a reasonable time, the file would have to be released and in all events is subject to court order directing its release. The President would be required to notify the Congress on an agency-by-agency basis each year of the number of files withheld for these reasons. These disclosure provisions should apply to files held on organizations and corporations, as well as individuals.

Another bill I am introducing today also deals with the right of individual privacy. This measure, originally introduced in the Senate by Senator SAM ERVIN, would prohibit the use of the lie detector tests in employment practices. It covered both Federal agencies and businesses engaged in interstate commerce, and would prohibit an employee from requiring a job applicant to take a polygraph test as a condition of employment, and the denial of employment, the denial of promotion, or the discharge of an individual for his or her refusal to submit to such a test.

Requiring polygraph tests debase an individual and undermine the person's right against self-incrimination protected by the fifth amendment. Courts have refused in most jurisdictions to admit polygraph tests as evidence because of their gross unreliability.

Although there may be honest disagreement on the legitimate role, and the

scope of that role, the Government has in collecting information on its citizens, I would hope that everyone would agree that once the information has been collected, there must be some mechanism whereby the individual citizen can be apprised of what has been collected, and how that information may be dispensed. I believe that both of these bills are essential to protect the citizens of our country and hope that Congress will act favorably on this legislation in the 93d Congress. The age of the computer is already with us. The question is will we control the computer or will it control us?

SPACE ENGINEERING GENIUS, DR. REES, TO RETIRE

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Eberhard Rees will be retiring as director of the Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Ala., January 19 after more than 27 years of constant dedication to the advancement of this Nation's space efforts.

Dr. Rees is a soft-spoken and well-liked engineer who has been a keystone in a variety of scientific programs and technical projects over the years. He has been deeply involved in the development of the Saturn launch vehicles, lunar science, high resolution astronomy through the Stratoscope, Large Space Telescope, high energy astronomy through a spacecraft called the High Energy Astronomy Observatory, solar astronomy through the Apollo Telescope Mount and the Skylab program.

In addition to his space work, Dr. Rees has been a conscientious citizen of Huntsville and of the United States. He has been involved in the enhancement of the civic and cultural life of his adopted community and will continue to be a positive force for improvement.

An interesting profile of Dr. Rees was published recently in the Huntsville Times. Because of his significant contributions to our national effort in the space sciences, I am including the profile by Jack Hartsfield as a part of my remarks:

"I'M JUST AN ENGINEER . . ."

(By Jack Hartsfield)

Few men of such modesty can look back on such a distinguished career, a career often pursued in the shadow of a giant. But then, he worked best that way.

Dr. Eberhard Friedrich Michael Rees, 64, the softspoken director of Marshall Space Flight Center and one of the great engineering geniuses of his time, is stepping down from his post early next year.

What has seldom been said about this quiet, private person is that man probably would not have made it to the moon so quickly had it not been for him.

Associates close to him have always credited his methodical mind as the famed Dr. Werner von Braun's most valuable asset.

Unknown to most, the decisions on how to go to the moon and the concept of the machine that would blast men away from the earth came from Rees' technical competence.

A PROFILE

The charismatic von Braun simply had the uncanny ability to both evaluate Rees' work and "sell" the ideas to government, the nation and eventually, the world.

While Rees had the "nuts and bolts" job behind the Saturn 1B earth orbital rocket and the Saturn 5 moon rocket, von Braun handled the managerial-political front.

And it is often forgotten that when a fire killed three astronauts in Jan., 1967, during a test at Cape Kennedy, setting the moon landing program back almost two years, the space agency reached into the ranks of its rocket experts and gave Rees the job of untangling the technical mess.

Rees led a task force from Marshall and moved into the North American Rockwell Corp., plant at Downey, Calif., where the Apollo spacecraft was built, to direct a rebuilding of the craft and putting the U.S. manned moon landing program back on track.

Always it was Rees who efficiently filled the role of technical "nit-picker"—sometimes with dry wit and not always without stepping on some toes.

And it was Rees who stepped into von Braun's job as boss at Marshall in March, 1970, when von Braun was transferred to Washington.

Even then it was obvious that an era was over at the space complex here.

Von Braun had carried the U.S. quest for space superiority from the rugged days of the non-believer to landings on the moon, but more rugged days lay ahead for Rees.

The President and Congress were trimming the space budget, cutting back on planned programs within the space agency and looking for a "redirection."

Rees moved into the Marshall job, knowing the hurdles ahead and modestly "apologizing" that he could not replace von Braun as the dynamic, outgoing public marvel.

Eberhard Rees is not another von Braun. He never aspired to be.

He is reserved and, as one of his associates confided, felt a deep personal responsibility for his work force and "hurt deeply" when manpower reductions put people out the door.

He wasn't a personal newsmaker. It simply wasn't his style.

He'd grant personal interviews, but the result was a no-nonsense appraisal of Marshall programs, where they stood, where they would go.

He wasn't a day-dreamer who espoused "pie-in-the-sky" speculation of what the future for Marshall, or the space agency might or might not be.

"I'm an engineer," he once commented, "I don't know about speculations about this or that . . . I'll just leave the speculating to the press. You're much better at that sort of thing."

It had to be the toughest years of his life, being thrust into the spotlight when he had, for years, been content to serve in the "nuts-and-bolts" capacity.

He was not a self-promoter. He sought no personal prestige. If he had an ounce of vanity, it never showed.

But he earned respect from his co-workers who marveled at his engineering expertise.

What can't be ignored is that while he was in the post at Marshall, the entire image of the complex changed from one as a "rocket factory" to one of advanced scientific space research.

Skylab, the nation's first space station, will fly in April. The center is deeply involved in payload studies for the space shuttle; work is under way on a variety of unmanned satellites including the phenomenal High Energy Astronomy Observatory (HEAO) and the Large Space Telescope (LST); work is progressing for the center's work on the shuttle itself.

He insisted that a single major integrated type of mission such as the Apollo program would not suffice in the future if Marshall was to thrive.

He talked of multi-facet programs. And they came about.

"This is what Marshall has become," he would say later, "... a multi-project management and engineering establishment."

But 32 years in the rocketry and space business is enough to ask of any man, particularly a man who can remember when the rockets of his younger day looked like fire candles compared to the behemoth boosters of the 1970s.

Rees was there in the embryonic beginnings of the V-2 rocket at Peenemuende, Germany and he was still there on man's sixth moon landing.

An original member of the von Braun rocket team, he came to the U.S. in 1945 with 120 other German rocket specialists to develop space and rocket technology for a relatively space-ignorant nation.

At Fort Bliss, Tex., Rees and his companions spent five years "chasing rockets across the desert" as captured German rockets were test-fired.

When the team was transferred to Huntsville and the Army Ballistic Missile Agency, it was Rees who contributed heavily to the development of the Jupiter C launch vehicle that placed Explorer I, this nation's first satellite, into orbit.

He also was a major factor in the success of the Army Jupiter and Pershing missile projects. The Pershing is still deployed with U.S. troops in NATO countries.

From the formation of Marshall Space Flight Center in 1960 until he became its director, Rees served as deputy director for technical and scientific matters.

Born in Trossingen, Wuertemberg, Germany, he received his scientific and engineering education in Stuttgart and at the Dresden Institute of Technology.

After graduating, he became assistant to the manager of a steel mill in Leipzig, Germany.

His career in rocketry began in 1940 when he became technical plant manager of the German Guided Missile Center in Peenemuende.

Becoming a U.S. citizen in 1954, Rees then devoted his professional life to both his dreams and his adopted country.

The quiet Rees, however, never boasted of his personal achievements.

He was, as one associate put it, "a company man."

Despite his modesty, the scientific world recognized in him a uniqueness seldom found.

His credits speak for themselves.

He holds the Exceptional Civilian Service Award presented by the Department of the U.S. Army; the Distinguished Civil Service Award from the U.S. Department of Defense; the Medal for Outstanding Leadership and two Distinguished Service Medals from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; the Distinguished American Award for Exceptional Service through space science, and the Oberth Award of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics.

FARM SUBSIDY LIMITATION

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, since entering Congress I have fought to end or at least curb the farm

subsidy program which pays agribusinessmen not to grow crops. This multi-billion dollar program is a disaster to both the taxpayer and the consumer.

In addition, the farm subsidy program serves primarily the special interest agriculture conglomerates who are not in need of this kind of "welfare."

Thus, today I am reintroducing a proposal to limit Federal farm subsidies to \$10,000 per crop per farm.

The 91st Congress took a step in this direction when it set a limit of \$55,000 per crop per farm. However, due to slack administration of the program, huge farm corporations and absentee fat cats are still collecting enormous sums of tax dollars.

WASTE OF TAXPAYER'S MONEY

In this era of a record high public debt—interest on which costs the taxpayer over \$20 billion a year—we have a responsibility to reduce Federal spending in order to get the very most out of the tax dollar, and to provide a measure of tax relief to the moderate and middle-income wage earner.

The first item we should cut is the farm program that pays billions of dollars to producers of cotton, wheat, and feed grain not to grow crops.

For the 5-year period 1966 through 1970, the Department of Agriculture paid between \$2.5 billion and \$3.3 billion annually in direct payments to producers participating in the cotton, wheat, and feed grain programs. In 1970, 17 producers received between \$500,000 and \$3.5 million each; and over 300 producers received over \$100,000 each.

In 1970, to restrict what was quickly becoming "welfare for the rich," Congress limited to \$55,000 the amount of direct Federal payments a person could receive annually under the cotton, wheat, and feed grain programs.

This restriction was to save an estimated \$68 million a year. However, due to administrative decisions made by Agriculture Department officials, there was no significant reduction in 1971.

The General Accounting Office conducted a study of the arrangements made by some agribusinesses to avoid the intent of the law, and slip through the loopholes allowed by the Department of Agriculture. They revealed that agribusinesses were simply leasing part of their acreage, and thus collecting both government payments, and rental fees.

One such operation was in California. According to the General Accounting Office:

A California corporation and its wholly owned subsidiary leased about 11,600 acres of cotton allotments, worth about \$2.5 million on the basis of 1971 direct payments, to five newly created organizations qualifying for 53 separate payment limitations. In addition to receiving lease fees, the corporation contracted with the organizations to farm the cotton for fees based on the cost to produce the crops. This latter arrangement, called custom farming, allowed the 53 individuals to receive Federal payments of about \$2.5 million without actually farming.

Another such method to avoid the intent of the law is the practice of forming partnerships, a la John Wayne. The GAO revealed a case in Mississippi which illustrates this technique:

Under the 1970 cotton program, a Mississippi farmer received about \$87,000 and his adult son received about \$46,000. Had the father made no changes in his farming operation for 1971, he would have qualified for payments, in the absence of the payment limitation, of about \$79,300. Application of the \$55,000 payment limitation would have resulted in reducing his payments by about \$24,000.

In 1971, however, the father and son combined their farming operations and joined with a son-in-law to form a three-member partnership. The partners increased the size of their farming operations by leasing additional cotton allotments and, as a result, were eligible, before application of the payment limitation, for \$165,152 in 1971 cotton program payments. Because each of the three partners could receive \$55,000, or a total of \$165,000, a savings of only \$152 resulted.

These are not rare examples, Mr. Speaker. According to a March 1972 Department of Agriculture report:

Of about 1350 producers who received more than \$55,000 each in 1970 payments under the three programs; 1046, or 77%, changed their farming interests or operations for 1971.

GROCERY PRICES ARE HIGH

While the taxpayer pays up to \$3.3 billion to benefit agribusiness, he does not receive the benefit of low-cost food and fiber.

Choice steers at Omaha rose from about \$29 per hundredweight in January 1971 to nearly \$34.50 in December 1971. In February 1972, choice steers at Omaha were at a 20-year high of \$37 per hundredweight.

In fact, food costs have increased by 7.4 percent since the beginning of phase II in November 1971.

According to a study commissioned by former Secretary of Agriculture Hardin, food and fiber can be produced at reasonable prices without the Government subsidy. The report, issued on June 16, 1972, states:

We feel the agricultural industry can provide adequate supplies of food and fiber at reasonable prices and equitable returns to resources, including family labor, with a minimum of government intervention. Programs costing the U.S. taxpayers \$4 to \$5 billion annually are not needed for these purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the housewife who buys the family groceries knows that prices are high and getting higher.

This farm giveaway program cannot be justified by claiming to keep down the price of groceries.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, the taxpayer is tired of paying his hard-earned dollars to the Government. He is especially irate when the program is of no benefit to him, but, instead, benefits the wealthy.

The taxpayer would like a cut in taxes, but that cut cannot come until we reduce Government spending.

Let us get the fat-cat agribusinessmen—who would not know a boll weevil from a weaved bowl—off the backs of the taxpayer. Let us dump the farm program, and save the taxpayer billions of dollars a year.

How can anybody possibly justify paying billions of dollars to agribusiness for not growing crops while millions of Americans are being denied an adequate diet? While the taxpayer continues to bleed? While the national debt climbs to almost half a trillion dollars? And while

the consumer pays record-high prices for groceries?

I cannot.

Mr. Speaker, if we cannot completely end this blatant waste of tax dollars, let us at least put a lid on it by enacting this proposal which would limit farm payments to \$10,000 per farm per crop.

JET NOISE CURFEW NEEDED

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the problem of excessive noise abuse from jet traffic has dominated citizens' concerns ever since the first jet began swooping and soaring over their homes. The situation has deteriorated for residents as jet traffic has increased to a point of constant bombardment of noise. Studies amply demonstrating the psychological traumatic effects on people have been made on the debilitating effects of jet noise. The noise impact is 10 times more disturbing during the normal sleeping hours, when it is much more difficult to assimilate sounds, than during the day.

Action by airports and airlines to remedy the problem have been inadequate for the most part. The constitutional right to domestic tranquility includes freedom from noise. Unfortunately, this largely has been blatantly ignored by the noisemakers.

One of the few successful attempts at regulation has been the ban on late evening and predawn jet traffic at Washington National Airport. I strongly urge other airports to follow this example. It is morally, socially, and environmentally necessary.

Increasingly, and at a very disturbing rate, the people are furiously complaining about the sleep-shattering whine and roar of jet aircraft operating out of nearby airports. The complaints have been present for some time but are even more vociferous today because those responsible have failed to substantially reduce engine noise levels.

The airlines apparently favor increasing noise levels to correspondingly increase public tolerance and thereby build a generation of Americans acclimated—albeit slightly deaf—to aircraft noise pollution. The carriers are perhaps the worst offenders; with only the slightest exceptions they have shown themselves unwilling to do anything substantive to reduce noise, especially if it looks like it will cost them money. At the same time, however, they are constantly running to the Civil Aeronautics Board for rate increases. Their greed will get the best of them. They have an obligation to the public, too, not just their stockholders.

The industry has shown itself unwilling even to discuss the matter; the Congress cannot ignore this arrogance.

FAA Administrator John Shaffer acknowledges that aircraft noise—

is the single greatest impediment to airport development in the United States at the present time and prompt remedial action is required if we are to meet the projected growth of aviation in the 1970's and beyond.

Unfortunately, lip service is about all he's willing to give to this effort.

Those thousands of my constituents who live near La Guardia Airport and beneath its flight patterns, like those in other cities, suffer the consequences of decades of neglect of the noise pollution problem. Most of them were there before the jets arrived.

They used to live in comfortable, convenient neighborhoods which, while noisier perhaps than rural areas, nonetheless struck a reasonable balance between city hustle and bustle and suburban quietness. But today, that balance is gone. Now those people come home from their jobs and find themselves beneath an intolerable roar as jetliner after jetliner screeches over their roofs. The night does not bring peace to them because La Guardia and the Port of New York Authority do not or will not understand or recognize the citizen's right to quiet.

These city dwellers have lost that balance of toleration which once existed in their neighborhoods. They find that their homes offer not less, but more noise, more distraction and more simple human discomfort than their jobs in the heart of the city.

Alleviation of this situation is not terribly difficult. A reasonable solution would be to begin curtailment of all but essential military air traffic from scheduling departures and arrivals between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m., the hours normally reserved for sleeping.

The number of flights during those hours is relatively small. At La Guardia, for example, only 29 of the day's 716 flights arrive or takeoff between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m., or about 4 percent of the total operations for the 24-hour period, according to Federal Aviation Administration figures for March 1972. That's a drop of 1 percent—36 out of 718 operations—from a year before. In June 1970, 44 of 662 flights, or about 6.6 percent, were during these sleeping hours.

The new generation of air buses like the DC10 and L1011 are quieter than their predecessors, but that is only relative and they will remain in the minority of operational jet aircraft for many years to come. The louder first generation of narrow-body jets will continue to comprise the bulk of the domestic airline fleets throughout the 1970's.

Not all middle-of-the-night flights carry passengers. A great many are all freight at many terminals. Others are what are called repositioning flights, which are primarily designed to move a plane from one city to another to be on hand for the next day's service. To schedule these at less disturbing times would benefit thousands, if not millions of people, while offering the airlines only minor inconvenience.

The number of flights during normal sleeping hours is relatively small. But it does not seem that way if you happen to live nearby. Then the din of the air-

craft becomes almost unbearable. Aircraft noise during these hours has a compounding impact on residents because the noise cannot be assimilated as it is during the day with other noises. One jetliner taking off at midnight has 10 times the effective noise impact of the same plane taking off at noon.

Washington National Airport prohibits scheduled jet commercial traffic between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. The FAA, which runs National, and the airlines operating out of the airport, have a voluntary agreement on the night flight limitations. The agreement began in 1966 and has worked rather well. Only minor adjustments by the airlines were needed in rescheduling flights to conform. Similar agreements exist in Los Angeles, Newport Beach and Fresno, Calif., and Boise, Idaho, as well as London, Tokyo, Geneva, Zurich and many other major European cities.

The constitutional right of domestic tranquility includes freedom from oppressive noise. Steps must be taken by airport managements, airlines, and public officials, including the Congress, to protect and respect that right and to halt the acoustic abuse heaped mercilessly upon the citizenry.

I have personally written to the Port of New York Authority, La Guardia Airport management and the airlines using that airport, requesting they voluntarily set noise curfews. For once, those noisemakers are strangely silent. They have turned a deaf ear on the request. Their silence is a demonstration of their contempt for the people bombarded by aircraft noise. It is also further evidence that voluntary self-regulation, which industry in general professes to prefer, is meaningless. The only answer, unfortunately, appears to be stiffer governmental regulation.

Mr. Speaker, I am, therefore, offering today legislation to take the first step toward solving the problem of aircraft noise pollution. What I propose is a thorough study of the possibilities of establishing curfews on nonmilitary flight operations at the Nation's airports.

This bill, the Airport Noise Curfew Act of 1973, would set up a nine-member commission consisting of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, two representatives of the aviation industry and five public members. They would report the findings of their investigation and their recommendations to the Congress within 6 months of creation.

This Commission would be a temporary investigative body, not a new governmental agency. It would exist solely for the purpose of informing the Congress and would go out of existence upon submitting its report and recommendations.

A curfew on aircraft operations is a short term solution to the problem and is not meant to be an alternative to such long term answers as quieter engines and improved operational procedures. Both approaches are needed; they are complementary. This bill is a valuable and important first step toward solving the vexing problem of aircraft noise pollution.

A curfew would help combat another form of pollution as well. The hours between sunset and sunrise are usually when the atmospheric ground-based temperature inversion layer grows vigorously and aggravates our air pollution problem. Therefore, reducing nighttime jet traffic for noise reasons also reduces significantly the amount of polluting exhaust from jet engines being injected into this stable surface layer of air in which we all live. So, Mr. Speaker, a curfew on nighttime operations would not only let airport neighbors get a good night's sleep but also to breathe cleaner air while they slumber.

The cosponsors follow:

COSPONSORS OF THE AIRPORT NOISE CURFEW ACT OF 1973

Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Bella S. Abzug, Frank Annunzio, Herman Badillo, Frank J. Brasco, Joshua Ellberg, Ella T. Grasso, Gilbert Gude, Ken Hechler, Robert McClory, William S. Moorhead, Bertram L. Podell, Charles B. Rangel, Peter W. Rodino, Edward R. Roybal, Lester L. Wolff.

FULL CITIZENSHIP RIGHTS FOR ALL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of the 93d Congress, I introduced the Government Employees Political Activities Act of 1973 which would insure that every American's right to free expression of his political opinions is adequately protected. We have been requesting concerned American citizens to work through the political system; but at the same time, one anachronistic piece of legislation, the Hatch Act, has the effect of excluding millions of U.S. citizens from active political participation. Today I am cosponsoring legislation which would correct those provisions in the Hatch Act that infringe on the political freedom of Government employees.

The Hatch Act was originally intended, when it was first enacted back in 1939, to protect public employees from involuntary political activity, coercion, and abuse of office, and its provisions in these areas remain valuable. However, the effect of the act's blanket prohibition against active political participation has been to deny these workers their political rights. What my bill would do would be to eliminate from the present law this sweeping prohibition against political activity by Government employees. The only restriction on political activity to remain would be a prohibition on holding a salaried office in a partisan political club. Furthermore, this bill would empower the Civil Service Commission to take action against officials, including those appointed by the President—who are not currently subject to Civil Service Commission jurisdiction—that it finds guilty of unlawful coercion. Most important, however, for civil service employees, the prohibition against soliciting political financial contributions is retained, so that

these employees may not be made the subject of political extortion. The Civil Service Commission would have a functional interrelationship with the Department of Justice by referring violations for criminal prosecution. At the present time, the Justice Department is empowered to initiate such actions, but has rarely pursued such prosecutions in the past.

When the Hatch Act was first enacted, the extent of its coverage was by modern standards only minimal. Even when the Hatch Act was amended in 1940, to include State and local government employees working in programs receiving Federal funds, less than one-half million workers were subject to it. Now, after three decades of growing government responsibility, that number has expanded to more than 5 million employees. There are very few areas of modern society that are not affected or involved in some way with Federal programs or programs using Federal funds. And there seems every assurance that more and more Americans will come under the restrictive provisions of the Hatch Act simply by choosing to work for the Federal Government or a federally funded local project. In fact, Congress recently expanded the act even further to cover employees of private groups administering community action programs funded by the Federal Government through grants under the Economic Opportunity Act. Certainly it is ironic that those persons who are concerned enough about public affairs to choose to work for Federal and State programs are the ones that are excluded by this act from political activity.

In 1966, Congress created a Commission, known as the Hatch Act Commission, to study all Federal laws restricting political participation by Government employees. In its final report, in December 1967, the Commission noted the need for substantial reform of the present act, particularly in the areas of clarifying its vagueness and reducing its application to the fewest employees. As the Commission noted, most Government employees are so confused by the more than 3,000 specific prohibitions issued over the years by the executive branch and have so little idea what they are permitted to do that they tend to avoid taking part in any political activity at all. Congress has taken the initiative in recent years in expanding the opportunities for political activity through its civil rights legislation and the 18-year-old vote. Is it not about time that Congress restores to Government employees their right to free political expression and to act on the recommendations made by the Commission that it created?

The city of New York has more than 300,000 municipal employees. A great number receive some Federal contribution toward their salaries and are, under the existing law, "Hatched."

Other Government employees, both city and State are currently prohibited from engaging in political activity by similar local regulations. This bill would lift the ban on political activity imposed by any Government agency and would mandate compliance by any State or city agency in order for that agency to receive revenue sharing moneys. This bill, if en-

acted, would restore full citizenship to all Government employees.

THE ROGERS DOOR

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, as we convene in this great building, a constant symbol of the strength of our democracy and the central place that representative legislative government has in it, I want to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleague one of the finer works of art which grace the Capitol.

The Rogers Door, a monumental memorial in bronze to the discoverer of our land, lends a dignity to the Capitol befitting the life and work of Columbus. It was with some surprise and a great deal of delight that I learned recently that the great-great-niece of the artist, Mrs. Mildred Yahnka, was a resident of Beaverton, Mich., in my congressional district. As will be seen from the newspaper article which I am adding to my remarks, Mrs. Yahnka never tires of bringing to the attention of potential visitors to the Capitol the monument which Randolph Rogers created in the memory of Columbus. By doing so she certainly shares in the pride which we all have for the beauty of the Capitol Building but more than that, I am sure that this reminder serves to draw attention to the many other works of art in the Capitol. Certainly we who walk these halls daily overlook the value and history of the beauty in the building.

I commend the following article, by Mrs. Genevieve Lloyd of the Midland Daily News, to the attention of my colleagues and hope that each of us will be prompted to be more aware of the artistic heritage which surrounds us in this symbol of our democracy.

The article follows:

THE ROGERS DOOR

(By Mrs. Genevieve Lloyd)

"Don't forget to see the large bronze doors at the front entrance to the Capitol Building," said Mrs. Mildred Yahnka when she learned a Washington, D.C. trip was being planned.

It wasn't until our return that she was aware the famous Rogers Door, sometimes referred to as the Columbus Door, had been transferred to the East Wing of the Rotunda.

She explained that they had not visited the Capitol since the summer of 1932.

Randolph Rogers, the world known sculptor and great, great uncle to Mrs. Yahnka, designed and modeled the door.

Mrs. Yahnka, a retired school teacher from Dearborn, Michigan, and now a resident of Beaverton, said she remembers her father telling how Uncle Randolph came to Quincy (Michigan) to visit the family.

"It's like a folklore," she said, "handed down from generation to generation."

She recalled that the stories her father related to them were very realistic.

"He used to come to Quincy to visit his sister, Rebecca Rogers," she said.

"He always went to the Quincy House Hotel, dressed in a homespun suit, carrying all of his money in a carpet bag. He would

register, throw the bag of money under the clerk's desk and then go to the livery stable. There he would hire a horse and buggy and drive out to the homestead to visit his sister," Mrs. Yahnka's great, great aunt.

Mrs. Yahnka's father, Charles H. Meredith, Randolph Rogers' great nephew, was born in 1870 and died in 1947. He preceded her mother in death.

There are two daughters, Myrtle Inez Meyers who still lives in Allen, Michigan within five miles of Quincy, and Mrs. Yahnka, the younger of the two. Her father was supervisor of Hillsdale county and constructed many roads and bridges in the Quincy, Allen, Hillsdale area and throughout southern Michigan.

"My grandmother," Mrs. Harriet West Meredith, niece of Randolph Rogers, also "told us many interesting 'tales'."

"One specific thing, and I remember it very vividly," she said, "is grandmother telling how he sat by the hour, days in and days out, drawing, redrawing, and drawing again the pattern for the door."

The Rogers Door, measuring 16 feet 8 inches by 9 feet 9 inches, and dating back to November 1863, was installed between Statuary Hall and the south extension, and in 1871 it was removed to the East Portico entrance.

It has two valves, with four panels in each valve, and one semi-circular transom over the entire door. The scene depicts events in the life of Christopher Columbus. The sculpturing was done in 1858 in Rome, Italy and cast in Munich, Germany by Ferdinand von Miller at the Royal Bavarian Foundry in 1861.

In viewing some of the highlights of the famous door, you can see scenes of "Columbus Before the Council of Salamanca, 1486-1487"; "Columbus' Departure from the Convent of La Rabida, 1492"; "Departure of Columbus from Palas, August 3, 1492"; "The Landing of Columbus in the New World, October 12, 1492," "Columbus' First Encounter with the Indians"; "Entry of Columbus into Barcelona, 1492"; "Columbus in Chains, 1500" and "Death of Columbus, 1506."

On the door, on the sides and between these panels, Rogers sculptured sixteen small statues, set in niches, of eminent contemporaries of Columbus.

Between the panels of the door and at top and bottom of the valves are ten small heads. These heads represent historians who have written on Columbus' voyages. Above the transom arch are the bust of Columbus, the American Eagle and flags. The door is covered with heraldic emblems of that period.

The most recent move, included in the extension of the Capitol project, was transferring the door to its present location, in 1961, to the extended East Portico entrance.

Talking about her great, great uncle, Mrs. Yahnka said that he married in Italy. (Contrary to history and encyclopedia books which state he married in America.)

"I believe he was married when he went there to do his carving," she said, "which resulted in more than three years before completing his work."

"I cannot remember his wife's name, but believe she was of Italian descent," Mrs. Yahnka said.

"To my knowledge, my family, at least going back through my grandmother Meredith, never met her."

"However," she said, "they learned about her through Randolph's letters."

Mrs. Yahnka, who graduated from Eastern Michigan University with an art major moved from Allen, Michigan to Ypsilanti while attending college there. A classmate, in art, once told her that she knew of great grandchildren of Rogers, and who were at that time, living in Toledo, Ohio.

"I didn't realize the importance of family ties," she said.

"Even my instructors tried to encourage me to make an attempt to locate them, but I

didn't have the foresight to pursue the search."

Randolph Rogers was born in 1825 and died 1892. He was noted for his memorial monuments and his monuments to the state of Michigan and Connecticut. His works are displayed in the Detroit Museum of Arts, also at the Chicago Museum. "And," Mrs. Yahnka and, "I have been told he has additional art work in the San Francisco Museum of California."

He was born in Waterloo, New York, but "came to Ann Arbor," which is about 90 miles from Quincy, "where he spent most of his boyhood."

Still reminiscing, she recalls her grandmother telling that Rogers studied under Lorenzo Bartolini in Rome.

"And I believe," she continued, "he attended school at the University of Michigan before going to Rome."

"I can't remember at what time in his life that he returned to Rome to live, but my grandmother told us that he died there."

Mrs. Yahnka, who taught school at Marshall, Dearborn and Garden City, resides with her husband, Otto P. Yahnka at 3891 West Calhoun Road in Beaverton. They have one daughter, Martha, who is married to Dr. Roger F. Luneke, and three grandchildren.

Their home, Bellevue, Michigan, is within 50 miles of Quincy where Randolph Rogers came to visit the Rogers, West and Meredith families.

JAMES ELBEL HOWE RETIRES AS DIRECTOR OF STATE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF UNITED TRANSPORTATION UNION

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to commend and to call recognition to James E. Howe on the occasion of his retirement as director of the California State Legislative Board of the United Transportation Union. Jim Howe has served as the first director of the State board since its inception in 1969, in which capacity he has represented with honor and distinction the members of the union. He has retired as of December 31, 1972.

For the past 30 years, James E. Howe has been a leading representative of the railroad workers of California, and he served for a period of years as the chairman of the California State Legislative Board of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. He joined the brotherhood in 1928, and has held continuous membership since that time. During the years he has held the positions of local secretary and treasurer, legislative representative, chairman of the legislative board, and legislative director.

As a representative of railroad employees of California, Jim Howe was continually an ardent and fair advocate of all legislation designed for the protection of the public and for the improvement of the status and working conditions of railroad workers. He has proven to be a tireless student of the problems of the railroad industry and its various employees, and always has been willing to lend his knowledge and talents to officials and governmental committees who requested

his expert advice to assist them in their deliberations.

James Elbel Howe was born in Berkeley, Calif., on August 12, 1907; his father was a native Californian and his mother was born in England. His grandfather was one of the first judges under Mexican rule. His education was in California in Calaveras County, Berkeley, Lancaster, and UCLA Extension. Jim Howe has 49 years of service on railroads as clerk, switchman, brakeman and conductor. For 43 years he has been married to Lillian Payton Howe. Jim and Lillian were constituents of mine for years when I served in the California State Legislature, before they moved to Sacramento where Jim assumed the post from which he has just retired.

Jim has also been involved in community affairs. Since 1940 he has been a member of the Elks, since 1945, a Mason, and since 1959, a Shriner.

Jim Howe's service has been not only to railroad employees and members of the union, but his work has had a beneficial effect on the people of California and this country, as well. I am pleased to extend congratulations and felicitations to James E. Howe for his meritorious service on the occasion of his retirement as the director of the California State Legislative Board of the United Transportation Union, and to extend best wishes and hopes to him and his wife for many years of happiness in the future.

STRENGTHENING OUR CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing five bills which deal with the strengthening of correctional institutions, revamping of the parole system, striving for a reduction in repeat offenders, the upgrading of training opportunities for law enforcement officers, and the curtailment of international narcotics entering the United States.

These bills are the result of recommendations by my citizens committees in the Fourth District of Florida and show the genuine concern of my people in a better America.

The correctional center bill would assist the States in the construction and maintenance of correctional facilities providing a broad range of services and programs including educational, vocational, and recreational programs, medical, psychiatric, dental care, and counseling.

The real intent of this measure is to cut down on what we might call the professional jailbird—the one who comes in for a light sentence but who is jailed with longtime criminals and thus, himself, becomes a hardened and repeat criminal.

Three kinds of centers would be established under the bill: regional youth correction centers for the treatment of young adults and youth; centers for per-

sons sentenced to a year or less; and centers for longer term offenders, the mentally ill and the violent and dangerous.

My parole bill would give more latitude to parole boards in evaluating an offender who has made a serious attempt to rehabilitate himself. The bill also provides that where an offender is to be imprisoned for more than 180 days, a complete study be done on him to assist parole officials in determining the best rehabilitative steps to be taken.

Mr. Speaker, society cannot afford to continue with the type of system we now have that encourages a prisoner to consider the institution his home. I am encouraged by the hearings which the Judiciary Committee held on this measure and others during the last session. I trust the committee will report out a bill early in this Congress.

The third crime measure I introduce today would enable a policeman to take a year's leave of absence to return to school for additional training in colleges and police academies. The bill provides for grants equal to 1 year's salary.

The fourth measure, the International Opium Control Act, authorizes the President to negotiate treaties with other nations to stop the flow of illicit drug traffic. It empowers the President to withhold economic and military assistance from any nation which continues to allow the exportation of drugs which enter America.

One of the most effective ways to eradicate drugs from our society is to dry up their sources. It is absolutely imperative that we get nations to agree on regulations and enforcement against drug traffic.

One of the key factors in effective law enforcement is the proper dissemination of information among law enforcement agencies. To assist our State and local law enforcement agencies in this area, I am introducing a bill to authorize the Attorney General to exchange criminal information with other law enforcement agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to examine these bills and to join with me in working for legislation this session to improve our correctional system, stop the flow of narcotics, and assist our law enforcement officers in carrying out their duties.

THE LEGION OF ESTONIAN LIBERATION POLLS ITS MEMBERSHIP—A SUMMARY

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, during the first 2 weeks of October 1972 the Legion of Estonian Liberation polled its membership on a number of national and international issues, and later that month sent me a copy of the results of the poll.

I believe the summary of this poll will be of interest to other Members of the House and therefore include the summary at this point:

1972 Membership Opinion Poll

(Responses in terms of percent, unless ranked in numerical order)

1. Do you believe that the Economic Stabilization Program announced on August 15, 1971 by President Nixon has achieved its main goal of controlling inflation? Yes 58.5, No 26.6, No opinion* 14.9.

2. Do you approve of the Nixon Administration's policies of trade? a. with U.S.S.R.? Yes 25.5, No 69.2, No opinion 5.3. b. with China? Yes 44.7, No 35.1, No opinion 20.2.

3. Do you favor the President's recent efforts to open more normal relations with China? Yes 52.1, No 37.2, No opinion 10.7.

4. a. Do you favor the continuation of the wage-price controls? For six months 6.4, For 1 year 24.5, For 2 years 60.6, Not at all 4.5, No opinion 4.0. b. If continued, do you feel they should be made more stricter 74.5, Less stricter 7.4, No opinion 18.1.

5. Would you favor the adoption of a no-fault auto insurance program on a national level? By an Act of Congress 72.4, On a State by State basis 7.4, Not at all 12.8, No opinion 7.4.

6. Should busing of students be required to achieve greater racial balance in our schools? Yes 4.3, No 87.2, No opinion 8.5.

7. The National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse has recommended that the possession of marihuana for personal and private use no longer be an offense. a. Would you favor such a change in Federal law? Yes 16.0, No 69.1, No opinion 14.9. b. Do you believe that the use of marihuana has greater or lesser social consequences than the use of tobacco and alcohol? Greater 74.4, Lesser 10.6, No opinion 16.0.

8. How would you characterize present U.S. expenditures for defense? Too high 6.4, Too low 42.6, About right 50.0, No opinion 1.0.

9. On the basis of personal trust, whom would you trust more as the President? McGovern 0.0, Nixon 90.4, Not sure 6.4, Other-Schmitz 3.2.

10. After President Nixon's plan to withdraw U.S. troops from South Viet Nam is completed, do you think the U.S. should continue to send military aid? Yes 87.2, No 3.2, No opinion 9.6.

11. Do you support the all volunteer army concept for national defense? Yes 21.3, No 68.1, No opinion 10.6.

12. Would you favor a "Value Added" tax, in effect a national sales tax, as a method to reduce property taxes? Yes 53.2, No 21.3, No opinion 25.5.

13. Should the Federal Government pass a law requiring the registration of all handguns? Yes 80.8, No 16.0, No opinion 3.2.

14. Should Congress limit the President's power to commit U.S. troops to an undeclared war? Yes 19.1, No 74.5, No opinion 6.4.

15. Which political party do you think can do a better job of handling:

a. High cost of living? Rep. 72.3, Dem. 3.2, No difference 24.5.

b. Viet Nam war? Dem. 1.1, Rep. 80.8, No difference 18.1.

c. Crime/lawlessness? Rep. 72.4, Dem. 1.1, No difference 25.5.

d. Race relations? Dem. 5.3, Rep. 62.8, No difference 31.9.

16. The prisoner of war issue is one of the main stumbling blocks in terminating our military role in South Viet Nam. If the enemy does not yield and the last issue to be resolved is their demand that we withdraw our support from the South Vietnamese Government, would you agree to this demand to terminate the war and get our prisoners back? Yes 10.6, No 78.8, No opinion 10.6.

17. Do you favor the U.S. establishing diplomatic relations with:

a. Cuba? Yes 11.7, No 83.9, No opinion 6.4.

b. China? Yes 43.6, No 43.6, No opinion 12.8.

*No opinion includes no answers.

18. Do you favor a Constitutional amendment limiting the Presidency to a one six year term? Yes 53.2, No 39.4, No opinion 7.4.

19. If you had to rank the major causes of inflation today, in what order would they be? (Please rate 1, 2, 3, etc.)

a. Excessive wage demands 1;
b. Excessive price increases 3;
c. Excessive Government spending and deficits 4;

d. Excessive business profits 2; and,
e. Balance of trade deficits 5.

20. An issue that the Congress and the President will face in the near future is that of amnesty for those who left the U.S. to avoid the draft. Under what conditions would you favor amnesty?

a. After hostilities have ended in Viet Nam and the prisoners have been returned and then on an individual and selective basis as was done after World War II 20.2;

b. On condition that they perform some kind of alternate public service for (1) one year 1.1, (2) years 10.6, (3) more than two years; 16.0.

c. Never under any conditions 47.9;

d. Grant amnesty now without any conditions 2.1; and,

e. No opinion 2.1.

21. Do you favor Federal revenue sharing with State and local governments? Yes 62.8, No 14.9, No opinion 22.3.

22. Do you believe the U.S. tax system should be restructured? Yes 76.6, No 6.4, No opinion 17.0.

23. Should Federal and public employees have the right to strike? Yes 5.3, No 90.4, No opinion 4.3.

24. Do you think the Federal anti-pollution programs should provide for:

a. More stringent controls 68.0;
b. Less stringent controls 6.4;

c. As present 16.0; and,
d. No opinion 9.6.

25. Would you be willing to pay higher taxes and prices to support anti-pollution programs? Yes 37.2, No 45.8, No opinion 17.0.

26. Would you favor more research for and help solve the energy crisis? Yes 80.9, No 13.8, No opinion 5.3.

27. Should more stringent controls be established to protect the consumer? Yes 89.4, No 2.1, No opinion 8.5.

28. Do you favor reduction of funds for foreign aid? Yes 70.2, No 26.6, No opinion 3.2.

29. Do you favor creating a national child day care program (including educational and nutritional services) to enable mothers to work and thereby reduce welfare rolls? Yes 67.0, No 20.2, No opinion 12.8.

30. Do you favor a minimum guaranteed annual income for every family? Yes 29.8, No 51.1, No opinion 19.1.

31. Should the Federal Government institute a national lottery to obtain additional revenue? Yes 77.7, No 8.5, No opinion 13.8.

32. Should the space program be continued at its present level? Yes 69.1, No 16.0, No opinion 14.9.

33. Should the number of U.S. troops in Europe be reduced? Yes 17.0, No 77.7, No opinion 5.3.

34. Would you support the position that air piracy or hijacking is not justifiable under any circumstances? Yes 64.9, No 22.3, No opinion 12.8.

35. Do you think the U.N. is doing a good job in handling and solving the problems it faces? Yes 4.3, No 87.2, No opinion 8.5.

36. The U.S. contributes the largest percentage and total dollars of the U.N. budget. However, on a per capita (per person) basis, the U.S. contribution is not the highest. Do you think the U.S. monetary support of the United Nations should be: Increased? 2.1, Decreased? 76.6, Remain the same? 21.3.

37. Do you support the Strategic Arms Limitation Agreement signed by the President with the Soviet Union? Yes 29.8, No 54.2, No opinion 16.0.

38. Do you think your local newspapers

report the news impartially? Yes 24.5, No 56.4, No opinion 19.1.

39. Do you think that network television fairly presents both sides of most issues? Yes 16.0, No 74.4, No opinion 9.6.

40. If Presidential elections were held tomorrow, to whom would you cast your vote? Nixon 92.1, McGovern 0.0, Schmitz 7.9, Spock 0.0.

41. How do you rate President Nixon's performance in office? Excellent 26.6, Good 47.9, Fair 13.8, Poor 8.5, No opinion 3.2.

42. How do you rate Vice President Agnew's performance in office? Excellent 59.6, Good 29.8, Fair 6.4, Poor 1.0, No opinion 3.2.

43. Please give your rating (in terms of excellent, good, fair, poor, no opinion) of President Nixon's performance in the following areas:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No opinion
(a) Inflation.....	6.4	39.3	27.7	14.9	11.7
(b) Vietnam.....	16.0	50.0	18.1	6.4	9.5
(c) Jobs.....	3.2	34.0	34.0	14.9	13.9
(d) Crime.....	4.2	20.2	28.7	35.2	11.7
(e) Environment.....	5.3	26.6	41.5	8.5	18.1
(f) Race relations.....	7.3	41.5	25.5	7.4	18.1
(g) Drugs.....	8.5	21.3	28.7	24.5	17.0
(h) Relations with Soviet Union.....	4.3	27.7	29.7	24.5	13.8
(i) Relations with China.....	10.6	35.1	26.6	14.9	12.8
(j) Overall domestic policy.....	8.5	47.8	27.7	4.3	11.7
(k) Overall foreign policy.....	11.7	44.6	21.3	9.6	12.8

44. If President Nixon were to ask for your advice in any of the above areas in No. 43, which area would you choose?

a. Inflation 5.1; b. Viet Nam 8.5; c. Jobs 3.4;

d. Crime 23.7; e. Environment 1.7; f. Race relations 0.0;

g. Drugs 5.1; h. Relations with Soviet Union 27.1;

i. Relations with China 5.1; j. Overall domestic policy 8.5;

k. Overall foreign policy 11.8.

45. Do you see any potential changes in the United States policy of non-recognition of the illegal annexation of the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania?

a. If President Nixon is reelected?

Yes 14.9, No 78.7, No opinion 6.4.

b. If Senator McGovern is elected President?

Yes 58.5, No 24.5, No opinion 17.0.

46. Do you believe that the question of the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania should be placed on the United Nations Agenda?

Yes 81.9, No 9.6, No opinion 8.5.

47. Would you favor continued U.S. support of:

a. Radio Free Europe? Yes 98.9, No 0.0, No opinion 1.1.

b. Radio Liberty? Yes 78.7, No 1.1, No opinion 20.2.

48. Do you support the U.S. decision to participate in the European Security Conference? Yes 63.8, No 18.1, No opinion 18.1.

49. Should governments or private organizations yield to terrorist demands when holding hostages? Yes 11.7, No 70.2, No opinion 18.1.

50. Would you support the idea of granting satellite country status to the Baltic States by the Soviet union in lieu of complete freedom? Yes 28.7, No 59.6, No opinion 11.7.

ROBERTO WALKER CLEMENTE

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, how does one eulogize a giant, a

man whose deeds and actions were legend for hundreds of thousands, whose warmth and humanity and love of life, brought strength, enjoyment, and brotherhood to multitudes?

Indeed, words fail in moments such as these.

Roberto Walker Clemente, one of the greatest baseball players the world will ever know, is dead.

He was virtually loved by thousands of Pittsburghers who thrilled to his epic feats on the baseball diamond. He could run, throw, hit, field, with the very best. In most of these categories, he was the standard, the benchmark which his peers sought to reach.

Fiercely prideful, Bob Clemente played 18 years for the Pittsburgh Pirates, leading them to two world championships and two division championships. He won every laurel a player could, including most valuable player, the batting title, the golden glove for his excellent fielding, outstanding player in the world's series, and just last year, although missing a good part of the season, he managed to bang out the 3,000th base hit of his career, a feat only matched by 12 men in all of baseball.

His performances on the field were virtuoso. Some people described his play and his demeanor as regal. He was simply the complete ball player.

Yet he was more.

A super star, making well over \$100,000 per year, he never forgot the real owners of the game, the fans. He always said that he played for them and for them only.

His native Puerto Rico and his beloved countrymen were always uppermost in his thoughts. During the off season he would play for the local team and display those talents that made him great.

He worked with the children of Puerto Rico, always mindful that many would not have the same opportunities which he did. Roberto's great dream was to erect a sports city for the children of Puerto Rico, where they could play and learn and thrive on the competition and joy which are so much a part of organized athletics.

Unselfish, a dedicated family man, a nationalist, a good man—these but scratch the surface of Bob Clemente.

He died in a plane crash while on a mercy mission to help those suffering in neighboring Nicaragua. This is the man, Clemente.

He was a catalyst for the city of Pittsburgh. He was one thing that all people of our city, no matter their color or social status could agree upon. Roberto was "the Great One."

It is a label he lived up to in a dozen ways.

Our city and its residents were shocked and dumbfounded at the news of his death. He meant so much to the fans as a player, yet he was even more as a symbol.

The untimely death of a man like Clemente often forces us to realize how mortal we all are and how fragile, brief, and faulted our time on earth is.

But there is good in all things. And the death of Roberto Clemente has made thousands want to carry on the work which Bobby only began.

There will be thousands of dollars pledged to the Nicaraguan Relief Fund in his name. A sports city for the children of Puerto Rico will be started in his name and his deeds will be a standard for many young men, regardless of their color, creed, or native country, to emulate.

Next spring, there will be a new right-fielder for the Pittsburgh Pirates. No matter who the man is, he might substitute for, but he will never replace Roberto Clemente.

COMMUNITY SCHOOL CENTER DEVELOPMENT ACT

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Community School Center Development Act; Senators CHURCH and WILLIAMS are introducing an identical bill in the Senate. The purpose of the bill is to utilize school facilities beyond the normal school hours to provide a wide variety of social services to all members of the community. The bill provides grants to promote and aid the development and expansion of community school programs throughout the Nation.

The community schools concept is not a new one; the idea was fostered in Flint, Mich., in the 1930's by Charles Stewart Mott of the Mott Foundation. It has since been adopted by over 600 school systems across the country. The impact the existing programs have had on the communities served has been so exemplary that many experts cite community education as key to solving the problems of both urban and rural communities.

Focusing first on the impact that a community school has on children in the normal academic program, it is notable that their classroom performance is significantly improved.

Psychologists have noted that in order to best serve the child, the school must be able to relate to some degree to the family and to the total community. A child's attitudes and perceptions of school as learned outside the classroom are large factors in determining his behavior and success in school. With the reinforcement of family and community involvement, the child's attitude toward his schoolday is significantly strengthened and his potential and motivation for learning correspondingly enhanced.

Beyond bolstering elementary and secondary education, the community school programs have contributed to the viability of the community through basic adult education programs. The increasing demand for a more skilled work force by public and private industry and the abnormally high percentage of adult illiteracy and high unemployment in many inner city and rural areas underline the need for adult education. In most instances these education needs can best be met at the neighborhood level, after hours, and on the weekends. Community education programs can serve greatly to improve the quality of the community's

labor force and thus its economic strength.

Further, the community school program can reach now alienated and isolated groups both in our cities and rural areas. Perhaps two of the least understood and most mistreated groups in our society—delinquent youth and elderly—can both be better served through community school programs. The Montana State Task Force for Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention vigorously supports the community school bill as instrumental to reducing dropout and juvenile arrest rates. Community school programs can be an attractive alternative to the street corner with flexible programs that give youth needed psychological and social support.

For the elderly, space in the school can be set aside for social and recreation functions throughout the day. Programs of health and hot meals provided at minimal cost are low-cost investments with inestimable returns for the lives of the elderly.

In rural areas, the community school program is a hope for ending the isolation and severe lack of rural cooperative services. The director of the Appalachian Adult Education Center claimed, "It is apparent that the only viable and potential public system through which needs and the promise of rural America can be solved" is the community school program.

In sum, the advantages for the Federal Government to undertake leadership in encouraging the community school program are enormous in terms of attacking multiple community-related problems, using the existing systems and facilities, responding to local needs, and helping to serve groups presently alienated from our society. I urge all of my colleagues here in the House to join in supporting the Community School Center Development Act.

I attach the bill so that it can be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

H.R. 972

A bill to promote development and expansion of community schools throughout the United States.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Community School Center Development Act".

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to provide recreational, educational, and a variety of other community and social services through the establishment of the community school as a center for such activities in cooperation with other community groups.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act the term—

(1) "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education;

(2) "State" includes, in addition to the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

(3) "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of State elementary and secondary education or if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or State law;

(4) "Council" means the Community Schools Advisory Council;

(5) "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which (A) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (B) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (C) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (D) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (E) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if not so accredited, (i) is an institution with respect to which the Commissioner has determined that there is satisfactory assurance, considering the resources available to the institution, the period of time, if any, during which it has operated, the effort it is making to meet accreditation standards, and the purpose for which this determination is being made, that the institution will meet the accreditation standards of such an agency or association within a reasonable time, or (ii) is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. Such term also includes any school which provides not less than a one-year program of training to prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation and which meets the provision of clauses (A), (B), (D), and (E). For purpose of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered;

(6) "local educational agency" means a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or any combination thereof as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary schools. Such term also includes any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school; and

(7) "community school program" means a program in which a public elementary or secondary school is utilized as a community center operated in cooperation with other groups in the community to provide recreational, educational, and a variety of other community and social services for the community that center serves.

TITLE I—COMMUNITY EDUCATION CENTER GRANTS

SEC. 101. (a) The Commissioner shall make grants to institutions of higher education to develop and establish programs in community education which will train people as community school directors.

(b) Where an institution of higher learning has such a program presently in existence, such grant may be made to expand the program.

APPLICATIONS

SEC. 102. A grant under this title may be made to any institution of higher education upon application to the Commissioner at such time, in such manner, and containing and accompanied by such information as the Commissioner deems necessary. Each such application shall—

(1) provide that the programs and activities for which assistance under this title is sought will be administered by or under the supervision of the applicant;

(2) describe with particularity the pro-

grams and activities for which such assistance is sought;

(3) set forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this title; and

(4) provide for making such reasonable reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 103. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE II—GRANTS FOR COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

SEC. 201. (a) The Commissioner may, upon proper application, make grants to local educational agencies for the establishment of new community school programs and the expansion of existing ones.

(b) Grants shall be available for the training and salaries of community school directors as well as actual and administrative and operating expenses connected with such programs.

APPORTIONMENT

SEC. 202. The number of project grants available to each State, subject to uniform criteria established by the Commissioner, shall be as follows:

(1) States with a population of less than five million shall receive not more than four projects;

(2) States with a population of more than five million but less than ten million shall receive not more than six projects;

(3) States with a population of more than ten million but less than fifteen million shall receive not more than eight projects; and

(4) States with a population of more than fifteen million shall receive not more than ten projects.

CONSULTATION WITH STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY

SEC. 203. In determining the recipients of project grants the Commissioner shall consult with each State educational agency to assure support of a program particularly suitable to that State and providing adequate experience in the operation of community schools.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 204. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE III—COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROMOTION

PROMOTION

SEC. 301. In order to promote the adoption of community school programs throughout the United States the Commissioner shall—

(1) accumulate and disseminate pertinent information to local communities;

(2) appoint twenty-five teams, consisting of not more than four individuals on each team, to assist communities contemplating the adoption of a community school program; and

(3) establish a program of permanent liaison between the community school district and the Commissioner.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 302. (a) There is hereby established in the office of the Commissioner a Community Schools Advisory Council to be composed of seven members appointed by the President for terms of two years without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code.

(b) The Council shall select its own Chairman and Vice Chairman and shall meet at the call of the Chairman, but not less than four times a year. Members shall be appointed for two-year terms, except that of the members first appointed four shall be appointed for a term of one year and three shall be appointed for a term of two years

as designated by the President at the time of appointment. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall serve only for the remainder of such term. Members shall be eligible for reappointment and may serve after the expiration of their terms until their successors have taken office. A vacancy in the Council shall not affect its activities and four members thereof shall constitute a quorum. The Commissioner shall be an ex officio member of the Council. A member of the Council who is an officer or employee of the Federal Government shall serve without additional compensation.

(c) The Commissioner shall make available to the Council such staff, information, and other assistance as it may require to carry out its activities.

FUNCTIONS OF THE COUNCIL

SEC. 303. The Council shall advise the Commissioner on policy matters relating to the interests of community schools.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

SEC. 304. Each member of the Council appointed pursuant to section 302 shall receive \$50 a day, including traveltime, for each day he is engaged in the actual performance of his duties as a member of the Council. Each such member shall also be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of his duties.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 305. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROHIBITIONS AND LIMITATIONS

SEC. 401. (a) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

(b) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize the making of any payment under this Act for the construction of facilities as a place of worship or religious instruction.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 402. (a) If any State or local educational agency is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of applications submitted under title II, or with his final action under section 405, such State or local educational agency may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such agency is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of that petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner shall file promptly in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided for in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon cer-

tiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 403. (a) The Commissioner may delegate any of his functions under this Act to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

(b) In administering the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement as may be agreed upon.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 404. Payments under this Act may be made in installments, in advance, or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of underpayment or overpayment.

WITHHOLDING

SEC. 405. Whenever the Commissioner, after giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a grant recipient under this Act, finds—

(1) that the program or activity for which such grant was made has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of this Act; or

(2) that in the operation of the program or activity there is failure to comply substantially with any such provision; the Commissioner shall notify in writing such recipient of his findings and no further payments may be made to such recipient by the Commissioner until he is satisfied that such noncompliance has been, or will promptly be, corrected. The Commissioner may authorize the continuance of payments with respect to any programs or activities pursuant to this Act which are being carried out by such recipient and which are not involved in the noncompliance.

AUDIT AND REVIEW

SEC. 406. The Commissioner and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination, to any books, documents, papers, and records of a grantee, under this Act, that are pertinent to the grant received.

REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS

SEC. 407. The Commissioner shall transmit to the President and to the Congress annually a report of activities under this Act, including the name of each applicant, a brief description of the facts in each case, and the number and amount of grants.

APPELLATE REVIEW OF SENTENCES

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to provide for appellate review of sentences arising in the district courts of the United States, and to call upon the States to adopt similar measures.

The problem of disparities in sentences is one that has concerned Congress for many years, and during the 90th Congress, the Senate passed a bill which provided for appellate review of sentences imposed in Federal courts. The House took no action during that same year, however, and the measure, therefore, was not enacted into law.

The National Commission for Reform

of Federal Criminal Laws—Brown Commission—and the ABA Advisory Committee have urged the adoption of some form of appellate review of sentences. This concept, therefore, has already won approval many times over by respected authorities within the legal profession, as it is recognized that both the defendant and society suffer when the law is not applied with equity and fairness.

Unusual sentencing disparities may occur because of the individual nature of each trial court judge, as each has a different set of values, reactions, and points of view. In brief, each judge simply is the product of a unique life experience, and this, many argue, would make it inevitable that some errors in judgment will occur—even among the best of judges. This is one of the major reasons why our judicial system contains an appellate procedure.

Under existing Federal law, however, the determination of the sentence is the only discretionary authority of the trial court judge which is not subject to review by a higher court. As long as the sentence imposed is within the statutory limits provided by law, the sentence is unreviewable by appeal. No matter how unduly severe, an appellate court is powerless to modify the sentence in any way.

Twenty of our own States, in addition to many foreign countries, provide for at least some form of appellate review of sentences. Moreover, in U.S. military courts, often criticized of being stringent or even unfair, appeals are automatic in each case—with each appellate authority possessing the power to reduce, but not to increase, the sentence imposed by the next lower authority.

To state the problem in its simplest form, therefore, the Federal legal system is an almost unique example of an advanced system of justice which does not allow for review of sentences.

As a result of this situation, our courts and correctional institutions are beset by numerous problems stemming from sentencing disparities. Aside from the obvious unfairness of subjecting some offenders to inordinately severe penalties, the recipient of an unusually harsh sentence will learn, through comparison of his own sentence with those of other offenders, that he was the victim of an apparent injustice. His resentment will likely breed unrest and severe disciplinary problems, and, in addition, may well undermine his prospects for successful rehabilitation.

The effects of inappropriate sentencing disparities, therefore, are harmful to both society and the defendant, serving only to perpetuate the cycle of crime and increase disrespect for our legal institutions. For sentencing must be an effective deterrent to future commissions of crime by the offender, and much of that deterrence is apt to be lost if an offender receives a sentence which bears no reasonable relationship to the crime he committed.

Furthermore, there is a substantial and growing body of opinion from within the legal profession that the impossibility of a direct challenge to unfair sentences often results in a great volume of appeals on tenuous technical grounds,

and a corresponding tendency on the part of the appellate courts to find merit in otherwise questionable allegations of error, or to find error prejudicial where it would normally be considered harmless, in order to alleviate the inequitable sentence.

In addition, public confidence in the judicial system must suffer when unjust sentences go unredressed, in blatant violation of a most basic principle of legal justice—that similarly situated individuals be treated alike. This loss of public confidence becomes even more serious when members of minority groups interpret uncorrected disparities as a form of legally sanctioned discrimination.

Although the bill I am introducing today is intended to ensure a fair and equal application of the law for all defendants, this bill in no manner diminishes the authority of the trial court judge to implement a necessary degree of reasonable sentencing disparity. For if sentencing is to achieve its purposes, it must prevent further criminality on the part of the offender, and it must deter the commission of similar offenses by others. For this reason, the trial court judge must be permitted some range of sentencing alternatives.

Defendants with a recurring history of criminal convictions, for example, often require more severe sentences than first offenders. Defendants with a known propensity for wanton disregard for the rights of law-abiding citizens may also require stiffer penalties than defendants with a history of involvement in the so-called "victimless crime." Also, what may be considered a relatively minor offense in one jurisdiction may be considered a particularly heinous offense in another, due to varying social mores and values throughout different areas of the country.

In summary, there are many reasons why a trial court judge may be justified in giving a particular defendant a more severe penalty than another defendant convicted of the same offense. The bill I am introducing today certainly does not alter this principle, as it would be a grave error to assume that all defendants convicted of the same offense should be given identical criminal penalties. What the bill does mandate is that defendants convicted of the same offense, and under the same general circumstances within the same jurisdiction be treated with a reasonable measure of equity.

In an effort to address these issues in a responsible and fair manner, a sincere effort has been made to produce a bill which strikes a proper balance between the rights of criminal defendants and the rights of law-abiding citizens who expect criminals to be treated with toughness as well as a measure of fairness.

Briefly, the bill I have introduced today contains the following provisions:

First. A Federal criminal defendant who has received a sentence of imprisonment of 1 year or more or death may file an application for leave to appeal to the court of appeals within 10 days after the imposition of this sentence;

Second. The court of appeals, upon reviewing the application shall consider whether the sentence imposed on the defendant is excessive in that it clearly

exceeds the length of sentence normally imposed on defendants convicted of the same offense under similar circumstances;

Third. If the court of appeals grants the leave to appeal, they may review the sentence imposed to determine whether it is excessive as described above. If the application for leave to appeal is denied, this decision shall be final and not subject to further judicial review;

Fourth. Upon consideration of the appeal, the court of appeals shall be empowered to select from the full range of statutory alternatives open to the district courts in directing an appropriate sentence, except that a sentence shall not be increased as a result of an appeal under this section;

Fifth. A denial of the application for leave to appeal on the ground that the sentence imposed is excessive shall not prejudice any aspect of the appeal predicated on other grounds;

Sixth. Upon certification to the court of appeals the transcripts of the trial proceedings, the defendant shall have access to all presentence reports as he had at the district court;

Seventh. This act shall become effective 6 months after its enactment and shall apply only to sentences imposed thereafter;

Eighth. The Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts is authorized to make emergency payments to those circuit courts which require immediate funds to implement the provisions of the bill, and a yearly authorization of \$1 million is provided for this purpose;

Ninth. Finally, in order to be eligible for receipt of funds from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, those States which do not have rules of procedure which permit appeal on the grounds of excessive sentencing must adopt such rules or face the loss of LEAA funds to that State.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that the House act on this proposal at the earliest practicable date. This reform in our criminal justice system is long overdue, and I am confident that this body is unanimous in the opinion that a fair and equal application of the law is a goal worthy of our serious attention.

RECOMPUTATION OF RETIRED PAY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing legislation that provides for full recomputation of retired military pay.

The principle of recomputing retired military personnel pay based on active duty pay was incorporated in the American military retired pay system from the time of the Civil War to 1958, with short exceptions. All military personnel who served before June 1, 1958, did so with the expectation that this principle would continue to be followed. It is quite likely that the recomputation feature of the retirement system was largely responsible

for the decision of many to make the military a career.

Although there was no signed contract with the U.S. Government promising that this system would be continued after service was completed, there certainly was a moral obligation on the part of the Government not to reduce the entitlement after it was earned.

The hundreds of thousands of retired career personnel, both regular and reserve, who served in several wars believed that their Government would continue to honor that obligation by preserving their entitlement to those rights earned under laws existing during their active service. Repeated governmental statements concerning the matter strengthened this belief.

For example: In 1806, in the case of *United States v. Heth* (7 US 399, 2d Ed 479), the Supreme Court stated:

While it is true that pay is subject to the will of Congress, the presumption is where a person performs service under the prospect of certain emoluments, it is in the interest of the government to engender a confidence in the minds of its citizens which leaves no room for distrust. . . .

In January 1931, a joint congressional committee, after reviewing the overall military compensation system, stated in Senate document 259, 71st Congress, 3d session:

The pay of any person on the retired list should be based on the pay of persons of like grade on the active list.

On June 16, 1942, the 77th Congress, in passing Public Law 607, recognized the provisions of existing law relative to computing retired pay when it stated in section 15 thereof:

On and after the effective date of this Act, retired officers * * * shall have their retired pay * * * computed as now authorized by law on the basis of pay provided in this act.

In 1946, in passing Public Law 474, the Congress again adhered to the existing law by permitting those already retired to participate in the new pay schedules.

Career members of the uniformed services, regular and reserve, active and retired, had their faith in the dependability of their earned retirement rights further strengthened in 1949 when the Advisory Commission on Service Pay—the Hook Commission—recommended that the Congress continue to uphold the basic principle of keeping retired pay geared to current active duty pay schedules. The recommendations of this Commission were accepted by the Congress when it enacted Public Law 351 in October 1949. Section 511 of this law reads in part:

Retired pay shall be computed on the monthly basic pay * * * which such member would be entitled to receive if serving on active duty in such grade.

In 1952 and again in 1955, Congress enacted legislation increasing the pay of the active services and, in each of these laws, continued the time-honored principle of equating retired pay to current active duty pay.

In 1957, the Cordiner Committee, which, like the Hook Commission, had been formed to study the military compensation system concluded:

* * * that the incentive value of the existing military retirement system depends to a major degree upon its integral relationship with active duty compensation and the confidence which has been built up in the military body that no breach of faith or breach of retirement contract has ever been permitted by Congress and the American people.

The uniformity of compensation thus achieved is considered appropriate and the inclusion of retired personnel within the new compensation system is considered by the Committee to be a mandatory and essential feature, fully in consonance with the long-established principle that retired compensation must always remain closely related to current active duty pay.

During the past 14 years many attempts have been made to justify the Government's abrogation of its moral responsibility. In spite of these attempts, the fact remains that those who entered careers in the uniformed services before June 1, 1958, served under a guaranteed formula which provided that their retired pay would be determined as a percentage of current active duty pay and the actions of Congress in passing Public Laws 65-422 and 88-132 reduced the entitlements after they had been fully or partly earned. The fact that such entitlements are not legally enforceable cannot in any way relieve the Government of its moral responsibility to provide compensation to retirees in accordance with the laws in effect when the compensation was earned.

In 1958 Congress abandoned the recomputation principle and substituted an across-the-board 6-percent increase for retired personnel. In 1963 Congress offered a one-time recomputation to those who were retired prior to the 1958 changes, or a 5-percent cost-of-living increase, whichever was greater. The cost-of-living system of adjusting retired pay is in effect today.

Although changes have been made in the system in an effort to protect the retiree from the rapid rate of inflation, they have not done so. The average retiree's pay has increased by 58.6 percent since 1958 while active duty pay has increased by 108.1 percent during the same period. A tremendous gap in retired pay has grown between the retirees of the same grade and years of service. The inequality will continue to widen unless Congress restores the traditional system of computing retired pay on the basis of current active duty rates.

Many of the lower grade retirees who served their country well for 20 or 30 years through two or three wars are in dire straits. They served at times when pay scales were very low and raises few and far between. Their retired pay is small, they pay taxes on it, and end up with less than many people get who never did anything for their country, who will not work, who pay no taxes, and who live off other people's money.

The argument that pre-1958 retirement entitlements would be monetarily prohibitive is nonsense. When an individual enters into a contract, he cannot use inability to raise money as a defense in any court in this great land. There are many places where we are spending money much less wisely.

There have been a number of proposals for one-time recomputation. If a com-

promise is necessary, my recommendation is that it be no less than the administration's proposal, but with pay scales in effect at the time legislation is passed rather than those of January 1, 1971.

As I said on the floor of the House on September 13, 1972, I reluctantly voted for adoption of the conference report on H.R. 15495 because of my deep regret that the conference committee deleted the recomputation amendment.

Also, I said then that the many retired military men who have served our country and who have given of their minds, bodies, and years—none of which can be replaced—certainly deserve no less than equity in their retired pay.

WHAT EVER BECAME OF CHARLIE FARNSELEY?

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, where is Charlie Farnsley? He is alive and kicking vigorously, often in the city of Louisville, sometimes in Indiana, and occasionally in southern Kentucky.

In 1964, it was my good fortune to serve in Congress and on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee with the Honorable Charlie Farnsley, former mayor of Louisville, former State representative, former member of the board of trustees of the University of Louisville and, more importantly, the husband of a cultured southern lady, "Miss Nancy" Carter Farnsley.

Charlie Farnsley is one of the most intelligent men I have ever known. Under an "Ed Wynnish" facade reposes one of the finest brains in the State of Kentucky. Charlie Farnsley is indeed a man of many parts. Few people realize that he is deservedly successful in the field of advertising. Many of the eye-catching advertisements often seen in national magazines originated in Charlie's fertile brain.

I know that the Members of this body who served with Charlie wish for him and Miss Nancy meaningful success and true happiness in their present pursuits. I include a recent story of how Charlie Farnsley is now occupying his time:

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal and Times magazine, Dec. 31, 1972]

WHAT EVER HAPPENED TO CHARLIE FARNSELEY?

(By John Ed Pearce)

What's Charlie Farnsley doing these days? You know, the guy who used to be mayor of Louisville. Wore string ties and gray broadcloth suits, started the one-way streets and quoted Confucius to his critics. Instituted the Occupational Tax, saved the orchestra, took classes at the University of Louisville, lectured on Jeffersonian democracy, modernized the library system, fought the merchants, fought the newspapers, fought the legislature and brought the city more national publicity than it ever had before or since.

What's he doing? He's having a ball, that's what. Enjoying life. Has more projects going than a dog has fleas. Hustling real estate, re-

storing old homes, trying to save the Jack-sonian Hotel in Scottsville, Ky., that served old-fashioned, boarding-house-style meals (he was forced to abandon the old hotel as a money-loser last month), operating a publishing business, defending the University of Louisville, dabbling in politics, hassling the establishment. But mostly he is engaged in an effort to revive downtown Louisville. He says he knows how, and it has nothing to do with the River City Mall, new office buildings or the riverfront development. And it's easy, he says. It has to do with people.

"The riverfront will help," he says, "especially if it has enough apartments. But office buildings won't bring back shoppers, and that's what Fourth Street needs. Neither will the Mall. It'll make it nicer for the people who're already there, that's all. What you've got to do is get people back downtown. Replace the 80,000 who moved out."

Charlie's views are not the usual views, but then they never were. City planners? "They're well-meaning, but most of them don't know what they're doing." Expressways? "The minute you brought them downtown, you killed everything within a mile on either side of them." Urban renewal and redevelopment? "A national disaster."

Charlie lives well. "I'm just a poor boy trying to make a living," he says, easing back in his black, luxury-model Mercedes, a thing of panelling and leather that powers into traffic as quietly as a hummingbird. "Nicest car I ever had," he says contentedly. "You ought to get yourself one, chief."

He has a comfortable apartment in town, a home up the Ohio, assorted real estate and the profitable Lost Cause Press publishing business. He wasn't born exactly poor, his four kids are grown, and he and Miss Nancy (he married Nancy Carter, and she has been Miss Nancy ever since, for some reason) have the time and money to do pretty much what interests them, and a lot of things do. After a life in the goldfish bowl of politics, he doesn't mind being out of the public eye for a bit.

When Charlie was mayor of Louisville, he got a press like you wouldn't believe. News people were crazy about him, reporters, editorial writers, everybody. Even when they criticized him, they did it with affection. For one thing, every newsman sees himself as an unsung intellectual, and here was this politician quoting Mencius and talking of the application of Jeffersonian principles to the problems of cities. The philosopher-king thing, right here on the Ohio.

And he was colorful. He had a psychiatrist as an adviser, and a soundproof room in which he played classical music at full volume. ("No sense playing Wagner if you don't play it loud," he'd say, and blast you out of the room.) He tried to market a whisky called "Old Rebel Yell," and when the Patent Office said the label was in bad taste, he put out a brand called "Old Bad Taste." Instead of flying off to Florida when the going got too rough, he'd go out to the monastery at Gethsemani and hole up with the monks for quiet and meditation.

He baffled reporters.

"What are you going to do about the one-way street plan, Mr. Mayor?"

"Hell, I don't know, chief. What would you do? You news people know all about these things."

Charlie believed people ought to be involved in their government. Years before the kids started squalling about participatory democracy he started his Beef Sessions and invited everyone to come to City Hall one night a week and complain. Had some wild sessions, with people shouting and department heads sweating. They led to a lot of action, too.

He'd charter special trains and lead delegations to New York to watch the U of L basketball team play in the Garden, or to hassle foundations for money for the orchestra or library. He got reams of publicity for the city. Time, Life, Fortune wrote about

the cultural renaissance in Louisville, and, of course, about the colorful mayor.

But he was always in the middle of a controversy. He hired Roy Owsley as city manager. It was a good system. Roy handled the nuts and bolts of administration, leaving Charlie free to talk with people, study the city, see where it was going. But he had to put Owsley on a personal-service contract, because the state Constitution at that time limited public officials to \$5,000 a year, and Roy wasn't about to work for \$5,000. People screamed. We didn't elect Owsley, they said. If Charlie didn't want to be mayor, why did he run?

He hired experts by the handful, usually on a one-day basis. People couldn't understand it. "Experts usually spill their guts in one day," he explained. "I'd rather pay them \$250 for one day than pay them \$1,000 for a study that said what they'd say in a day." He believed in getting expert advice. "One man can't know everything," he said.

Charlie refused to fit the image of the pompous public official. He'd put his feet on his desk. On TV, he slumped down in his chair until he was almost flat on the floor. No dignity, they said. He lectured people on superiority of the Chinese emperor system, which he declared was more responsive to people than the classic democracy of ancient Greece. They called him Chopstick Charlie.

He didn't mind. He was moving too fast. The orchestra was about to go out of business; he got it a big foundation grant to commission new works, and started it producing records that made a lot of money. He hired Skip Graham, the hottest library man in the country, and together they re-made the Louisville Free Public Library system, doubled the circulation of books, put in the audio-visual department and FM station, started lending records and paintings as well as books. In town, classical record and art sales spurted. Cultural revolution.

It was strange to see Charles Peasley Farnsley, born to the center of the local establishment, fighting the establishment. But he resented the rich suburbanites who leached off the city, moaned about its problems and then went home at night to Prospect and Glenview, where they didn't pay city taxes. He viewed the Occupational Tax, which made suburbanites with jobs in the city bear part of the city's financial load, as a personal triumph.

Charlie was a great believer in making do with what he had. When he was short of money to re-pave streets, he "half-soled" them, paving only the center portion where the cars drove. When he didn't have money for new parks, he made Tot Lots out of bits of city property, vacant lots, filling them with swings and boxes, barrels and junk for kids to play on. They loved them.

He was the despair of local Democrats because he seemed to lose interest in an office once the term was up. He refused to run again for mayor, eight years after he left the office, and the Democrats lost it. He served a term in Congress, made a good record and seemed a shoo-in for re-election. He refused to run, and the Republicans won the seat with Gene Snyder, who has held it ever since. "Once is enough," he said. "Let someone else have a turn at it." Actually, he admitted later, "I just got homesick."

Which does not mean that he has lost interest in the causes he fought for. It has been 20 years since, at the age of 45, he left the mayor's office, but he still feels that cities are the only places to live, and that Louisville is the pleasantest city he knows. He also thinks that planners ("bricks and mortar people; think any problem can be cured by building something"), politicians and the establishment are causing American cities, including Louisville, to "die from the inside out." This irks him because he warned them 20 years ago what was going to happen, and they wouldn't listen to him.

He's still telling them, and he thinks the evidence of disaster is strong enough to force them to start listening.

Charlie holds forth from an office on the seventh floor of the Starks Building at Fourth and Walnut, in the heart of downtown Louisville. The office is a clutter of desks, chairs and stacks of papers surrounding a green velvet sofa, and a huge window facing east to where I-64, I-65, and I-71 knife through the guts of the city. For some, they are heaven-sent short cuts from home to office, but to Charlie they are "a disaster," one of two mistakes that led to the disintegration of the downtown business district.

"Run a sword through a man, he dies," he explains, "and when you run an expressway through a neighborhood, it dies. It's cut in two. As Jane Jacobs (a noted urban expert and sociologist) says, it tears the fabric of living."

Briefly (if it can be stated briefly), his theory is this:

Cities were functional because they grew up to serve the needs of the people living there. Neighborhoods developed institutions—the school, the church, groceries, shops, the neighborhood tavern—as people needed them. Some of the neighborhoods may have looked shabby, tax rates may have declined, but the people were comfortable in them. They knew each other, felt secure. Children grew up, went to the same school and church, married and lived down the street from their parents. Change came slowly, through death, intermarriage with outsiders, a few new people moving in to replace those dying. People knew the cop, the preacher, the drunk, the mean kid. They kept watch on each other, kept things in check.

Then comes an expressway, cutting through the heart of the old neighborhood. Streets are blocked by the hump of earth with its concrete lanes of hurtling steel. You can't get to places and people any more. The tavern loses its customers, the church part of its congregation, school lines have to be redrawn and outside kids are brought in, and the kids of the friends you grew up with go to another school. The neighborhood is gone. It dies. People move out. Property values drop.

"See what this does to the downtown business district?" asks Charlie. "Social scientists say that a store like Stewart's draws up to 80 per cent of its trade from people living within two miles. But we've driven out too many of the people who lived within two miles of Fourth Street. So the stores moved out with them. Had to."

The other killer of downtown, he feels, is redevelopment, Urban Renewal. The effect of Urban Renewal, he believes, was much like that of the expressways.

City planners, Charlie believes, are obsessed with building; they believe new buildings solve all the problems present in old buildings. To them, the old homes and buildings lining downtown streets after World War II represented urban blight—poor living conditions, poor tax sources. So they bought them, tore them down and replaced them, in most cases, with new office buildings or government housing—or nothing.

"What they were doing was running out the people, most of them poor people, forcing them to move farther out or into government housing that many of them didn't want or couldn't afford. Maybe the old neighborhoods looked shoddy, but they functioned. Gave people a feeling of community, of belonging. Nobody feels a sense of community in a project."

"Together, the expressways and redevelopment drove 80,000 people out of the central city of Louisville, out of the area lying within two miles of the business district. Then they started all these schemes to get people back downtown—free parking and all that. But they had already driven the stores out to the suburbs, so the suburban people had no reason to come back downtown."

Stupid, says Charlie. All of it unnecessary. The result of bricks-and-mortar mentality, and federal bureaus that are not responsive to the real needs and wants of people.

"It's peculiar to America, and especially the cities of the northeastern United States," he says, running his hand through his thinning, gray hair. "You don't see European cities dying at the core. That's where people want to live. The rich live on the first two floors, the poor in the attic; or people live over their stores. So that's where the shops are, that's where the people come to buy; where visitors stay. They don't move the people out to the suburbs by tearing down their buildings and then making it easy for them to live outside with low-cost loans, like the FHA did. The FHA will guarantee any kind of loan for a house in the suburbs, but not in the city, not to buy an older home. Its policies helped to destroy the cities."

The downtown merchants, according to Charlie, helped to contribute to their own woes.

"When I was mayor, we argued all the time. I was trying to help them. They knew we had to move traffic through downtown, and I showed them that a one-way grid was the only way to do it, with every street alternate oneway. We one-wayed most of them, except for the two that counted—Fourth and Market. I got tired of fighting them on it, said if they didn't want to help themselves, all right. You can't force things on people."

"Same with store hours. They wouldn't keep the shops open at times when people wanted to shop. They'd open them in the morning when people were busy, but as soon as people started coming in, late in the afternoon, they'd run them out, close up. Wouldn't stay open nights or on Sundays, I don't know why; probably because they had always done it that way, and couldn't change. Then the same stores, when they moved out to the suburbs and shopping centers, signed leases agreeing to stay open at night."

All this is not new-found theory with Charlie. He fought the process as hard as he could as long as he was in office, but even then he had a feeling he was swatting flies with a tennis racket.

"When the establishment, the white Protestant middle class, gets its head set on something, nobody can stop it. And I don't mean this in a bad sense. These people read magazines, watch television. They don't have the time really to study complex questions of urban growth, and when they read that expressways are going to solve our traffic problems, they're all for expressways. When they read and hear that redevelopment is going to stop urban blight and brighten up downtown, they don't have time or inclination to question it."

"So they listen to the planners, the men with table models of how cities are supposed to look. But the average planner doesn't know anything about people. He's an architect or an engineer; he knows about building, tearing down, laying down concrete, putting up things. But you never get social scientists, the real experts on people, on these planning boards. You ought to have architects and engineers, don't misunderstand me, but they ought to be just part of the team. But people won't listen to the real experts, won't spend money on social research. We spend billions on research in the natural sciences, hundreds of millions on health research, but peanuts on social sciences."

Why?

"Well, mostly because everybody thinks he can run a government. You in the newspaper express opinions on social matters all the time without expert advice. It's in the mores of the people. They say hell, the experts don't know anything. But they do. For the money we've spent on social research, they know a lot, and could save us a lot if we'd let them."

Lack of research and reliance on planners,

Charlie is convinced, have made guinea pigs of city dwellers.

"Bureaucrats will do anything," he says. "I read in the paper the other day, the National Observer, about this papaya-juice treatment for slipped discs. There's some enzyme in it that eats up the fluid in the spinal column causing the trouble. Billy Keller says it works. (That's Dr. William Keller, U of L psychiatrist. When Charlie was mayor, Billy was his adviser, and enemies quipped that he needed a shrink to get from his home to City Hall.) But the government won't let them use it till it's been tested more. You've got to try it on rats, camels, people. But let someone get a scheme for cities, and they'll do it without any tests at all."

Politics, sectionalism, all sorts of things are mixed up in the problem of cities, Charlie believes. Southern cities are generally better off than northern ones, he says, because Southerners, partly as a result of the Civil War, have always been more suspicious of federal government and programs, and resisted postwar federal programs more. Louisville, being a border town, has been torn in this respect.

"As long as we (the Democrats) were in office we resisted these programs for Louisville," he says. "Then Cook and Cowger came in (Marlow Cook, then county judge, now U.S. senator; and the late William O. Cowger, then mayor), and they were basically northern-oriented because they were Northerners, Cook from New York, Cowger, I think he was from Nebraska. They went all out for it, and that's when they started messing things up. When I was in office, per-capita income in town rose and the stores didn't move out. Then they turned things around and income started dropping and the business district went to pieces. Let's have lunch, chief."

The Mercedes purrs through the crowded downtown streets. Charlie gestures toward the new riverfront buildings, looming against the sky.

"A lot of people see the answer in new office buildings. Bring in new tax money, new people for downtown. But, hell, everybody's after new offices. Who's going to rent them? There's office space standing vacant all over the country. They're renting it for four-and-a-half a square foot in New York, where it used to be twenty. And office buildings aren't filled with shoppers. They'll work downtown, eat there some, but they'll go home to the suburbs, and their wives will shop in the suburbs. Like the riverfront. It may bring in some people, but they'll tend to shop in the shops there. It'll help some, not much."

How about the new River City Mall?

"What's it going to do? Will it produce any new shoppers? No. New shops? No way. Look at the other malls—Kalamazoo, the big one in Fresno. Disaster areas. They're no good without people. You've got malls, open spaces, in your suburban shopping centers. Plus free parking."

Yet, he insists, as the car rolls east on River Road to a riverside restaurant, the whole downhill process could be corrected. Louisville's downtown, he says, is not dead—just about two-thirds dead. It could still be saved, the whole process reversed in six weeks. Seated in the restaurant, he gestures toward the broad, boat-lined river and declares that it is part of the answer.

But what is the magical recipe for recovery?

"Tourists," he says. "Most people here don't realize what we've got. A hundred million people live within an easy drive or flight from Louisville, and all of them want to get away from home for a while, want a change of scenery. I had this fellow, forget his name, head of the Sheraton chain tourist bureau, tell me Louisville had two of the country's outstanding tourist attrac-

tions—Churchill Downs and the Ohio River. But we're doing nothing to promote tourist trade. Nothing. Give me a million dollars and I could turn it around in six weeks. Not cure it in six weeks, but make a start. Fill these hotels—and we've got plenty of them now—and in a year the three per cent room tax will support the promotion. Not cost the taxpayers a cent."

Package tours, says Charlie, are the big thing in the tourist business, and Louisville is made for package tours. Bring people in from north and east, and out in the state, and fix them up with tours and tickets to keep them busy and entertained.

"We're perfect for it," he says. "The Belle, the Downs, two good theaters now, plenty of movies, getting better restaurants all the time. Got one of the best orchestras in the country, the opera, the ballet, golf courses, clubs, getting more night life. And we're right in the middle of tourist country—lakes, caves, horse farms, historic sites. We're made for it. Instead, we're spending money trying to promote conventions, and any travel man will tell you conventions are the poor end of the travel business."

"They don't spend anything. Half of them don't get out of their hotel. The men don't bring their wives, and it's the wives who do the shopping. The men are busy all day, and at night they want the kind of entertainment that doesn't do the city any good. Tourists have plenty of time. They have money to spend. They want to see stores, shops. Put 10,000 tourists a day in here, and you have 10,000 shoppers a day downtown."

But won't the lack of luxury hotels and shops in the downtown area be a handicap?

"In the first place, we still have plenty of good stores downtown—Rodes, Martin's, Stewart's, Byck's, bookstores, jewelry stores, record shops, restaurants. But the point is there'll be more when there's a demand, when there's somebody to buy. And tourists buy. They buy high-class goods. And we have plenty of hotel rooms; look at all the new hotels downtown now—Stouffers and the Galt House, Rodeway, Holiday Inn, all of them, not to mention the Seelbach and Watterson. Sure, we've lost the Brown, but something like it would come back if the demand was there. And we can create the demand."

Does he ever think about getting back into politics in order to put his theories to work?

"No. I had my run at it. I ran for Congress when I was 23, you know. Lost to John Y. Brown in a statewide primary. Served two terms in the legislature, then ran against Happy Chandler for the Senate, and lost. Lost a race for Congress from the Third District, and then was mayor, and then served a term in Congress. It was fun, but it was enough. Like Earle Clements said, you never shut the door really closed, but I can't see ever running again. I've got too much to do. Got those houses in Vevay (Indiana; he owns five old homes there, some of which he has restored, one as a weekend home, one as a guest house; one houses an antique shop) and three row houses up in Madison (Indiana). May be worth a lot of money someday. Hope so. Then we've got Fernlea subdivision out on 42, in Oldham County. Still have about 600 of the 1,000 acres."

Charlie and Miss Nancy got interested in Vevay in a rather casual manner.

"We were reading The Courier-Journal one Sunday, and saw that they were having this wine festival the next Thursday up in Vevay, so I said why don't we go, so we did, and the first thing we saw was this beautiful old home, overlooking the river, and Miss Nancy wanted it, so we just went down that day and bought it. Didn't take much fixing up. You get a lot for your money in these older houses."

Now he and Miss Nancy go up to Vevay on

summer weekends, and play host to the people who flock to the festival each August, mooring their hundreds of boats along the riverfront, and clambering up the muddy banks to watch the grape-stomping contests, drink wine and eat beans-ham-and-cornbread lunches along the curbstones of Main Street. In a way, says Charlie, it's an effort to show people the attractions of the river and the advantages the Louisville area offers for tourist promotion.

"This is a great city," he says, driving back to town, "fine place to live. I wouldn't live anywhere else. What do I want to do with the rest of my life? Just what I'm doing. Maybe I lose some battles, but I get a little bit done, too. And it's all fun."

"Fellow the other day said 'Charlie Farnsley's the only man I know who's making a living doing just what he wants to do.' I guess that's about right. And that's not bad, is it, chief?"

No. Not bad at all.

GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER'S PROPOSAL FOR ADDICT OFFENDERS IS NOT THE ANSWER

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller in his annual state of the State message delivered to the New York State Legislature proposed the following:

... that crimes of violence committed by persons under the influence of hard drugs be punished by life imprisonment. The avenues of escape would similarly be closed, and to close all avenues for escaping the full force of this sentence, the law would forbid acceptance of a plea to a lesser charge, forbid probation, forbid parole and forbid suspension of sentence.

The approach of the Governor, who admits failure in the State's antinarcotic program costing \$1 billion to date, makes no sense. While none would dispute the venality of a nonaddict's pushing of hard drugs and the singularly stiff sentences, including life imprisonment, that should be imposed on such offenders, it does not follow that an addict, particularly if an adolescent, apprehended in a crime of violence should be treated differently than another individual not on drugs committing the same crime. Crimes of violence run the gamut from purse snatcher to murder. How long an offender should spend in jail must be determined by the gravity of the crime and the rehabilitation of the individual during incarceration. Furthermore, express efforts should be made to give the drug addict therapy during his imprisonment, as opposed to abandoning him to the brutalizing regimen of prison life. To foreclose the opportunity of parole undermines the correctional process and eliminates any incentive for good behavior and rehabilitation by the individual while imprisoned.

There is always a balance to be struck in matters involving the rights of an individual and the rights of the public. Too often the rights of the public have not adequately been protected by the police, the courts, and public officials. There must be some redress in those rights. But,

the Governor's proposal can only remind one of the situation in Saudi Arabia where there are people without one or more of their limbs—amputated because they committed a crime. Can the Governor really believe that simply threatening heroin addicts with life imprisonment will deter them from engaging in crimes of violence? Such deterrents will be even less operative in the drug addict than in the nonaddict who is not under the physical compulsion of getting a heroin fix, no matter the consequences. I believe heroin addicts involved in violent crimes should be treated as stringently as nonaddicts even though there is a medical aspect to the addict's case. But similarly, the pivotal issue in either case is the crime committed and not whether an individual is or isn't an addict.

I appreciate the frustration of the Governor in dealing with the problem of street crime compounded by drug addiction. All of us in public office feel similarly frustrated because none of us knows the answer to the heroin addiction problem. But, to yield to this frustration by supporting irrational proposals is simply to delude the public and compound the problem by forestalling legitimate efforts to find workable solutions.

CONGRESS MUST END THE WAR

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on October 26, 1972, Dr. Henry Kissinger announced to the American people and the world that "peace is at hand." He reported that only minor details remained to be cleared up before there was an end to the war in Vietnam, the return of American prisoners, and on accounting of the missing in action.

At that time most Members of the U.S. House of Representatives were campaigning for election or reelection.

At that time I, as I am certain did many of my colleagues, took time from my campaign to personally express my approval and appreciation of the developments in Paris and to praise President Nixon for bringing the war to an apparent end.

What ensued brought not peace but tragic disillusionment.

Peace was not at hand. The Paris talks broke down, because of lack of good faith by the North Vietnamese we are told, and on December 18, 1972, the United States unleashed what has been termed "the most massive bombing of the Vietnam conflict, if not any war."

The bombing which the United States unleashed on North Vietnam has been a shock to millions in America and to millions more throughout the world.

Civilians have been killed at random if they happened to be too close to military targets, many of which were in the midst of residential and commercial areas. An American prisoner of war camp reportedly was hit, a hospital damaged, and entire

strips of residential land, hundreds of yards wide and more than a mile long, leveled by our so-called carpet bombing through our Government says many of these civilian-populated areas were not targeted for bombing.

And there is personal tragedy for many Americans, too. At least 93 U.S. airmen have been killed, captured, or reported missing as a result of the bombing which has seen at least 15 B-52's as well as other aircraft shot down and destroyed.

And what explanation or reasoning by the powers which ordered this escalation of warfare has been given to the American people and the world? Absolutely none.

Immediately after the announcement of the renewal of the bombing I telegraphed President Nixon respectfully urging that he report to the American people by radio and television on the decision to bomb again. Please tell us "why," I asked, because I believe we have a right to know. Neither the American people nor its elected representatives in the U.S. Congress have heard the first word from our President. Nor has the receipt of my telegram yet been acknowledged.

The silence on the part of those who made the decision and gave the order to bomb again is almost deafening in our ears.

Why is this? Is it because these men believe that after 13 years of official American involvement in Vietnam that the American people are so steered to savage warfare and so inured to the prolonged continuation of the war that we will benignly accept or ignore this latest unilateral exercise of raw military power and destruction?

The Washington Post this past Sunday carried a heartbreaking list of quotes from American civilian and military leaders dating back more than a decade giving assurances that the end of the war and American involvement militarily in Southeast Asia was within our grasp, that "peace was at hand."

Perhaps, being aware of the many times we have hopefully accepted these past assurances, our decisionmakers felt that just one more time we would accept them again.

For my own part I do not.

For 10 years now I have sat in this body while three administrations have assured us and the American people that either through might or reason the war would soon be ended and Americans would be out of Southeast Asia.

For 10 years now I have witnessed the "the best and the brightest" men who could be found to serve in our government as they failed time after time to bring peace either through the weaponry of war or the art of negotiation.

For 10 years now I have witnessed the list of Americans killed, wounded, captured or missing grow until it numbers in the hundreds of thousands.

And for 10 years now I have sat as the Congress permitted the executive branch of government to continue this war without restraint either by voting authority and funding to war or by refusing to exercise our own constitutional authority and moral obligation to intervene.

No more. I do not question the President's motives or his sense of moral obligation in his decision to bomb again but do sincerely feel the decision was wrong and I also condemn his cavalier treatment of the Congress and the American people by his refusal to explain or justify his decision. He was reelected decisively but he is our President and as such is accountable to the people, particularly on decisions and failures of this magnitude.

However, I have no real hope that such action will be forthcoming. Even should it be, we have sat idly too long. Those whom we have permitted to hold and exercise power through three administrations have demonstrated time and again their inability to employ this power effectively to end this war.

I believe our only hope now is for the Congress to say "stop, enough."

Accordingly, I joined with the overwhelming majority of my colleagues in the Democratic caucus yesterday in support of the resolution putting our party on record as a matter of policy in the House to work for an end of combat funding in Indochina as soon as prisoners are returned and arrangements made for the safe withdrawal of our troops.

For my part I do not view the qualifying statement concerning our prisoners and troop withdrawal as consent to prolong the war indefinitely pending a peace agreement. To me it means the United States should reach an agreement first on these issues and then get out.

In closing I respectfully urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, particularly those of you who today took the oath of office as U.S. Representatives for the first time, to join with us to end this war. You may well, as new Members, hold the balance in this decision.

For those of you who, as I, have served in this body before and have had growing doubts about the war, its conduct and our inability to end its deviousness and waste of money, resources and human lives, let us work together in this worthy effort.

For all who have the inclination, though you may have doubts, to move effectively, forcefully and finally to stop the killing and restore the peace, search your conscience and reason with your mind. If you feel you can then I respectfully suggest you must join in stopping the war.

CAREER EDUCATION: AN ALLIANCE WITH PRIVATE VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, last June the National Association of Trade and Technical Schools held its eighth annual conference in Washington, D.C. The speaker for that conference was Dr. Robert M. Worthington, Associate Commissioner for Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, Office of Education. While some months have elapsed since

Dr. Worthington made his speech, his remarks are still pertinent and will be of interest to Members of the House. I therefore ask unanimous consent that Dr. Worthington's speech may appear at this point in the RECORD, together with a letter to the NATTS from President Nixon. The speech and letter follow:

CAREER EDUCATION: AN ALLIANCE WITH PRIVATE VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS

(By Dr. Robert M. Worthington)

President Larson and distinguished guests, I am grateful for the privilege of participating in the 8th Annual Conference of the National Association of Trade and Technical Schools. In the few short years since NATTS has been organized, it has provided leadership and centralized representation for its member institutions. These institutions have contributed much to this nation's postsecondary and adult career occupational education. And they give promise of continuing to provide the specialized and exemplary programs for meeting the needs of our increasingly technological society.

I note with special interest tomorrow's agenda in which you honor State officials who deal directly with private schools, and the sessions on "Working With State Governments" and "The Interaction of Private and Public Education."

The practical realism which has contributed so greatly to the excellence and success of your institutions is clearly evident. For it must be at the State and local levels where the details of the cooperation and support, as visualized in the Vocational Education Act of 1963 as amended in 1968, will be realized. I refer to the contracting with private schools by States for educational services, and a similar utilization of the excellence and availability of private institutions under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

The excellent quality of education offered in non-public and private trade technical and other specialized occupational schools is well known to employers and is an important and integral part of the total career education capability of the Nation. It is available to prepare full-time students for technical and specialized occupations and to upgrade and update education for adults whether they are employed or are seeking employment. In a true sense this part of the career education concept, in which we are all so deeply involved, is among those parts which already are in place and functioning.

Let me share with you now some of the concepts and developments concerning this career education movement.

As many of you are aware Career Education is now the principal thrust of the U.S. Office of Education. Its fundamental concept is that educational experiences, curriculum, instruction, and counseling should be geared to preparation for economic independence, an appreciation for the dignity of work, and development of the full man. Its main purpose is to prepare all students for a successful and rewarding life by improving the basis for occupational skills, enhancing educational achievement by making education more meaningful and more relevant to the aspirations of students, and by increasing the real choices and alternatives people have among the many occupations and training avenues to them. It is a lifelong, systematic way of acquainting students with the world of work in the elementary and junior high years and preparing them in high school and college to enter and advance in a career field of their own choosing.

For adults it is a way to re-enter formal education and upgrade their skills in their established career field or to enter a new career field. It embraces all occupations and professions and can include any individuals whether in or out of school.

The Office of Education is involved in a number of exciting ways in furthering the career education movement. Last month we created in the Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education a Curriculum Center for Occupational and Adult Education. The Center already is handling 39 projects. One project alone called for reviewing 32 proposals for developing the capabilities of State Curriculum Laboratories in reorienting them towards career education.

Recently, through a grant to the Texas State Education Agency, the center was able to announce that seven bibliographies of State Curriculum materials in seven major vocational areas are now available through ERIC.

Our emphasis on Career Education is primarily based on the growth of technology in this country and its effects on the lives of the American people. For too long our educational system has assumed that all our youth must be channelled into college and universities when in fact fewer than 20% have in the past graduated with bachelor's degrees into professional and managerial leadership jobs. In addition the Bureau of Labor's statistics indicate that in the foreseeable future 83% of the jobs will not require bachelor's degree preparation.

Each year then it becomes more evident that the largest increase in job opportunities will continue to be for persons skilled as technical, clerical, or paraprofessional workers. These people are needed to support the professionals and guide the efforts of the skilled and semi-skilled persons at the technical and specialists level in all major fields of work. The education and work experience required to prepare such specialized supportive people has to be based not only on high school preparation but also technical education beyond high school. And this type of training has traditionally been provided in large measure by the Nation's nearly 10,000 proprietary vocational schools.

Several special advantages over the public schools are offered by proprietary vocational schools and these include:

The ability to respond quickly to changes in the manpower needs of local business and industry; courses can be added as soon as they can be organized without months of red tape and procedural delays inherent within the public school system;

The ability to concentrate on the needs of each student—marginal students who have never before experienced academic success can proceed at their own pace and successfully complete courses which are aimed at developing practical techniques rather than theoretical knowledge; faculty members are chosen more on the basis of practical experience and consequently act as excellent teachers for such training; and innovative teaching techniques such as the use of short, sequential learning units and small teacher to student ratios are utilized;

Special introductory courses have been set up in many schools to help educationally disadvantaged students meet entrance standards;

Shorter courses, enabling students to complete their training and begin working in a much shorter time. This provides an opportunity for the poor students who don't have the time and money necessary for a four year college program;

More flexibility in that they offer both day and evening classes and operate on a year-round rather than a nine month basis with classes starting an average of 4 times a year; and

In addition, proprietary institutions have incorporated such programs as loans, installment payments for tuition fees, and work placement in nearby industry and business to help disadvantaged students.

In spite of these significant advantages, proprietary schools have frequently been met with a less than enthusiastic response from

educators, school counselors, and, to some extent, the Federal government.

Some of the negativism has been provoked by the few schools which give all the others a bad name by not providing what is promised by their catalogue or their school representatives or by providing insignificant training or job placement. Despite this, however, the fact that these schools exist and prosper financially indicated that one cannot get the type of training they provide elsewhere or that the private schools have superior resources and teaching techniques or both.

According to Dr. A. H. Belitsky of the Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, private vocational schools will continue to remain viable then principally because the public schools alone cannot presently meet the needs of all the people who want vocational training and if the public institutions were to be expanded, the costs of adding new vocational programs and the possible social waste of unutilized or underutilized private facilities would be prohibitive;

Unique course offerings such as diamond setting, dog grooming, meat cutting, and time-study engineering, to name a few, could be provided in public schools only at high costs, and vocational courses of short duration would be hard to integrate into the public school curriculum; and

Private vocational schools have an advantage of early experimentation with new programs and innovation in methods of instruction which will continue because of their close ties with industry and their desire to maximize profits.

At a time when resources are scarce and time is short, it is urgent that a viable alliance be developed and strengthened between the U.S. Office of Education and organizations such as NATTS in furtherance of the concept of career education.

There are some problems which cannot be overcome except by our joint efforts. For example, at present all trade and technical schools are operating at only about two thirds capacity at a time when we need to maximize our potential vocational resources to meet the challenges of Career Education. If these schools were encouraged to operate at full capacity, an additional one half to two thirds million more people could be accommodated.

Another problem is that most guidance counselors must be taught to make known to their charges in the high schools the opportunities which are available in the private vocational schools. The vocational schools need additional guidance counseling within their own institutions as well.

A third problem is the fact that the vast majority of private vocational schools are not accredited or associated with a national organization such as NATTS or even eligible for accreditation. Accreditation is extremely important because:

It provides the schools with an objective method of upgrading their educational standards and practices, thereby improving the reputation and opportunities of all effective schools;

It provides prospective students, teachers, counselors, and lending institutions with an objective assessment of the quality of the programs provided by these institutions;

It focuses public attention on competent schools and enhances their competitive status with prospective counselors, students, and teachers;

And it forces other schools which are not accredited to raise their standards in order to compete with those schools which are accredited.

A fourth major problem is the high cost of tuition at private vocational schools and the problem of securing loans for the students. I mention this only in passing since I am sure that David Bayer will address himself to this problem in his talk after lunch.

In the future then, with the help of organizations like NATTS, private vocational schools will undoubtedly experience a consistent growth in enrollment and greater general acceptance as a training resource for persons who do not attend college or junior college. The importance of their greater social role can not be underestimated if we are to successfully pursue the concept of Career Education.

Under the Vocational Education and Manpower Development Training Acts, the intent of Congress is evident that the excellence of private institutions should be made available to those who might thus profit from them with support of Federal funds through the contract mechanism.

Under the Vocational Education Act, contracts for specialized educational services may be let by the State provided that there are no State laws prohibiting such contracting.

The provisions of the MDTA have permitted a realization of a larger amount of cooperative effort between non-public and private schools. Beginning in 1963 when only about 2 percent of the total trainees under the Manpower Development and Training Act were in non-public institutions, the number has grown rather steadily. In 1971, sixteen percent of the total were in such institutions. Many placements in recent years have been through individual referrals to specialized private trade, technical, and otherwise specialized schools.

We believe this to be clear evidence of the willingness of the States to incorporate the excellence and specialization of private school programs into the total plan of delivery of high quality education in the States.

We are now making a complete assessment of all aspects of the new pending legislation in Senate Bill 659, "The Education Amendments of 1972," as they apply to occupational education. The "Amendments," passed by both the chambers, are now awaiting the President's signature.

This is the first piece of educational legislation which clearly states that the United States has a responsibility to provide some form of postsecondary education to all students.

It provides for the first time a mechanism by which all postsecondary, non-professional occupational education programs can be planned, coordinated and administered within each of the separate States according to their peculiar and specific needs.

Some provisions under Title X, "Community Colleges and Occupational Education," are of particular interest to the NATTS membership.

Section 1057(b) "Program Grants for State Occupational Programs" reads as follows:

"Programs authorized by this part may be carried out through contractual arrangements with private organizations and institutions organized for profit where such arrangements can make a contribution to achieving the purposes of this part by providing substantially equivalent education, training, or services more readily or more economically, or by preventing needless duplication of expensive physical plant and equipment, or by providing needed education or training of the types authorized by this part which would not otherwise be available."

And in Section 1202, "State Postsecondary Education Commissions" you will want to note the role of private institutions.

"Sec. 1202(a) Any State which desires to receive assistance under section 1203 or Title X shall establish a State Commission or designate an existing State agency or State Commission (to be known as the State Commission) which is broadly and equitably representative of the general public and public and private non-profit and proprietary institutions of post-secondary education in the

State including community colleges (as defined in Title X), junior colleges, post-secondary vocational schools, area vocational schools, technical institutes, four-year institutions of higher education and branches thereof."

Section 1203, just alluded to, states in part: "The Commissioner (U.S. Commissioner of Education) is authorized to make grants to any State Commissioner established pursuant to Section 1202 . . . to enable it to expand the scope of the studies and planning required in Title X through comprehensive inventories of, and studies with respect to, all public and private post-secondary educational resources in the State, including planning necessary for such resources to be better coordinated, improved, expanded, or altered so that all persons within the State who desire, and who can benefit from, postsecondary education may have an opportunity to do so."

Another section of this Act, which is one of the most important educational acts in this nation's history, appears in section 404 of Title III. It creates an Assistant Secretary of Education who under certain conditions may make grants to, and contracts with, public and private educational institutions and agencies to improve post-secondary educational opportunities by providing them assistance for the design and introduction of cost-effective methods of instruction and operation.

It has been an honor and a pleasure to appear before this eighth annual conference of the National Association of Trade and Technical Schools. In closing, I want to assure you that we in the U.S. Office of Education look forward to continuing and strengthening our close relationships with your representatives at the National level, particularly in view of the scope of the new educational legislation which looms on the horizon which offers greater utilization of the services of your excellent institutions.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., June 13, 1972.

The basic obligation of American education is to prepare our young people for socially productive and personally rewarding lives. The National Association of Trade and Technical Schools plays a vital role in the fulfillment of this responsibility.

Your steadfast dedication to raising the quality and expanding the scope of occupational education enables thousands of young Americans to achieve greater economic security and to find self-fulfillment in the constructive use of their talents. Your accomplishments provide a splendid example of the creativity and vitality that privately operated schools adds to our educational system.

My congratulations to you, and my best wishes for every success at this Annual Meeting.

RICHARD NIXON.

PUBLIC MASS TRANSPORTATION

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing legislation which would allow a portion of the Highway Trust Fund to be spent for mass transit systems.

First, let me preface my remarks regarding the need for this amendment by giving a brief history of the action taken in the 92d Congress:

When the Federal Aid Highway Act

amendments (S. 3939) were before the Senate in September 1972, Senators COOPER and MUSKIE led the fight to allow the use of funds earmarked for the urban system to be used for the purchase and construction of mass transit systems. The Cooper-Muskie amendment was adopted in the Senate by a more than 2-to-1 margin.

Then, in October, a similar bill (H.R. 16656)—but without the mass transit amendment—was considered in the House of Representatives. Prior to consideration by the full House, I attempted to amend the act in the Public Works Committee by inserting an amendment similar to the Cooper-Muskie amendment. We were defeated in the full committee by a 26-to-10 vote.

As there was a question regarding the germaneness of the amendment, I appeared before the Rules Committee to obtain a "rule" which would have assured a vote on the merits of the mass transit amendment. The Rules Committee turned down our request by an 8-to-7 vote.

As a result, we were forced to attempt to amend the rule on the floor and, on a complicated procedural question, we were defeated 200 to 168, thus negating the consideration of our mass transit amendment.

The Federal Aid Highway Act amendments went to a conference committee and shortly thereafter died during the waning hours of the 92d Congress.

As a result, one of the first orders of business during this session will be the consideration of the Federal Aid Highway Act amendments and, again, we will attempt to open up a portion of the Highway Trust Fund to be used for mass transit.

PURPOSE OF THE MASS TRANSIT PROPOSAL

I am reintroducing this bill today in order to give the Members time to study it and its implications before the Federal Aid Highway Act amendments are considered by the House in the coming weeks.

This proposal would permit—not require—local urban officials to use their share of the urban system money to purchase or construct public transportation systems. Rather than continue to construct highways in the cities, the mayor and city council could decide to use part, or all, of their share of funds to buy buses or to construct a rail transit system.

Some local officials will determine that more highways are needed to meet their transportation needs. They can continue to use the urban system funds for highway construction.

Some local officials will determine that a bus or rail system will do much to take a burden off their congested urban highways. They will be permitted to use their share of the funds for the acquisition or construction of bus or rail systems.

Obviously, some local officials will determine that their particular transportation problems will best be met by constructing both highways and a public mass transportation system. They will be permitted this flexibility.

Many have raised the questions "Won't

this halt the Interstate system?" "Won't this hinder the construction of primary or secondary highways?"

The answer, very simply, is "No." The mass transit proposal does not touch one cent of the over \$3 billion a year Interstate money. Nor does it affect the money allocated for the primary and secondary systems.

The proposal which I am introducing today would merely allow the local officials to use their share of the fund allocated for the urban system to purchase or construct a public transportation system.

ENERGY CRISIS

Mr. Speaker, there is little question that by the end of this decade the United States will be confronted with a severe energy shortage.

Today, we import about 25 percent of our oil.

According to the Petroleum Council, we will be importing over 58 percent of our oil by 1985, and will be even more dependent on the oil-rich Middle East to run our factories, heat our homes, and fuel our cars.

And by 1980, with the number of automobiles in the United States expected to double, it is little wonder that oil prices are expected to increase by 100 percent.

What is the answer?

Certainly one answer to the energy crisis would be a more rational use of oil. According to a study conducted by the Chase Manhattan Bank, automobiles—passenger cars only—account for nearly 4.3 million barrels of oil demand daily or 30 percent of our daily consumption.

By 1985, automobiles will consume 7.4 million barrels of oil daily.

Rather than continue to consume such a large amount of oil in our pollution-belching automobiles, we should offer commuters and other marginal highway users an efficient, safe, and economical alternative—public transportation.

Not only would a diversion of traffic off of the highways and onto the public transportation system reduce auto pollution, it would also save our precious resources of oil. A 25-percent diversion of auto traffic from private passenger cars to mass transit could reduce petroleum demands by almost one-half million barrels daily.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. Speaker, we know that emissions from automobiles cause approximately 90 percent of the air pollution in our cities.

Autos account for nearly two-thirds of all carbon monoxide in our air, more than one-half of hydrocarbons and two-fifths of nitrogen oxide.

According to Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Ruckelshaus "drastic measures" will have to be taken to limit the number of automobiles entering 67 of our cities, if clean air standards are to be achieved.

In short, not only are we going to have to clean up the automobile engine and the stationary sources of pollution, we are going to have to limit the use of the automobile in our cities.

LAND USE

Today we have almost 4 million miles of road in the United States which consumes approximately 35,000 square miles—an area equal to the size of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Rhode Island combined.

In addition, highways in and around our urban areas make it necessary to devote large amounts of land to interchanges, parking facilities and the like. The percentage of urban land devoted to streets and parking approaches 50 percent in the business district of most of our major cities.

Mr. Speaker, rather than continue to take more and more of our land off the tax rolls and build more and more highways, we should use existing rights-of-way for mass transportation and, thus, use our land more effectively and more efficiently.

CONGESTION

Our highways and freeways have become so clogged and backlogged with commuters and other marginal users, that no one really benefits from the road. Due to congestion of the highways—especially during rush hour—travel time costs are high, operating efficiency is low, and nerves are frayed. Ironically, one study shows that traffic during peak periods in New York City actually moved faster in 1900 than in 1971.

If the old adage that "time is money" is true, then yearly we are throwing away billions of dollars in time wasted sitting in traffic.

The congestion that I have been talking about cannot be eliminated by more and more highways. Study after study demonstrates that new urban freeways merely encourage additional traffic. The Hollywood freeway, in my native California, was designed to reach a capacity of 100,000 vehicles per day within 10 years. However, within only 1 year, the freeway was carrying an average of 168,000 vehicles per day.

THE SANCTITY OF THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

When the highway trust fund was created in 1956, the taxes paid by motorists were to be used only for highway construction purposes.

In fiscal year 1972, 95 percent of the receipts of the highway trust fund were derived from taxes which were on the law books long before the trust fund was created and which, prior to 1956, were used for general revenue purposes. Specifically, the gasoline tax, which accounted for 67 percent of the trust fund revenues in fiscal year 1972, was enacted in 1932. The tire and tube tax, and the lubricating oil tax, which together account for 15 percent of the receipts, were enacted in 1919 and 1932 respectively.

Those funds—up until the trust fund began functioning—were used for a host of nonhighway purposes.

In addition, the trust fund, presently, has been so changed to meet other needs that it is difficult to argue that mass transit is not highway related.

In 1962, Congress allowed trust fund moneys to be used to help relocate families who were forced to move by highway construction.

In 1970, Congress permitted the use of

trust fund moneys to construct ferry boats on the same basis as in the construction of highways.

Two-thirds of the cost of the highway safety program is paid out of the Highway Trust Fund.

The 1970 act also permits trust fund revenues to be used for exclusive busways, passenger loading facilities, and fringe parking to serve any type of public mass transportation.

Mr. Speaker, under existing law, we can use the gasoline tax to construct a ferry boat, but not to purchase or construct a bus or rail transit system.

My proposal would change that and at least elevate mass transit to the same priority as ferry boat construction.

Mr. Speaker, the highway user, especially in the urban areas, does not derive the full benefit of the tax he pays into the trust fund. Less than 10 percent of Federal-aid mileage is found in urban areas; yet urban areas accounted for more than 51 percent of all Federal gas tax revenue.

In conclusion, to pretend that a diversion of part of trust fund moneys for mass transit would constitute a "breaking of faith" with the highway user is hardly defensible.

CONCLUSION

Mass transit is certainly not the complete answer to solving the energy crisis, nor to cleaning up our environment. Neither is mass transit a cure-all for our transportation problems.

However, by permitting local urban officials to use their share of trust fund moneys for mass transit, we are giving them an effective tool to help solve the energy crisis, clean up our air, use our land more effectively and transport people in a safe, efficient, and economical manner.

In order to restore mobility in our urban areas, locally elected officials must have the capacity to provide acceptable transportation alternative to highways. By adopting my proposal as an amendment to the Federal Aid Highway Act, by permitting local officials to spend some \$700 to \$800 million on mass transit we will have those alternatives.

FAITHLESS ELECTOR

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I submit that under the 12th amendment to the Federal Constitution an elector has no right to vote as he wishes.

The crucial point that is always overlooked by those who defend the freedom of the electors is that the 12th amendment became necessary because of a change in the role and function of electors. Electors—as contemplated by the framers of article II—were persons intended to choose dispassionately and independently the best man. However, the elections of 1792, 1796, and 1800 dramatically changed the essence of electors. With the rise of political parties, the

role of the elector evolved from one of exercising discretion to one of executing instructions. Were it not the fact that the office of elector had become ministerial by 1800 so that all of Republican electors voted for both Jefferson and Burr—as instructed, the 12th amendment would not have been necessary.

Thus, when the framers of the 12th amendment referred to electors, they did not mean—as did the framers of article II—that electors were free and independent. Rather, they referred to electors as they knew them—ministers of political parties. Consequently, I find it a bit incongruous to impute to the word “electors” in the 12th amendment a freedom and an independence that was, even as early as 1804, a historical anachronism.

In other areas of constitutional interpretation, we adopt historically contemporaneous concepts to define terms. The first amendment right of free speech does not protect obscenity because the framers did not think of it that way. And the seventh amendment right to jury trial does not grant that right in a suit for an accounting because the framers did not think of it that way.

Of course, there are instances when the development of the law has deviated from historic considerations. But all such changes were accomplished purportedly to modernize the law. The view that electors have discretion is the only instance that I know of where we would intentionally renounce historically contemporaneous concepts in order to widen the gap between the law and modern life.

I realize that as recently as 4 years ago, we grappled with this same constitutional issue. But I suggest that we overrule ourselves—as the Supreme Court so often does on difficult constitutional issues. Nothing in the 12th amendment, the subject of our interpretation, requires the belief that electors have discretion. History tells us that in 1804 the very opposite was true. Is there any one in this body who thinks it is good for the country to have electors who are free and independent?

It has been suggested that we are restrained by our own handwork—namely, section 15 of title 3, United States Code—from reaching the conclusion I suggest. But that provision only requires that we not reject an electoral vote “regularly given.” If the provision were directed to the issue before us, it would implicitly support my suggestion that this irregularly given vote should not be counted as cast. However, if the provision is directed to the problem presented by dual certification of the electoral vote of a State, which I believe it is, then the provision cannot control our decision here.

The several States have it within their power to bind their presidential and vice-presidential electors by statute. In Michigan, for example, the failure or refusal of an elector to vote for the candidates for President and Vice President appearing on the Michigan ballot of the political party which nominated the elector constitutes a resignation from the office of elector, his vote shall not be recorded and the remaining electors shall forthwith fill the vacancy. If all States would similarly provide, we would not in the

future have to deal with faithless electors.

WE MUST TIGHTEN THE PURSE STRINGS OF GOVERNMENT

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in recent months the President of the United States has delivered a simple message to the Congress of the United States. We must move quickly and decisively to control Government spending or be faced with “higher taxes, higher prices and a cut in purchasing power for everyone in the Nation.”

Over the years lipservice has been given to “balanced budgets” and “fiscal responsibility,” but the fact is, the liberal majority of the U.S. House of Representatives, as managers of the Public Treasury, has done an appallingly bad job. So bad has been the majority's performance that were the Congress to exchange places with the board of directors of General Motors or any other corporation, they would bankrupt the business in short order by their profligate spending policies. Fortunately or unfortunately, the U.S. Treasury has a greater capacity to absorb debt than any private enterprise. And the liberals in Congress have not lost any time in piling up that debt upon debt by adding millions upon millions of dollars to almost every program that comes before the Members for a vote. From fiscal year 1963 to fiscal year 1971, outlays—expenditures plus net lending—have increased from approximately \$111 billion to about \$211 billion. During the same period, receipts increased from \$106 billion to \$188 billion. Only once during that whole period, in fiscal year 1969, did receipts exceed outlays—\$188 billion as opposed to \$185 billion—for a budget surplus of about \$3 billion. And even then the budget was only in balance when the collections of the trust funds were incorporated into the total for Government revenues. In every other year since 1963, outlays were greater than receipts, resulting in budget deficits which ranged from somewhat less than \$2 billion in fiscal year 1965 to an alarming high of \$23 billion in fiscal year 1971. The almost continual annual deficits of course have led to substantial increases in the gross Federal debt. The debt increased from \$311 billion in fiscal year 1963 to \$408 billion in fiscal year 1971, the highest in American history.

Estimates for fiscal years 1972 and 1973 are very disturbing. The most current data available for fiscal year 1972 indicate an outlay level of \$233 billion versus anticipated receipts of \$207 billion, for an expected budget deficit of \$26 billion. Initial forecasts estimated an even greater deficit of almost \$39 billion. The expected reduction in the deficit is fortuitous rather than planned. A deliberate policy of expanding Federal outlays was adopted; only the inability to spend money fast enough—the incapacity to translate plans into on-going programs—prevented outlays from reaching the intend-

ed level. With lower outlays, the higher receipts than originally estimated, the fiscal year 1971 budget deficit is now projected at \$26 billion—less than expected but still the highest since the peak deficit years of World War II. Furthermore, the deficit for fiscal year 1973 is expected to be even higher; \$27 billion, with outlays programed at \$250 billion and receipts anticipated to be \$223 billion. Several nongovernment economists, however, predict that the eventual fiscal year 1973 deficit will be significantly higher than the official \$27 billion. Because of the continuing deficits, the growth in the public debt will persist; the debt will be about \$436 billion for fiscal year 1972 and is expected to reach \$477 billion at the end of fiscal year 1973. Interest on this debt is presently costing the taxpayers billions of dollars per year.

Some economic theorists have advanced the proposition that fiscal policy—the management of outlays and receipts to create desired budget surpluses or deficits—is a useful tool to counter the ups and downs of the business cycle. Implementation of such a countercyclical policy would in theory result in the creation of surpluses during periods with high levels of business activity and low rates of unemployment, and in the creation of deficits during times of depressed business activity and high unemployment. Budget surpluses tend to inhibit the economy whereas deficits serve to stimulate economic activity. Pursuit of this policy would, in addition, operate to increase the public debt during depressed periods but to decrease the debt during prosperous times. The history of the past few years indicates that there has been no consistent attempt to follow such a countercyclical policy and there is good reason to question the basic premises of the theory. Deficits have been produced both in depressed and prosperous years. Failure to control the increase in expenditures combined with failure to increase taxes in prosperous years, have, as I have already noted, added to inflationary pressures on the economy.

Overall Federal expenditures continue to increase even though costs for the Vietnam war have been declining. Vietnam war costs reached their peak in fiscal year 1969 when the incremental costs of the war—costs over and above what would have been spent for defense in peacetime—reached \$19.8 billion. War costs since then have declined to an estimated \$6.8 billion in fiscal year 1972 and an expected \$3.5 billion in fiscal year 1973. These latter estimates do not take into consideration the current expansion of the bombing program. But this decline in Vietnam costs has been accompanied by increases in income maintenance and Great Society programs. A recent study by the Brookings Institution indicates that from fiscal year 1963 to fiscal year 1973, defense and defense-related expenditures dropped from 53 to 34 percent of the total budget, while civilian outlays grew from 47 to 66 percent. Furthermore, the study concluded that many of the numerous social programs, costing billions of dollars, had failed, indicating that money and good intentions alone cannot provide solutions to social problems. Nevertheless, the Brookings experts predicted that

Federal expenditures for existing programs will increase in the future and that there will be demands for new services from the Government. With the tax reductions effected during recent years, the Federal Government will be hard pressed to find the resources needed to finance these increased demands.

The continued increases in expenditures, in budget deficits and in the national debt have fortunately led to renewed interest in proposals to reduce or control Federal expenditures, to balance the budget, and to limit the growth of the public debt.

We must recognize that, despite the control over the Federal purse strings given to Congress by the Constitution, in practice, the Executive exercises extraordinary control over spending. However, the President frequently cannot take the most desirable action in the public interest when Congress enacts appropriation bills in excess of budget requests. His only recourse may be to veto the entire appropriation bill, which in many cases will be impractical. It has therefore been suggested that the Chief Executive be given the item veto power, whereby he could prevent specific increases which he considers without merit or of low priority.

Several critics believe that there is presently too little coordination between expenditure and revenue decisions by Congress. Congress now views the budget largely as a series of separate and unrelated acts, with decisions on taxes and expenditures made independently by separate committees in each House. I believe that some way must be found to insure that Congress considers the budget as a whole and relates revenues to expenditures. One attempt to accomplish these purposes was the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which established the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget. The committee was to meet early in each session of Congress, consider the President's budget proposal in relationship to economic conditions and efficiency, set an annual ceiling on appropriations, and coordinate taxes with expenditures. This committee did not live up to expectations. It was probably too large to be effective, and the overall expenditure limit was difficult to implement. At any rate, the committee died after it was unable to agree on a ceiling in 1947 and after its 1948 ceiling was not enforced.

The Committee for Economic Development has recommended creation of a "joint budget policy conference," to include congressional leaders, majority and minority representatives from the revenue and appropriations committees of both Houses, and members of the Joint Economic Committee. This conference would study the budget as a whole, and would provide communication among the revenue and appropriations committees of the two Houses and the Joint Economic Committee.

There appears to be much room for improvement in the coordination of appropriations decisions. At present, appropriations are determined in some 13 separate appropriations bills, with little consideration given by the subcommittee responsible for each bill of its

effect on total new obligational authority, total obligations to be incurred, or the likely level of expenditures. The costs of the programs considered in each of the individual bills are not considered in relationship to the costs associated with the other bills. Thus, Congress does not look at appropriations and other expenditures as a whole and compare alternative programs. The omnibus appropriation bill, associated with the fiscal 1951 budget, was an attempt to introduce the necessary coordination, but this proposal met the same fate as the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget.

It is apparent that the Government has not heeded the advice of Thomas Jefferson when he said:

To preserve our independence, we must not let our leaders load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude.

Over the years, many Members of Congress have proposed various methods to bring to the attention of responsible Federal officials the need to restrict expenditures to available receipts and thus to assure a balanced budget. Unfortunately, as the record testifies, these efforts have not been successful. Expenditures keep climbing, deficits continue to occur, the national debt continues to increase. The time for positive and dramatic action has long since arrived. I believe that the only way to insure fiscal responsibility is by means of the constitutional amendment. I am therefore introducing a constitutional amendment which would contain the following provisions:

Total appropriations as well as total expenditures for any fiscal year cannot exceed total expected revenues for that year. There is to be no permanent increase in the national debt.

The existing debt is to be redeemed.

The above provisions may be suspended only in times of war or national emergency.

When Federal officials are forced to observe the mandates of this constitutional amendment, the financial integrity of the country will be insured. Less drastic steps have clearly failed. It is high time to adopt this amendment as rapidly as possible.

LEGISLATION TO DELAY ALL BUSING ORDERS

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to delay any and all busing orders pending the exhaustion of all appeals, including to the Supreme Court if necessary.

One would think that with all of the debate and deliberation which the 92d Congress devoted to the so-called Broomfield amendment to delay court-ordered busing pending appeal that this legislation would be unnecessary today.

Unfortunately, that is not the case.

The same Federal courts which have handed down massive and unprecedented forced busing orders are the same Federal courts which have, in some instances, refused to implement the Broomfield amendment to the Education Amendments of 1972.

This new version of my amendment leaves no room for misinterpretation, it offers no loopholes, no room for manipulation by those who would subvert the true intent of Congress. My measure delays all busing orders, regardless of the reasoning or rationale behind those orders.

Now, more than ever, my amendment is necessary. I need not remind my colleagues that two very similar massive busing orders have reached exactly opposite conclusions on appeal.

The first forced busing order that required busing of students across municipal and county lines was handed down in Richmond, Va. On appeal to the fourth circuit that order was overturned.

Later, in Detroit, busing across county and municipal lines was upheld by the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we are operating under one Constitution, how can we call this justice when one city must undertake massive forced busing while another is told that this same busing is not constitutionally required? The answer is clear. This is not justice.

My legislation is designed to perfect the inequality and obvious inequity of situations such as this. It merely provides each and every defendant the opportunity to have his case reviewed at the forum of last resort, the Supreme Court, before any busing begins.

Mr. Speaker, until the Supreme Court speaks out loud and clear on massive forced busing, this measure is absolutely imperative. I respectfully urge that it receive the immediate consideration that it deserves.

PRICE BILL TO RESCIND DES BAN

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, an old proverb says that one should not throw out the baby with the bath water. And yet, the Federal Food and Drug Act which has required a ban on the further use of diethylstilbestrol—DES—in animal feeds has accomplished this result.

The intentions of Congress in enacting legislation to protect the quality and purity of our food supply have undoubtedly been well meaning, and the pure food and drug laws have prevented the use of hazardous substances which might otherwise have found their way to the consumer in a strictly "buyer beware" marketplace.

However, our laws must be the product of reason and must deal with real instead of imaginary problems; they must not impose a "cure" that is worse

than the "disease." And yet in the application of the Delaney amendment toward the use of DES we have achieved an injustice which demands corrective action. Commissioner Charles Edwards of the Food and Drug Administration has acted to order a ban on DES in animal feeds in spite of the fact that no known hazard to human health has ever been established after two decades of prescribed use.

DES in levels established and monitored by Government has been a boon to the American meat-consuming public and has allowed livestock producers to provide our people with an abundant supply of wholesome and nutritious meat at reasonable prices. The Delaney amendment, however, because of its zero toleration standards, has banned this most useful product without any compensating benefits. If residues of a food additive appearing in food destined for human consumption are a definite threat to human health, we ought to take action to prevent their presence. However, because of increasingly sophisticated technology, our ability to find residue traces has reached a point where we can detect parts per billion and perhaps even parts per trillion. At what point do residues cease to be a threat to health, or put another way, what is to be gained by requiring a zero toleration of residues?

Mr. Speaker, the Delaney amendment requires the complete ban on DES in animal feeds assumingly because insignificant residues somehow pose a threat to health. Automobiles have killed more Americans than have been lost in all the wars this Nation has ever fought combined and contribute to pollution, congestion, and urban decay—and yet who among us will propose legislation to abolish the automobile, especially those of us who drove to work today?

Every year multiple thousands of Americans suffer injury and death from accidents in the home—but do these justify prohibiting the manufacture of bathtubs, table knives, or staircases?

Fluoride is a known poison—but are we to deny the obvious benefits of using fluoride in our water supply in trace amounts for the prevention of tooth decay?

The threat to human health posed by trace amounts of DES residues nowhere approaches the risks involved in smoking a cigarette or getting into an automobile—in fact, the threat is nonexistent according to the best information available. We need, therefore, to amend the law to provide for the flexibility needed to administer the law in a reasonable manner. Some Americans are livestock producers and they will be adversely affected by a prohibition on DES; however, all Americans are consumers. We all eat meat, and we will all pay the penalty of higher prices without any demonstrable improvement in the quality of the meat that comes to our dinner table.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to modify the Delaney amendment to permit the use of DES in animal feeds when residues arising out of such use will not induce cancer in the insignificant amounts detected.

THIS WAR MUST END

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, it is a tragedy that, despite the President's campaign promise of impending peace, the 93d Congress convened under the dark cloud of impending war. The unconstitutional and immoral destruction of North Vietnam, which occurred while Congress was not in session, is the clearest proof we have had yet that one man's temper tantrums—when that man happens to be President of the United States—are enough to cause immeasurable destruction on this earth. Someday, the history books will tell the story of why the bombing was renewed at the brink of peace. But we do not need future historians to tell us that President Nixon's thwarting the will of the American people has resulted in millions of people left slaughtered, crippled, homeless, and starving.

When I have spoken out previously in this Chamber against the travesty of this war, I have often referred to the wisdom and humanitarianism of Mr. Cyrus Eaton. Today I do so again.

On Mr. Eaton's 89th birthday, he was interviewed by a reporter from the Cleveland Plain Dealer. That account appeared in the December 28, 1972, edition of that paper.

In the course of the interview, Mr. Eaton repeatedly decried the madness of continuing the war. He went on to draw the compelling comparison between the actions of President Nixon and those of Adolph Hitler. Mr. Eaton concluded with his expression of faith that world opinion will stop President Nixon where American public opinion has failed.

Indeed, our country's diplomatic relations with one country have already been severely damaged because of this war. On December 29 we learned that the fury of Swedish public opinion and that government's critical statements about the bombing caused the State Department to take retaliatory action. We have recalled our ambassador to Sweden and have refused to receive the new Swedish emissary. If Mr. Eaton's prediction is correct, many other nations will join Sweden if the holocaust continues.

Included below is the accounting of Mr. Eaton's remarks on the occasion of his 89th birthday:

[From the Plain Dealer, Dec. 28, 1972]

EATON TURNS 89 DECRYING "MADNESS" OF VIET WAR

(By Allen Wiggins)

Cyrus Eaton walked into the room for an interview on his 89th birthday with a matter of urgency on his mind.

He carried a newspaper, its biggest, blackest headline blaring about the heaviest U.S. bombing of Hanoi and about the city's evacuation.

Throughout the interview yesterday, the old industrialist would return again and again to that headline, underscoring it with his finger, and talking about the "madness" of America's war in Vietnam.

He reminded the reporter that they had talked with two North Vietnamese officials together, less than two months before the election last November.

"They were very well-informed people," he said, "and they didn't believe that Nixon was serious in seeking a settlement. They felt he would make it seem to be a settlement until after the election."

"They were unfortunately correct."

"I do not believe that the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China will permit this to continue."

Eaton was being interviewed in his office on the 36th floor of Terminal Tower, the old Van Sweringen office, the office he still reports to every working day he is in the city, the office with its commanding view of the city and the lakefront.

We have a tradition of paying the old a condescending tribute—we say they still have lively minds. And what we mean is, they can recall vividly scenes from the past.

Just as we expect children to live in the present and young men to live in the future, we expect old men to live in the past.

Cyrus Eaton will not live according to our expectations. For an average young man to say of him that he still has a lively mind is like saying of the shark that it has a healthy appetite.

Eaton yesterday was as exercised over the U.S. bombing of Hanoi as the most rabid antiwar activist. Although he thought back, when asked, about earlier days, earlier wars, he wanted to talk about now.

He said he thinks Nixon has pushed the war to the breaking point.

"Under ordinary warfare," he said, the North Vietnamese "were able to take care of themselves."

"But this is a giant and brutal destruction, a great departure from ordinary warfare."

Eaton said he does not think China and Russia will stand by for what he called "the attempt to crush a little nation with massive bombing."

"It is time for the industrial leader, the banker, the businessman, to speak up against this," he said. "It is increasing the burden of taxation to sustain this madness, and increasing the cost of money to American industry."

Eaton recalled that the late President Eisenhower said to him, after his retirement, it would be "sheer stupidity" ("be sure you get his exact language," Eaton said—"sheer stupidity") to send American troops to fight in Indochina, next to the country with the largest standing army in the world and aided by the country with the most sophisticated weaponry in the world.

Eaton continued: "As President, he later told me, his chief problem was with his vice president, Richard Nixon, who implored the French to keep fighting and promised he would do everything in his power to persuade the American government to send troops."

Eaton also said: "It's no answer to say that the majority of Americans elected Nixon. The same thing can be said of Hitler. He was a madman who led the great German people to crushing defeats."

Just as the United States was forced to enter World War II to stop Hitler, Eaton said, the world community will arise to stop what he called Nixon's madness.

"I've been around for 89 years," Eaton said. "I've been an observer and a constant reader of history. I think I've learned something, maybe. And I think now is the time when the businessmen and the industrialists have to speak out."

"Wonderful things will happen in the next 89 years—things that will surpass the great inventions of the last 89—but only if we don't let this military madness carry us into a world war that destroys everything."

THE PURE FOOD ACT OF 1973

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today on January 3, the first day of the 93d Congress, I introduced a bill aimed at increasing the powers of the Food and Drug Administration to deal with the low level of sanitation and hygiene in the U.S. food processing industry. If enacted, this bill would effect one of the most significant and comprehensive reforms in the history of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. I am proud to have as cosponsors of this bill Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BELL, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. STOKES.

I first introduced this bill last January and I revised and reintroduced it in March. The impetus for the bill stems from the well known cases of food contamination, some resulting in death, as well as from complaints from my constituents. In addition, I made a personal observation of food processing inspection methods in New York City and conferred with FDA officials there.

In April 1972, the Government Accounting Office issued a report on the FDA to Congress entitled "Dimensions of Insanitary Conditions in the Food Manufacturing Industry." That GAO report confirmed my observations and underscored my contention that a revamping of the FDA's legal authority is imperative if the consumers of this Nation are to be guaranteed that food processed in the United States is fit for human consumption. Presently, the legal powers of the FDA do not enable that agency to compel food manufacturers to observe necessary standards of sanitation, and the intent of the Congress to protect the American consumer remains frustrated.

A careful analysis of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act reveals four serious shortcomings in the legal authority of the FDA.

First, the FDA does not know the identities of all current U.S. food manufacturers. At present, there is no requirement for a manufacturer to be licensed by the FDA in order to be permitted to do business. The FDA discovers the identity of manufacturers through a mixture of haphazard methods—reports of field agents who happen across new plants, complaints of aggrieved consumers, news reports, advertising, and voluntary reports of food producers. The FDA's list of U.S. food manufacturers is perennially out of date, because plants may open and close down without notifying the FDA. The GAO's report stated that—

FDA officials have advised us that there are food plants in existence which may not be included on the inventory because, in the absence of plant registration requirements,

FDA does not have an effective means of identifying all food plants subject to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

If the FDA is ever to be able to inspect all food processing facilities, it must be given a rational method of knowing who to inspect.

Second, the FDA is unable to control methods and machinery used in food production. It has no legal power to require manufacturers to install basic sanitary equipment such as sterilizers, temperature and timing devices, and warning mechanisms which insure the production of unadulterated food. In addition, the FDA has no authority to establish appropriate educational standards for employees who operate complex food processing machinery. By way of contrast, the Congress passed a law in 1970 to strengthen the drug control powers of the FDA. That legislation empowered the FDA to demand that drug manufacturers comply with standards for adequate equipment, analytical controls, and personnel training. In order to protect American food consumers from serious health hazards, the FDA must be given comparable authority over the food processing industry.

Third, the FDA is unable adequately to uncover potential public health hazards. In 1971, approximately 200 authorized FDA inspectors conducted 11,000 inspections of food processing plants. Since there are over 60,000 food plants in the United States, this indicates that the average plant is federally inspected only once every 6 years. The GAO report revealed that 40 percent of the food processing plants which it investigated together with the FDA were operating under unsanitary conditions. In over half of those unsanitary plants, the conditions were "serious in terms of either having potential for causing product alteration or having already caused product alteration." One-third of this latter group of seriously unsanitary plants had never been inspected by the FDA, and another one-third had not been inspected for over 2 years.

These figures reveal a pathetically inadequate record of Federal inspection. Although some States and municipalities conduct their own food plant inspections, those inspections frequently are not as thorough as Federal ones.

It is fair to assume that the headline cases of fatalities resulting from contaminated foods represent only the tip of the iceberg of the problem of impure foods being foisted upon the American public by a lazy and indifferent industry. The GAO estimates that 40 percent of food plants operate under unsanitary conditions, and FDA inspections indicate that sanitation in the food industry is actually declining, not improving. During the GAO-FDA investigations, the major observed unsanitary conditions included:

First. Rodent excreta and urine, cockroach and other insect infestation, and nonedible materials found in, on, or around raw materials, finished products, and processing equipment;

Second. Improper use of pesticides in close proximity to food processing areas; and

Third. Filthy equipment and dirty areas over and around food-processing locations.

The FDA-GAO inspection uncovered live roaches and flies in manufacturing and storage areas, rodent infestation of raw materials, mold-contaminated foodstuffs, dead mice, and rodent excrement in processing areas.

Fourth, the FDA possesses only inadequate authority to protect the public in cases of public health emergencies. When that agency discovers that a certain product already shipped in interstate commerce is contaminated, it cannot command the manufacturer to recall its poisonous wares. At best, the FDA must involve itself in lengthy court procedures to seize the shipment which may result in a decision too late to save the consumer victims. Also, if the FDA suspects that a pending shipment of food is contaminated, it must drag through the lengthy procedure of obtaining court orders to prevent the shipment.

American consumers are now fairly well protected in the fields of drugs, poultry, and meats by the FDA and the Department of Agriculture. It would be a rational and necessary step for this Congress to extend similar safeguards of the consumer's health to the food manufacturing industry as a whole.

The bill which I am introducing today would accomplish five basic objectives if it were enacted.

First, all food manufacturers, packers, and processors would be required to obtain a license from the FDA in order to do business. This would enable that agency to maintain an accurate listing of food-industry establishments and to inspect all facilities producing food in the United States. Operation of a food-manufacturing facility without a license would be a punishable offense. Licenses would be valid for a 2-year period, subject to renewal after a reinspection by the FDA.

The FDA would be given the authority to require, as conditions precedent to licensing or relicensing, that food producers: First, install necessary sanitary equipment, including sterilizers, temperature and time controls, and warning devices; second, use certain approved types of food containers; third, retain processing records for 5 years; fourth, meet employee educational requirements; and, fifth, obtain insurance to cover damages caused by production of contaminated food. Failure to observe FDA regulations could result in denial or suspension of a license.

Second, food processors would be required to report to the FDA all known instances of contamination, spoilage, and improper manufacture or packaging of foodstuffs which occur during routine food-processing operations. Failure to report to the FDA would subject the violator to loss of his license.

Third, the FDA would be given new powers to act swiftly in instances of suspected public health emergencies. If the FDA had reason to believe that a product is contaminated or adulterated, it would be empowered to embargo the shipment and sale of that product for a 48-hour period. During that time it

would conduct a thorough investigation of the product.

If the results of the investigation demonstrate that the product is indeed dangerous, the FDA could order a recall of the shipment in which the contaminated product was found, embargo the shipment or sale of all goods produced by that manufacturer, and suspend the manufacturer's license.

Fourth, new civil financial penalties of up to \$10,000 per violation of the Pure Food and Drug Act would be instituted. Present penalties under the act are criminal sanctions which prosecutors are often loath to seek and judges hesitant to impose, because of the onus attached to a criminal conviction. The establishment of civil penalties of a financial nature would therefore provide a more effective deterrent to violations of the pure food laws.

Fifth, the FDA would be required to put into operation a uniform system for receiving, processing, investigating, and responding to consumer complaints. In the past, consumer food complaints made to FDA offices often have been ineffectively handled. This bill would give the FDA a congressional mandate to organize its consumer investigation and response systems in a manner which insures that a valid consumer complaint made to the FDA will result in effective action.

In summation, this bill gives to the FDA the legal powers needed to protect the American public, including the wealthy, middle-income, and lower-income populations, from the serious health hazards caused by the scandalously inadequate level of sanitation found in the American food-processing industry.

This statement was prepared for delivery in the opening session of the 93d Congress on January 3, 1973, but could not be delivered on that day, because the House adjourned immediately after completing the formalities of organizing itself out of respect for Members who died during adjournment after the 92d Congress:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE PURE FOOD ACT OF 1973

Section 1. Title.

Section 2. This section describes the findings which gave impetus to the bill and the Congressional purposes behind the bill.

Section 3. This section amends Section 404 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act as follows:

Section 404(a) empowers the Secretary of HEW to promulgate regulations in the food processing area and to charge licensing fees.

Section 404(b) requires every person engaged in interstate food processing to obtain a license biannually from the Secretary of HEW.

Section 404(c) sets forth the conditions which must be fulfilled by an applicant for a license before the license can be issued or renewed by the Secretary of HEW:

(1) an applicant must furnish the Secretary with the name of his business and the location of all his food processing facilities,

(2) an applicant must provide a listing of all his food products,

(3) an applicant must inform the Secretary of the methods he uses to produce foods and the sanitary devices which he employs, and

(4) each food processing establishment of the applicant must pass an FDA inspection.

Section 404(d) requires a licensee to use food containers prescribed by the Secretary, to retain food processing records for five years, and to hold back from public sale any lots of food which the manufacturer believes to have been improperly manufactured and to report to the Secretary before releasing any such suspected products for sale.

Section 404(d) requires a licensee to:

(1) use food container prescribed by the Secretary

(2) retain food processing records for five years

(3) hold back from public sale any lots of food which the manufacturer believes to have been improperly manufactured and to report to the Secretary before releasing any such suspected products for sale

(4) report to the Secretary any instances of improper food manufacturing when that food has already entered interstate commerce

(5) open all food processing records for inspection

(6) use sterilizing equipment, temperature and time control devices, and equipment prescribed by the Secretary to warn when sanitary devices are malfunctioning.

(7) comply with educational and training requirements set by the Secretary for employees working in the food processing industry

(8) insure itself against damages caused by the improper processing of food

(9) comply with all regulations established by the Secretary.

Section 404(e) provides that the Secretary may revoke a license for cause according to due process.

Section 404(f) provides that a license may be altered, transferred, or surrendered only if the Secretary agrees and thirty days public notice has been given.

Section 404(g) instructs the Secretary to coordinate his efforts with those of State food regulating agencies and to establish a coordinated FDA program for gathering, investigating, and responding to consumer complaints.

Section 4 and Section 5. These sections amend sections 703 and 704 of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by expanding the inspection authority of federal food inspectors to include performance records and quality controls.

Section 6. This section amends the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by creating a new section, section 708.

Section 708(a) permits the Secretary upon notification by a licensee under section 404 or upon belief that food which is misbranded or adulterated has entered interstate commerce, to investigate within 48 hours to determine whether a public health hazard exists, to embargo suspected foods pending completion of that investigation, and to make public the results of the investigation.

Section 708(b) permits the Secretary, upon determination that a health hazard exists because of contaminated food, to order the recall of the shipment of which the contaminated food is a part, to embargo all food products of the offending producer, and to suspend the producer's license.

Section 7. This section amends section 303 of the present Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by increasing existing criminal financial penalties for violation of the Act and by adding new civil financial penalties of up to \$10,000 for each violation of the Act.

Section 8. This section conforms other parts of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to this legislation.

Section 9. This section makes the effective date of the Pure Food Act of 1973 six months after the date of enactment of the Act.

BACH MAI HOSPITAL EMERGENCY RELIEF FUND

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the week before Christmas, the Bach Mai Hospital—whose name in Vietnamese means "white blossom"—was completely destroyed by over thirty 500-pound bombs dropped from B-52's. This 950-bed civilian hospital, the largest in North Vietnam, contained extensive clinical laboratories and all of the auxiliary services required to operate a major teaching hospital. Twenty-five doctors and nurses, plus an unknown number of patients, died in these raids.

In response to this wanton act by our Nation, a group of concerned Americans has formed the Bach Mai Hospital Emergency Relief Fund. In its first 10 days of existence, the fund received donations totaling \$300,000. This sum represents 10 percent of the \$3 million needed to rebuild Bach Mai.

The purpose of the Bach Mai Hospital Emergency Relief Fund is to show to the world our outrage at the acts of our Government and at the same time to give Americans the opportunity to make available to the North Vietnamese some of the medical supplies and equipment they will need to replace the hospital. There can be no question of rebuilding the physical plant of the hospital as long as there is a danger that the bombs will continue to fall. Not until U.S. bombers are removed from their bases within striking range of Hanoi will it be safe to begin rebuilding. In 1970 and 1971 the people of North Vietnam undertook the rebuilding of the Vietnam-Czechoslovakian Hospital in Haiphong that had been bombed under the Johnson administration. Reconstruction was completed in February 1972, and 2 months later, on April 16, 1972, the hospital was once again bombed by U.S. planes sent this time by the Nixon administration. It was bombed again during Christmas. The immediate goal of the Bach Mai Hospital Emergency Relief Fund is to send medical supplies to help the North Vietnamese substitute decentralized and underground health-care facilities for the services provided in the past by Bach Mai.

Bach Mai Hospital was more than the largest center for health care in all of North Vietnam. Within its walls, some of the major research and teaching of future doctors and health workers took place. In addition, Bach Mai served as a center for emergency treatment of civilians in the Hanoi area.

Unfortunately, Bach Mai Hospital is not an isolated incident of U.S. bombing of civilian structures. From April 1972 to October 1972—before the massive Christmas bombings—all 26 provincial hospitals and every district hospital in North Vietnam had been hit at least once by U.S. bombs. In addition, during the week before Christmas and the few days there-

after, the following North Vietnamese hospitals were damaged or destroyed—according to the Boston Globe of December 28, 1972: Nga Tu So dispensary in Hanoi, Kien An Hospital and the contagious disease block of the Vietnam-Czechoslovakian Hospital in Haiphong, the An Duong dispensary in Hanoi, the Hoai Duc Hospital in Ha Tay province, the tubercular diseases Hospital in Bach Thai province.

The campaign will attempt to involve as broad a spectrum of the American people as possible, with individuals, organizations, and church bodies who have the confidence of large numbers of Americans and the capacity to involve them in a successful campaign. A partial listing of sponsors of the Bach Mai Hospital Emergency Relief Fund includes: Ramsey Clark, Arthur Miller, Julian Bond, Dr. Charles E. Janeway, Salvador Luria, Rt. Rev. Robert DeWitt, Leon Eisenberg, M.D., Erik Erikson, Bishop Thomas Gumbleton, Rev. David Hunter, Representative Robert Drinan, Bishop John Wesley Lord, Rt. Rev. Paul Moore, Jr., Albert Szent-Gyorgyi, George Wald, Dr. Charles Mayo III, and Dr. Herbert Abrams.

Events of this campaign will range from benefit concerts to direct mail solicitations to individual donations, however, the backbone of this massive fund-raising effort will be street corner and door-to-door solicitation by thousands of Americans across the United States. These efforts will thus constitute a message: that we, as American citizens, believing life is precious and all human beings are created equal, want the bombing to stop once and for all, with no further tactics of deception or acts of violence by the U.S. Government.

The campaign for Bach Mai Hospital is being cosponsored by the Medical Aid for Indochina Committee—MAI—Medical aid for Indochina has been operating for more than a year and in that period of time has sent over \$100,000 worth of medical supplies and equipment to the people of Indochina through the Red Cross Societies of North Vietnam, and those areas of South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia being attacked by the United States. Medical Aid for Indochina has established reliable information and transportation channels to provide the American people with a method of responding to the medical needs of the people of Indochina and a way of joining the rest of humanity in protest against the senseless brutality of the U.S. Government.

Contributions to the Bach Mai Hospital Emergency Fund may be sent to 140 Sixth St., Cambridge, Mass., 02142.

PRICE REINTRODUCES PRAYER AMENDMENT

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing legislation which

I believe has the strongest support among the American people, legislation which was among the unfinished business of the 92d Congress.

Very simply, this constitutional amendment would permit voluntary prayer in our Nation's classrooms. While I am opposed to any legislation which would combine the powers of church and state, likewise, I cannot condone actions by our courts which would jeopardize the free exercise of our basic freedoms outlined in the Bill of Rights, including freely given expression of thanksgiving and prayer to God in public institutions.

Mr. Speaker, each day the U.S. House of Representatives begins its proceedings with a prayer to God. And the U.S. Congress has sanctioned the motto "In God We Trust" upon the currency of our Nation. To deny our great historical record as a religious, God-fearing Nation would be a great disservice to those whose sacrifices laid the foundations which have been our great strength. Let us not deny to our children the lessons of respect and reverence so essential to their well-being as whole citizens. Our schools are more than a place to learn the mechanics of English; they are and ought to be a source of inspiration and moral strength which will contribute to the betterment of future generations of American citizens.

I believe the enactment of my constitutional prayer amendment would give the American people a direct voice in deciding the important question currently unsettled. The Congress would through the ratification process turn this matter over to the States and the people therein for final disposition. It was in this manner that the 18-year-old vote issue was resolved, and I believe this is in keeping with the best traditions of the American political system.

Mr. Speaker, let us act without delay to reestablish and redefine the right of each and every American citizen, young and old, to voluntarily give thanks and prayer to God in our public-sponsored institutions.

SAFEGUARDING PRIVATE PENSION PLANS

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit to my colleagues, and all others concerned about safeguarding the benefits of citizens who participate in private pension plans, two bills that I consider a "first step" toward our goal of securing retirement benefits earned during working years.

These measures are introduced today, on the first meeting of the 93d Congress, to underscore the immediate need for congressional attention to the plight of workers who, for one reason or another, do not realize the income to which they should be entitled upon retirement. I do not maintain that the two bills I put be-

fore the House today are the final answer to this complex problem, but they are the product of comprehensive studies in the field. It is my hope that they will serve as the vehicles by which we can renew our efforts to solicit constructive suggestions for reform of the private pension system, and fashion legislation which will eventually result in the enactment of meaningful safeguards for the rights of retirees.

It is my intention to call for hearings in Washington early next month before the General Subcommittee on Labor, and to press for early action on this issue.

VOTING ATTENDANCE REQUIREMENT FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a joint resolution which, if adopted by the Congress and ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, will amend the Constitution by requiring Members of Congress to be recorded on at least 70 percent of the rollcall votes during a session of Congress or have their office declared vacant.

The purpose of the bill is to require Members of Congress to do what they are elected by the people to do—represent their constituents by voting on legislation before Congress. My bill is really quite simple. It would merely amend the Constitution of the United States in such a way that, if a Member of Congress is not recorded on at least 70 percent of rollcall votes of the House or Senate, the office becomes vacant and the State from which he is elected is notified of the vacancy. The only absences that would not be included in computing the 70-percent voting requirement would be those when a Member of Congress is excused or necessarily prevented from being present due to illness or official business.

In my opinion, justifiable absences should not count against a Member, but it seems to me that, especially in light of the salaries received, we ought to be working and voting much more than some are doing at the present time.

What is wrong with an amendment requiring a Member of Congress to be present to do the job the voters are paying him to do? Absolutely nothing, in my opinion. For the voters have a right to expect us to be here in Washington tending to business.

Contrary to what some have said about the Congress, I am not yet ready to concede that we do not have the will to police ourselves and that Congress will not live up to its responsibilities by seriously considering this much-needed amendment.

I for one intend to do all in my power to see that this amendment is adopted and ratified by the States, and I urge you to join with me in that effort.

FLEET AID CORP.'S NEW WARRANTY PROGRAM

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Irwin Tucker, president of the Fleet Aid Corp., of New York, has written to me to tell me of a new service warranty program to protect the consumer which I feel certainly should be brought to the attention of the Congress and the public with the idea that possibly more organizations will follow their lead in developing this type of program.

The letter follows:

FLEET AID CORP.,

New York, N.Y., January 2, 1973.

The Honorable PETER A. PEYSER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is well known that you are extremely interested in consumer affairs. I would like to call your attention to a new program regarding automobile safety and warranty protection.

Automotive repair costs, as you may well know, have risen considerably in recent years. The quality and costs for such work leaves much to be desired. The Congress has already enacted legislation concerning automobile safety standards and I think that now is the time for the development of standards covering automotive repair work.

A step in this direction was recently taken by Fleet Aid Corporation, of New York, an independent automobile service and maintenance specialist. This organization has developed a unique, comprehensive maintenance and service warranty program which offers the consumer complete protection against the costliest type of automobile breakdown in new and used cars.

The Fleet Aid program includes a 12,000 mile or 12 month, whichever comes first, power train warranty program for buyers of new and used cars. The power train of an automobile includes the engine block, head and all internal parts, intake manifold, transmission in oil case and internal trans-

mission parts, torque converter, drive shaft, universal joints, rear axle and differential.

This warranty program has already been introduced by Ford dealerships and has been proven successful in creating customer confidence in the purchase of 1973 models, as well as Ford produced used cars, the last four model years, which Ford dealers acquired as trade-ins or used for their lease and rental operations.

This warranty assures buyers that each automobile is thoroughly inspected, tested and in good running order before leaving the dealership. This same warranty program has been in effect for some time with Hertz and other rental companies covering all American made automobiles that are sold directly to the public.

This unique power train program is considered by many in the automotive industry as a major breakthrough in protecting the automobile buyer. In the past, used car buyers usually receive a 30 day warranty, from the date of purchase. Today, this Fleet Aid/Ford power train warranty commences after the manufacturers warranty expires on the 1973 models. On used cars, this warranty program stays in effect for 12 months or 12,000 miles, up to 62,000 miles on the odometer, from the date of purchase.

Fleet Aid has developed an emergency road service option as part of their consumer protection program. Should a Ford customer's car breakdown, he can call the selling Ford dealer if the breakdown is in his general area. If not, he has a toll-free Fleet Aid telephone number to call and the dispatcher, who is on duty 24 hours a day seven days per week, will direct him to the nearest of the Fleet Aid 3,000 affiliated service stations and repair centers. The most important part of this emergency road service program is that a motorist will never be stranded, no matter what time of day or night they need help.

Fleet Aid Corporation has been in the automotive maintenance and service business for five years handling maintenance and service of automobiles which are leased and rented to the public by major fleet owners. Their activities, from Maine to Florida, from coast to coast, has generated many fine comments for their high quality of work and their standardization of repair costs no matter where a vehicle breaks down.

Cordially,

IRWIN TUCKER, President.

A BILL TO REDESIGNATE NOVEMBER 11 AS VETERANS DAY

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1973

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to redesignate the 11th day of November of each year as Veterans Day.

In 1968, the Congress changed the observance of several legal holidays, including the designation of the fourth Monday in October as Veterans Day, for the purpose of providing 3-day weekends for our citizens. However, while this action seems reasonable and justifiable in the observance of such holidays as Labor Day and Columbus Day, I believe we have erred in applying this concept to Veterans Day. Veterans Day, which was originally known as Armistice Day, marked the closing of World War I in 1918, and was set aside as a special day of thanksgiving and remembrance for the great sacrifices of our servicemen and women during that conflict.

After World War II, Veterans Day gained new significance as our Nation paid new respect and honor to the millions of Americans who stopped the tyranny which threatened to engulf the world.

Veterans Day is not just an ordinary holiday, an excuse to get away from it all. Let us recall what those who have served our Nation proudly in the Armed Forces of the United States have contributed to our lives and our freedom. As a veteran of the Korean war myself, I know that I share the sentiments of all those who have served to defend our Nation—Veterans Day is a day for pausing and remembering, and I hope that the Congress will see fit to enact my bill which would restore the unique purpose and observance of this day of thanksgiving that our Nation has withstood the test by fire in the crucible of war.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, January 9, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

He that would love life and see good days, let him keep his tongue from evil and his lips from speaking guile.—I Peter 3: 10.

O God, our Father, who art the source of all our being and the goal of our nobler efforts, we thank Thee for this quiet moment when facing crucial issues, and carrying heavy responsibilities. We can turn away from things seen, give expression to our faith in the reality of the unseen and affirm once again—in Thee do we put our trust.

In the secret place of the Most High may we tap the spiritual resources which give to us strength of character, loyalty to high ideals, love for our country, and such courage that we may keep ourselves devoted to the right as Thou dost give us vision to see the right.

Bless our President, our Speaker, these representatives of our people, and all the citizens of our dear land. Let freedom ring from shore to shore, let justice rule, and good will reign in the hearts of all.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 1. Joint resolution extending the time within which the President may transmit the budget message and the economic report to the Congress and extending the time within which the Joint Economic Committee shall file its report.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS-ELECT

The SPEAKER. Will any Member-elect who has not been sworn come to the well of the House and take the oath of office.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS, of Michigan; Mr. WHALEN, of Ohio; and Mr. RUPPE, of Michigan, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.